COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

UPDATE

ON IMPLEMENTATION OF

CHANGE & REFORM

RECOMMENDATIONS

December 1996

Report Web site: *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

Questions and comments concerning C&R should be addressed to:

Mail: Chair, Strategic Planning Committee
Office of Vice President for Research & Information Technology
203 Administration Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523-2001

E-mail: *spc@vines.colostate.edu*

Voice mail: 970/491-5255

Update on Implementation of Change & Reform Recommendations

December 1996

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

What was the university trying to do? Beginning in the Summer of 1994, the university undertook steps to define and recommend changes and reforms (C&R) to better equip it to meet significant internal and external challenges. This broad-based self-study and subsequent recommendations for implementation were intended to sustain and improve university programs and activities in both pragmatic and philosophical terms. C&R reminds us that changes and reforms are essential - that our personal and institutional commitment to excellence must always be open to questioning and finding better ways of achieving the university's mission. In specific terms, the C&R recommendations served as mandates for action, the implementation of which will be sustained through their key linkages to university strategic planning in the identification, development and prioritization of strategies.

How did the university do it? The process started with a reaffirmation of the rationale for C&R and defining principles for identifying where and how changes should be made. Operating on the premise that nothing was exempt from scrutiny, the university community identified candidate activities and processes. This input that led to specific recommendations for action coming from the C&R Subcommittees on Academic Program Reform (AP) and Academic Support (AS).

The Subcommittees presented their recommendations to the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) in three reports (*January*, *May* and *September 1995*). The SPC solicited comments from the university community on each of these reports. Comments were received and integrated into the SPC's recommendations to the President in May, October and December 1995. The SPC recommendations either concur, modify or reject the original Subcommittee texts. A summary of these recommendations, President Yates' response, and implementation status were provided in the *December 1995 Comprehensive Report on Change & Reform*.

What is this report all about? The on-going need for accountability and reporting to the university community on the status of these recommendations was codified in C&R recommendation 3AS.03, Follow-up Report on C&R Recommendations. This report formally responds to that charge and, for each recommendation, provides:

    a. **Subcommittee Recommendation:** Original text of the subcommittee recommendation
    b. **SPC Recommendation:** Recommendation forwarded to the President
    c. **Rationale:** Rationale for any difference between SPC recommendation and original text
    d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation:** President's response and charge
    e. **Current Status:** Implementation status of SPC recommendation

In most cases, items (a) through (d) are unchanged from the *December 1995 Comprehensive Report on C&R*. Item (e) summarizes all action from finalization of the original recommendation through December 1996.

Has C&R been completed? Implementation continues and will be reported periodically to the university community.

How is this report organized? This report is organized the same way as the *December 1995 Comprehensive Report on C&R*. Recommendations are numbered to reflect source by report date and originating Subcommittee:

- Numbers in the prefix relate to the date of the original subcommittee report:

  1AP or 1AS: 1st Report of Subcommittees - January 1995
  2AP or 2AS: 2nd Report of Subcommittees - May 1995
  3AP or 3AS: 3rd Report of Subcommittees - September 1995

- *AP* if from the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform; *AS* if from the Subcommittee on Academic Support.

Recommendations addressing related issues are grouped together under broad topic areas:

Specific recommendations are located on the following pages.

Please note: If a recommendation was replaced in its entirety by another (e.g., 1AP.03 by 2AP.01), only the final recommendation is included in this report (e.g., 2AP.01).

Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform:

Recommendations of the Subcommittee on Academic Support:

WWW locations:

This report has been posted on the Web at *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

Links have been provided, where possible, for other documents referenced in this report:

- Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual:
  http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/FacultyCouncil/table.html

- Analysis of FY 96 Activities Identified in the USP for FYs 1996 through 1999 (USP of June 1995):
  http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp

- Annual Update of the University Strategic Plan for FYs 1997 through 2000 (USP of June 1996):
  http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp

- Change & Reform Report 1 (January 1995):   *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- Change & Reform Report 2 (May 1995): *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- Change & Reform Report 3 (September 1995): *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- Comment: http://www.colostate.edu/Depts/PR/comment/index.html

- Comprehensive Report on Change & Reform (December 1995): *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- CSU Computer & Network Standards: *http://www.colostate.edu/Services/ACNS/itec/itec.html*

- Draft Implementation Plans (to be posted in mid-January 1997): *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- Enrollment Book, Fall 1995: *http://www.colostate.edu/Depts/OBIA/obiapub1b.html*

- General Catalog:
  http://www.productive.com/folio.pgi/csucatalog?

- Graduate & Professional Bulletin: *http://www.ColoState.EDU/Depts/Grad/index.html*

- Strategic Planning Framework (Updated December 1995): *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp*

- The Future of Colorado State University: The Context for Planning (Updated June 1995):
  http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REFORM

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY & EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY (3AP.01, which extends 1AP.02, Faculty Workload):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that Colorado State University should adopt and implement the following Faculty Responsibility Policy:*

1. *Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty members at Colorado State University. Teaching occurs: 1) in a variety of classroom settings and in other interactions with students, including advising and mentoring; 2) in research/scholarship/artistry activities; and 3) in outreach and professional service activities. These three categories traditionally define the dimensions of a faculty member's responsibilities as an educator.*

2. *This Faculty Responsibility Policy is stated as the normal responsibility for full-time regular faculty members. Consistent with overall University objectives and the mission of the unit, college deans or departmental administrators may vary the duties of individual faculty members, taking into consideration individual talents and professional goals. A faculty member's distribution of effort should be stated clearly in writing, used as a framework for evaluation, and reviewed annually and adjusted as appropriate. Effort distributions for untenured faculty must provide sufficient opportunities to demonstrate appropriate levels of competency and accomplishment in all components of faculty responsibility.*

3. *The normal distribution of effort for full-time regular faculty members in each major area is as follows:*

    Classroom Instruction, Advising, and Mentoring (50%): The normal instructional load for an academic year is 15 credits, of which 12 credits are regular classroom courses. The remaining 3 credits can be either regular classroom courses or credit hours of one-on-one instruction, such as independent studies, direct supervision of doctoral theses, clinical training, art or music instruction, or similar activity equivalent to a 3-credit course. Advising and mentoring, which take many forms, also are required of all faculty members. All aspects of instruction (including time preparing for lecture, grading, and meeting with students), advising, and mentoring constitute approximately 50% of the normal effort.

    Research/Scholarship/Artistry (35%): All faculty members are expected to contribute to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. These activities range from the basic to the applied and generally are judged by the consensus standards of the discipline. To the fullest extent possible, these activities should include substantial student participation. Such activities constitute approximately 35% of the normal effort.

    Service/Outreach (15%): All faculty members are expected to play a service role in the activities of the institution and of their profession as well as an outreach role in the community, state, nation, or world. The usual pattern for beginning faculty should be a modest effort in this area that expands as careers become more established. These activities constitute approximately 15% of the normal effort with at least 10% focused on professional service and outreach.

    The performance standards within each of the three areas and the flexibility of individual distributions will be set by the department with oversight by the dean and the Provost. Appropriate demonstrations of the amount and quality of such work must be required for meaningful evaluation.

4. *Faculty with administrative appointments will have a higher percentage of effort devoted to service and have corresponding reductions in one or more other areas. However, departmental administrative faculty should have continuing responsibility for some effort in each area. Similarly, faculty members whose salary is paid in part from external sources will have distributions reflecting those commitments but also should retain some effort in each category.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop and implement appropriate policies and procedures to effect the basic tenets of the subcommittee recommendation.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Faculty responsibilities need to be defined on a consistent basis, including clearly articulated effort distributions in instruction, scholarship and service/outreach. These distributions need to reflect the differences in responsibility that exist among faculty in a research university such as Colorado State University. The polices defining effort distribution need to be flexible and recognize different modes and types of instruction, the different uses of faculty time directed toward teaching (with the need to maintain appropriate balance in undergraduate- and graduate-level instruction), research, and service/outreach existing currently and in the future. Well defined faculty responsibilities are the basis for all forms of performance evaluation.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Building upon activities begun in Spring 1995 and described in 1AP.02, the Committee on Responsibilities & Standing of Academic Faculty (CORSAF) of the Faculty Council has continued its deliberation on faculty responsibilities. Revision of the existing Section E.10, Academic Faculty Advancement in Rank (Promotion) Policy, of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* was discussed at the September 3, 1996 meeting of Faculty Council and should be completed by CORSAF in Spring 1997. After approval by Faculty Council, the revised policy will be submitted to the SBA. Implementation of a new policy will enable Colorado State University to be more accountable to its many constituencies and better utilize its human resources to achieve the teaching, research, and outreach missions of the university.**

FACULTY WORKLOAD (1AP.02, extended by 3AP.01, Faculty Responsibility):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends the development of a Faculty Workload Policy for Colorado State University within the following framework.*

The articulation of Faculty Workload should:

✍ *Reflect and express the totality and essence of the faculty's professional responsibilities;*

✍ *Be based on high professional standards;*

✍ *Capture the unique form and impact of the faculty's responsibilities in teaching, advising, research, artistry, outreach, and service;*

✏ *Relate appropriately to the mission of Colorado State University both as a land-grant and a Carnegie Class I institution;*

✏ *Recognize the necessary diversity of ways in which faculty teach, investigate, and serve, as well as the necessary diversity of balances among these professional activities; and*

✏ *Provide a credible benchmark for equity within the university and for legitimacy with those served by the university.*

Faculty Council Executive Committee should form a Special Committee, consisting of one faculty member from each college and the libraries and chaired by the Provost, to formulate a draft Faculty Workload Policy by May 1, 1995.

The Faculty Workload Policy, in its draft form, should be presented directly to the faculty for their consideration and discussion prior to presentation to Faculty Council for action.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Concurs and encourages expeditious Faculty Council consideration.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** To assure the development of a comprehensive faculty workload policy, Faculty Council deliberations should be conducted in the context of the extended recommendation 3AP.01 of the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Activities to implement this recommendation were extended and are in progress under recommendation 3AP.01. In Spring 1995, the Faculty Council Executive Committee appointed a Subcommittee on Faculty Productivity, chaired by Dr. Penelope Bauer, and consisting of six faculty, a Dean, the Provost/Academic Vice President and the Director of the Office of Budgets & Institutional Analysis (OBIA). This Subcommittee was charged with developing a recommendation on faculty workload that would take into consideration a broad draft CCHE policy statement on faculty productivity for all Colorado institutions of higher education.   The Subcommittee on Faculty Productivity's recommendation was forwarded to CORSAF, which is expected to complete its revision of Section E.10, Academic Faculty Advancement in Rank (Promotion) Policy, of the** *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* **in Spring 1997.   Subsequent implementation information is provided in 3AP.01.**

POST-TENURE REVIEW (3AP.02):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University implement a post-tenure review policy containing the following elements:*

1. *Post-tenure reviews will be conducted for all tenured faculty. Normally, these reviews will be conducted at five-year intervals and should be coordinated with the annual review process.*

2. *Each review is to be based on the standard promotion and tenure document, with emphasis on accomplishments since the last review, including a performance plan for the next review period.*

3. *Each review is to be conducted by a committee of three Full Professors, two from the faculty member's college (one from the department), and one from another college.*

4. *There are to be three review levels for Full Professors following promotion to that rank. A major evaluation is to be conducted to go to the third review level, and those who advance to this level will be designated as Meritorious Professors. The purpose is to recognize and reward those who have performed at an exceptional level of excellence and productivity after their promotion to Full Professor. Normally this evaluation will occur no earlier than 15 years after promotion to Full Professor. This evaluation should be conducted with the same formality as the process used for promotion and tenure and include external evaluations of the person's contributions and professional reputation.*

5. *Reviews will be used to ascertain whether or not a professor should be advanced to the next level. The evaluation committees may recommend advancement to the next review level or above or against advancement to the next level in this review cycle. If deficiencies are identified during the review process, a plan to correct the problems will be implemented by the professor and the departmental administrator.*

6. *Recommendations by evaluation committees will be submitted to the faculty member's department for its recommendation to the dean, the Provost, the President, and the governing board, where necessary.*

7. *Salary increases should accompany each advancement. The salary increase for advancement to Meritorious Professor will be at least $2500 in addition to the annual merit increases and will be funded from the annual salary exercise. In the event that no increases are allotted to the University in any given year, any automatic salary increases will be deferred until such funds become available.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Thorough annual evaluations of faculty need to be uniformly conducted across all academic units at Colorado State University. These annual evaluations shall form the basis for a periodic, comprehensive post-tenure review process. Procedures for conducting a comprehensive post-tenure review, directed toward both evaluation and professional development, should be developed and implemented expeditiously. However, the SPC does not recommend that these comprehensive reviews be combined with a new, unique academic rank and salary compensation system.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The requirement for annual reviews is stated in Section C.2.5. of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual*, but is not uniformly applied across all academic units. When conducted in a consistent, rigorous and thorough manner, these annual reviews can form an effective basis for a comprehensive post-tenure review system, directed toward both evaluation and professional development.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The university will implement new procedures for evaluating faculty performance that incorporate faculty effort distribution and workload. Revision of performance reviews will include periodic comprehensive reviews of the performance of tenured faculty (post-tenure review) as well as comprehensive mid-probationary term reviews of tenure-track faculty. The new policy will specify when such**

reviews will occur and possible outcomes. The expected revisions to the current Section E.2, Responsibilities of the Academic Faculty, of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* will more clearly define expectations of faculty with respect to teaching, research, and service (outreach) and establish general guidelines for establishing effort distribution and workload.

Discussions about the development and implementation of new policies regarding faculty performance evaluation and establishing guidelines for faculty effort distribution and workload were initiated in Spring 1996. Intensive deliberations on these issues were conducted by CORSAF during Fall 1996 and resulted in a new section of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* that deals with faculty performance evaluations. The manual's new Section E.10, Academic Faculty Advancement in Rank (Promotion) Policy, was approved at the December 3, 1996 meeting of Faculty Council and will be submitted to the SBA for its approval in Spring 1997.

SENIOR REDUCED APPOINTMENT (3AP.03):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University establish a policy authorizing Senior Reduced Appointments. The appointment and its terms must be determined to be in the best interests of the unit and the University by the department administrator, the dean, and the Provost. This appointment will require the following:*

1. *Agreement of the faculty member, department, college, and Provost.*

2. *Specification of the portion of appointment reduction, which can be fixed or phased. If the portion of reduction is fixed, the appointment may not exceed a half-time appointment. If the portion of reduction is phased, the appointment may exceed a half-time appointment only during the first two years.*

3. *Articulation of a detailed plan for the faculty member and for his/her department that defines an appropriate level of instructional responsibility for the faculty member.*

4. *Only tenured faculty members who have reached 55 years of age and have provided 10 years of service to Colorado State University will be eligible.*

5. *Reduced appointments can be approved only if they are for a specified term of at least one year and no more than five years.*

6. *Upon the completion of the specified term, the faculty member will be fully retired.*

7. *Upon retirement, former faculty members will continue, as they are now, to be eligible for annual temporary appointments.*

8. *The tenure of the faculty member on a reduced appointment will be continued during the period of the specified term.*

9. *The dean of the college of the faculty member proposing a Senior Reduced Appointment may request of the Provost, to whom all salary lines return, that the released portions of the faculty member's salary be retained.*

Senior reduced appointment is not a faculty right but a benefit. Not all requests will necessarily be approved and not all terms will necessarily be approved for five years.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs, after modifications to assure consistency with current retirement programs and policies and that the term of the senior reduced appointment (SRA) be defined in a manner consistent with the transition of faculty from full-time to full retirement, that a policy of allowing SRAs be implemented, and that it be closely tied to policies concerning faculty responsibility and annual performance evaluations.

Item 8 should be amended to read as follows by the addition of the italicized sentence: "The tenure of the faculty member on a reduced appointment will be continued during the period of the specified term. *At the end of the specified term, tenure will be terminated.*"

Addition of Item 10: "Persons on a SRA will not be eligible for sabbatical leave."

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** SRAs can be designed to be of significant benefit to both the university and faculty persons by assisting transition to full retirement while performing useful functions at the university. As currently written, however, the recommendation is not consistent with PERA and DCP retirement requirements.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, Faculty Council and Vice President for Administrative Services, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. An *ad hoc* committee's recommended changes to the current Transitional Appointment Policy (Section E.4.5, *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual*) were not adopted by the Faculty Council and requests for transitional appointments longer than four years for persons enrolled in PERA are not being approved by the Provost/Academic Vice President. The Senior Reduced Appointment policy, which would replace the current Transitional Appointment Policy, needs to be consistent with both PERA and DCP retirement requirements. The Director of Human Resource Services is working with Faculty Council (CORSAF) and the Provost's Office to find a way to resolve current differences and develop a transitional appointment policy during Spring Semester 1997 for faculty who have DCP.**

ANNUAL REVIEW (3AP.04):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the Provost, through the Council of Deans, develop a single form for faculty to complete for annual department reviews. This form should be consistent with the form used for tenure and promotion applications and include a one-page summary and a performance plan.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, with implementation.

e.   **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. A more standard reporting procedure will be developed during Spring Semester 1997 for faculty annual reviews. The process will include a single one-page form that includes an evaluation summary and performance plan. It will be consistent with the form used for tenure and promotion applications.**

<h1 style="text-align:center">UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS</h1>

ACADEMIC CORE (3AP.05, which is in addition to 1AP.01, Academic Core):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends:*

1. *The University Curriculum Committee develop an Academic Core for all Colorado State University undergraduate students.*

2. *The general purpose of the Academic Core will be to articulate a set of curricular requirements that constitutes the essential, developmental foundation for every Colorado State University student's overall program of study; gives coherent direction and integration to students' general and specialized learning; and defines the academic foundation for educated citizenship as well as for competency in specialized areas of study.*

3. *The Academic Core should be developed and delivered within the framework of the following guiding principles.*

   - *Students must have the opportunity to develop an understanding of various forms of knowledge, methods of inquiry, and skills, particularly communication and logic and critical thinking.*

   - *Students must have the opportunity to develop an understanding of their cultural heritage, its complexities and diversity, and its relationship to other cultures and to international life.*

   - *Most subject matter is interrelated, complex, varied, dynamic, and international. It should be taught accordingly, rather than as if it were isolated, one-dimensional, uniform, static, or parochial.*

   - *Teaching should be guided by how students learn so that it will foster the development of knowledgeable, competent, and responsible citizens.*

4. *The Academic Core should:*

   - *be approximately equivalent to one year of studies, primarily in the arts and sciences;*

   - *encourage colleges and departments to build within and beyond Core requirements in order to formulate foundations specifically relevant to their disciplines;*

   - *be composed of a limited number of targeted courses substantively designed to implement the general purpose and guiding principles of the Academic Core;*

   - *be organized so that all identified Academic Core courses will be reviewed regularly to ensure that they are effectively serving the purposes for which they were designated;*

   - *ensure that all multi-sectioned Academic Core courses will be taught with common course descriptions, objectives, and syllabi;*

   - *incorporate "state of the art" technology where appropriate;*

   - *encourage faculty-student interactions both in and outside the classroom, including direct experiences with the processes and products of scholarly research and creative expression;*

   - *be completed by students prior to earning junior classification;*

     be publicized to high school students to encourage appropriate preparation; and

     be scheduled so that all qualified students needing a Core course to attain Junior status will be accommodated, and so that any qualified student denied access to a Core course will be guaranteed registration the following semester.

5. *The college deans should initiate a comprehensive, substantive reconsideration of the curricular structure of all undergraduate majors within their jurisdictions. The purpose of this exercise is to focus and integrate the curricular structure of each undergraduate major, to ensure that each undergraduate major is grounded in a sound academic foundation, to achieve efficiencies to the greatest extent possible by reducing curricular duplications and excessive fragmentation, and to link more coherently students' general learning in the Academic Core with their specialized learning in the major.*

6. *The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) should formally designate the Commission on the Undergraduate Experience subcommittee on Infrastructure, Curriculum, and Instruction as a subcommittee of the UCC. In addition to other responsibilities, this subcommittee could provide significant preparatory and support work for the development and implementation of the Academic Core.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The President charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, working in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to develop and implement a new academic core that is consistent with the general principles contained in the subcommittee's recommendations.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** There is a need to develop an innovative academic core for all Colorado State University undergraduates. To do this will require that we recognize the many unique features and constraints that characterize the existing major degree programs at the university, and the special needs of transfer students. Implementation of a new academic core may require bold initiatives regarding how the first two years of undergraduate instruction are organized at Colorado State University.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The university will implement a new all-university core curriculum that meets the changing needs of students and other constituencies. This is described in draft Implementation Plan 1, to develop and implement a new all-university core curriculum, including alternate methods of delivery, that is being provided to the university community in January 1997 for review and comment. The new core will enable graduates of Colorado State University to cope with the challenges of an increasingly interdependent, internationalized, complex, and technological world. A coherent and focused all-university core curriculum will be required of all undergraduate students and will: (1) constitute the essential, developmental foundation for every Colorado State University student's overall program of study; (2) give coherent direction and integration to a student's general and specialized learning; and (3) define the academic foundation for educated citizenship as well as competency in specialized areas of study.**

Discussions regarding the development and implementation of a new all-university core curriculum began in Spring 1996 and were continued at the Fall 1996 Leadership Forum. Further discussions and work on the core were conducted by the Faculty Council's University Curriculum Committee during Fall 1996, resulting in a document defining the objectives and guiding principles of the core curriculum. This document was discussed and approved at a special Faculty Council meeting on December 10, 1996 and will be the basis for establishing the new core curriculum. Work on selecting existing courses, revising existing courses, and/or developing new courses comprising the core will be undertaken during the next 18 months. In addition, discussions with external constituencies regarding the impact of the new core will be conducted during this period. A target date of Fall 1998 has been established for implementing the new core curriculum.

ACADEMIC CORE (1AP.01, which is in addition to 3AP.05, Academic Core):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that there should be a general sense of urgency regarding curricular reform, but not at the expense of appropriate discussion and investigation.*

Curriculum is and should be predominantly a faculty responsibility, but this principle does not preclude accepting input from faculty committees, administrators, or any other source.

Faculty Council and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) should move forward with Commission on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) recommendations and proposals for further study.

There are significant advantages to a coherent and rigorous academic core curriculum. As an initial step toward this goal, the Subcommittee supports elimination of the "B" list and streamlining of the "A" list in the University Studies Program (USP).

In addition, the University Curriculum Committee is asked to initiate a systematic and purposeful consideration of the University Studies Program that directly focuses on the challenge of how USP should respond to both the diverse academic needs of a comprehensive university and the common need to provide a shared knowledge foundation for educated citizens.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Faculty Council to consider the recommendation in the context of the Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform's recommendation 3AP.05 concerning the Academic Core.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. A special meeting of Faculty Council was held on April 18, 1995 to consider the recommendations in the Commission on the Undergraduate Experience (CUE) report. Recommendations 1 and 2, dealing with goals for the undergraduate experience and measuring their accomplishment, and Recommendation 3, concerning the retention of the current four categories in the University Studies Program, had been previously passed.**

Recommendation 4, which would have required CO 150 (College Composition) and either SP 200 (Public Speaking and Discussion) or a discipline-based substitution in the Category I (Communication & Reasoning) of the current University Studies Program, was rejected.

Recommendations 5 and 6 were passed, dropping approximately 300 courses from the B lists of the University Studies Program. Recommendations 7 and 8, dealing with each department having a capstone course with a significant communications component, were sent back to committee to define the cost impacts associated with implementation before reconsideration.

Subsequent to 1AP.01, the C&R Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform made a second recommendation, **3AP.05**, concerning the academic core. This second recommendation defines the objectives and guiding principles for an all-university core curriculum that, when approved in accordance with university procedures, will replace the University Studies Program.

ACADEMIC ADVISING (3AP.06):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends:*

1. *The dean of each college should engage departmental administrators and their faculty and students in the development of a College Academic Advising Plan, to be submitted to the Provost, that articulates advising commitments, expectations, and delivery arrangements in the context of the following issues:*

    *   *what are the most effective current academic advising practices?*

    *   *what are the primary limitations or inadequacies in current academic advising practices?*

    *   *what modifications of current academic advising could preserve effective practices and improve problem areas?*

    *   *what role should University academic support units play in the advising process?*

    *   *what should be done to better integrate academic advising in the College with other academic programs and academic support units?*

    *   *what mechanisms for implementing, evaluating, and rewarding academic advising have been put in place?*

2. *Academic advising should be defined as an ongoing process, based on a collaborative relationship of students and advisers, that assists students in achieving their educational, career, and personal goals through the appropriate and effective use of relevant information and resources. Components of comprehensive academic advising include:*

    *   *clarifying the interrelatedness of learning;*

    *   *identifying the specialized knowledge and practices unique to every discipline;*

    *   *promoting the application of this learning and knowledge into the shaping of students' personal, professional, and intellectual objectives;*

☞ *assisting students with immediate concerns related to University policies and procedures.*

3. *The following guidelines for achieving high quality comprehensive academic advising, based on the 1993 Task Force Report on Undergraduate Advising, should be adopted. Academic advising:*

   ☞ *can be accomplished successfully in a variety of ways;*

   ☞ *is both a collaborative responsibility and the specific responsibility of an assigned adviser;*

   ☞ *should encourage students to critically select, organize, and utilize varied information to pursue and accomplish their goals;*

   ☞ *is built on personal contacts that include the articulation of students' individual needs and goals;*

   ☞ *is the responsibility of students, faculty, and staff, all of whom must take an active and informed role in the advising process.*

b. **Subcommittee Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the addition that the development of College Academic Advising Plans will address coordination with the advising activities performed by the HELP/Success Center.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The HELP/Success Center is currently advising all students who have not declared a major and provides advising to many others. It is important, therefore, that each college's plan be coordinated with HSC activities in an appropriate manner.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Two colleges have completed academic advising plans, and the others are due by March 1997. The review and approval process will be developed by the Provost in discussion with the Vice Provosts. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies has primary responsibility for review and comment, including checking for coordination with the HELP/Success Center.**

<div align="center">

STRATEGIC PLANNING RECOMMENDATIONS

</div>

STRATEGIC PLANNING (2AP.01, which replaces 1AP.03, Strategic Planning):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the President immediately initiate a process that will lead to effective refinements of the University Strategic Planning process, giving special consideration to the following planning issues:*

   ✎ *Strategic planning that anticipates and is responsive to new issues, circumstances, and fiscal conditions;*

   ✎ *Clarification of administrative responsibilities for development and implementation of the Strategic Plan and formation of a Strategic Planning Committee whose composition reflects that clarification;*

   ✎ *Prioritization of Aims, and of the Goals, Objectives, and Strategies among Aims;*

   ✎ *Limitation of the number of Strategies and of their total dollar value to realistic projections;*

   ✎ *Consolidation of Aims 5, 6, and 7 into a single support Aim that is essential to the accomplishment of Aims 1 through 4; and*

   ✎ *Effective implementation of strategic planning within routine university operations, including documentation relating to the implementation of planning priorities.*

   ✎ *Focus membership of the Strategic Planning Committee on Academic Deans and Vice Presidents. (1AP.03 amended by addition of this item.)*

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995):** Concurs, with the exception that the current membership of the SPC should be continued. The current membership is: Provost/Academic Vice President, and the Vice Presidents, two Deans, Chair of Faculty Council, Chair of CAP, Chair of B&FP, one undergraduate and one graduate student, one State Classified representative, and one Administrative Professional representative.

c. **Rationale (October 1995):** The membership, appointed by the President, represents a balance of persons from all parts of the university community. This balance is important because successful strategic planning includes all aspects of the university.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** SPC recommendation has been implemented.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): On-going.** *The Future of Colorado State University: The Context for Planning* **for FYs 97→ 00 was revised during Spring 1995. In response to the thrust of 1AP.03, as amended by this recommendation, the revised process increased the involvement of the Council of Deans (COD) and the Executive Budget Committee (EBC). At the beginning of each four year cycle (e.g., the June 1996 USP for FYs 97→ 00; the June 2000 USP for FYs 01→ 04) of the University Strategic Plan (USP), the COD and EBC propose prioritized objectives organized under each of the plan's five goals to develop the Strategic Planning Framework. Although the objectives are open for revision as necessary during each annual update of the USP, relatively few revisions would be expected, thus creating a stable**

strategic planning framework upon which strategies for their implementation can be developed during the course of each four year time period.

University-wide input was solicited on the draft revision of the planning/budgeting process and was incorporated where appropriate. Faculty Council considered and adopted the goals in the revised document at its meeting on May 2, 1995. The revised *Context for Planning* was approved by President Yates and published in June 1995.

The revised process was used for planning/budget hearings before the SPC and EBC in March 1996 and provided input for the completion of the annual update of the strategic plan. Each of the Academic Deans, the Library, Provost/Academic Vice President, the other Vice Presidents, Agencies, and the President proposed strategies focused upon effective implementation of *Strategic Planning Framework* goals and objectives. Strategies describe specific activities, including timeframe, resource requirements/source(s), and responsible party(ies). This proposing of strategies provides another opportunity for all the Academic Deans to actively participate in and shape the strategic plan.

During the Spring 1996 update of the USP for FYs 97→ 00, the SPC felt there was insufficient implementation detail about some of the plan's strategies. For this reason, the SPC identified six key strategies (Appendix C) within that USP which addressed recommendations from Change & Reform, SBA Areas of Strategic Emphasis, and Legislative Policy Areas for Higher Education (Appendix B). Detailed draft implementation plans were developed with comment and review by the Council of Deans and SPC during Summer and Fall 1996. Following university-wide review in January and early February 1997, these draft implementation plans will be finalized and will focus planning and budget (FY 98) hearing presentations in Spring 1997.

MISSION & GOALS (2AP.02):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that:*

The university officially adopt and promote a single, concise statement both of its mission and of its goals.

Such statements should be utilized to build community within the university and to project a common purpose to external constituencies.

The official statement of mission should consist, in large part, of material currently in the university catalog and other existing documents.

The official statement of university goals should be identical with the goals articulated in the current strategic planning process.

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995):** Concurs and recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, working with the Council of Deans, to develop a mission statement for consideration and adoption by the university.

c. **Rationale (October 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):**   Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The mission of Colorado State University is defined by statute as that of a comprehensive teaching and research institution. This mission statement is referred to in the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* while other mission statements appear in the *General Catalog*, the *Graduate & Professional Bulletin* and the *SBA Handbook*. The CCHE has adopted yet another mission statement for Colorado State University. These multiple statements suggest a lack of clarity, making it important that the university adopt a single, well thought out statement that is consistent with the goals defined in *The Context for Planning*.   By June 1997, the Provost will complete the recommended draft mission statement for submission to the appropriate review bodies.**

RETIREMENTS (2AP/AS.01):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *As a result of work done jointly, the Strategic Planning Subcommittees on Academic Program Reform and Academic Support recommend that the university plan for allocation of resources resulting from retirements.*

Given the academic mission of the university and the fact that academic faculty represent the largest category of salary dollars likely to be released by retirements, the Provost and Council of Deans should propose a plan for allocation of the significant resources likely to result from retirements over the next decade. The proposed plan should include:

✒ *Estimates of the likely retirements in the next 10 years and the amount of salary dollars likely to be released as a result;*

✒ *Recommendations for allocating resources resulting from retirements to high priority areas;*

✒ *Cost/benefit and feasibility analyses of incentives for retirements and, if applicable, a proposal for seeking modification of state laws and fiscal rules to permit such incentives; and*

✒ *Policies (including opportunities to continue to assist with advising, mentoring, teaching, or provision of other services) that will allow retired faculty to maintain their ties to university life and ease the transition from full-time employment to retirement.*

No later than December 1, 1995, the Provost should submit the proposed plan to appropriate bodies, including the Executive Budget Committee and Faculty Council Executive Committee, for review and action.

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995):** The SPC agrees that faculty retirements deserve more attention and incorporation into planning as the university moves forward to meet future needs, challenges and opportunities. However, the SPC feels the recommendation should be broadened to include more than the academic sector. With this in mind, the SPC recommends that:

1. The Provost/Academic Vice President, working with the COD, develop estimates of retirements in all academic sectors in the next 10 years and the resources they would release by March 1996. In a similar manner, the other Vice Presidents will estimate potential retirements in their respective areas.

2. Allocation of resources coming from retirements and all other sources continue to be based on the priorities defined in the USP.

3. The university administration continue to look for feasible ways to encourage retirements that are programmatically effective and beneficial to both the retiree and university.

4. Policies providing opportunities for faculty to continue teaching, research and scholarship, advising, outreach and mentoring as a part of a planned transition from full-time employment to retirement be continued and/or improved.

c. **Rationale (October 1995):** Although the majority of personnel reside in the colleges, there are large numbers of personnel associated with administrative offices. Estimates of administrative retirements and their related resources need to be developed.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the other Vice Presidents, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The Provost/Academic Vice President, working with the Council of Deans, is developing estimates of retirements over the next 10 years in all academic sectors and the resources they would release. OBIA has provided basic data and information to the Provost to support this effort. The expected completion date for assembling a list of potential retirements in the academic areas is September 1997. In a similar manner, the other Vice Presidents are estimating potential retirements in their respective areas.**

Allocations of all resources coming from retirements or other sources are currently being made according to the priorities of the University Strategic Plan.

An extensive study of retirement incentives that benefit both the employee and the university and also meet legal and programmatic requirements was undertaken during Spring 1995. This study included data and information from other institutions. This work provided extensive background on which subsequent efforts could build, but no retirement incentive proposal has as yet been defined that meets all these requirements. Currently, State Fiscal Rules do not permit financial incentives; however, the university is looking into potential modifications that may be pursued through official channels.

See 3AP.03 for the status of transitional retirement (Senior Reduced Appointments).

ACADEMIC STRUCTURE & COORDINATION (3AP.07):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform received a variety of proposals for reorganization and better coordination among colleges in order to meet the University's academic mission. In addition, each dean responded to a series of questions posed by this Subcommittee concerning reorganization. After careful consideration of many interesting and potentially beneficial proposals for reorganization, this Subcommittee recommends:*

1. *No colleges be combined, eliminated, or added at the present time.*

2. *Ongoing plans to combine departments and/or programs within colleges be encouraged and facilitated.*

3. *All units of the University continue to increase coordination with affinity units. (Examples of units that might benefit from coordination of activities are listed in an attachment to this recommendation.)*

4. *A document be prepared and distributed across campus that details the findings of the Application of the Strategic Plan (ASP) process that occurred at St. Malo, including actions that have taken place as a result of those findings.*

5. *A University-wide evaluation similar to the Application of the Strategic Plan take place on a periodic basis to ensure that each department and college is meeting expectations and contributing to the mission of the University.*

6. *The Provost, through the Council of Deans, examine programs, courses, and degrees to identify and eliminate unnecessary duplications.*

7. *The University should develop a policy on initiating and evaluating centers, institutes, laboratories, and other similar administrative units.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the general recommendation of the subcommittee especially since academic structure may be an important factor in developing and implementing a new academic core. The SPC also recommends that existing program review policies and procedures be reviewed and revised to ensure that every academic program is thoroughly and meaningfully reviewed at least every five years, that productivity data be included in such reviews, and that the results of these reviews be the basis for strategic planning in the academic units and at the university level. The SPC concurs that the results of the St. Malo report (Application of the Strategic Plan) be widely circulated. The SPC recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council committees, to implement the subcommittee's recommendations.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Rationale given in recommendation.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. One of the six key strategies identified in the University Strategic Plan for FYs 97→ 00 called for the revision of existing academic department/program review policies and procedures. An implementation plan for an improved review process (draft Implementation Plan 2) was begun in August 1996 and addresses this C&R recommendation. The new process requires that all academic programs undergo a comprehensive review at least every six years. Reviews will start with a self-study, including survey data in a standard format. The self-study document will be reviewed and evaluated by external disciplinary experts, the College Dean and Vice President for Research & Information Technology. Site visits by disciplinary experts appointed by the Provost and College Dean may also be performed. The new process calls for an additional review by an all-university Campus Program Review Team (CPRT) appointed by the Provost in consultation with the College Deans. CPRT's charge will be to assess the quality, productivity, centrality and cost effectiveness of the department/program and to prepare**

specific recommendations for improvements as appropriate. With this input, the department and Dean, with concurrence of the Provost, will prepare a plan that will integrate into the university's strategic planning and budgeting process.

During Fall Semester 1996, drafts of the new academic program review procedures were presented to the Strategic Planning Committee and Council of Deans for comment. The new procedures will be finalized by May 1997 after additional input is obtained from the campus community

RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION STUDY (3AP.08):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University examine its distributive practices and policies to ensure a distribution of all resources among colleges and units that is appropriate, consistent, and open to public understanding. The President should charge the Provost to:*

1. *Determine and articulate the University basis for the distribution of resources to clarify whether distributions are to be determined by quality, productivity, market forces, equity, historical practice, or a combination of factors.*

2. *Ensure that current distribution patterns are appropriate and consistent. Among the areas to be considered are number and funding source for tenure-track positions, base upon which salary increases are distributed, number of and funding for state classified positions, operating expense support, space allocation, and appropriate equity for salaries.*

3. *Make adjustments to University policy or practices necessary to ensure an appropriate and consistent distribution of University resources.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The university, through the strategic planning process, comprehensive program review, and the oversight of the Provost/Academic Vice President and other Vice Presidents, should ensure that resources are appropriately distributed within the university. Accountability in this regard is extremely important.

The SPC supports the President's intent to develop and implement a functional position management system so that the university can better monitor operating expenditures vs. those for personnel (faculty and staff). A functional position management system defines the number of FTE faculty and support positions with a corresponding level of E&G funding distributed to each academic unit.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Appropriate resource distribution requires both comprehensive and accurate data concerning unit productivity, quality, market forces, equity, etc., to inform administrative judgments on these matters. Such data are not consistently available at present. This need is part of the rationale for the SPC's revised 3AP.07 recommendation (Academic Structure) for revised and greatly improved academic program reviews, and concurrence with 3AP.10 (University Statistics). Based on good data, resource allocations and reallocations can be presented, justified and budgeted through the annual strategic planning and budgeting process.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the other Vice Presidents, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The on-going strategic planning process is being used to allocate all budget resources (reallocated and new) toward strategies identified as highest priority. An analysis of budget allocations and one-time distributions is done each year and reviewed by the EBC and Faculty Council Committees on Academic Planning and Budget & Financial Planning. This analysis documents the relationship between budget allocations and USP priorities. The FY 96 analysis was expanded to include a narrative report on activities associated with each strategy of that year's USP. This report (*Analysis of FY 96 Activities Identified In the Annual Update of the University Strategic Plan for FYs 1996 Through 1999, June 1995*) is posted on the WWW at *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp* and hard copies may be obtained through the Office of Vice President for Research & Information Technology.**

Comprehensive and accurate data concerning unit productivity, quality, market forces, equity, etc., are required to inform appropriate administrative judgments regarding resource distributions. Although necessary, such data are not consistently available at present. This need is also part of the rationale for C&R recommendation 3AP.07, Academic Structure, which called for revised and greatly improved academic program reviews, and which is in concurrence with 3AP.10, University Statistics. Based on good data, resource allocations and reallocations can be presented, justified and budgeted through the annual strategic planning and budgeting process.

Improved resource distributions require development of a functional position management system for Academic Faculty, Administrative Professionals, and State Classified Personnel. The university is moving forward to select a new Human Resources Management System that will include an automated position management module. Until these plans are in place, position management is partially accomplished through the setting of base salary levels.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR & ENROLLMENT (3AP.09):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the University deal with pressing and related enrollment issues as follows:*

   1. *Academic Calendar*

      The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should address issues relating to the academic calendar and scheduling of classes. Issues include increasing the number of times that courses are offered, offering courses during non-traditional times, increasing the number of courses offered in concentrated blocks of time, evaluating summer session, exploring alternative calendars (such as a trimester system), and modifying course scheduling to utilize new delivery technologies.

2. *Minimum Course and Program Enrollment*

   The University should adopt a minimum enrollment policy (for example, the CCHE guidelines set a minimum of 15 students for lower-division courses; 10 students for upper-division courses; and 5 students for graduate courses).

   The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should create and enact a plan to address continuation of courses and programs with a history of low enrollment.

3. *Unmet Student Demand*

   The Provost, through the Council of Deans, should obtain and interpret data regarding unmet student demand and develop a long-range strategic plan for dealing with existing and projected problems.

4. *Classroom Capacities*

   The Facilities Services staff should determine the maximum capacity of each classroom (no greater than that dictated by local fire code) and post this number by the door of each room.

   Facilities Services staff should be responsible for maintaining the appropriate number of functional seats in each room.

   Room scheduling personnel should be responsible for oversight of course enrollment, allowing no more students in any section than the specified maximum capacity of each room.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Generally concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The university must be prepared to meet the changing needs of students and projected enrollment increases through an efficient use of the academic calendar and class scheduling. The university should conduct appropriate student surveys to determine need and demand, and should be prepared to experiment offering classes during non-traditional times (e.g., evenings, Saturdays). It may be necessary to more fully utilize the Summer Session to meet student demand in some academic programs. It also may be necessary to eliminate some academic programs and courses so that the associated resources can be reallocated to areas of higher priority and demand. Facilities Services has difficulty assuring the appropriate number of seats exist in the classroom since students often move seats between classrooms.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans, Vice President for Administrative Services and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. A survey of key advisers was conducted to determine student preference about class type and time. Results indicate a scheduling demand from working and non-traditional students for more evening and late afternoon courses, as well as employing Summer Session to address turnaway in required classes. The Provost's Office, with help from Enrollment Services and OBIA, developed a turnaway analysis that tracks numbers of students denied classes from one semester to the next. This analysis provides important information to departments for scheduling class sections and recruiting instructors in order to minimize turnaway problems.**

Classroom capacities have been determined and posted by Facilities Management. Utilizing custodial staff, Facilities Management monitors classroom seating on a daily basis. Problems still occur at the start of each semester, when faculty and students move additional seating into some classrooms due to "overbooking". Room scheduling personnel should be responsible for oversight of course enrollment, allowing no more students in any section than the specified maximum capacity of each room.

UNIVERSITY STATISTICS (3AP.10):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the Provost, through the Council of Deans:*

   ❧ *should evaluate University policies and practices regarding record-keeping and statistics in order to determine what information would be helpful in carrying out administrative functions and*

   ❧ *should work with the Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis (OBIA) as well as other academic support units to develop methods for gathering and reporting such data.*

The Subcommittee further recommends that the following addition data should be recorded and reported:

   ❧ *Second majors, minors, and licensure or certificate program enrollments;*

   ❧ *Enrollments in off-campus programs by departments.*

   ❧ *Interdepartmental majors by colleges and by departments advising them.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Accurate and complete statistical data are important to a variety of administrative functions to implement the recommendation. The procedures to collect and track advising assignments associated with interdepartmental majors will have to be developed.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and OBIA, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Beginning with the *Enrollment Book, Fall 1995*, OBIA now publishes information on second majors and teacher certifications for each academic department. Enrollments in off-campus RI programs are now being counted as RI activities and included in those reports. It must be noted, however, that this does not include DCE extended studies classes. Work still needs to be done on interdepartmental majors by colleges and departments advising them.**

FACULTY GOVERNANCE (1AP.04):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the structure of faculty governance be reorganized and enhanced in relationship to the following considerations:*

   ✎ *That the pursuit of practical, operational values such as effective, deliberative action, timely responsiveness, policy coherence, and functional efficiency should have the highest priority in the formation of faculty governance structures and procedures;*

   ✎ *That Faculty Council be reorganized to more closely resemble a Faculty Senate model of faculty governance, with two representatives from each college and a limited number of university-at-large representatives for a total Faculty Senate of 24 to 32 members;*

   ✎ *That the Faculty Senate should be an exclusively faculty body, representing only members of the regular faculty;*

   ✎ *That the new Faculty Senate's committee structure be substantially streamlined into fewer committees with less specifically specialized responsibilities to encourage committees to focus their efforts on broad, policy issues rather than on changing details of implementation; and*

   ✎ *That the practical details of "shared governance" be articulated to clarify differentiations of responsibilities between the Faculty Senate and the administrative structure and to coordinate these differentiated roles.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Supports the recommendation that the structure of faculty governance be reorganized and encourages expeditious Faculty Council consideration.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and requests Faculty Council consideration.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. The Executive Committee of Faculty Council developed a survey on the structure of Faculty Council that was sent to all academic faculty. Data from the survey were tabulated and provided to the Code Committee of Faculty Council for deliberation.**

   At its September 3, 1996 meeting, Faculty Council approved changes to Faculty Council membership as defined in Section C.2, The Code of Colorado State University, of the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual.* **These changes reduced the membership of Faculty Council from 113 to 75 by using a procedure that attempted to reduce the variability in the number of regular faculty per representative for each college. The SBA approved the code changes at its October 1996 meeting.**

   The Code Committee also proposed revisions to Section C.2.1.9.5, The Standing Committees: Membership and Function, that called for realignment and reduction in the number of Faculty Council Standing Committees. The amended proposal was passed by Faculty Council

at its October 1, 1996 meeting and implementation will result in a reduction in the number of standing committees from 17 to 11. These code changes will be considered by the SBA at its February 1997 meeting.

GRADUATE EDUCATION RECOMMENDATIONS

GRADUATE SCHOOL (1AP.05):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that the current structure of the Graduate School should be replaced by an organizational arrangement that:*

   ✏ *Places primary administrative leadership in a staff position in the Office of the Provost, e.g., Associate Provost for Graduate Studies;*

   ✏ *Emphasizes that the primary administrative responsibilities for academic standards of graduate programs rest with college deans and department heads;*

   ✏ *Creates an administrative framework for graduate education that parallels the administrative structures and processes for undergraduate education as much as possible and appropriate; and*

   ✏ *Preserves and enhances current services, record-keeping functions, and monitoring procedures and places them within the responsibilities of appropriate central administrative services.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President to study the specific functions and organizational structure of the Graduate School and make specific recommendations concerning modification or elimination.

c: **Rationale (May 1995):** The organizational structure and administrative responsibilities of the Graduate School are the administrative prerogative of the Provost/Academic Vice President.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Some restructuring of the Graduate School occurred during August 1996 when the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate School was eliminated and those responsibilities were reconfigured. The Graduate School is scheduled for program review in FY 99. The most appropriate organizational structure and staffing pattern will be determined at that time, based on peer comparisons, campus input, and data provided in the self-study document.**

GRADUATE STUDENT ENROLLMENT (1AP.06):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Academic Program Reform recommends that Colorado State University require graduate student registration during any term in which the student is using university resources, including the time of faculty or other university personnel, the Library, laboratories, studios, or other university facilities.*

   Each term, a graduate student using university resources must enroll in and complete an appropriate number of credits, to be determined by the student's department. Implementation by department heads and chairs will be reviewed regularly by academic deans and the administrator for graduate education.

b. SPC Recommendation (May 1995): Recommends that the President charge the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and appropriate Faculty Council Committees, to develop and implement policies and procedures for the continuous registration of graduate students.

c. Rationale (May 1995): Continuous registration of graduate students is the norm at research universities to accurately account for: all graduate student activity; level of effort by faculty relative to graduate education; usage of university resources by graduate students; and to assure students have access to appropriate medical coverage.

d. President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995): Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Council of Deans and Faculty Council, with implementation.

e. Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. A continuous registration policy was endorsed by the Council of Deans and approved by the Executive Budget Committee during Fall Semester 1996. On-campus graduate students who have not completed their degree and who are not enrolled in course work will be required to pay a $100/semester fee; off-campus graduate students will pay a $50/semester fee.   The policy goes into effect Fall Semester 1997.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ACADEMIC SUPPORT REFORM

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES RECOMMENDATIONS

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROVOST (3AS.01):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Provost/Academic Vice President title should be changed to Provost. The Provost's responsibilities and authority should be expanded to fully reflect the primacy of the academic mission of the University.*

The Provost should have full authority and responsibility for University strategic planning. The Provost should work with Deans and Vice Presidents to develop a plan which defines the long-range vision of the University. The plan should provide clear direction for long-range decision making and resource allocation.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The appointment of the Provost/Academic Vice President is the prerogative of the President.

Also, no additional change in the university strategic planning process is recommended beyond the changes made in Spring 1995 incorporating the recommendation in 1AP.03 as amended by 2AP.01.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The academic activities of the university demand primacy among all the university's activities. To achieve this end, each of the five Vice Presidents is charged by the President to oversee specific areas of the university, all of which support academic programs while taking an all-university perspective in the performance of their duties. The current organizational structure is working and provides coherence to all university decisions and actions. "Provost" is added to the title of "Academic Vice President" to clearly indicate that the individual occupying this position acts for the President in his absence by virtue of the primacy of the academic mission.

Changes made in the planning process call for the Provost/Academic Vice President and the Vice Presidents to work with the Council of Deans to provide a vision for plans to direct long-range decision making and resource allocation, which increases the role of the academic leadership in strategic planning.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. At this time no change is being made in the title or scope of activities of the Provost/Academic Vice President.**

EXECUTIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE (3AS.02):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The composition and functions of the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) should be communicated to the campus community via appropriate means and included in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Staff Manual.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the modification that the composition and functions be appropriately communicated to the university through such mechanisms as the

Campus Administrative Manual (currently under development) and not the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual*.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The EBC is appointed by the President, who has full discretion to make changes to this group at any time. Inclusion in the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Manual* would require action by the Faculty Council, as would any further changes made by the President. This approval requirement is contrary to the authority of the President, and could lead to awkward situations (e.g., the President wishes to abolish the EBC but, since it is in the manual, changes must be approved by Faculty Council).

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. A description of the composition and function of the EBC was presented to and approved by the President, and distributed to all governance groups and the Council of Deans. Minutes from weekly EBC meetings are distributed electronically to a broad campus constituency.**

FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON C&R RECOMMENDATIONS (3AS.03):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *A report should be distributed to the University community, within one year, which notes the Subcommittee's recommendations which have been implemented and those which are in process. A rationale for those recommendations which are rejected or modified should be provided. The Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee should coordinate the compilation of the report.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Strategic Planning Committee with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. This report contains the original C&R recommendations, the recommendations of the SPC to the President, including the rationale for any changes in the subcommittees' recommendations, and the President's December 1995 response to the SPC recommendations, including his charge for actions by specific administrators. The implementation status of each recommendation has been assembled by the Vice President for Research & Information Technology and is summarized [item "e. Current Status (December 1996)"].**

   This information has been posted on the Colorado State University World Wide Web home page at *http://www.vpr.colostate.edu/usp.*

REFILLING VACANT POSITIONS (1AS.01):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *In the short run, the Subcommittee submits one general recommendation. In order to facilitate the process of Change and Reform, where*

reasonable, the university should consider leaving vacant or filling on an interim basis all current and newly vacated positions which are in areas identified for potential change and reform.

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Concurs that vacant academic faculty, administrative professional and state classified positions be carefully reviewed to determine if filling them is consistent with the University Strategic Plan and the best use of university resources. Further, that all searches to fill new or vacant positions be approved by the appropriate Vice President before searches are initiated.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Since all areas of the university are potential candidates for C&R, this recommendation reflects the type of position review and management needed to assure that the university focuses the reallocation of resources on its highest priorities.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented.**

RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT (1AS.06):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The subcommittee recommends that the university develop specific plans for examining resource enhancement.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Supports the recommendation for developing plans for resource enhancement within the context of the University Strategic Planning process.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges each Vice President and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 19960: In progress. The annual budget instructions request that each presenter (Dean, Vice President, Provost/Academic Vice President, Agency Head, Office of the President) identify and define revenue enhancement opportunities. Examples include:**

- **The Division of Administrative Services negotiated a gravel mining lease with a private firm on the east side of Rigden Farm. Proceeds from this lease will be used to help purchase additional lands at ARDEC for relocation of Animal Sciences programs. In addition, the possible use of 2.14 acres on Elizabeth Street for commercial use was reviewed.**

- **Within the Division of Vice President for Research & Information Technology, Laboratory Animal Resources entered into fee for service contract animal care work which fully utilized facilities and supplemented animal care activities, holding per diem costs at current rates.**

- **The Division of Student Affairs will initiate a new student identification card in Fall 1997 that will integrate and automate a variety of functions. Card production costs will be covered by vendors who will be identified on the card.**

ORGANIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS (3AS.25):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The current structure for international programs should remain in place for an additional two years, and at the end of two years the Faculty Council International Committee should evaluate the current structure and make appropriate recommendations.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The current organizational structure for International Programs should remain in place for an additional two years, until June 30, 1998. Then, after a total of five years with the current structure, an evaluation should be made by the three vice presidents involved: Provost/Academic Vice President, Vice President for Research, and Vice President for Student Affairs. Following the organizational evaluation, changes may be recommended.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The SPC concurs that the current structure should remain in place two more years. Currently, each program (International Education, International R&D, and International Student Services) is enhancing services to the campus.

    The Change & Reform response process recommended that evaluation of the structure should be conducted by the Faculty Council International Committee. The SPC recommendation modified this process, to be accomplished by an administrative review team, noting that university organizational structure is an administrative issue.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Provost/Academic Vice President, in conjunction with the Vice President for Research and Vice President for Student Affairs, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. International Programs (International Education, International Student Services, International Research & Development) are scheduled for program review during FY 98. At that time, the current administrative structure for international programs will be evaluated by the Provost/Academic Vice President, Vice President for Research & Information Technology, and Vice President for Student Affairs. Recommendations for changes in the current organizational structure will be considered as part of the review. It is anticipated that the current structure will remain in place through June 30, 1998.**

STUDENT ACADEMIC SUCCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

STUDENT SERVICES - UNIVERSITY COUNSELING CENTER (2AS.01):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (May 1995):** *The University Counseling Center was established to serve students working toward successful completion of academic work while attempting to manage emotional problems and crisis situations. After examining the need for these services and the funding source, the Academic Support Subcommittee makes two recommendations:*

    ✎ *The services offered by the Counseling Center should be continued because a significant number of the students who attend Colorado State avail themselves of cost-effective counseling help during their matriculation.*

    ✎ *An alternative method for funding the Faculty Testing Service should be established because test scoring services provided to academic departments are subsidized by student fees.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (October 1995):** The SPC concurs with the recommendation that the Counseling Center be continued using student fees as the principal source of support. Further, the SPC recommends that the Faculty Testing Service continue scoring answer sheets on classroom examinations but the costs be covered from E&G sources rather than student fees.

c. **Rationale (October 1995):** The University Counseling Center is performing an essential service in a cost effective manner. The Testing Service has developed the capability to score many types of tests for the Counseling Center, national entrance and aptitude tests and examinations and it is cost effective to continue this service at a single location. However, student fees should not be paying for the scoring of classroom examinations, making it appropriate to move these costs to E&G sources. The impact of moving these costs from student fee funding should be considered by the Vice President for Student Affairs when the fee and budget for the Counseling Center are evaluated annually.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented: (1) the services offered by the University Counseling Center are being continued; and (2) the Faculty Testing Service is being continued but, effective Spring 1997, will be funded by E&G funds, not student fees.**

HELP/SUCCESS CENTER (3AS.05):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Subcommittee endorses the work of the HELP/Success Center (HSC). The HSC fulfills a role in the University that would not be accomplished as effectively or with the same level of student service by other units. Specific recommendations to enhance the impact and efficiency of the HSC follow.*

    (1) Because the recommendations in the change and reform process indicate an on-going tension between decentralized and centralized advising functions, the HSC Advisory Board should develop a plan to foster new and innovative opportunities to enhance the advising connections between academic faculty and the HELP Center. The plan should be

implemented jointly by the HELP Center, the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

(2) The HSC should have a presence in the Student Center. The HSC currently serves students and faculty at two locations, Aylesworth Hall and the Durrell Center. The Aylesworth location manages withdrawals and faculty referrals. The Durrell Center works mainly with freshmen and sophomore students living in the residence halls. Close coordination with the Career Center and the Advocacy Offices can best be maintained with an office in Lory Student Center which provides easier access for students and faculty and better serves the advising needs of students.

(3) The HSC and Enrollment Services should develop a systematic method for collecting and disseminating student data to facilitate student procedures. For example, when the HSC receives reports on students with scholastic standards problems, there is no indication of grade points from the ISIS records. Registration for Continuing Education students is done by hand which delays entry into ISIS. Determining scholastic standing for Continuing Education students has been difficult. Consistent classification of students across the University would enhance the advising role of faculty and help students graduate.

(4) In order to increase the retention rate of transfer students, the HSC should work with the Council of Associate and Assistant Deans to develop a more effective orientation program for transfer students.

(5) HSC, Admissions, the Career Center, the School of Education and other appropriate units should develop a plan to work more closely with public schools to prepare students for selecting a major and to be well grounded in the core subjects needed for a successful experience in higher education.

(6) HSC and key college advisors should develop a training package that offers advising training for new faculty to be included in a new faculty orientation program and in a faculty seminar shortly after classes begin.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with the Provost/Academic Vice President, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996):**

(1) **In process. The HELP/Success Center Advisory Board has been reviewing the relationship between the HELP/Success Center and academic departments and colleges. From this review, a plan will be developed to enhance advising connections between academic faculty and the Center. When completed, the plan will be cooperatively implemented by the HELP/Success Center, the Provost/Academic Vice President, and the Vice President for Student Affairs.**

(2) **Rejected. The recommendation to locate at least part of the HELP/Success Center in the Lory Student Center (LSC) has been reviewed by the Vice President for Student Affairs.**

At this point, it is not feasible to relocate all or a portion of the HELP/Success Center to the Lory Student Center because of lack of space. Location of the HSC in the LSC had not been included in the original plan for the new addition and funding was unavailable to increase its size. When Black Student Services moves from Aylesworth Hall to the Lory Student Center, the HELP/Success Center will expand into that vacated space.

(3) **Implemented. The HELP/Success Center and Enrollment Services have been working with OBIA to develop a systematic method for collecting and disseminating student data to facilitate student procedures. The key to this system is OBIA's serving as a checkpoint to ensure all data collected and disseminated are accurate. A good example of this teamwork was the recent production of the *Report on Student Academic Standing*, which was prepared as a joint effort among these offices and disseminated to faculty.**

(4) **In process. The HELP/Success Center is working with the Council of Assistant & Associate Deans, Enrollment Services, and Off-Campus Student Services to continue development of a more effective orientation program for transfer students entering Colorado State. This is a complicated issue and, consequently, the discussion and planning leading to a more effective orientation process for transfer students will continue as issues are identified and addressed. Some issues being addressed are: (a) professional development of faculty advising transfer students; (b) finding ways for transfers to value and attend orientation programs; (c) early advising of transfers to prepare for their transfer while still attending their former institution; (d) funding an extensive transfer program; (e) building linkages with community colleges to address the needs of community college transfers; and (f) conducting research to assess current and future transfer initiatives.**

(5) **In process. The HELP/Success Center has established a working relationship with the Provost's Office and the School of Education to be actively involved with public schools. An example of a successful initiative is a pilot project coordinated between the HELP/Success Center, Admissions, the School of Education, and the Thompson Valley School District. This program links HSC staff with Thompson Valley school officials and students to assist high school students better prepare for admission to Colorado State.**

(6) **In process. The HELP/Success Center is currently working with key advisers in selected academic departments to design training programs that will assist faculty in improving their academic advising. It is anticipated that professional development opportunities will be offered during the 1997 Spring Semester.**

ADVOCACY OFFICES (3AS.06):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Subcommittee endorses the work of the advocacy units and the ethnic and cultural diversity which these programs support. Specific recommendations to improve the impact and efficiency of the advocacy groups on the campus community follow:*

(1) The Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with a committee from the advocacy offices, should develop an annual reporting process for the various Advocacy groups which is consistent across the various units, and which includes the following information: the number of students recruited, retained and graduated from each constituency group, the

number of students served within the programs and by the various activities of each advocacy unit, time effort for professional staff across their various responsibilities, and comparative data from other universities. The committee understands that tasks and responsibilities of the advocacy units are diverse and therefore difficult to document. Yet the current reporting process appears highly variable across groups, and does not adequately inform the university of the many services offered by the advocacy offices. This reporting should then facilitate funding and planning decisions.

(2) Programs should be developed which increase the contact of the advocacy offices with academic departments.

(3) Closer working relationships should be developed between the ethnic advocacy offices and CASAE.

(4) The Women's Studies Advisory Board, in conjunction with a representative from the Provost's office, should evaluate the current organizational structure given the academic nature of this interdisciplinary program and make relevant recommendations. Specifically it should consider whether the responsibilities for the Women's Studies Program reside with the Provost's office.

(5) The Women's Programs Office does an excellent job of meeting the needs of sexual assault victims on the CSU campus. However, the committee is unclear how these programs interface with programs offered by the University Counseling Center. The Vice President for Student Affairs should evaluate potential redundancy across these units and make appropriate recommendations.

(6) Increased efforts should be made to find external financial support for the advocacy offices through agency grants, private foundations, and businesses throughout the state of Colorado.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Student Affairs, in conjunction with the Provost/Academic Vice President, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996):**

(1) **Implemented. A common reporting format was developed for reporting the annual activities of the Advocacy Offices. A pilot model was developed in Spring Semester 1996 and used for each office's annual reports. This format has been adjusted and will be used for the 1997 and future reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs.**

(2/3) **Implemented. The Advocacy Offices have increased their contact and cooperative efforts with academic departments across the university and with the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity. Through these relationships, the Advocacy Offices have assisted many academic departments with consulting, retention projects, curriculum infusion initiatives, and recruitment of under-represented students.**

(4)   Implemented. The Women's Programs and Studies Advisory Board met this past year and evaluated the current organizational structure for Women's Programs at Colorado State. Upon completion of this review, the Advisory Board recommended that the current reporting structure for Women's Programs and Studies should be continued. The Provost's Office has reviewed and concurred with this recommendation.

(5)   Implemented. The Vice President for Student Affairs Office has evaluated the Victim's Assistance Program with regard to possible redundancy between the roles of the Office of Women's Programs & Studies and the University Counseling Center in the assistance of victims. Upon completion of this review, it was determined there was no redundancy or overlap in function, and that the Victim's Assistance Program was being administered in an efficient and effective way, using the resources and expertise of both offices.

(6)   Implemented.   Each Advocacy Office has need of additional funding for special initiatives, outreach efforts, educational programs, and additional support staff. Many efforts have been made with some success to secure external funding for a number of projects and activities that the Advocacy Offices conduct. The Director of Development for the Division of Student Affairs periodically meets with the leadership of each Advocacy Office to assess needs and to match them with the division's fund raising efforts. Raising gift dollars to support Student Affairs diversity programs is a very high priority for the division.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (3AS.07):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The President should charge the Vice President for Research to provide leadership, management and coordination of information technology as a means to further the mission and goals of the University. To reflect this as a primary area of the Vice President's responsibilities, the Subcommittee recommends that the Vice President's title be changed to Vice President for Research and Technology.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the one change that the Vice President for Research's title be changed to Vice President for Research & Information Technology.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The use of the word "technology" was seen as being too broad and, therefore, confusing. The recommended title change for the Vice President highlights the added responsibility for information technology and importance of this area to the university's success in achieving its mission.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation that the position's responsibilities be formally enlarged to include leadership, management, and coordination of information technology, and will formally seek change in the title of Vice President for Research to Vice President for Research & Information Technology through appropriate channels.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. The title of the Vice President for Research was changed to Vice President for Research & Information Technology by action of the State Board of Agriculture at its March 1996 meeting. The university officer in this position has direct responsibility for a number of areas dealing with information technology: Academic Computing & Networking Services (ACNS), which is responsible for the campus backbone network, training and operation of central computing systems; the Office of Telecommunications (OTC), which is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the university telephone system; and Information Systems (IS), which is responsible for central administrative computing.**

   The Vice President for Research & Information Technology also chairs the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC), which coordinates all university information technology activities. Other members of ITEC are the Provost/Academic Vice President, Vice President for Administrative Services, and one representative from the Council of Deans. The information technology area directors (Director, ACNS; Director, IS; Director, OTC; Dean, University Libraries; Director, Office of Instructional Services) are non-voting *ex-officio* members of ITEC. These directors meet regularly to address information technology issues, including planning.

   As part of the university strategic planning process, the Vice President for Research & Information Technology has been charged with developing and implementing a long-term strategic plan for the deployment, use and support of information technologies. Implementation of this responsibility is described in 3AS.09, Strategic Plan for Information Technology, and provided for comment in draft Implementation Plan 3.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PRINCIPLES (3AS.08):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should develop a set of specific principles that will govern decisions regarding information technology infrastructure, applications, training, and support issues. Procedures should be established for the adoption and implementation of the principles on a university-wide basis.*

Specific Objective: Develop a set of basic underlying principles on which individual technology decisions can be made that are in conformity with university-wide technology objectives. The ultimate aim is to guide the university toward the utilization of technology as a means to create administrative operating efficiencies. It may be useful to direct these underlying principles toward three specific areas:

1. *Infrastructure, which describes the type of equipment the university uses, the operating software that runs on them, and the communications networks that provide connectivity between individual pieces of equipment.*

2. *Applications, are the specific computer programs used to organize data and provide management information to assist in the administration of the university.*

3. *Training and Support, encompasses the methods used to train users of information technology and provide ongoing support.*

The development of principles should be a community activity reflecting broad university representation. To facilitate a more effective use of technology to achieve institutional goals, local technology decisions must be made consistent with university-wide principles.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the addition that the underlying principles need to be broadened to include applications associated with the teaching, research and outreach activities of the university and not be confined only to administrative functions.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The role and importance of information technology affects the entire university, making it necessary that the principles include all aspects of the university mission.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. With input from the university community, principles were defined that provided the context for the long-term Strategic Plan for Information Technology at Colorado State University (see 3AS.09). The draft Strategic Plan for Information Technology (draft Implementation Plan 3) will be presented to the university community for review and comment in January 1997, prior to finalization and presentation at the Spring 1997 Planning & Budget Hearings. The principles are reiterated in an appendix to the Strategic Plan for Information Technology.**

STRATEGIC PLAN FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (3AS.09):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Based on the established principles, the Vice President for Research and Technology should design and implement a long-term strategic plan for the use of technology on a University-wide basis. Such a plan should guide the leadership, management and coordination of information technology to further the mission and goals of the University.*

The plan should include:

Recommendations for realignment of current administrative structures, including lines of reporting and scope of responsibilities, to facilitate institution-wide policy-making and guidance in the strategic use of technology;

Identification of the Vice President for Research and Technology as the person responsible for providing leadership in technological planning;

A focus on technology as a tool for or means of achieving institutional goals, rather than an end in and of itself;

The integration of instructional technology as a tool for meeting the instructional goals of the University;

Specific identification of the extent to which decisions and guidelines should be made on a centralized v. decentralized basis;

Broad-based input and participation on the college and unit level;

A plan for funding and allocation of resources to support University-wide technology goals;

A plan for providing ongoing training and support.

In the development of such a plan, it is critical to obtain broad-based academic and administrative participation and input, including at least the Council of Deans from an academic standpoint and the Technology Area Directors for technical expertise. The plan should be prepared in a time-frame that will permit it to be implemented for Fiscal Year 1997-98.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. The** *Annual Update of the University Strategic Plan for FYs 1997 through 2000* **identified the development and implementation of "a long-term strategic plan for the deployment, use and support of information technologies" as one of six key strategies requiring a specific implementation plan. This implementation plan for information technology was developed during Fall 1996 and identifies specific actions, expected outcomes, resource requirements, and a timeline that addresses all the points identified in 3AS.09. The plan defines university information technology infrastructure and provides the framework that will serve as the basis for individual college and vice presidential information technology plans identifying each unit's specific directions and needs.**

Input into this implementation planning effort came from the Council of Deans, meetings with each college and Vice President's division, discussions with information technology area directors (Academic Computing & Networking Services, Information Systems, Office of Telecommunications, Office of Instructional Services, and University Libraries), the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC), Strategic Planning Committee, and other key administrative groups. The implementation plan adheres to the specific information technology principles developed in accordance with 3AS.08.

The draft information technology plan (draft Implementation Plan 3) will be circulated in January 1997 for review and comment by the university community. After appropriate incorporation of comments, the finalized implementation plan will be presented during the planning/budget hearings in Spring 1997 for consideration and funding.

TECHNOLOGY UNITS - REORGANIZATION (3AS.10, which replaces 1AS.07, Director - Office of Telecommunications):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The video communications infrastructure of Instructional Services, and the Departments of Telecommunications, Academic Computing and Network Services, and Information Systems should be reorganized to support two primary functions: 1) applications and 2) infrastructure. Names of the reorganized units should clearly reflect their functions. The technology functions of the Libraries should be included in planning and coordination efforts.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. As part of a comprehensive review of the four named units (Office of Instructional Services, Office of Telecommunications, Academic Computing & Networking Services, and Information Systems) reorganization options and opportunities have been carefully considered. A reorganization proposal was developed and is included in the draft Strategic Plan for Information Technology which will be circulated for comment in January 1997 as draft Implementation Plan 3. The reorganization proposal calls for: (1) moving the Office of Telecommunications to departmental status under ACNS to consolidate functions related to managing, installing, maintaining and monitoring the campus network infrastructure that transmits data, voice and video; (2) the Office of Instructional Services continuing to support the applications of information technology to instruction on- and off-campus; and (3) Information Services continuing its focus on administrative computing applications.**

During this review, recommendation 1AS.07, Director - Office of Telecommunications, was implemented and an interim Director of the Office of Telecommunications appointed pending the its outcome.

The Dean of the University Libraries, and Directors of Academic Computing & Networking Services, Office of Telecommunications, Office of Instructional Services, and Information

Systems meet periodically to coordinate planning and information technology related issues. In addition, they are *ex officio* members of the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC), where their participation provides input into planning associated with information technologies.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION (3AS.11):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should develop a set of University-wide standards that would enable the following:*

   (1) Send e-mail easily to any person on campus including the ability to attach and retrieve attachments to e-mail with ease and determine addresses easily.

   (2) Access central computing resources in a seamless fashion. This would include resources such as Gopher, Integrated Student Information System (ISIS), Financial Records System (FRS), Human Resource Management System (HRMS), Campus Information System (CIS).

   (3) Provide a high quality electronic, campus-wide, one-way distribution system for general university announcements.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. Standards have been identified for desktop and server software and hardware, and are posted on the ITEC home page at *http://www.colostate.edu/services/ACNS/itec/itec.html*. Adherence to these standards at unit levels will accomplish the aims called for in this recommendation, increasing efficiencies and decreasing user frustration with basic electronic communication functions. These standards will be reviewed and updated periodically to reflect changes in the computing hardware and software environment required to support the university's academic and administrative computing functions.**

   The one-way, centralized e-mail distribution system was put in place late in Spring 1997 and is described in more detail under 1AS.03, Electronic Information Distribution.

NETWORKING INFRASTRUCTURE (3AS.12):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Research and Technology should implement the concept of a University infrastructure for networking in which the basic functions of networking (such as physical wiring, basic network transport and mail services) would be centrally provided and funded.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. Addressing network infrastructure starts with defining wiring, hardware, software and management standards. Wiring standards for buildings have been agreed upon that will support future network requirements. A plan has been developed to rewire all buildings that currently do not meet standards (Category 3 for voice, Category 5 for data). A RFP has been developed for the rewiring of 24 buildings, which will be issued in January 1997.**

   Adherence by the LANs (local area networks) to hardware and software configurations that conform to the basic standards identified in the January 1997 draft Strategic Plan for Information Technology (draft Implementation Plan 3), will make central management, operation and maintenance of LANs feasible. This will free LAN computer support personnel to focus on user assistance and improved local applications. The implementation of central management as called for in 3AS.12 will depend upon the priority this activity is accorded by the strategic planning process and availability of funds.

   E-mail service issues are addressed in the draft Strategic Plan for Information Technology (3AS.09) and as part of university-wide electronic communication (3AS.11).

CAMPUS INFORMATION SYSTEM (3AS.13):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Campus Information System (CIS) should be completed and implemented as soon as possible.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Information Systems is working with the campus to complete CIS module functional specification, program creation and testing. The current status of CIS is:**

   (1) **CIS Financial Reporting System (FRS) module target completion dates by function:**

      DPO (Departmental Purchase Order) - completed in 4th quarter of calendar year 1995
      XPO (Express DPO) - completed in 4th quarter of calendar year 1995
      REQ (Purchase Requisition) - completed in 4th quarter of calendar year 1995
      EJE (Electronic Journal Entry) - to be completed in 1st quarter of calendar year 1997
      IMO (Intramural Order) - to be completed in 1st quarter of calendar year 1997

   (2) **CIS Student Information System (ISIS) academic advising module - to be completed in 1st quarter of calendar year 1997**

(3) **MS-Windows conversion completed in 3rd quarter, installation and testing performed in 4th quarter of calendar year 1996**

(4) **CIS undergraduate module installed and tested in 4th quarter calendar year 1996 - to be completed in first quarter calendar year 1997**

It is expected that a 6 to 12 month period of improvements and enhancements will follow each initial CIS module implementation.

CENTRAL SUPPORT OF COMPUTER APPLICATIONS (3AS.14):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Information Systems, or its successor, should support the use of computer applications that have been developed and exist in local units by providing coordination and a clearing house function.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The recommendation is supported with the modification: "to the extent that it does not compromise the continued maintenance and upgrading of critical central software systems."

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Information Systems has limited staff resources.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Historically, local units have had to develop many of their own computerized report and tracking processes. Use of the Campus Information System (CIS) will eliminate the need for duplicative applications and double entry of transactions, providing a closer interface to centrally managed data while providing a comprehensive tool kit for development of reports to serve unique local unit needs. Since CIS modules are scheduled for completion during calendar year 1997 (see 3AS.13), increased usage of CIS in lieu of local application development is anticipated.**

Once CIS is fully implemented, Information Systems will work with campus units to identify remaining local applications and to establish a bulletin board clearing house for them.

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION (1AS.03):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should move toward utilizing electronic means of distributing information to the campus-at-large, eliminating the volume and expense of informational mass mailings to the greatest extent possible. Such action should include reducing or eliminating distribution of multiple copies of reports, mailings, and other communications, by posting such information electronically. Where it is necessary to distribute hard copy, the subcommittee recommends doing so by distribution to a central departmental or college resource point.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Concurs with the thrust of the recommendation; however, before it can be implemented, a number of technical and procedural issues need to be resolved.

Once the specifics of the process(es) and procedures are known, they should be forwarded to the Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC) for review and action.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Representatives of Academic Computing & Networking Services, Central Receiving and Research Services have resolved most of the technical and procedural issues associated with electronic distribution of information at no cost to the message originator. Several issues remain to be resolved, such as developing more refined distribution lists to avoid sending messages targeted for a narrow audience to the entire campus. Also see 3AS.11, University-wide Electronic Communications.**

At present, electronic messages may be sent to: (1) all CSU employees; (2) all Academic Faculty and Administrative Professionals; (3) Academic Faculty only; (4) Administrative Professionals only; (5) State Classified Personnel only; (6) department secretaries; and (7) deans, directors and department heads. Procedures to process and send messages through Central Receiving have been streamlined to make use easier and more efficient. Central Receiving's addition of "CSU - " at the beginning of the subject line makes it easier to recognize these messages and read them when convenient. Blockage of direct "reply" responses prevents message originators from being barraged by error messages, automatic responses, or other non-intentional replies.

The process is too new to compute specific use figures or savings, but on the majority of university work days, several messages are distributed that were previously copied and distributed through campus mail. Although some areas of the university have made an effort to distribute major reports electronically on the WWW, more potential remains for this area. In the strategic planning area, electronic availability and limited hard copy distribution (to deans, directors, department heads, and upon request to any interested individual) of reports has significantly reduced copy costs from upward of $2,000 to under $500 for any single report.

PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW & EFFICIENCY RECOMMENDATIONS

REVIEW OF VICE PRESIDENTS' UNITS (3AS.04, which replaces 1AS.02, Programmatic Review):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Each Vice President should develop a meaningful review process for their units. Unit reviews should include comparisons with peer units at other universities and specific action plans to improve quality and efficiency. Reviews would be analyzed and critiqued by individuals with relevant expertise. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require review by outside consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate Vice President.*

The following units are perceived by campus response (the change and reform process, and a survey of deans, heads and vice presidents) as being essential units which need improved responsiveness. They should be reviewed as soon as possible.

> *Office of Budgets and Institutional Analysis*
> *Facilities Management*
> *Environmental Health Services*
> *Human Resource Services*
> *Business & Financial Services*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with the modification that the timetable, general guidelines, and review order should be determined by the Vice Presidents, working together, as part of their development of a meaningful review process.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** By working together, the Vice Presidents will be able to develop comprehensive review processes that will best serve the university. It is expected that every unit will be reviewed at least once every five years, with the order of rotation developed to facilitate the reviews and minimize disruption of on-going services and activities.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President, working together, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. A formal, on-going university process and timeline for administrative and academic support program reviews have been developed and instituted by the Vice Presidents, with periodic information updates distributed to the university community. To solicit campus input, the review schedule was publicized in the September 26, 1996 issue of *Comment* and announced by campus-wide e-mail. The results of the reviews will be summarized in *Comment* in Fall 1997 after they are completed. The following programs are scheduled for review in FY 97:**

   (1) *Provost/Academic Vice President (non-academic department)*: **Office of Instructional Services**

   (2) *Vice President for Administrative Services* : **Office of Budgets & Institutional Analysis; Office of Purchasing; Accounts Payable and Technical Support areas within Business & Financial Services; Police Operations**

(3) *Vice President for Research & Information Technology*: Colorado Water Resources Research Institute; Academic Computing & Networking Services; Office of Telecommunications; Information Systems

(4) *Vice President for Student Affairs*: University Health Center; Food Distribution & Warehousing System for Residence Halls within Housing & Food Services

(5) *Vice President for University Advancement*: Alumni Relations; Planned Giving

COST/QUALITY COMPARISONS WITH PEERS - BENCHMARKING (3AS.17):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The University should participate in the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) benchmarking project in order to make appropriate cost/quality comparisons with peer institutions.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The Vice President for Administrative Services carefully and formally review the benefits and costs associated with participation in the NACUBO benchmarking project as one option to collect such data. Upon completion of this review, a recommendation will be made to the EBC for action.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** This recommendation is an important step in implementing 3AS.04, calling for regular, formal reviews of all administrative units. It is very important for the university to gather data for cost and quality of service comparisons with peers, as well as other providers (public or private) of similar services. In addition to NACUBO, other options to collect comparative performance data (AAU data exchange program, individual professional association data exchanges, local associations where the alliance includes public and private sector suppliers of the services, etc.) should also be examined. The Vice President for Administrative Services should take the lead in following-up on this recommendation and involving other campus entities as appropriate. The data gathered here will, hopefully, provide valuable comparative data for implementing 3AS.04.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress.**

(1) *NACUBO Benchmarking Program*: **Three directors from the Division of Administrative Services initiated reviews of the NACUBO Benchmarking Program in Fall 1995 to see whether it might be useful at CSU as a means for routinely gathering outside information for program comparison. This issue was again reviewed in the Fall 1996. The overall evaluation was that this would not be a useful tool for developing the kinds of comparative information envisioned by Change & Reform for several reasons:**

- **There are almost no comparable institutions participating in the NACUBO process at this time. The AAU schools (many of our peers) have their own, long-standing data exchange. The NACUBO process is being used primarily by small private institutions as a *de facto* data exchange standard.**

- **The comparable institutions that have previously participated in the NACUBO program indicated that the program required a tremendous amount of time and staff resources to implement. In fact, the perception was that it took so much time that it wasn't practical to do it annually.**

- **It would require full participation from all units included in the study - partial participation is not possible.**

- **The utility of the information would vary widely across the institution - for some departments, it might be useful and worth the time; for others, it wouldn't be detailed enough to assist in making effective decisions.**

- **Simply participating in the NACUBO study was perceived as generating a lot of numbers with little understanding of where we, as an institution, want to be and how to effect that change.**

(2) *Other options*: **Opportunities exist for local comparisons with regional institutions and industries that would be far more germane to effective decision making. These regional comparison initiatives should be continued and enhanced, such as the one between Facilities and regional corporations. We can concentrate our attention and, over time, focus on specific areas within these programs to identify and effect positive change.**

To assist us in designing local/regional comparative information, a copy of the NACUBO questions/data elements/requested statistics was acquired and shared with the relevant offices, as well as a full set of data from a participating institution that has decided to discontinue its NACUBO participation. If we develop a few examples of effective program comparisons in different areas of the university, we would have a sound basis for expanding to similar comparisons for other units.

Membership in the AAU is being considered. If successful, this would provide access to a data exchange process with many comparable institutions. That data exchange, a required part of membership, could form a good focal point for regionally based reviews and program evaluation.

Currently, all administrative and academic support unit reviews include information on cost and operating comparisons with peer institutions. This has been expanded, where appropriate, to include private provider comparisons.

SERVICE UNITS - SIX-YEAR REVIEWS (3AS.18):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *For units where services may be provided by the private sector, six-year reviews should include both peer comparisons at other universities and comparisons with the private sector. Reviews must also show quality of service as indicated by customer evaluation, cost, and centrality to the University's mission. Reviews would be analyzed by individuals with expertise in delivering services. This analysis may be done by a Colorado State team of experts or may require outside review by consultants. The responsibility for correcting any deficiencies uncovered or implementing*

any improvements called for in the self assessments shall be assigned to the appropriate Vice President.

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs, with the change that all administrative units be reviewed as recommended by 3AS.04 and the reviews contain peer comparisons.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** This recommendation is an important part of 3AS.04, and should be incorporated into a complete set of review parameters and guidelines that are established for campus service units.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice Presidents and Provost/Academic Vice President, working together, with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. Each Vice President has established a schedule of in-depth reviews for all service units within his/her division. These reviews are being conducted as part of the implementation of 3AS.04, Review of Vice Presidents' Units, and will follow the format identified in that recommendation, which includes a customer evaluation of service, evaluation of costs and centrality, and review by knowledgeable individuals outside the unit being reviewed.**

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE EFFICIENCIES (3AS.19):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Opportunities should be pursued with public and private entities to explore possibilities of cost sharing, consortium purchasing, shared services, and similar efficiencies.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs that the recommendation should be done as part of the reviews recommended in 3AS.04. Options such as those suggested should be routinely examined by Colorado State University, and the 3AS.04 review process should include them on a formal basis.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges each of the Vice Presidents and the Provost/Academic Vice President with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): On-going. The following are examples of opportunities being pursued at the current time. The university will continue to seek new opportunities and follow through appropriately.**

   • **The Vice President for Administrative Services has been working with the City and Poudre School District officials to develop plans for reusing the Old Fort Collins High School, and joint development of a City-CSU Performing Arts Center. In addition, university officials have been working with TransFort to construct a mass transit center on campus. As part of an effort to extend TransFort benefits to faculty and staff, a pilot test will be initiated January 13**

and run through Spring Semester 1997, during which time CSU employees can ride any of the 11 TransFort City routes for free by showing their CSU ID card.

- The university, through association with the Rocky Mountain Government Purchasing Association, will continue to pursue collaborations in this area. Currently the university has a joint agreement with the City of Fort Collins in regards to cellular phone rates with US West. In Spring 1997, the university will be exploring efforts with Larimer County for joint bidding on fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides.

- Natural gas purchasing was done with a consortium of about 40 hospitals, school districts and city facilities. Actual savings are estimated at over $650,000 above the original FY 96 budget. E&G savings will be about $350,000.

- The university, anticipating electrical deregulation in the near future, is examining its options and opportunities, which may include a private and public consortium.

- Colorado State University collaborates closely with the Colorado Higher Education Computing Organization (CHECO), which fosters activities to improve the efficient purchasing and utilization of information technologies through beneficial interactions with the computing industry. In a similar fashion, the university works with the Information Management Committee of the State of Colorado to develop information technology standards that will lead to cost savings and efficiencies.

- Housing & Food Services is working with suppliers to deliver directly to food service locations on campus, and to effect significant operational efficiencies by consolidating warehousing.

CONTRACTING SERVICES (3AS.20):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Legislative or constitutional change should be pursued to allow contracting for services where cost and quality is better than what is currently provided. Decisions for implementation must be consistent with University values regarding employees.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs, excluding the recommendation for constitutional change.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The constitutional changes suggested in the C&R recommendation are not deemed feasible at this time. However, one aspect of program review as recommended in 3AS.04 should be a cost and level of service comparison with private service providers, which is included in recommendation 3AS.18. The data collected from such comparisons should be carefully studied and if private providers can offer superior service at lower costs, specific reasons for this occurrence need to be identified. The results of this review need to be communicated to the staff involved in delivery of the service, and discussions initiated to identify changes where appropriate. If private service providers can clearly offer a superior service, for lower or equal cost, and the employees of these firms are treated fairly relative to institutional values, this analysis should be shared with legislators as the potential basis for legislative changes allowing flexibility in contracting for services.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):**   Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996):**

    (1) **Implemented. The university is not pursuing constitutional changes at this time.**

    (2) **In progress. Some services are currently contracted because of the need for specialized expertise or equipment, or infrequent use. These include, for example, some legal services, elevator service/repair, fire extinguisher maintenance, bleacher/backstop maintenance, autoclave maintenance, deionized water, glass replacement, furniture refinishing, pest control, and wood floor restoration. Additional areas for contract services, within the limits of the constitution, have not been identified at this time, but may be as a result of peer reviews as described under 3AS.18, Service Units - Six-year Reviews.**

ONCE-A-DAY MAIL DELIVERY (1AS.04):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should institute a once-a-day mail system.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Recommends that the impact and cost benefit of once-a-day mail service be fully defined before implementation. The Vice President for Administrative Services should be charged with the task of analyzing once-a-day mail delivery and making a recommendation regarding implementation.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):**   Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. The Vice President for Administrative Services conducted a cost/benefit analysis of this service. The review identified concerns that cancellation of the second delivery and pick-up of mail would lead to increased costs campus-wide, with many departments indicating they would have to use their own staff to walk items to and from Mail Services to assure that the mail was delivered off campus or to campus departments to meet timing requirements.**

    This review of the once-a-day mail service led to better tracking and improved service through the use of the four digit add-on zip codes, which currently provide time and effort savings, and will provide more savings in the future (as departments use the codes and as auto-sorting devices are purchased over the next 18 months).

    Electronic distribution of information via the data network has been implemented in response to 1AS.03. As more experience with electronic distribution is gained and its impact on the paper mail delivery schedule determined, the recommendation should be re-evaluated.

COPY CENTER CONSOLIDATION (1AS.05):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (January 1995):** *The university should consider consolidation of the various copy center activities on campus. The Subcommittee requests that the Vice President of Administrative Services evaluate and report on the costs and benefits of such potential action.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (May 1995):** Concurs. The findings and recommendations of the Vice President for Administrative Services should be forwarded to the EBC for its consideration.

c. **Rationale (May 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. An *Ad Hoc* Committee to Review Campus Copy Services was appointed and a report submitted to the Executive Budget Committee. The EBC approved all primary recommendations in the report: consolidation and distribution of information about all campus copy services and prices; standardization of handling procedures for class packets and laboratory manuals; development and use of standard copyright guidelines; and the periodic compilation and review of copy costs. In addition, the EBC agreed to monitor operations of the current system and formally evaluate the question of centralizing management of all copy centers in one year. The EBC also charged the *ad hoc* committee to review and define the situation regarding independent copiers owned by departments and make recommendations for future directions.**

The Purchasing Department will continue to work with the *ad hoc* committee in reviewing purchases of copy machines. Procedures will be implemented for the following:

• **Not allow financing for the purchase of copy machines costing less than $10,000 over more than two years.**

• **Limit departmental purchase of copy machines to the "convenience copiers" category, which are defined as all copy machines through those designated as "Higher Mid-Volume" (specified to meet monthly volume of 20,000-95,000 copies, speed range of 60-80 copies/minute, and which currently have a base retail price range of $16,000 to $35,000). Allow purchase of machines above this level ("High-Volume", "High Speed" copiers/duplicators) only by the established campus copy service providers.**

HUMAN RESOURCE SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

STATE PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (3AS.15):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *Legislative or constitutional change should be pursued to change rules governing the state personnel system for higher education in order to provide greater opportunities for institutional flexibility, including the ability to reward excellence and to deal effectively with marginal employees.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Legislative and other changes of the rules governing the State Classified Personnel System and other options under current rules should be carefully studied to provide greater opportunities for institutional flexibility, including the ability to reward excellence and to deal effectively with marginal employees.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** The recommendation is a very important priority for Colorado State University. The first step in addressing it should be the preparation of a detailed plan outlining institutional priorities relative to the State Classified Personnel System. This plan should take into consideration the report from the State Personnel System Working Group, as well as other university priorities. The responsibility for putting this report together should be designated to the Vice President for Administrative Services, who will involve individuals and organizations on the campus as appropriate (e.g., Council of Deans, Classified Personnel Council, Administrative Professional Council, EBC, etc.). While legislative and other change must be carefully studied, constitutional changes do not appear to be a feasible alternative to pursue at this time.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): On-going. Constitutional change is not being pursued by CSU, although a bill will come forward this legislative session [see (2) below].**

    As a result of CSU's efforts, the following changes are being implemented in the State Classified system:

    (1) The State approved an alternative plan with respect to bumping rights and privileges in layoff situations. As a result, effective January 1, 1997, employees will be offered an alternative option of a cash buy out.

    (2) During the 1996 Legislative session, the State adopted a "Pay for Performance" option and asked the State Department of Personnel (SDOP) to develop a proposal. The proposed plan has been presented to the Legislature. After careful review of the proposal, the university developed and recommended alternatives to the plan. Pending the final decision by the Legislature, due in January 1997, the SDOP may provide some opportunity for greater flexibility within the State Classified System.

    The Classified Personnel Council has been informed and involved with all state and university initiatives involving State Classified Personnel.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT ISSUES (3AS.16):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should design and communicate procedures for dealing with employee issues involving administrative professionals to facilitate sound personnel practices, enhance trust and protect rights of such employees to the extent consistent with "at will" status.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Not applicable.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. The statement was reviewed and endorsed by the Administrative Professional Council and adopted by the President's Cabinet in December 1995. Information was disseminated to campus via memorandum, published in COMMENT, and the final statement appears in Section D.5.6, Formal Procedure for Dismissal of Administrative Professionals on the Grounds of Unsatisfactory Performance, in the *Academic Faculty & Administrative Professional Staff Manual*.**

TRAINING NEEDS (3AS.21):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should evaluate campus training needs and design a training program to meet the most critical and pressing needs of the University. Identified training needs include:*

   a) *management and supervisory training;*

   b) *expansion of new employee orientation to include formalized training for job duties;*

   c) *mandatory financial and management training programs;*

   d) *computer literacy;*

   e) *legal and ethical issues; and*

   f) *professional development.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** This recommendation is supported, including the specific requirement that some training be mandatory.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** While it is believed that training programs can do much to improve efficiency and effectiveness of staff, it will be very important that a clear listing of training priorities be developed and agreed upon by the campus. The campus basically has no central training program at this point in time. Therefore, the programs implemented must be very strong and of high quality, so as to form an effective foundation for the evolution of additional programs.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): In progress. Given that this recommendation is very similar to the training initiatives coming out of the President's Task Force on Financial Management, significant work has already been done to identify training priorities, including the following:**

(1) **An "Asset Manager" manual has been drafted, which includes assumptions and expectations for campus managers, as well as other written information that would be very useful as part of a campus training program.**

(2) **Work is underway on developing a proposal for a new employee orientation program for the campus, which will be pilot tested in Spring 1997.**

(3) **A draft implementation plan (draft Implementation Plan 4, Defining Faculty and Staff Responsibilities, Performance Expectations, and Professional Development Plans, with Evaluations Based on Those Definitions) has been developed that includes a description of basic campus training priorities. This draft will be provided to the university community for comment in January 1997 prior to finalization and presentation at the Spring 1997 Planning & Budget Hearings for consideration and funding.**

(4) **The Division of Administrative Services has implemented a "customer service" training program, using faculty and staff in the Department of Design, Merchandising & Consumer Science. Work is underway on an advanced session for supervisors.**

HUMAN RESOURCE EFFICIENCIES (3AS.22):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Vice President for Administrative Services should identify issues and create a plan to implement strategies to improve human resource efficiencies. Areas to be addressed first are coordination and consumer oriented provision of information concerning employee benefits and appointment/employment processes.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs. Given the overlap among 3AS.15, 3AS.21 and 3AS.22, it is further recommended that the Vice President for Administrative Services prepare a detailed plan for overall campus human resource service programs, which would address classification and compensation for state classified and administrative professionals, training needs, and other personnel and payroll changes that would increase service effectiveness (including automation needs and options). The report should recommend a level of priority for each new/enhanced service and associated resource requirements, and be ready for the FY 97 planning and budget cycle, requiring campus review prior to March 1, 1996.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** "Human resource" programs at Colorado State University have not been centralized in one office, neither has there been a rich array of personnel/human resource opportunities available to the campus in the past. The Human Resources Office has focused on payroll, personnel file maintenance, maintenance of the current automated personnel data base, procedural issues in meeting State Classified Personnel System requirements (classification, compensation, recruitment, hiring, termination, and grievances), and providing basic support in benefit management for all employees (which includes overall management of the campus self-funded health care program). The training program within this office, although small, was eliminated in previous reallocation exercises. The Office of Equal Opportunity currently provides some human resource services for faculty and administrative professional staff (recruitment,

conflict intervention, etc.); the Office of Instructional Services has historically offered some campus training programs (PDI training program each January, and the new general faculty orientation program each fall); the campus Ombudsman's office has provided support for employee conflict resolution; and the half-time faculty/staff coordinator, currently staffed in the University counseling center, who has provided "employee assistance program" support to the campus staff.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Administrative Services with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): A Human Resource Plan has been prepared. The Vice President for Administrative Services and the Director of Human Resources have shared the draft document with various campus groups for comment, and a final draft was included as part of the Spring 1996 Planning & Budget hearings. Key features of this plan involved: replacement of the current Human Resources System (HRS); enhanced and improved training programs for university employees; increasing the support for the assistance program for Academic Faculty, Administrative Professionals, and State Classified Personnel; participation in State Personnel Pilot Programs; hosting financial planning sessions for employees; improving health and other benefits for graduate students; developing a classification and compensation system for Administrative Professionals; and enhancing employee handbooks.**

Some aspects of the plan have already been implemented, such as: on-campus review of current State Classified position description questionnaires (PDQs); moving ahead on procurement of a new HRS system (RFP will be released early in calendar year 1997); and improving benefits for graduate students (to be implemented in FY 98, and already included in benefits rates submitted to DHHS).

<h1>INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS RECOMMENDATIONS</h1>

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS REPORTING LINE (3AS.23):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The Director of Intercollegiate Athletics should report directly to the Vice President for University Advancement.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The SPC supports the continuation of Intercollegiate Athletics' direct reporting to the President, with responsibility for daily oversight for Intercollegiate Athletics given to the Vice President for Research.

c. **Rationale (December 1995):** Given the nature of athletics, its relationship to the university and the NCAA, whose Council of Presidents plays a significant role in national athletic policy, the direct reporting relationship to the President is essential and must be continued. Assigning responsibility for the daily operations of athletics to a Vice President provides the necessary oversight of this large and complex activity without it taking a disproportionate part of the President's time and attention. After considering the distribution of responsibilities among the Vice Presidents, the President has asked the Vice President for Research to provide daily administrative oversight of athletics given the latter's personal experience at the university, which provides an understanding of the demands placed upon the President by NCAA and related responsibilities, in addition to the university-wide perspectives shared by the Vice Presidents.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. The Vice President for Research & Information Technology provides daily administrative oversight of Intercollegiate Athletics.**

REVIEW OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND E&G SUPPORT (3AS.24):

a. **Subcommittee Recommendation (September 1995):** *The President should request an external review of the Intercollegiate Athletics program with specific attention to the trade-offs between the use of E&G funds in athletics versus other high priority academic programs. If warranted by the review, a plan for reducing the amount of E&G funds to support Intercollegiate Athletics should be developed.*

b. **SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** The comprehensive, on-going reviews of the athletics program should continue to assure that Intercollegiate Athletics fulfills its role and mission in appropriate relationship to the other activities of the university. These reviews need to examine the levels and sources of financial support, program integrity, compliance with NCAA and federal regulations, and programmatic relationship with the university.

c. **Rationale (December 1995 and amended December 1996):** On-going reviews of Intercollegiate Athletics are:

1. Monthly reviews of income and expense budgets by the Vice President for Research & Information Technology with the Director and Business Manager of Athletics;

2. OBIA staff and the Vice President for Research & Information Technology meet with Intercollegiate Athletics on a quarterly basis to review budgets and financial conditions;

3. Intercollegiate Athletics' budgets are updated, reviewed and approved by the SBA;

4. Internal Auditing conducts an annual NCAA financial and compliance audit;

5. The NCAA requires a 5-year Athletic Certification consisting of an extensive self-evaluation and external review. This review is underway and is chaired by Dr. Elnora M. Gilfoyle.

6. The Office of Equal Opportunity and Office of Civil Rights perform an extensive annual Title IX compliance review.

7. Comparative financial data from Conference and College Football Association members are collected and reviewed annually.

These reviews provide input to the university administration and the State Board of Agriculture, which look carefully at Intercollegiate Athletics in terms of programmatic integrity and the balance of expenditures against other programmatic requirements to assure that Intercollegiate Athletics is pursuing excellence along with all other segments of the university.

Precise comparisons of athletic budgets with other universities are difficult because of differences in accounting and reporting practices. Unlike many universities, Colorado State University pays for facilities, debt retirement, public safety costs at games, conference dues, etc. Given these differences, it appears the Colorado State University Intercollegiate Athletics receives E&G support at a level that is essentially the average of WAC schools.

The increases in Intercollegiate Athletics' budget over the past five years were largely provided to cover increased tuition costs associated with athletic scholarships, supporting additional women's scholarships for Title IX compliance, and providing additional academic support service personnel to assist student athletes' progress to the goal of obtaining a degree. Currently, athletic scholarships are paid from E&G and donations. Athletics' strategy of enhancing donations and revenues from marketing should lead to reducing the percentage of E&G support to their overall budget in the future.

With E&G funding for athletics remaining essentially flat, variations in the percent of the total budget covered from E&G and student fee sources are a function of the total budget level of Intercollegiate Athletics. In FY 95, revenues and expenditures increased significantly because of the Holiday Bowl, which allowed Intercollegiate Athletics to repay a long-standing obligation of $475,000 to the university.

d. **President's Response to SPC Recommendation (December 1995):** Concurs with SPC recommendation and charges the Vice President for Research with implementation.

e. **Current Status (December 1996): Implemented. All seven types of reviews of Intercollegiate Athletics are on-going.**

   To aid the review and control of the Intercollegiate Athletics' budget, all revenue and expenses have been categorized as either recurring or one-time. This analysis is important

since athletic revenues and expenses fluctuate annually due to variations in scheduling, game guarantees, television coverage, bowl and post season play, etc. This analysis is designed to prevent on-going budget commitments being made in excess of the base recurring budget.

Recent athletics budget increases have come from such sources as increased ticket sales and prices, expanded sponsorships, and additional concession sales. Over time, the expectation is that the percentage of the athletics budget coming from E&G and student fee sources will decline.