Chapter 3
1994 Strengths and Concerns

In the 1994 NCA Evaluation Team report, strengths of CSU were identified and concerns were expressed. To provide some historical perspective, those strengths are listed and the institution's responses to the concerns are described.

Strengths

The strengths of CSU, as identified by the Evaluation Team, in respect to the criteria for accreditation were:

- CSU's mission was understood by all constituencies; and the University's academic programs, in emphasis and outcome, are fully consistent with its mission as well as being appropriate for a post secondary educational institution.
- The University's faculty is highly supportive of the University's mission and is actively seeking to create an optimal balance between teaching and research.
- The University's infrastructure for the support of instruction and research is of good quality.
- There is a high level of trust and confidence in the University's current leadership.
- The high quality of the faculty's research efforts is demonstrated by the faculty's success in attracting a large amount of extramural support for their research.
- The academic and student support staffs of CSU are working with dedication and effectiveness to support the University's academic mission.
- The University's Centers of Excellence and Emerging Centers of Excellence for research unmistakably advance CSU's reputation as a research university.
- The existence of a comprehensive university-wide strategic plan on whose aims, goals, and objectives there is consensus among the institution's various constituencies.
- The University has a commitment to and has made progress toward a system of collaborative and shared institutional governance.
- The extensive efforts to achieve diversity throughout the University show promise but remain vitally dependent on continued funding at current or increased levels.
- Innovative approaches to curriculum development and services to students are being encouraged throughout the University.

Response to Concerns

Seven concerns were identified and noted "as having direct consequences for the certification of the University as an accredited institution." An essential part of the Self-Study is to respond to concerns expressed by the previous NCA Evaluation Team. Progress in addressing each of these concerns is summarized in this chapter with detailed discussions referenced in subsequent chapters.

Concern One: The widespread reliance on temporary faculty to provide instruction in some departments may dilute the quality of the educational programs of those departments.

In 1992, the issue of increased hiring of part-time faculty and the associated problems became a focal point of discussion in Colorado with the formation of a statewide task force that reviewed the issue and submitted their findings in reports to the CCHE and governing boards. The reliance on temporary, part-time and nontenure-track faculty at CSU seems to mirror national trends. Most of the individuals filling these positions are highly motivated and well qualified.

The concerns associated with temporary faculty continue to receive serious consideration at CSU, especially in the face of budget challenges that limit the hiring of tenure-track faculty. An analysis of SCH production by instructor appointment type is presented in Chapter 6 (Table 6-17). In a number of programs and for a variety of reasons, the University continues to be highly dependent on persons other than tenure-track faculty to fill teaching assignments. Budget reductions, increased enrollment, and implementation of the AUCC are key factors that continue to drive the need for temporary faculty. With implementation of the AUCC, there was a campus-wide effort to increase the number of small enrollment (< 20 students) sections of courses taught by tenure-track faculty. Progress in this effort has slowed in FY04 in response to budget reductions. Limited revenue growth during the past 10 years has resulted in a decrease in the number of tenure-track faculty members. Also, tenure-track faculty members are managing many competing demands with increased emphasis on research productivity, graduate education, advising, and outreach activities as illustrated in the accomplishments described in Chapters 7 through 10. Finding the optimal mix of temporary instructors and tenure-track faculty continues to be a challenge for many departments of the University.

Concern Two: The library, both in study space and holdings, is inadequate to support the University's academic mission.

Morgan Library, the main facility, underwent a $20M expansion from 150,600 gsf to 299,600 gsf and renovation of all areas. The project was nearing completion at the time of the 1997 flood and was ultimately completed during 1998. This project added 900 user seats

offering a variety of study options including carrels, open tables, group studies, and informal seating. The popularity of the new facility is reflected in the significant increase in onsite use of the Libraries. Use of the building has increased almost 50% since building renovation with individual user entries as high as 20,000 on a single day.

The Libraries' collection continues to increase annually in the number of volumes (up from 1,606,642 in FY95 to 1,896,848 in FY03). The University has made it a priority to fund inflation of library materials each year since 1994, allowing the Libraries to maintain its acquisition level.

The Libraries suffered great loss in the July 1997 flood when approximately 462,000 volumes were damaged. This event provided funding opportunities to enrich the electronic infrastructure, holdings and services of the Libraries to accommodate the growing use of electronic resources. Insurance funding was used to restore items which could be repaired, replace remaining items which were identified as "core critical" to the print collections, and also fund a series of initiatives designed to create the *Library of the Future*. A Provost's Task Force, consisting of individuals from the Office of P/AVP, the Libraries, and academic faculty, outlined a plan for the *Library of the Future* following the 1997 flood <manta.library. colostate.edu/taskforce.pdf>. They strongly supported increased reliance on electronic resources and funding the Libraries for state-of-the-art technology. Morgan Library is now designed to support extensive use of web-based collections/access and also support increased use of web-based instruction and services. For example, students can now access reserve readings electronically from any location and the Libraries offer over 500 electronic databases.

Increased access has been facilitated by an expedited Interlibrary Loan (ILL) journal article delivery program (RAPID) developed at CSU, growing out of a customized ILL journal delivery system (FastFlood) that CSU designed to serve its users following the 1997 flood. RAPID is now used by 15 members of Association of Research Libraries (ARL). RAPID provides a high-speed, low-cost ILL model designed to provide users at each participating campus with 2-day or less article delivery directly to their desktops. CSU's ILL service has received national attention for its electronic innovations. Quality of the ILL service is explicitly indicated by the results of the 1997 *ARL Performance Survey on ILL*. The study identified CSU as one of eight institutions (out of more than 100 ARL libraries) as having high performing ILL operations. For borrowing, CSU was identified as the top performer.

The Libraries is an emerging leader in many aspects of electronic resources and services. A growing percentage of its materials budget is devoted to electronic resources. Morgan Library is in the process of implementing sophisticated software (SFX and MetaLib), which will facilitate access to full-text articles and integrate multiple formats of information for easy retrieval. Remote access to electronic resources has increased over 500% since 1998.

Morgan Library now boasts a staffed Electronic Information Center with over 300 public workstations, two high-end teaching laboratories, and wireless networking throughout the building. Laptop computers equipped for the wireless network are available for checkout at the Loan Desk and are in heavy demand by students.

CSU has made significant progress in addressing this concern. The Libraries is now ranked through ARL at 86 of 114 compared to 107 of 108 ten years ago. The adequacy of these library improvements is further evaluated in Chapter 6.

Concern Three: In consideration of equity, there is a need to establish consistent and clear standards, procedures, and processes for the determination of faculty promotions and tenure across the University.

In order to create consistency and to address concerns regarding inequities among the colleges' and departments' procedures and processes for evaluation of faculty members for promotion and tenure, a series of policy changes were made in the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (*AF&AP Manual*) Sections E.9-13 <facultycouncil. colostate.edu/files/manual/table.html>. To address this concern, these changes were adopted starting in 1995 through 1999.

Provision was made for compelling reasons that may warrant an extension of the probationary period for tenure, such as childbirth, care of an infant or sick child, the care of an elderly parent, or disability. The provisions for childbirth and childcare were added to aid in the recruitment and retention of female faculty members. Allowance was provided for an extension period of up to two years for childbirth and care of immediate family members. Up to two separate extensions, each not to exceed one year, may be approved. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prohibits discrimination against employees with disabilities in all employment practices, including tenure. Allowance was provided for extension of the probationary period under the ADA when documented to be necessary. Each extension is limited to one year, but without limitation on the number of extensions (Section E.9.4).

Tenure can be awarded upon appointment to a newly hired senior faculty member (previously awarded tenure at another academic institution and has the rank of associate professor or professor) if that person meets the requirements for tenure and is approved through the normal procedures of the institution (Section E.9.4).

Faculty productivity is defined as the basis for tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases. The new policy also addresses changing interests and talents over a faculty member's career and recognizes the value of differentiated effort distributions for individual faculty (Section E.9).

Performance reviews must be based upon the faculty member's effort distribution in each of the areas of responsibility. Adjustment of distribution of professional responsibilities throughout a faculty member's career is encouraged. All faculty members are subject to

annual reviews of performance for the purpose of evaluation for merit salary increases. Comprehensive performance reviews are required at the midpoint of a tenure-track appointment probationary period to make an early determination of the prospects for the granting of tenure. Comprehensive performance reviews are also required at 5-year intervals after the achievement of tenure to assess progress toward promotion, to facilitate continued professional development, to refocus professional efforts when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their obligations to the University. The effort distribution may be adjusted by agreement between the faculty member and department head to focus on the faculty member's interest, demonstrated performance, and needs of the department. A linkage has been provided between performance reviews and corrective actions (Section E.11).

The general responsibilities and standards for achieving tenure and promotion were clarified. The changes assure that annual and periodic comprehensive evaluations are based upon each faculty member's assigned distribution of effort in teaching and advising, research and other creative activity, and service and/or outreach, and provide examples of the types of activities that may be evaluated in annual and periodic comprehensive reviews and considered in decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases (Section E.11 and E.12).

Changes were made to provide a more comprehensive definition of teaching, to expand the list of characteristics of excellent teachers, to clarify the policy on evaluation of teaching effectiveness, and to clarify the policy on evaluation of advising effectiveness. The "creation of opportunities for learning" was added to the definition of teaching to emphasize the increasing recognition of student-centered learning. In 2000, service learning was added to the definition of teaching to clarify that it is a form of experiential education aimed at enhancing and enriching student learning of course material. Service learning is a teaching method that is specifically designed to develop knowledge, skills and values. It provides a balanced emphasis on both student learning and on addressing community issues (outreach) (Section E.12).

When tenure is granted to an assistant professor, the individual will be promoted concurrently to associate professor. Section E.13 also establishes five years in rank as the norm between associate professor and professor, defines conditions for early consideration, and codifies provision for allowing service at other academic institutions to count toward time in rank by requiring explicit stipulation in the appointment letter.

The Office of the Provost/Academic Vice President (P/AVP) has prepared and updated standard procedures, guidelines, and forms for evaluations, promotions, and tenure decisions to create consistency among the activities of the University's colleges and departments and to standardize reports to the Board. Instructions and forms are readily accessible on the web <www.provost.colostate.edu/index.asp?url=faculty_affairs> for complying with the above described policies and procedures.

The standardized annual evaluation form requires individualized quantification of effort distribution (in percentages) for each of the three evaluation categories (Instruction, Advising and Mentoring; Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity; University/ Professional/ Public Service and Outreach) and one of five ratings that best matches the faculty member's accomplishments. Efforts are currently underway to develop a standardized workload appraisal system for performance-based budgeting to colleges and departments. Two colleges (Applied Human Sciences, and Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences) are currently testing sophisticated workload appraisal models. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has noted weaknesses and inconsistencies in the evaluation of service and outreach activities of individual faculty members. Issues such as this are discussed with the Council of Deans (COD) so they can be addressed within the colleges.

The promotion and tenure application form has been reviewed and revised several times in recent years, most recently in August 2001. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is responsible for monitoring compliance with all application procedures and consistency of applications. All application packets are required to include a copy of the department code (specifies the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure), the three most recent annual performance evaluations (to gauge consistency of performance and assigned effort distribution), and the appointment letter (to identify any explicit agreements). When applicable, the application must also include mid-probationary reviews, post-tenure reviews, and/or departmental "progress toward tenure" reviews. In addition, all application packets must contain a minimum of five external peer review letters from evaluators with rank equivalent to or higher than the applied for rank. The nomination and selection process for external evaluators is designed to identify evaluators qualified to judge the accomplishments, contributions, and reputation of the candidate. The evaluators are asked specific evaluation questions regarding the qualifications of the candidate. This process is intended to establish equity within disciplines and fairness across the University. After consideration in the home department, all promotion and tenure applications are reviewed by a senior administrative body within each college to foster consistency among departments and advise the Dean in composing the college recommendation. The Provost and Vice Provosts evaluate all applications and select some for detailed review and discussion by the COD. All applications that seem to be poorly documented, controversial, or present candidates for "early" consideration are selected as well as a few exemplary applications from diverse disciplines. The subsequent review and discussion of promotion and tenure applications helps the Deans identify best practices and improves the consistency of procedures, processes and decision-making for all disciplines of the University.

Concern Four: More needs to be done to create programs fostering the development of women faculty, staff, and students.

CSU values all employees and has taken specific actions to promote gender equity at all levels. In Fall 1994, the Task Force on the Status of Women was created to determine the issues and priorities for women at CSU and to make recommendations to the President for addressing these priorities. In April of 1996, the task force completed its report entitled *Women at Colorado State University,* which identified the most salient concerns of women at CSU. Issues of campus climate, work environment, work/life balance, safety and harassment, diversity, and communication were all perceived as advancement challenges for women.

The Task Force on the Status on Women recommended the establishment of the President's Commission on Women and Gender Equity to more systematically address gender concerns at the institutional level. This Commission was appointed in January 1997 and charged with assisting the University in designing, implementing, and evaluating strategies for achieving gender equity, based on issues and recommendations raised in the Task Force Report. In 1998, a symposium on Women and Gender Equity was held at CSU, and the Commission proposed and was granted two-year pilot funding for an employee development project. Since that time the Commission has served a significant leadership role and has been proactive in making recommendations for change.

During the mid-1990s, the Institute for Women and Leadership was organized to explore gender issues in leadership. Mentoring groups were organized each semester for female faculty and staff at all levels to discuss advancement issues and to receive peer support. Over 80 CSU female faculty and staff participated in this mentoring program.

In 1997, the Commission on Women and Gender Equity and the Institute for Women and Leadership jointly identified and submitted 15 recommendations for improving search processes at CSU. Several of the recommendations have been implemented. For example, training for search committee chairs started in 1997 and the training of search committee members began in 2000. Staff from the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) lead these training sessions and include the following topics: a review of the research-based literature on gender issues in search and selection processes; how to design appropriate, consistent and nondiscriminatory interview questions to assess candidate competencies and attributes critical for the position; information on differences among qualified candidates and how these differences influence communication and leadership style; and ways to equitably evaluate the accomplishments of men and women and overcome bias in search and hiring practices. The OEO requires each search committee to develop a formal plan and timeline for advertising faculty searches, guidelines for questions asked of references and candidates, and criteria and standards used in evaluating individuals in the applicant pool. The charging party and the OEO representative then approve these materials.

CSU has made significant progress toward gender equity in hiring, retention, promotion and tenure actions within the tenure-track faculty as presented in the *Study of Faculty Retention, Promotion and Tenure 2002-03*. A total of 700 faculty members were hired into tenure-track positions in FY90 through FY03. Women accounted for 325 (46%) of the total hires, including 46% of new assistant professors. Of the 376 total faculty members hired into a tenure-track position in FY90 through FY97, 256 (68%) were still employed in a tenure-track position after seven years, including 95 (68%) of the women. Of the 226 assistant professors hired during FY90 through FY97, 182 (68%) were still employed in a tenure-track position at the end of the seven-year period, including 83 (69%) of the women. The average time to tenure and promotion for assistant professors hired into a tenure-track position during the period FY90 through FY96 was 6.2 years for men and 6.3 years for women.

Although there continues to be a historical deficit of women in the faculty, especially in the higher ranks, the percentage of women in the faculty has risen to a new high of 25.7% in FY03. This percentage of women in faculty positions at CSU is just below the median of peer institutions (*The Fact Book*).

In a December 2000 *Survey of Work Experiences and Diversity Activities* of CSU faculty and staff, a larger percentage of women (34%) than men (19%) reported the perception that they had experienced the discomfort of discrimination, and over three times the percentage of women (33%) than men (10%) indicated that they had been treated less favorably because of their sex. A follow-up survey in 2003, sponsored by the Office of P/AVP and OEO, found women's perception of the campus work environment to be more positive but still a concern. In the 2003 survey, 29% of women indicated that they had experienced the discomfort of discrimination (20% for men), and 31% of women indicated that they were treated less favorably because of their gender (11% for men).

Other programs that support the development of women faculty include the Career Enhancement Grants sponsored by the Office of P/AVP and OEO, and the professional development plan in the College of Liberal Arts (CLA).

In Fall 2003, women comprise 51.3% of overall student enrollment at CSU. Some noted programs readily accept and advance women. For example, the Professional Veterinary Medicine (PVM), University Honors Program, and US Air Force ROTC currently enroll 75%, 72%, and 41% women, respectively.

CSU is actively involved in efforts that support the development of young female scholars through programs for underrepresented students in science and engineering as described in Chapter 9. In addition, promising undergraduate students from underrepresented populations in graduate school who are seeking careers in science or engineering and/or college teaching have been supported through external funded initiatives. The Women and

Minorities in Engineering Program provides information, resources, and academic/professional development programs for women and minority engineering students.

As an example of turning adversity to advantage, CSU was the subject of a Title IX lawsuit in 1993, resulting from the elimination of women's softball. The University is now one of only a handful of Division IA athletic programs in full compliance with Title IX. The Office of Civil Rights praised CSU for achieving full compliance with Title IX – and for setting a nationwide standard and example through its support of gender equity in athletics. In recent years, CSU has achieved unprecedented success in women's and men's athletics, particularly in women's volleyball and basketball.

Concern Five: Clear goals and direction for departmental actions in response to important University initiatives such as diversity are often not clearly delineated.

The major mechanism for coordinating and integrating departmental activities with key institutional initiatives is consistent attention to clear and frequent communications. In the early 1990s, semi-annual leadership retreats provided an opportunity for CSU leaders at all levels from both academic and support units to come together to address major issues of concern and to focus efforts for the coming year. The Fall Forum was typically held off-campus for 1-2 days, so participants could devote uninterrupted time and attention to institutional priorities. Although the format and theme varied somewhat from year to year, ample time was always allowed for facilitated discussion of the key issues. This dialogue has been the vehicle to solving problems, meeting challenges and addressing new opportunities. Topics discussed over the past few years at the retreats have included such crosscutting areas as program assessment and evaluation, student recruitment and retention, faculty workload and effort distribution, interdisciplinary education, building community, strategic planning, and implementation of the core curriculum. Achieving diversity goals has been a recurring theme, and was addressed again in Fall 2002 as a major component of strategic planning. The leadership retreats are being de-emphasized as communication among all levels of administration (department chairs through vice presidents) has improved.

At CSU, diversity planning is integrated with other University-wide planning processes. The USP for FY 1998-2001 identified the development of the 5-year University Diversity Plan as a key strategy. As special USP objectives and strategies developed over the 5-year period covered in the University Diversity Plan, the plan's goals and initiatives were articulated in revisions to the USP. This critical planning linkage assures high-priority consideration for diversity initiatives in the planning process and the annual budget process. The annual Diversity Summit is another venue for unifying departmental actions in meeting institutional diversity goals. It provides a forum for addressing diversity initiatives and facilitates the process of updating the University Diversity Plan.

In 2001, the Office of P/AVP instituted a requirement for a student retention plan in each department that emphasizes the retention of diverse students. At that time, the Diversity Summit focused on helping department heads and directors develop their departmental retention plans. To enhance communication and planning regarding diversity initiatives across the institution, the CSU Diversity Advisory Committee was reorganized and renamed the Diversity Coordinating Council (DCC) to enhance its effectiveness by providing stronger leadership and more clearly delineating goals to all units. Other efforts to support the University's diversity initiatives include appointment of the President's Commission on Ethnic Diversity Issues and the establishment of a website that provides access to diversity information resources <diversity.colostate.edu/>.

The adoption and successful implementation of the AUCC provides another example of collaboration and shared vision across all academic units. This initiative was the result of several years of discussions and planning with broad campus involvement. Many departments teach courses that fulfill general educational requirements, and each academic department or college teaches two key components of the undergraduate core: the first year seminars and senior capstone courses. This broad participation in delivering core courses has contributed to the successful transition to a new AUCC with common experiences for undergraduate students regardless of discipline.

The connection and integration of various institutional planning activities are discussed in more detail in Chapter 11.

Concern Six: The University's program review and evaluation process may require revision to enhance the appropriateness of this process in providing guidance to strategic planning.

The Academic Program Review Process has been revised and updated several times in recent years. The current operation of this process and its integration into strategic planning are described in Chapter 11. In addition, the Plan for Researching Improvement and Supporting Mission (PRISM) is designed to provide a closer link between the program improvement research process (outcomes assessment) and strategic planning. For example, every assessment plan is required to identify how it links to CSU's strategic plan and mission. The integration of program reviews, strategic planning, and budgeting processes is discussed in detail in Chapter 11.

Concern Seven: Uncertainties in the level of state funding, both near- and long-term, may jeopardize the success of the University's strategic plan.

During the early stages of strategic planning at the time of the 1994 Evaluation Team visit, the USP represented an unrealistic wish list of needs that could not readily be prioritized. It was unreasonable to expect that limited available resources could accommodate

allocation of base funds or one-time allocations for lists that were 100-1000 times larger than the resources. The evolution of the USP process has resulted in focusing priorities into a much shorter list of needs that are reasonably balanced against resource projections. Certainly in these economic times, each state can claim there is uncertainty in funding for all public programs. However, the successes of CSU over the past decade strongly suggest that its leadership has developed strategies to deal with revenue parameters in the state and the expectation is that creative solutions will continue to be crafted to address institutional needs. The University planning process and current uncertainties of state funding are reviewed in Chapter 11.

Conclusion

Each of the concerns identified in the 1994 Evaluation Team report has received serious consideration by the institution as documented above. Some issues have been resolved, progress has been made on others, and some are ongoing challenges. The responses in this chapter are meant to be summaries with in-depth discussion of the accomplishments and ongoing challenges in subsequent chapters of the Self-Study Report.