

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, April 12, 2022
3:00pm – Microsoft Teams

Present: Sue Doe, Chair; Andrew Norton, Vice Chair; Melinda Smith, BOG Representative; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Mary Pedersen, Provost/Executive Vice President; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Linda Meyer, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Mike Antolin, Natural Sciences; Jennifer Peel, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences

Guests: President Joyce McConnell; Jenelle Beavers, Vice President for Strategy; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Frederick (Bill) Rankin, Business (substituting for Rob Mitchell)

Absent: Rob Mitchell, Business (excused); Jane Stewart, Agricultural Sciences

Chair Sue Doe called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

April 12, 2022 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – March 29, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: On page 5 of the agenda packet, am quoted as saying “locations” and meant “occasions.”

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Asked if there were any additional corrections.

Hearing none, minutes approved by unanimous consent with the edit from Pedros-Gascon.

B. Faculty Council Minutes – April 5, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from April 5th. Have one addition. Silvia Canetto asked us to make sure we indicated that the words she spoke were also placed into the chat as part of the record.

Pedros-Gascon: Indicated in the chat that second question and exchange between him and Athletic Director Joe Parker does not appear in the minutes. Will advance wording for inclusion in the minutes.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further corrections, will consider these approved by unanimous consent. If there are further changes, we will hear them on the floor of Faculty Council.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on April 19, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on May 3, 2022 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

B. *President's Report – President Joyce McConnell*

President Joyce McConnell: Want to start with some legislative updates that would be helpful for the Faculty Council to be aware of. One is the possibility of legislature and then the governor signing into law the rights of faculty and administrative professionals to bargain collectively. There has been a lot of conversation, especially since the legislatures decision to have Colorado WINS represent classified staff, and there have been ongoing negotiations at the state level with Colorado WINS. This collective bargaining legislation is different in that the legislature and the government would not be declaring Colorado WINS as the representative. It would allow administrative professionals and faculty members to engage in collective bargaining like any other private sector employees and they would be able to choose among any of the highly regarded organizations.

President McConnell: If the state were to permit public sector collective bargaining among higher education employees, we are wondering if the state would then see itself in any way obligated to address the concerns that are being raised in the collective bargaining. For example, if there were changes in benefits, would that be the responsibility of the local campus or would the state be willing to pay for those changes. Have not heard these conversations taking place. Would be happy to send the collective bargaining legislation.

Chair Doe: Would be great if we could see the legislation.

Mike Antolin: Commented in the chat that having the legislative on collective bargaining in hand would allow us to have an informed discussion about what form this might take, and whether Faculty Council has a direct role in advising how the collective bargaining might be organized.

President McConnell: The other piece of legislation that is going through that could possibly be detrimental for us, depending on the form it gets passed in, is a piece of legislation that allows for stackable certificates and credentialing in different ways, The funding is solely focused on community colleges and there seems to be some concern that four-years would not be allowed in the game or squeezed out of the game. Provost Mary Pedersen went to the Higher Learning Commission conference this week, and one of the keynote speakers talked about the significance of four-years being able to get to a place where we are able to offer certificates and stackable certificates, not only at the undergraduate level but at the graduate level as well. If there is legislation that freezes us out, that could be a concern for future educational innovation.

Melinda Smith: Asked in the chat: Can you clarify what is meant by “stackable”?

President McConnell: Responded to Smith's question. What is happening in a lot of other states is students, whether they are degree-pursuing or not, can take a limited number of courses. Often it is three 3-credit courses, so nine total credits, and it gives them a certificate in something. A student could get a certificate in something like coding, and then get another, totaling eighteen credits, and use this as a basis for an Associate's. Gave example of a niche area in someone's discipline. They may pursue a certificate, even though it is not a degree, to better understand their area. These become stackable and they can accumulate other credits and other certificates which will ultimately lead to some other higher level of credentialing. Provost Pedersen may have more academic insights on this, but the idea is that many of our newer students demographically may not be traditional students following a four-year degree in an uninterrupted pattern. Allowing them to get certificates as they go can help them in the workplace and leverage to an Associate's and then an undergraduate degree and graduate degree. It is really about addressing the academic needs of the perceived new trend.

Smith: Asked in the chat: Is the idea that it would put CSU competitively at a disadvantage?

President McConnell: There are two concerns around that. If this is going to be a new trend and competitive space in academics around innovation, we certainly do not want to be squeezed out of that and lose revenue. That is really the biggest concern. We do not want to see any doors closed on us at this point before we understand how our students and future students may benefit.

President McConnell: Know people have been following the fact that the state has \$450 million in ARPA funds, which are one-time funds coming off stimulus funds, but the state has not made firm decisions on how they will allocate those funds. We have been trying to make arguments for one-time funds where they are appropriate, but so far legislature has had a fairly opaque process about how they will distribute that money. Behavioral health is a good example. They created a new Behavior Health Administration, and they will feed a chunk of that \$450 million into behavioral health and then they will have a smaller grant system where people on campuses could submit proposals for grants or smaller amounts of money. There are only twenty-one days left in the legislative session. We are trying to get in as much as we can.

President McConnell: On the federal side, the Pell amount went up \$400, and in the FY23 budget, President Joe Biden is trying to raise it another \$1,700. The total Pell increase over two years would be over \$2,100. At \$400, that is the highest bump in Pell funding for our neediest students. Our federal lobbyists are working on the larger Pell amounts.

President McConnell: In state budget issues, the state is slated to appropriate \$17.3 million to the CSU System and have the CSU System work as a conduit to us. This money gets cut up in a number of different ways. Around \$8.2 million of it comes forward as special educational program funds, and those program funds are not as discretionary as others. If you take out the \$8.2 million, we have a little less than \$10 million that is discretionary, and the 3% increase for state classified staff also comes out of this number. The \$17.3 million is 11.7% more than we got in FY22. Asked if there were any questions about this.

Smith: Curious about the special education programs. Asked: Are there particular earmarks that they have identified, or is this just a pool that this goes to?

President McConnell: They are not treated as earmarks, but they are funding for special programs defined by the state. For example, Extension and the Colorado Department of Forestry are special programs. That money gets separated from the funding formula because it is not supporting what the legislature has historically thought of as the core academic mission of the University. We have a lot of special programs because we are the land grant, which is typical around the country.

President McConnell: In the 11.7% increase over FY22, this includes the increases in special program amounts and the 3% the state has allocated to classified staff raises. We need to look at other revenue streams and tuition is one of them. This has always been a serious policy conversation. The state is giving us permission to raise tuition about 2%, and as far as we can tell, this is what institutions of higher education in the state are going to do. A 2% increase for our resident undergraduates comes to a little bit more than \$200 a year. It is up to us what we want to do with resident and non-resident undergraduates and our graduate students. In Pueblo, they are considering a 2% across the board raise in tuition for undergraduates and a 3% tuition increase for graduates. We have some serious thinking to do as far as our approach, because within Faculty Council and administratively, we have been trying to increase the conditions of our GTAs and GRAs. If we were to decide to raise graduate tuition by 3%, we will progressively be undoing the money we have set aside every year to increase their stipends. Thinking about what direction we want to go as a University is an important question for us.

Chair Doe: Asked in the chat: How much of the discretionary \$10 million will the 3% classified staff raise take?

President McConnell: Clarified that the 3% raise for classified staff is included in the 11.7% increase. It is calculated into the total amount.

President McConnell: Want to provide the normal caveats that we never really know what the budget from the state will be until the ink is dry. This is usually not until June.

President McConnell: Want to briefly give a review of where we have been over the last couple of years, so we understand the choices we have made through the pandemic. In FY20, faculty and administrative professionals had a 4% pool for raises. In FY21, by the time we were in the middle of budget planning, we had hit the pandemic and gone remote, and there was a 0% pool in FY21. In FY22, we did a 3% pool, which was paid at 1.5% in one fiscal year and another 1.5% in another fiscal year. We have not made the decision yet for FY23 because we are waiting for figures from the state and waiting to make decisions about tuition increases.

President McConnell: For state classified, there was a 3% increase in FY20, 0% in FY21, and 3% in FY22, and the legislature has agreed to a 3% increase for FY23. In four years, the budget commitment for state classified raises has totaled 9%. For faculty and administrative professionals, that total is 7%, if we were to do nothing this year. Wanted to put it in this way so we understand the perspective of where we are in each of our job categories.

President McConnell: In terms of tuition increases, we had a 0% increase in FY20 and FY21, and a 3% increase in FY22, as well as the approval for an additional 2% increase this year, but

we can decide what we want to do there. Want to make sure we are all on the same page. For every year we do not do a tuition increase and you have an inflationary year and have no other income coming from the state, you are falling behind. We are coming through a four-year period where we have not brought in the revenue needed given what would be normal growth and for competitive salaries, raises, or any other kinds of investments. The year before the pandemic, we had enrollment increases that increased our budget and increased revenue by \$13.9 million. In the pandemic year, we fell and had a decline of almost \$30 million in our revenue. We are trying to climb back out of that. In the midst of all this, we did bring up the base salaries of our non-tenure track faculty and we built in 10% bumps for the promotion ladder. All of this is budgeted in the current budget, and we have not taken this out for the FY23 budget. We want to keep that momentum. Asked if there were any questions.

Antolin: Would like to know what the annual rate of inflation is in the state, particularly for this part of the state, because it differs in other parts of the country and state, especially with the inflation being estimated to raise 8.5% this year nationwide. The other question is how the state budget varies within that each year. Feels this context is needed to understand this better.

President McConnell: Thanked Antolin. Inflation is a serious issue right now. Had not heard the 8.5% inflation for northern Colorado, had heard 5.7%. These may not be accurate, either could be possible. More significant than the consumer inflation rate that we are dealing with is the housing inflation rate. These are really serious concerns in terms of not just affordable housing for people who are here but also attracting top talent in the faculty ranks, because people may decide to go elsewhere because it is simply unaffordable to live here on the salaries we are able to offer. We have to be mindful of our competitive market and that other places have not experienced the housing crunch that we have.

President McConnell: Want to give a lot of credit to Laura Jensen, who has been working very hard to pull all the CUPA data of our peers for our faculty salaries to help us understand our competitiveness, or lack thereof, better. Provost Pedersen may be able to address this directly, but we have done some preliminary figures about what we think it would take to get all our faculty to 85%, or to 90%, 95%, or even 100% and how we could do that over a number of years. Have a question out to General Counsel about whether we can place caps each year so we can spread the money farther. There was some back and forth about whether we can draw distinctions among faculty over a certain income level. Last year's answer was probably not because of the new Colorado law that was passed on equity pay. Waiting to hear back for this year's analysis on that.

Vice Provost Susan James: Commented in the chat that Jensen says the CUPA data is from so many areas across the nation that it accounts for cost of living for us fairly well since CUPA data includes places with both lower and higher cost of living.

Pedros-Gascon: Happy to hear that we are taking into consideration the enormous impact of inflation. Expressed concern over report from Athletic Director Parker at the last Faculty Council meeting, where the budget was presented that was missing the info about bond payments, and then waking up this week to reports of the sale of Hughes Stadium being used for coach buyouts and to the Board of Governors. Think this speaks a lot to the disconnect between this and the

reality in the institution. We always seem to be competing with CU-Boulder, who announced they are doing a 3% pay raise and then we are unable to do that.

President McConnell: Have not said we are unable to do that. We have policy questions in front of us about how we want to do that.

Pedros-Gascon: It was presented in the Faculty Council meeting as potentially a 0% scenario.

Vice Provost James: Commented in the chat that the reality is that folks across campus have been assuming a 0% raise and some deans indicated they thought this was this case.

Antolin: Commented in the chat that the general impression across campus is that faculty raises of 0% are being considered. Today's announcement in the Coloradoan that Hughes Stadium sales revenues are being used for coaching buyouts does not look good to those who are seeing 0% raises at the same time. Bring this up in terms of poor optics. Also understand that the Hughes decisions were made by the Board separately from the current budget exercises, but this does not look good.

President McConnell: Can understand the context in which this was presented by Vice Provost James at the Faculty Council meeting. We weren't sure if we were going to get another allocation and weren't sure if there would be an increase from the state, or whether they would allow an increase for tuition. Today we know with greater certainty that there will be an increase in allocation from the state and permission to raise tuition, so it gives us more room to make decisions about how we want to allocate that funding.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed hope that the concerns would be transmitted. This is a serious and delicate situation, and people are asking for very clear follow-ups about the way in which this administration decides to proceed.

President McConnell: Thanked Pedros-Gascon for bringing this up. Part of the frustration is how late the legislature operates in the year. Budgets should be firm in February, but that is not how they do it in Colorado. For those in leadership positions, we make recommendations to the Board on the budget, and the Board has to approve it. Part of what we have to work on is a strong case for why we are recommending the budget we are recommending so that we can get the votes of approval on the Board. This is not done until May, so not surprised that people are anxious, because we are at that point in this cycle.

President McConnell: Want to comment on Hughes. The decisions about Hughes were made long before current administration, before Smith was the Board of Governors representative, and before many current members were on the Board. Those decisions were firmed up by the Board at the point which Hughes Stadium came down and plans went forward. Whether we like it or not, those decisions were made by a different Board at a different time. Now the city owns the land, and revenue goes to the System to fulfill commitments already made by the System. Understand how people are feeling, but this was something that was locked in long before we were able to have an impact.

Pedros-Gascon: This reinforces opinion that this Board of Governors is detached and insensitive to decisions they make. Have asked them to attend our Faculty Council meetings. Feels it would make sense to have them try to be in more contact with the people they are supposed to be ruling.

President McConnell: During the pandemic, we were not able to have them come to campus, but they will be coming for this next meeting in May, which will be great.

Pedros-Gascon: They will not be meeting faculty. They are just meeting with themselves and have little exposure to the problems of the people and the questions being raised by faculty.

President McConnell: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Will work on this.

Smith: What is being set up is the potential decision-making process for compensation, which is the idea of putting funds into a pool to bring them up versus merit increases. All for bringing up salaries and keeping them in line with peer institutions and making them competitive. By doing this, though, it seems the onus is put on colleges and departments to retain people that are not getting merit increases who may decide to go to another university to get their raises. It is a difficult situation. Thinking as well about our annual exercises of filling out faculty activity reports. Wondering, if we're going this route to bring people up, why we are bothering with the merit part of the faculty evaluation. Seems an exercise in futility if the outcome is that some faculty are not going to get a raise while others get brought up who are falling behind, while the people up there are going to continue to fall behind.

President McConnell: This is exactly right. It is hard to determine the best approach that is the fairest approach but also the approach that really supports our people. Thanked Smith for raising an important point. We have essentially put the pressure on individual faculty members, department heads, Deans, then the Provost's Office, and then the overall budget to do these out of cycle retention packages, which we are also trying to get some control over. There are also all sorts of ethical issues about what it means if one person gets something and someone else doesn't. It doesn't mean the other person was squeakier than the other. Then if you are looking at identity issues, gender issues, there are places where this can become a tool of inequity. Expressed appreciation for this being brought up. As President, have to ultimately make the decision, but hold this group in high regard and it is helpful to hear what everyone is thinking.

Smith: Would like to make a comment as the Board of Governors representative. It is true that they are over there, and we are over here, but they have a fiduciary responsibility to the System. That is their primary goal. Their goal is fiduciary responsibility, and that is different from what we are doing.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand, but they are very selective on the kinds of decisions they are willing to advance. Understand they are fiduciary, but they could be fiduciary in many other ways. Think their lack of engagement with this institution and the faculty here. They seem impervious to the struggles of faculty when it comes to budget. We are a university, and they should understand that point, and it feels that they are not really concerned with that.

Smith: Can communicate that to them.

Andrew Norton: Thanked President McConnell for this discussion. Requested clarification on earlier comment about giving raises to people based on equity positions. Said that this was something General Counsel said we could not do last year.

President McConnell: They are using the term of the law last year. We can always make equity corrections when they are based on what we would call legally identifiable characteristics. We are using salary competitiveness language to try to get clarity on what we are all talking about. What we are asking General Counsel is if we can make distinctions and say someone making over a certain amount is not eligible for a 3% raise so we can redirect the money where the need is greater. This doesn't mean we don't want to retain this individual or that they are not good employees. Had asked this during the pandemic, and their response was that they didn't think we could draw those kinds of distinctions. Trying to find this out.

Norton: Some years ago in department, there was a 4% salary exercise, and a portion of that was a percent-based on merit and had another portion that was a dollar value to try to address the unusually high variance and salaries in the unit. Wondering if this is a possibility.

President McConnell: This is absolutely on the table. This may be the direction we go because we can split it to achieve both goals at the same time. It doesn't help with Antolin's concern about the hedge against inflation, but that's the trade-off.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell for engaging us in this conversation. Have spent much of this past week responding to faculty questions about this and where we stand. Think this reflects a level of anxiety and real concern. Hearing this, it sounds like maybe things are not as solidly decided as we might have thought and there is still room for figuring out how things are going to move forward. It is not clear to faculty what this model might be. Think we need an understanding of what the strategy would look like as soon as possible because the level of anxiety and concern is extremely high, and it is within the context of the tremendous inflation that we are facing and being two years into a pandemic and feeling they have put their lives on the line to make things work. It is also in the context of high salaries in the coaching ranks and then reading things in the newspapers about buyouts.

President McConnell: In terms of timing, we are still waiting on last words from the legislature. We need to have our Board materials in by 5:00 p.m. on the 19th. The budget always goes in, but often gets tweaked between materials being submitted and the actual day of the meeting. It is not usually radical changes in policy, philosophy, or processes. It usually is that we are learning more about things like enrollment numbers or financial aid numbers. We wait for guidance from the System about what it is, and we are able to consider structuring very soon various scenarios in the budget. Once we build those out, we can share them publicly.

President McConnell: Not sure if this will be helpful, but with the Hughes money, that is all one-time money. When we are talking about salaries, this is to infinity. We are projecting out how we can make this budget year after year, and that is why it is so dependent on the state allocation and the revenue projections. There is one-time money out there and we could make different decisions. The one-time money won't fund raises over the long-term. There may be \$12 million that comes from Hughes, but it goes away and gets spent. There is no more of that money,

whereas when we are planning for raises, we are planning for those ongoing revenue streams that we can rely on. This will not be our last opportunity to talk about this. As this gets firmed up, we are going to do more of this work together and address how we communicate this out well to break through some of the anxiety.

Sybil Sharvelle: Expressed appreciation for acknowledgment of the anxiety. Think a large part of this issue is a lack of transparency or a lack of understanding from the faculty on what the priorities for spending are. There is a feeling that there are a lot of things being put at a higher priority than faculty and graduate students, which are core to our function as a university. Without good faculty and good students, Courageous Strategic Transformation can't go anywhere. Feels that more transparency on the priorities would be helpful.

President McConnell: One place we have not had hard conversations is how much money we spend administratively on student support services. Not saying students don't deserve this support or that this is not important, but if you look at areas of growth in our budget, the biggest increases have been in student services and student support. We value our students and those internally and externally want us to do more for our students. We do need to have conversations about the core mission of the University, which is educating students, and sometimes we have to make hard decisions to stop. We are still 47th in the country for funding of higher education, and with inflation and TABOR limiting what the state can do, do not see this getting better. If that is where we are, then we have to make some decisions about where our priorities are and how we can do a better job of delivering on our core and make smarter decisions about how we administratively support our students. We do wonderful things for our students, but our structure for supporting students is much bigger than comparable universities of our size.

Vice Provost James: Commented in the chat that investing in faculty is an investment in student success, so President McConnell has a point.

Chair Doe: Commented in the chat that the gamble has been that if we invest heavily in student support, we retain students and those students in seats are key to long-term fiscal and social success.

President McConnell: Responded to Chair Doe's comment in the chat. Expressed agreement, but we have not assessed which of our investments in student support actually move the needle in terms of retention and graduation. Asked in the chat: What if we are doing things that are not moving the needle? Think we would all agree that we should invest in support that will make a difference.

Chair Doe: Commented in the chat. Think that under former VP Paul Thayer and the Student Success Initiative, we were able to show that the suite of student support efforts was resulting in retention at a significant level. Understanding was that more recent efforts were to become more fine-grained. It sounds like the data has not demonstrated where the distinctions are that show the most important results.

Chair Doe: Thanked President McConnell for this conversation. Do not see any further questions. We look forward to hearing next steps.

President McConnell: Thanked group for rich conversation. Want to continue to engage and it doesn't necessarily have to be only at Faculty Council meetings. We can try to work through this in different ways. Would like to partner with faculty in tackling these big values and the questions ahead of us. It will make the budgeting a lot easier if we have some sense of where we want to go together as an institution.

C. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Mary Pedersen

Provost Mary Pedersen: Would like to have a conversation at another meeting around the credentialing item. Went to the Higher Learning Commission annual conference with Jensen. It was the focus of the conference, and everyone was talking about micro-credentialing and stacking credentials. Look forward to sharing more about this in the future.

Provost Pedersen: Want to add on to President McConnell's conversation. Expressed appreciation for President McConnell's transparency. This is one of our top priorities. It is important to recognize that a lot of the discussion and decisions we are dealing with revolve around enrollment. As many people know, our enrollment projections are based on a lot of assumptions, so we are focusing hard on making sure that we have a good strategy in place for enrollment. The projections for this next year are based on a 2% enrollment increase. We are working hard on a large incoming class, but our continuing numbers are smaller and are projected to be down about 200 students. We are looking hard at how we can increase transfers, and we need to put the revenue and funding for marketing and strategy around enrollment.

Provost Pedersen: With the 3% raise increase from last year, it was split and \$5.5 million went into last year's budget, and the other \$5.5 million is already in this year's budget. The other thing that is built into the budget every year is we put in almost \$5 million for all the tenure promotion raises. These are built into the base budget, which is a good model.

Vice Provost James: Commented in the chat that she regularly gets asked about the promotion bumps. Stated that promotion bumps for all faculty are built into base each year.

Provost Pedersen: Had a two-hour meeting with Deans last week and we went through the numbers for the faculty that is both CCA faculty and the tenure-track faculty. We know that in order to bring all of our CCA faculty to 100%, it will take \$3.4 million, and to bring all our tenure-track to 100%, it would take \$10.1 million. This is comparative data across the country with R1 institutions, 65 of them, which is a large pool, and this considers the cost of living. We are talking about \$13.5 million for faculty, and then our AON study that focuses on administrative professionals, would be another chunk. Our goal is to figure out what we address first. These are valuable philosophical conversations, because we want to support the lowest paid and retain our amazing faculty and be competitive.

Chair Doe: Thanked Provost Pedersen. Asked if there were any questions.

Chair Doe: Hearing no further questions, thanked Provost Pedersen for coming to the meeting.

D. Old Business

E. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – March 25 & April 1, 2022

Chair Doe: Asked if there were items to be pulled for consideration from these University Curriculum Committee minutes. Hearing none, requested a motion to place these minutes on the May Faculty Council agenda.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Chair Doe: Requested a vote in the chat.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for May 3rd.

F. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Sue Doe

Chair Doe: The AUCC 1C Task Force has been working hard to get things in good condition with 1C. They have been in various meetings with colleges to get feedback and we have made substantial changes to items as a result of that feedback. Think we will have items to share with Faculty Council. We intend to have items to share at the May meeting because this is time sensitive. We will not complete the 3E to 1C transition until the academic year of 2024-2025, but we need to be making progress. We have faculty and courses that are desirous of going through the curricular processes.

Pedros-Gascon: Wondering what the planning is for the discussion around 1C at the May meeting. Am representing a myriad of faculty who are extremely concerned about how this item gets discussed and are disappointed with the way this was advanced. Feel it would be worth having a special Faculty Council meeting and not try to squeeze this discussion in fifteen minutes. Feels that may be met with a lot of resistance because this is an important issue that affects the University in a big way.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Believe our intention is to have a special Faculty Council meeting. We are planning for Friday, April 22nd to provide the task force with enough time to get things done, as well as early enough to get something on the Executive Committee agenda for the following week so it goes to the May Faculty Council meeting. We realize some may not be able to attend, but we hope to put this together in the next day or two because there needs to be an opportunity for a robust conversation.

Pedros-Gascon: People are concerned about rushing into this decision like what happened last time. We don't want to end up in a similar situation where we were approving something and unable to process it. Think there are some points of contingency that need to be addressed and there needs to be a clear understanding of what the elements will be for approving and disapproving courses. Expressed hope that there will also be an understanding that this should not only have an Anglo-centered way of understanding the institution and there should be more pedagogies and participation not just in the English language, especially since we are trying to

become a Hispanic-serving institution. If we are advancing concepts of diversity that are only local, it could be a terrible backdrop for us.

Chair Doe: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Everything mentioned here is something the task force has heard and is attempting to be responsive to. The hope is that we are producing something that is capacious enough for faculty and courses to be able to see themselves and their valuing of expertise while also addressing the articulated needs that have been brought to us again and again over the years from so many student bodies. We are doing our best and looking forward to further conversation on April 22nd.

2. Board of Governors Report – Melinda Smith

Smith: Reminded members that the next Board of Governors meeting will be on the CSU campus on May 3-4. Will be last Board of Governors meeting.

Smith: Some of the key things in report to the Board will be the resolution we passed at Faculty Council last week, concerns about raises, and concerns about Board connections with faculty and understanding faculty concerns. Asked members to send forward any questions or thoughts they would like included in report.

President McConnell: Expressed appreciation for Smith's work with the Board. She has been an extraordinary advocate for faculty and graduate students. The Board members have come to value her presence and input. Had a practice of meeting before each Board meeting so we could divide up strategy and be on the same page.

Smith: Thanked President McConnell. Am curious about enrollment revenue. Would be curious to see when we look at revenue from the state versus enrollment revenue versus revenue from grants and contracts how each of these ranks and which pushes the needle the most.

Provost Pedersen: This is something we are working on right now. Have been meeting with the Deans and looking at this by college and revenue streams and have also been looking at how those funding sources have been used to pay faculty and staff. Have gone through four colleges and have five more to go. Am pulling all that data together and trying to create a summary sheet. Enrollment has the biggest impact.

Antolin: Struck by comment by President McConnell about how the biggest increases in expenditures are in student support. Asked: When you talk about increased enrollment bringing in revenues, are those offset by the increase costs in the calculation that come with all those student services that go with those? In other words, wondering if we are over-projecting how good enrollment increases are or does it plateau because the costs go up as classes get bigger.

President McConnell: Asking all the right questions, and this is something we are trying to tackle. It is one of the reasons we talk so much about reforming the budget model because our budget model right now doesn't allow us to actually pull those numbers. Everything is so disaggregated. Our systems are not set up to give us that information. What we want to know is whether what we are doing is effective and giving us the outcomes we want.

Antolin: Guess we have been running incremental budgets for a long time, which means that moving things around in any significant way becomes almost impossible. As department chair, saw that enrollments could change dramatically, but budgets would not. Want to bring attention that this sort of thing is happening locally as well.

Provost Pedersen: Has been one of the frustrations when looking at the budget model and trying to understand it. There is additional compensation for the newer programs with the cost sharing model or differential tuition, but it does not account for most of the programs. When we see student growth, we don't see a connection between supporting those. This is one of the major motivators for digging in to redo this budget model. We need to be able to have faculty to teach the classes because we are an academic institution and we need all the support things to, but what we are trying to find is the right balance and to create a model that more directly supports that.

G. Discussion Items

1. Executive Session -- UGO Survey
 - a. See materials sent previously

Chair Doe: Thanked our guests and substitutes for coming today. We will be moving into Executive Session. Requested a motion to move into Executive Session.

Smith: Moved.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Executive Session ended at 5:29 p.m.

Sue Doe, Chair
Andrew Norton, Vice Chair
Melinda Smith, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant