

MINUTES

Executive Committee

Tuesday, February 20, 2024

3:00pm – Microsoft Teams/Administration 106

Present: Melinda Smith, Chair; Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative; Sue Doe, Immediate Past Chair; Marion Underwood, Provost/Executive Vice President; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jennifer Martin, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts Christine Pawliuk, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Michael Antolin, Natural Sciences; Zaid Abdo, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Guests: Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee

Absent: none

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

February 20, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

- A. Executive Committee Minutes – January 30, 2024**
- B. Faculty Council Minutes – February 6, 2024**

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from January 30th or the Faculty Council minutes from February 6th.

Hearing none, both sets of minutes approved as submitted.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on February 27, 2024– Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.
2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on March 5, 2024 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

B. *Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Provost Marion Underwood*

Provost Marion Underwood: Since we last met, have continued to meet with various groups and leadership teams from the colleges. Also spoke with the entire Cabinet at its retreat. Have been sharing emerging priorities at these meetings and have been getting a lot of great feedback.

Provost Underwood: Have been working with the deans on the budget reduction scenarios. We had a meeting last Wednesday where they shared their strategies for these reduction scenarios to make sure that their plans do not undercut each other's student success. We want to make sure we are preserving student opportunities across the University. Am impressed with the strategic and creative ways the deans are thinking about these planning scenarios and trying to preserve what matters, which are the opportunities that our students have and as much support for our faculty as we can muster.

Provost Underwood: Thanked everyone that was able to attend last week's open forum on the budget. We thank everyone for their interest and for the great questions. Expressed appreciation for the invitation to the Faculty Council meet and greet event. Enjoyed getting to meet those that came and getting to know others.

Provost Underwood: Have continued discussions on the budget model redesign with Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin, as well as Rick Miranda and consultants. We are trying to gather relevant data and information so we can work toward possible decisions on what this new model might look like.

Provost Underwood: Have also been working through the tenure and promotion process. Expressed interest in working with Executive Committee to get more faculty advice and input later in the process. Am very impressed with the tenure and promotion candidates and the thoughtful recommendations of the tenure and promotion faculty committees, the chairs, the heads, and the deans. Expressed discomfort with the Provost stage of the review. Would love to have some more faculty advice at those later stages. Some of our colleges have college promotion committees that includes the heads and the Dean and would love to work toward a system where every college has this type of committee with the heads and the Dean, as well as a faculty member elected from each unit. Would like faculty input at the college level, as well as the University level. Would like to have more conversations around this.

Provost Underwood: Would also like to have conversations about working toward an even more distinctive academic mission for Colorado State University. Think this will help people understand who we are, raise the profile of the University and raise our impact. Some of these conversations have already been happening. Had a meeting this morning to look at the Institutional Learning Objectives that were in a report received by Faculty Council in 2019. To our knowledge, these Institutional Learning Objectives were not actually approved, so there was good conversation about taking another look at these and asking whether these Institutional Learning Objectives fit with our distinctive academic mission. If we do want these Institutional Learning Objectives, it might lead to thoughts about curriculum and innovation, with faculty in the lead. This also leads to the possible need for a shorter new program approval process, which we would need to make this new budget model work anyway. If we are going to have a budget model that encourages innovation, we need to make sure that new programs can be approved more quickly.

Chair Smith: Thanked Provost Underwood for the report. Thanked Provost Underwood for coming to the last meet and greet. Next month, we will have the Vice President for Research

coming to the meet and greet. Asked if there were any questions or comments for Provost Underwood.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Expressed appreciation to Provost Underwood for assisting his department to move toward a 2-2 teaching load that was finally agreed upon last week. Thanked Provost Underwood for the effort.

Provost Underwood: The credit should go to your department chair and Dean Ben Withers. A solution was created by the chair in consultation with faculty and with the dean's support. Was pleased to approve this, but all the creativity and problem solving came from the department and the faculty. Was delighted to see the proposal.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Provost Underwood. Indicated that there are still sixty-five (65) faculty in two (2) other departments where this needs to be addressed. Their situation may not be as easy as ours, as we were able to find a solution internally, but believe that Theatre, Music and Dance, the administration should try to engage financially in facilitating that decision. Believe this is an issue of equity in a Research I institution and is important.

Michael Antolin: Expressed appreciation in hearing that it is desired to form a faculty committee that reports to the Provost at the end process of tenure and promotion. Was part of the college level as a department head for a long time and it is an eye-opening experience to see how much potential variation there is, as well as seeing the excellence of our colleagues. Asked how Provost Underwood has seen this formed at other places and how she views setting this up.

Provost Underwood: At Reed College, the college promotion committee was called the Committee on Appointments and tenure was elected by the faculty. At the University of Texas at Dallas, it is an appointed committee that's appointed by the Committee on Committees of the University Senate. The Committee on Committees would pick people to be on the University Promotions Committee. At Purdue, the University Senate appoints the full professor members of the campus promotions committee. At Purdue, there is a panel for the tenure-track group, and there is a separate panel for continuing, contract and adjunct faculty. Have not been through the process here for continuing, contract and adjunct faculty. Understanding is that takes place in March. Have only seen the tenure-track and think it would benefit from faculty input at the college level, but especially at the University level.

Antolin: Asked: Is it required in each college that there is a college faculty committee that helps make the decision?

Provost Underwood: No. That process looks different across the University, and the criteria absolutely need to be different in the different units. Expressed appreciation for how specific the department codes are but feel the process and procedures that a candidate undergoes differ in some significant ways across the colleges, and that does not feel equitable.

Andrew Norton: At the budget open forum last week, Miranda mentioned the delays with FAFSA are delaying our ability to forecast. Asked if there were any updates.

Provost Underwood: Do not think there is any new information on FAFSA. Applications continue to be strong. Am hearing hope and optimism from enrollment about where our numbers might land this year, but it is hard to tell, and the information will come in late. All the data suggests that we should be in a good position.

Zaid Abdo: Would like to go back to the discussion on the tenure committee. Asked about representation and what Provost Underwood's experience was with representation on those committees.

Provost Underwood: At Reed, they were elected from tenured faculty. At University of Texas at Dallas and Purdue, it was full professors with the idea being that about half of the promotions to be considered would be promotions to full. The idea is that it is above-rank faculty who vote on decisions.

Chair Smith: Received an email with concern about a search for a department chair being stopped and searching internally because of impending budget cuts. There were also additional conversations around the idea that there could be faculty lines terminated. There is some interesting information getting out there about what these budget cuts might entail, and it is creating some concern among faculty, particularly when they are hearing messaging coming back from their dean or their chair. Asked what the timeline is for these kinds of decisions and how we can help dispel some of the fear and concern growing around it.

Provost Underwood: Firstly, this is hard. It is hard to come up with planning scenarios and not know for a long time what will need to be done. We heard that campus wants strategic cuts as opposed to across-the-board cuts. We have asked deans for hiring plans and have asked them to perhaps pause or pull back on searches that they may not be able to afford. Would hope that this would be communicated in a transparent way, and that deans would be honest about what is going on with a particular search and we have to empower deans to do the best they can with their resources. Would hope that whatever the dean was going to do, it would be communicated transparently and would be something they considered carefully and have consulted others on.

Provost Underwood: Leadership searches matter a great deal, so that is why we are doing national searches for the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, a Dean of Liberal Arts, and a Dean of the College of Agriculture. We are not pulling back on those. They are very important. Department heads and chairs are also important, and we would want to have a good conversation with the dean before they pull back on those. Deans are having to make hard decisions and they may not be able to afford all the searches they hope to do this year. Am encouraging deans to communicate openly and transparently about why they are doing what they are doing.

William Sanford: Indicated that there had been a meeting where it was announced that a search was being cancelled. There were also comments made encouraging those close to retirement age to retire. Expressed frustration with this.

Provost Underwood: Apologized to Sanford for this happening. This is not acceptable. This is not how this is handled.

Sanford: Asked if there was a plan from the deans to let us know what the plans are or if we will all be surprised.

Provost Underwood: The hard part is that the colleges are handling this in different ways, and we do not know what will be necessary. We hope that the state budget picture will improve, but also because we may not be doing cuts across the board. We may be doing deeper scenarios in some parts of the University. Have encouraged deans to be open about the general outline of the plan but to not share details that affect people, individuals, positions, because it is too soon to know and there is no reason to alarm people. There will be meetings starting February 26th where each dean and vice president will sit down with her, Vice President Brendan Hanlon, Miranda, Rico Munn, the Office of General Counsel, and Human Resources to talk through their plans and ensure what is being proposed is within our policies and is legal.

Chair Smith: Was speaking with a colleague from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and they just eliminated their anthropology and physics departments. From a faculty point of view, would like to know that faculty would be involved in those kinds of decisions. Mentioned Section E.18 that discusses the fiduciary piece of things when we are in a crisis. Asked about Provost Underwood's philosophy on this.

Provost Underwood: Having heard the plans from the deans, do not think there is much talk of eliminating departments at all. When the news came out about West Virginia, was shocked to hear that they were working with a consulting group called RPK, who looked at their entire enterprise and recommended what to cut. Was stunned by the long list of universities this consulting group works with. Indicated that CSU is not working with this firm. We are doing this differently and in an approach that works much better for us. To achieve what this University wants to be and how we maintain our excellence is to be a whole university. It does not serve us well to cut whole portions of the enterprise, and do not think this will be necessary.

Pedros-Gascon: Thanked Provost Underwood for the clarification. Stated that there are twenty-six members on the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and twenty-one in the Cabinet of President of CSU. One would think that running a nuclear nation should be more complicated than running a academic institution. There is a sense that the administration has been metastasizing for some time. Thinks this needs some explanation about why there is an enormous need for all these vice presidents, since they do not come cheap. There is a feeling that the administration has been growing extensively and consistently and that it may be part of the issue and is impacting us financially.

Provost Underwood: Can certainly pass this along. Indicated that it is the President that determines the number of vice presidents. Will definitely share this concern and can understand why anyone would raise this question when we are looking at reduction scenarios.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further questions or comments, thanked Provost Underwood.

C. Old Business

D. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – January 26, February 2 & 9, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the University Curriculum Committee minutes.

Brad Goetz: Stated that we have some new programs coming forward shortly.

Chair Smith: Hearing nothing further, requested a vote to place this item on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th as part of the consent agenda.

Jennifer Martin: Asked Goetz about the discussion on the University Curriculum Committee a few weeks ago about the stackable certificates and changes to the certificate policy. Asked if there was an update on what is happening with that.

Chair Smith: Stated that this should be on the Executive Committee agenda for next week.

Goetz: The University Curriculum Committee has been discussing this for a couple weeks. We are anticipating voting on it this week and getting a special action item ready for Executive Committee and aiming for the March meeting for Faculty Council discussion.

E. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Ceded report time for the task force discussion.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: Report at the last Board of Governors meeting was a bit of a review of reports from the last year and a half. Stated to them that the budget cuts and low salary raises are demoralizing and increasing turnover and burnout.

Norton: We also saw the incremental budget at the Faculty Council meeting, which was also presented at the budget forum by Vice President Hanlon. Henry Sobanet, who is the Chief Financial Officer of the System, is in charge of all the interactions with the governor and the Joint Budget Committee. Sobanet is cautiously optimistic of the responses from the Joint Budget Committee, and even more optimistic now with the capital funds for the Veterinary Teaching Hospital.

Norton: The Faculty Council meet and greet went well. Encouraged everyone to go to the next one. Asked Amy Barkley about attendance.

Amy Barkley: We had about ten (10) people from Faculty Council proper, and about fifteen (15) non-Faculty Council members.

3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin

Martin: Both the steering committee and the technical committee have been meeting. Have met with the larger groups and subgroups of each committee with Rob Mitchell. The intentionality, thoughtfulness, effort, and passion all the members of these committees are bringing to the conversation is fun to see and inspiring to be a part of. They are asking great questions and hard questions and trying to move forward in the best interest of the university.

Martin: The executive sponsor committee met with the consulting firm EAB and received some guidance on particular topics, as well as the process. The relationship we have with this firm is productive. They have been willing to answer any questions and share resources for other universities that have gone through the process.

Martin: Vice Provost Susan James is a member of the communication subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of the steering committee. They are now formally the body that will communicate with campus. A message came out a few weeks ago with updates about the process. The next communication will be coming out the first week of March and are aiming for a potential open forum in April to give an update to the entire campus about the process and solicit feedback. Indicated that the budget remodel design website is also used for updates as well as the monthly emails from the subcommittee.

Rob Mitchell: Encouraged members and their colleagues to submit questions if they have them. We have received a lot of questions this semester and will perhaps receive more as conversations are ongoing. Thanked everyone for continuing to be engaged in this process.

Sanford: Asked when this may be implemented.

Martin: The plan right now has not deviated from the shadow budget year starting in FY25. The timing of when that shadow budget is happening may vary, so long as we are able to use FY25 numbers to see how it would work if this budget model were to be in place. Then we would have a year where we implement it and what we call the “hold harmless” period where the model is in effect. There are some mechanisms to make sure that units within our campus are not seeing immediate impacts. We would be looking at FY27 as the first year where the incremental budget goes away in its entirety, and we have a new budget model in place. Think the only thing that may be a little different is when we actually start the shadow budget year and that may be a reflection of making sure our fiscal and budget officers have time to implement the FY25 budget. Given the timeline we heard from Norton at the state level, they may need some time to make that work right and then can focus on how we can use those numbers to inform what would happen if we had this budget model. That may be a little later in the fall versus in the summer given what we are seeing at the state level.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin and Mitchell. We appreciate your efforts and look forward to continuing to hear from you all.

F. Discussion Items

1. Task Force discussion

Chair Smith: We heard earlier from Provost Underwood about the meeting regarding Institutional Learning Objectives. Would like to provide some background context. The accreditation in 2014 called us out for a lack of Institutional Learning Objectives. The Committee on Teaching and Learning was tasked with developing a report on Institutional Learning Objectives in 2017-2018. The report was received by Faculty Council in 2019, and then COVID hit. The bottom line is even though we have these Institutional Learning Objectives developed and posted, they were never actually voted on and adopted by Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: The other piece of this is that each program in the University is not beholden to addressing each of these Institutional Learning Objectives that are posted online. There is movement toward connecting program objectives to the Institutional Learning Objectives because, in particular, this past accreditation pointed out that many of our graduate programs do not have learning objectives. The learning objectives are also not accessible in their current form and do not speak directly to the mission of CSU.

Chair Smith: With all this context in mind, it has bubbled up into an issue that we should be addressing as Faculty Council. Would like to discuss a potential task force or special committee to consider revising or reimagining these Institutional Learning Objectives. There was general consensus from the group that met earlier over these that this is something we should be prioritizing. It also speaks to the idea that we can view these Institutional Learning Objectives as a scaffold, which might open up other conversations, such as revisiting the core curriculum. As we have heard from Provost Underwood that she has a vision for thinking of these thematically. Provost Underwood has mentioned that this is up to faculty, but we can revisit that as well at the same time, particularly if we think of the Institutional Learning Objectives as framing.

Chair Smith: If we start to think of the core curriculum, then we start thinking about the program approval process, and it becomes clear that there are a lot of changes that could be welcomed at this University with respect to how we think about Institutional Learning Objectives and the core curriculum, and then how we potentially make it easier to approve new programs and revise existing programs.

Norton: Having a CSU-specific set of learning objectives or learning outcomes as a way of distinguishing us from everyone else would be a good thing. When you start to look at how this would interact with the core curriculum and the Graduate School, it gets to be a daunting task, but think it can be approached in an incremental fashion. Think it is exciting to look at learning objectives or learning outcomes as a way to tell the world what the CSU experience is about.

Joseph DiVerdi: Expressed agreement with Norton's points. This is not something we want to stretch out for a long period of time and move with a certain sense of urgency.

Mitchell: There is some tension, when you look at the budget situation within the state, we have clear challenges. Want to make sure, as we are moving forward, that we are reaching out and understanding our various stakeholders, so we are not just inward looking. Want to make sure we are engaging external people and external stakeholders and working with them, so we are doing work that enables growth and momentum.

Chair Smith: Thanked Mitchell. Expressed agreement that we should move quickly. Asked for feedback about whether we want to pursue this. Do not think this is a Committee on Teaching and Learning activity, per se, but is a broader conversation. We would want to bring in additional stakeholders to this task force or special committee. We would want Faculty Council representation but think we would benefit greatly with representation from the enrollment office, for example, as well as student success and student affairs. Asked for feedback from Executive Committee members.

Norton: Had a conversation with Shawn Archibeque and Matt Hickey, who were both members of that group, and they both agreed that we should do this. Do not feel the prior group is feeling particularly emotionally attached to what is out there.

Chair Smith: That is great. Believe their intention was to produce a report.

DiVerdi: This seems to be an instance where Faculty Council received a report that we should be voting on. Do not think we are necessarily voting on the report itself, but instead taking the recommendations and turning that into a resolution that we would vote on. Wanted to make this clear so we all understand the mechanics.

Mitchell: Want to go back to something mentioned by Chair Smith about this being more than a task force, particularly given how this has been described as longer term and with Norton's suggestion of an incremental approach. Wondering if we want to consider a standing committee that looks at engagement on innovation and what we are doing in the marketplace. We could have these conversations in all kinds of different spaces, but it is a longer-term process to structure this and formalize it in a way that is helpful. Do not think this would necessarily be under the purview of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning.

Martin: Wondering to what extent we might lean into Hanover consulting to help with this. Know the Provost's office has used them for various things, including certificates and micro-credentials and what the market looks like for those.

Norton: Think the learning objectives or learning outcomes will be meta and not about any specific program. Could see the same outcomes or objectives being applicable to music, theater, and dance majors as to physics, engineering, or science majors.

Provost Underwood: Really like Hanover. Think very highly of their work, and they are useful, especially when thinking about new programs. What we are talking about here is a little different, but it would not hurt to consult with them. Expressed hope that we can get a distinctively CSU set of institutional learning objectives and innovate our curriculum to fit exactly with who this University is.

DiVerdi: With the discussion going on here and the objectives we set earlier in the meeting regarding the Institutional Learning Objectives, would like us to think about the possibility of getting something tightly organized and directed. If we go with a task force, that is fine, and we have something to start with and think about. Think we can get some institutional learning objectives in place in a four-week timeframe and have something by March 20th. There are a lot of things that are coming and are staggered behind this. We need to get these sorted out so we can move forward on some of the other ones. We talked about program development and existing programs that will be folded into them. Would suggest that we think with a narrow focus at this point so we can get started and move in.

Chair Smith: When the Committee on Teaching and Learning produced this report in 2019, thinking about what the next steps would have been if Faculty Council voted on them. Not sure which entity within Faculty Council this would work best coming from.

Martin: This sounds like a conversation we had about a year ago around engaged scholarship, and that began with a small committee and morphed into a larger council. That council engages with the Committee on Responsibilities and Standing of Academic Faculty when they wanted language embedded into the Manual. The idea of a special committee that may engage in later months or years with the appropriate standing committee(s) and create a resolution, as well as looking at specific Manual and policy changes, is a good idea.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin. Wondering if we want to think about this in parallel with the core curriculum. It is clear there has been some stagnation with AUCC 1C and we may not reach the implementation date. There has been little interest from people in serving on the guidance committee for the AUCC 1C. Because it has been an arduous path to its realization, wondering if this is an opportunity to think bigger about all this.

Sue Doe: Was involved in a productive meeting around AUCC 1C this afternoon with Vice Provost Tom Siller and associate deans, and think we have made some interesting progress. There is a community of practice within TILT where we have some faculty interested in putting together AUCC 1C courses. Think maybe Vice Provost Siller should come speak to this group, but it is not quite dead in the water.

Norton: We do not have a clear structure in Faculty Council for how we change the core curriculum. We have state standards that we need to comply with, but there is still a bit of freedom, and custom learning outcomes would be a way to do that. When chairing a committee a few years ago that was looking at these issues, we learned that we do not all agree on what the purpose of the core curriculum is. Would recommend a backwards design. We should figure out what the objectives or outcomes are, and then it flows naturally as to what a core needs to contribute to that process. Think that would be more fruitful than doing it parallel or the other way around.

Mitchell: Expressed agreement with Norton's idea, which allows us to be more strategic. We can also be creative in the implementation of the strategy. We can look back at what we do and put that together in a way that fits a strategy and it ends up being more efficient. Climate initiatives

are a great example of this, where you pull a bunch of people who are doing great things together in a way that fits a lot of who we are as a University.

Chair Smith: Thanked Mitchell. Expressed excitement for putting together this special committee and appreciate everyone's support. The next steps will be thinking about who would be involved with this committee. We can save that discussion for another time. Will work on a list of people and send it to this group for feedback.

2. Budget Model Redesign Update – Steering Committee, Susan James

Discussion item deferred to February 27th due to scheduling conflict.

3. Athletics Subsidies Memo – Antonio Pedros-Gascon

Pedros-Gascon: This was requested by some faculty that were engaged in the previous resolution. Steve Shulman, from the College of Liberal Arts, requested us to consider the idea of revamping this resolution given the impending budget cuts. Indicated there was an email sent before the meeting with information on the athletics budget report. In the previous resolution, one of the “whereas” statements says that athletic subsidies had almost doubled, amounting to \$25.4 million, and in the report provided by Parker, five years later it is \$29.3 million.

Pedros-Gascon: Would request that we do not get in the weeds with the numbers, because the administration always uses this as a way to stall discussion. Want to just reaffirm the expectations about how budgets should be allocated in an academic institution. Quoted an email from Shulman that stated that almost all the budgetary strengths of CSU come from its faculty. The dollars that flow when faculty teach, conduct research, and inspire donors are the financial foundation of this institution. Indicated that Shulman also mentioned work with Doe. Asked if Doe wanted to speak to the idea of instructional surplus that is provided by instructors. The idea is to consider the idea of revamping this clear set of expectations of budget priorities for the institution.

Doe: We did a study of data across different Carnegie classifications to try to determine the reliance upon contingency across all different Carnegie institutional types and then also had access to the amount of income revenue that is generated by the instructional enterprise. The question that we ask is what happens to the surplus money that is generated by teaching. Fundamentally, we know universities have many priorities, but for many and for a long time, there were conversations that the teaching parts of the campus were drains on the campus. We know better now. The teaching enterprise is creating revenue and we are utterly reliant upon students in seats. The article attempts to put some numbers to that and ask the questions about where that money goes so the narrative changes from teaching being a drain to being understood as the revenue producer it is. Stated that there is a book related to labor history of contingency across the United States, and would be happy to share information about this.

DiVerdi: Have been speaking to Pedros-Gascon about this and share the concerns expressed. In relation to the previous resolution, think we need to think outside the box as to what we can do to

conserve funds and direct them towards the most important priorities of the University. We have also discussed that there is strong interest and support for athletics at the highest levels of the University and the System. Wondering what the efficacy of a resolution like this would be and can we possibly move the needle.

Pedros-Gascon: Parker acknowledged that for every \$5 of debt incurred by this institution, \$1 is incurred in Athletics. We could be doing amazing things for minorities. Athletics is spending \$9.6 million on student aid, which is less for all the student athletes combined than the amount of money being spent on coaches. Believe these numbers are representative of a metastasized situation in Athletics.

Mitchell: Asked if Vice Provost Susan James would be willing to speak to this, as one of the previous supporters of the resolution.

Vice Provost Susan James: Was one of the original department heads that signed this when it was passed around by Shulman. Expressed support for this discussion. What is not fully understood is where the money that goes to Athletics comes from. It is complicated, and do not think it is as simple as repurposing some of that money toward the academic side, but would like to see more transparency around that, which Parker never did for us. We did ask for this repeatedly. Some transparency there would help us craft even better resolutions on what we want and to be more specific. That said, athletics does add value to our students and our educational programs in many ways, and there is a place for athletics in university life. However, when we are talking about budget cuts and potentially multiple years of budget cuts, this is a serious thing we need to ask ourselves.

Mitchell: Think it has been a goal of the administration, with Vice President Hanlon in particular, to enable some of this transparency. Wonder if we can frame this more broadly. The fact is that there will be a lot of different perspectives on programs where someone else does not see the value while others do. It will be more effective if we do not target programs, but making sure that the limited funds we have are used well and that they fit into a clear strategy. Think we absolutely do need to make sure that we do not have unnecessary excess costs, because when you start taking into account deferred maintenance and other things we need to think about as a university, it might be something we need to be worried about. What we do not want to see happen is that we start pointing at everyone else's program because that will not be productive. We need to be focused on our mission and have a strategy behind it.

Martin: Acknowledged that she is a product of athletics, so there is some bias based on personal experience. The point that we are demanding accountability is important and especially when we are thinking about what a new budget model might look like, giving units more responsibility than demands. Athletics should be no different. Think it is reasonable to say that we as faculty think they should be held to the same standards that we are in relation to accountability, strategies around funds, etc. Think Vice Provost James' point about needing more information is important. With the news that Parker has left the University, wondering if there is an opportunity for Executive Committee and Faculty Council to have a transparent and open conversation around the Athletics budget and ask the questions we are posing right now versus making a resolution without full information.

Chair Smith: Clarified that Parker has not left the University. Parker is now a special advisor to the President.

Pedros-Gascon: Stated that Parker is receiving a \$750,000 severance. No one is questioning, for example, scholarships for athletes. People believe those students would qualify for those financial supports even if they were not doing athletics. The reality is that is a minimal part of the budget and we are discussing the rest. Asked: If Parker is still working for the institution, why are we paying a severance of \$750,000.

Vice Provost James: The Coloradoan broke the news before CSU did, and then CSU did a press release. Do not think we know whether he is getting a severance or is staying and getting paid but hope to learn more soon.

Provost Underwood: Understanding is that the salary for the special advisor role is toward the severance. It is paying down the severance, which is what universities usually do.

Pedros-Gascon: We just renewed Parker and he is removed a year later. We did this with several others, and we are paying severances like candy.

Sybil Sharvelle: Echoed concerns around the transparency around the severance and expressed hope that we get clarity on that. In a time of budget cuts, we should be thinking about how to do those in an equitable way, and when we are talking about taking away staff, we have to be critical of what we are funding in the Athletics department. Expressed hope that with this transition, we have an opportunity to have some influence over a new situation and have some optimism.

Chair Smith: Think this speaks to the idea of what our priorities are as faculty and what we want to see articulated as priorities in times of budget cuts and deficits. Will see if we can get Vice President Hanlon to come to Executive Committee next week to provide more information on where income for Athletics comes from.

Martin: Think the accountability piece is something missing across the entire institution. We have even seen this with the incremental model, with department heads and unit leaders not having accountability because it is just a pass-through of the previous year's budget. They do not have to be accountable to programs that are growing and programs that are not growing. If we want our unit leaders to be accountable, we should also look to our administration and ask them to be accountable, ask Athletics to be accountable.

Sharvelle: It is an excellent point around funding toward administration. There is a lack of transparency still there, although President Amy Parsons has tried to open up some more transparency. We still have little understanding of the administrative positions and the funding for those. There may be funds available that can be used for academic purposes versus athletics, but the sources of funding are not clear. Understand many of those come from sources that cannot be used for academic, so it is an important point.

Chair Smith: This is a request for consideration of revisiting this resolution, potentially adding to it and gathering more information.

Antolin: Expressed agreement with wanting more transparency around this. With this change in leadership, this is an opportunity for us to ask these questions.

Chair Smith: We will ask Vice President Hanlon to attend next week. The second question is whether we would like to invite Shulman to attend Executive Committee to provide voice and context to this resolution.

DiVerdi: Moved that we do both.

Abdo: Seconded.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote of Executive Committee members.

Motion passed to invite Vice President Hanlon and Shulman to the Executive Committee meeting on February 27th.

Chair Smith: Encouraged members to keep the student athletes in mind as we discuss this situation. We do not want to appear antagonistic to the athletes themselves and continuing to make this clear that this is not our intent. We are in support of student athletes. This is about more transparency and the way in which the Athletics department is funded.

G. Executive Session

DiVerdi: Moved to go into Executive Session, requesting that Doe and Barkley also stay.

Antolin: Seconded.

Executive Committee moved into Executive Session.

Executive Committee adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Executive Session concluded at 5:42 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative
Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant