

## MINUTES

Executive Committee

**Tuesday, August 29, 2023**

**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** Melinda Smith, Chair; Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair; Andrew Norton, BOG Representative; Sue Doe, Immediate Past Chair; Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant; Jennifer Martin, Agricultural Sciences; Rob Mitchell, Business; Sharon Anderson, Health and Human Sciences; Antonio Pedros-Gascon, Liberal Arts; Christine Pawliuk, Libraries; William Sanford, Natural Resources; Michael Antolin, Natural Sciences

**Guests:** Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Rick Miranda, Executive Vice President; Richard Magid, Vice President for Technology Transfer, CSU Strata; Gamze Cavdar, Chair, Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning; Laurel Halsey, Executive Director CSU Health Network

**Absent:** Janice Nerger, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President (excused); Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Sybil Sharvelle, Engineering (excused)

Chair Melinda Smith called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

### **August 29, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

#### **I. Minutes to be Approved**

##### **A. Executive Committee Minutes – August 22, 2023**

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from August 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Indicated that he sent some edits via email prior to the meeting.

Sharon Anderson: Noted an edit where Sue Doe was referred to as “Chair Doe” that will need to be corrected.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon and Anderson. Hearing no further edits or comments, minutes approved by unanimous consent.

Chair Smith: Given Executive Vice President Rick Miranda’s limited time, we will move to that discussion item first.

#### **II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

##### **A. *Announcements***

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on September 12, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: The next Executive Committee meeting will be on September 12<sup>th</sup> on Microsoft Teams. We had discussed meeting in a hybrid model, but with Amy Barkley's leave, we felt it would create another layer of complexity for the person taking over for her. Feels it made sense to remain meeting over Microsoft Teams until at least the spring. Asked if there were any comments about this.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on September 5, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

***B. Provost/Executive Vice President Report – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs  
Susan James***

Vice Provost James: One of the things that has become rather urgent is that the Student Disability Center has not been able to keep up with the need for accommodations for students. We discussed this some at the Committee on Teaching and Learning at their last meeting. This has been a chronic problem with the Student Disability Center, but students were approaching them over the summer to get a meeting with an accommodation specialist and they were already being pushed out to October or November for those meetings. Have discussed this with Tom Siller, our interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, as well as Executive Vice President Rick Miranda, and received permission for them to hire more people. They have also had trouble hiring due to the low salaries, so we are raising their salaries too. This will not happen overnight, and we are working on communication to go out to all faculty and instructors for workarounds in the short-term.

Vice Provost James: The budget model is mostly what is being discussed at the Provost and dean levels. CU Boulder came to present to us, and they shared a lot of their process. We have a budget forum on September 7<sup>th</sup>, which will be basically an all-day event with presentations from every unit on campus, particularly the academic units as well as the upper administration. This will give a snapshot of where they are and how they compare to each other and should give information to inform a discussion about the budget model. We are not sure what fall enrollment looks like until the census, but it sounds like it is going to be down a little bit.

Vice Provost James: A presentation about the Veterinary Teaching Hospital will be given at the next Faculty Council meeting and people can hear about the project.

Andrew Norton: In teaching a lot of students, the accommodation letters are coming in October, November, and even December, which is not very helpful. Happy to work with students but am noticing that around 50% of the accommodation letters include flexible due dates and the ability to walk in and out of class at any time. Have looked at literature around this and whether it is appropriate for college. Feels this is not helpful to students.

Vice Provost James: Have heard this from other instructors. It is not a new thing. Wondering how we teach someone and assess them and give them a grade. The way many of us teach, it's cumulative. Will send along this feedback.

Norton: Want to be sensitive to learning and other disabilities but feel that this is sometimes reinforcing the ability to procrastinate. Sometimes learning how to get things done on time is a key learning outcome or objective.

Vice Provost James: Another item is compensation, which has been front and center in our conversations for a long time. Our Chief Financial Officer and budget people have been meeting and trying to put together a plan for employee compensation, which they will hopefully be ready to talk about at the Faculty Council meeting next week. Believe they are putting together a communication plan.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice Provost James. Asked if there were any additional questions. Hearing none, will move on to action items.

### *C. Old Business*

### *D. Action Items*

1. Academic Calendar Updates – Fall 2022 – Summer 2024
2. Academic Calendar Updates – Fall 2024 – Summer 2026

Chair Smith: The first action items are minor updates to academic calendars. These are corrections to adjust the schedule, based on Juneteenth and other additional adjustments. Asked if there were any questions.

Chair Smith: Hearing no discussion, requested a motion to place these two (2) action items regarding the Academic Calendar on the Faculty Council agenda.

Pedros-Gascon: Moved.

Sharon Anderson: Second.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for September 5<sup>th</sup>.

3. Election – Faculty Representatives to Faculty Council Standing Committees – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: Our next item is a ballot for faculty representatives on Faculty Council standing committees. Asked if there were any questions about this.

Amy Barkley: Reminded members that an updated ballot had been emailed to everyone prior to the meeting.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further comments or questions, requested a motion to place this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda.

Jennifer Martin: Moved.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for September 5<sup>th</sup>.

4. Election – Faculty Representative to the University Benefits Committee – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: Requested a motion to place this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda.

Michael Antolin: Moved.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further discussion, requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for September 5<sup>th</sup>.

5. CSU Strata Updates Presentation for Faculty Council – Richard Magid, Vice President for Technology Transfer, CSU Strata

Vice President Richard Magid: Have prepared a brief presentation. There has been a fair amount of change, the most obvious of which is the rebranding from CSU Research Foundation (CSURF) and CSU Ventures to CSU Strata, which occurred last year. Simultaneous with that, there has been personnel turnover and additions. Was brought into this position last May and had previously served in a similar position at the University of Tennessee Research Foundation for the past sixteen (16) years.

Vice President Magid: Have had time to start to come up with a vision and a plan for the tech transfer unit and how we will serve the needs of Colorado State in tech transfer, which is research, translation, innovation, and entrepreneurship as the focus areas. The presentation includes an overview of what we think the tech transfer functions are, what we see as the vision, and brief updates on where we stand today in terms of numbers.

Chair Smith: Thanked Magid. Asked if there were any questions or if members needed to see the full presentation.

Martin: Do not need to see the presentation. Thanked Magid for all the work done in that office to engage more frequently with campus within the colleges and departments. Have noticed an

uptick in opportunities to interact with the staff there. Looking forward to seeing this presentation. Think it will encourage others to reach out to that office.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it would be okay to do highlights rather than the full presentation at Faculty Council.

Chair Smith: Thanked Martin and Pedros-Gascon. Think this is primarily informational and to make people aware of the changes. Asked Magid if that was correct.

Vice President Magid: Yes, that is correct. This is also an opportunity to learn of any issues that have not yet come to our attention.

Chair Smith: That sounds great. Asked if the intention was to give a brief presentation and then move to any questions.

Vice President Magid: Yes, that is correct.

Chair Smith: Thanked Magid. Asked if there were any questions. Hearing none, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item.

Rob Mitchell: Moved.

Martin: Second.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item for September 5<sup>th</sup>.

6. CSU Health Network Presentation for Faculty Council – Laurel Halsey, Executive Director CSU Health Network

Executive Director Laurel Halsey: Explained that the CSU Health Network is the student health services on campus. This presentation is to clarify what the CSU Health Network documents for healthcare needs for students. Intention is to have a five (5) minute presentation and then leave time for questions.

Executive Director Halsey: The CSU Health Network is here and available to our patients to provide support for ongoing accommodations that need documentation for the Student Disability Center office, which we discussed earlier. We need to maintain a channel of support for our patients with them. The other documentation we do is when students come to us with a healthcare need, and they need assistance modifying their schedule temporarily due to that healthcare need. These are two (2) aspects of care that it is appropriate for us to engage with healthcare providers.

Executive Director Halsey: The third topic is that we are not of the business of documenting absences from classes. Stated that students are still coming for an additional COVID test based on what is on their syllabus for certain classes. We want to have a discussion with Faculty Council and ensure we are all aligned and understanding.

Chair Smith: Thanked Executive Director Halsey. Asked if there were any comments. Think the main goal here is to inform faculty what the Student Health Network should be used for versus Student Case Management.

Executive Director Halsey: Our hope is to not have anyone caught in the middle, student, or faculty, and that we keep our communication lines open and clear.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further comments, requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item.

Joseph DiVerdi: Moved.

Mitchell: Seconded.

Executive Committee members discussed whether this item should be placed on the September Faculty Council agenda or the October meeting.

Chair Smith: Determined that September would be the better meeting. Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda as a discussion item for September 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### 7. Budget Model Values – Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning – Gamze Cavdar, Chair

Gamze Cavdar: Last spring, President Parsons visited the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, and we were invited to contribute to the issues of salary equity and the budget model. Because many on the committee are on 9-month contracts, we decided to have a subcommittee meet throughout the summer to work on recommendations for these issues. We have a subcommittee for each issue. The budget model subcommittee met three (3) times over the summer, and we came up with some values.

Cavdar: The values we drafted are broad and abstract, and now it is in the hands of the Faculty Council. We are also going to present these in front of the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council. Noted that the version shared here was updated with feedback from the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, which include the removal of the goals from the top of the document and some minor editorial changes.

Chair Smith: To be clear, the members of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning requested to have “goals” stricken both from the title and the document itself.

Cavdar: That is correct. The comment we received was that we should not worry about the goals and stick to the values.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions about this.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed disappointment with the idea of taking the goals away. Think the goals are a great way of keeping and reminding a committee of what they are aspiring to and supposed to be doing. Would encourage the goals to be kept.

Cavdar: This is in Faculty Council's court, so they can revise as they wish.

Antolin: Not understanding the reason behind getting rid of the goals. Asked: What was the reason for that?

Cavdar: The reason was the focus on the values. Indicated that Executive Committee can include them if they want.

Mitchell: Heard from our representative on that committee, and one of the values was transparency, and it put one value as the goal of all the other values, and there was a bit of a disconnect. Think the idea was to not have the goal and really delve into the values. The goal was an add-on that was not fully developed.

DiVerdi: Do not feel that it is the prerogative of Executive Committee to re-write a report from a committee. The committee writes the report, and we chose whether to accept it or not. We can send it back for changes, but Executive Committee does not make those changes.

DiVerdi: Got the impression from Executive Vice President Rick Miranda that it was desired to have this report include more voices from the University community and not just the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. If the Faculty Council accepts this report, it will be representative of the faculty since Faculty Council is a representative body. Expressed support for the document itself.

Norton: Wondering about the process here. This is not a normal action item, so wondering if this is a resolution or report. It is not clear where we are going with this. Would also like to see a broader cross-section of the campus participate in this. There is also representation from the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council on the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Expressed hope that this was being taken to them as well.

Cavdar: Clarified the membership of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Voting members include a non-tenure track faculty representative, the chair of the Administrative Professional Council, the chair of the Classified Personnel Council, as well as an undergraduate and graduate student.

DiVerdi: There is also a dean on the committee.

Martin: Had a similar question of what we are being asked to consider. While members of the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council are on the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning, like the idea of having a joint set of values that are presented versus a subset of the University community. If this were to go forward as a resolution, want to remind everyone that the budget model is just one piece of this, while the budget process is something we need to live with every year. This document only identifies the model and not the process, which includes the process at the administrative, college, and department levels. As we go through the budget model process, it is important for us to think of ways for faculty to be more involved and have increased transparency and more unit-based budget decisions versus administrative-based budget decisions. There is an opportunity for us to broaden this beyond the model and focus on the processes that exist at multiple levels. Would like to see that represented in this document.

Chair Smith: Thinks that is a great point. This was placed on the agenda prior to receiving an email from Executive Vice President Miranda about this involving a larger constituency. We could vote and have this go to Faculty Council, but based on communication, it sounds like there will likely be additional iterations of these values. The choice is whether we want to make a stand now and state that these are our values or wait and see what broader involvement with the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council, as well as administration, come up with.

Martin: Like the idea of a joint resolution that states that the Fort Collins campus community finds these values to be fundamental in guiding our budget model and budget processes moving forward. Think that is what we are aspiring to versus saying that faculty hold these guiding principles. Wondering if there is a precedent for a joint resolution across the employee councils and administration.

Barkley: Not aware of any but can look to see if we can find some examples in our records.

Chair Smith: There have been a couple resolutions that have come through Faculty Council. The reality is that the impacts of the budget model and budget processes have broad implications. There is a lot of power in saying that we adhere to these, and it is campus wide.

Norton: Not aware of a joint resolution from the employee councils, but this would be a good time to have one. Think we have been doing the legwork over the past few years to strengthen our relationship with the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council, so this would be a good time to do this. Would like to be aligned with them on this, because the budget is fundamental to their position at the University as well.

DiVerdi: Not sure if supporting the document now necessarily means this will be the last word from faculty, but it could be the first word from faculty on this. Not sure of the mechanism of how we would get something created through the three (3) employee councils but getting the ball rolling by articulating these reasonable set of values would be a good way to start.

Mitchell: Thanked Cavdar and the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for their work on this. This was one of the outcomes of two (2) of the task forces from last year, that the



Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning be more involved with administration. Noted that it was expressed by Executive Vice President Miranda that the Administrative Professional Council and the Classified Personnel Council be involved and on the same page so as not to cause friction. Ultimately, a lot of the budget is in the hands of President Parsons, and it is good that the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning continues to be involved. When looking at the challenges we are facing, the hope is that we can collectively work to manage these external forces so that there is some unity. Not sure of the mechanism for this, but a great mechanism is getting people in the same room talking together and seeing our common values and purpose in moving forward with this budget model so that we can better move forward to remain competitive as a University.

Chair Smith: Asked Cavdar how she would like to proceed with this.

Cavdar: Understanding was that this was taken to Faculty Council, where it could be discussed and revised. Once accepted, it could be presented to Executive Vice President Miranda. Did not expect these values to be the only values, but it could start the conversation.

Chair Smith: Question is whether we want to move forward with having this report received by Faculty Council or if there is more with this that we need to engage with Executive Vice President Miranda about. Think the rationale for involving a broader constituency makes sense and it would give it more power.

Martin: Confused about what we would be putting in front of Faculty Council. Asked: Would this be a report?

Antolin: Expressed appreciation for these values. If the Faculty Council accepted this report, it would be powerful on its own, even without administration signing off on it. At this point, it might be better to include members of the other employee councils in these discussions. Do not feel we need we need buy-in from the upper administration. This is to have our voice separate from that. Understand the idea behind having consensus, but do not feel that it is necessary to walk with administration every step of the way.

Mitchell: Asked for clarification. Asked: Would this be submitted revised without the goals, or as it currently stands? Wondering if we need to send it back to the committee before it can come back to us, or whether an amendment could happen.

Barkley: Clarified that the Faculty Council agenda needs to be sent out this evening or early tomorrow morning. Any edits to this, if going to Faculty Council, would need to happen immediately.

Pedros-Gascon: Would encourage the goals to be kept. An amendment can be made on the floor of Faculty Council.

Martin: Emphasized again that this document exclusively addresses the budget model, which is something temporal that we are going through right now. Understand the rationale behind having guiding principles for the budget model, but feel we are missing the larger picture as to the desire

for transparency for the budget process. Think there is an opportunity for us to lean into this and look at how these values and principles are implemented at the unit level. The budget model exists at the administrative level only. Would like to see this committee think about how they might give faculty some guiding principles by which they can lean into their local units to implement versus pointing upward to administration where the model exists.

Norton: Still not clear on whether this is a resolution or a report. A report from a committee might have further action and consideration, and a resolution would be a statement of faculty budget model values. Think we need to be clear about this before it goes to Faculty Council. Think we would also need a rationale for when this goes to the floor.

Chair Smith: Thanked Norton. Think it is important for us to understand whether this is a report or resolution for consideration by Faculty Council. Given the tight timeframe for sending out the Faculty Council agenda, would recommend that this be sent back to the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning for clarification. In the meantime, Executive Committee can provide feedback on the current document while you go back to the committee and figure out whether you want this as a resolution or report to be considered by Faculty Council.

Cavdar: Requested clarification on next steps once format is decided.

Chair Smith: If it is a report, then it is submitted to Executive Committee again and we will entertain a motion to place on the agenda for Faculty Council as a report item. If it is a resolution, that would be a different type of motion and would be considered by Executive Committee to be placed on the agenda as an action item for Faculty Council consideration.

Cavdar: Thanked Chair Smith. Requested feedback from Executive Committee members for improvements to the document.

## 8. Task Force Request

Chair Smith: Our final action item is a letter requesting the formation of a task force to tackle interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees. Since we are running short on time and this is not an action item for Faculty Council, recommend members read this letter and we can discuss it at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Deferred to next Executive Committee meeting on September 12, 2023.

### *E. Reports*

#### 1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Will send a PowerPoint presentation for feedback that we would like to use for every Faculty Council meeting that provides a code of conduct and rules of engagement, as well as reminders for the Microsoft Teams environment. Would like any feedback on this by next week. These slides will not be going into the agenda packet. Rest of report will be included in the PowerPoint presentation for next week, so will not go through all that right now.

## 2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: There is a report for inclusion in the Faculty Council agenda packet, which goes over all the topics we discussed last week.

### *F. Discussion Items*

#### 1. Budget Model Discussion – Executive Vice President Rick Miranda

Executive Vice President Rick Miranda: Wanted to give an update on the conversations around the possible development of a new budget model for the University. We started talking about the possibilities of revising our budget model in earnest after Amy Parsons took over as President. After reading the elements of the Courageous Strategic Transformation that encouraged reconsideration of our budget model, President Parsons bought into it and wanted to start conversations on campus about what this new budget model might look like.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We investigated budget models around the country, as well as inviting Andrew Comrie from the University of Arizona to meet with various groups. Comrie provided a report back with recommendations for us and things to consider. We also had an EAB presentation about changing budget models in June. In July, we recruited Jennifer Martin and Rob Mitchell as Presidential Fellows to assist with this effort, and now that it is August, we are thinking in earnest about what we want to do. Have provided this presentation at the President's Cabinet, the Provost's Leadership Council, and the Council of Deans, as well as the Faculty Council Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We are doing this because higher education is going to go through some disruptions in the future. The news talks about enrollment cliffs and disruptive technologies, as well as other peer universities going through some collapses, such as West Virginia, over the past month. We will need to address some serious challenges and be nimble about it. Our incremental budget model has some inherent sluggishness to it, as well as lack of nimbleness and flexibility. It is largely based on the past instead of forward-looking, and it does not acknowledge the disruptive nature of what our environment might look like. A new budget model should allow us to be nimbler and encourage the kind of activity that we need to have in developing new programs and new revenue. It should also have transparency regarding the budget decisions.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Will describe our current incremental budget model. We see the incremental revenue as the only change from the prior year. The only fundamental decisions we tend to make now involve moving money back into the University largely through mechanisms like reallocation. The entire budget process is designed to spend whatever new money we have in a sensible way. The features of this model are that only the incremental revenue goes in and then there is a budget process to decide where all the money goes.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The hybrid Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) budget model has a feature to it that colleges would start getting their money from formulas based on credit hours, majors, or other metrics depending on what we want to stimulate. The two

main formulas are credit hours and majors, and then there are additional ones such as graduation rates, retention rates, etc. The academic units would also get supplemental funding. We use the term “subvention” for this. This acknowledges that the formulas won’t pay the bills equally across all the colleges. There are two (2) ways universities can do this. They can either have a different formula for every college or top it off with subvention funding.

Executive Vice President Miranda: A big caveat to all funding models is that no funding models create more revenue. The hope is that after you put a new funding model in place is that the stimulating formulas will promote and enable growth. In this way, the hybrid model might be more attractive than the incremental budget model.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We have some decisions to make over the next year or so. Some of the decisions include whether to include state appropriations and what we want to stimulate with the formula. Once we decide, we can create formulas to stimulate what we want. What we are hearing from others doing this is that they look at what the formulas would give each college compared to what the incremental model would provide and provide supplemental funding initially. Other questions include what expenses should come off the top and what the proper mix of central funding and fee for service funding makes sense for each administrative unit. There is also the question of what formulas we should consider for administrative units.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Emphasized that we would still need a budget process. You cannot run the University on formulas, so a budget process is needed to decide the supplemental funding and how this might change over the years with new ideas and programs. You will need a budget process for the central funding decisions and how much should come off the top.

Executive Vice President Miranda: For next steps, over the next month, we want to decide on a governance or committee structure for how we will make decisions down the road. In CU’s presentation, they had three (3) separate groups, including a small set of executive sponsors, a larger strategic committee that responded to proposals about changing the model and communicating with their constituencies, and then a third committee that involved mainly accountants and institutional research representatives that could help make proposals for stimulating formulas. We need to decide if we want a similar arrangement or a slightly different one. We also need to put a communication plan in place. We want to have a strong goal of involving the entire University at the right cadence. These are things we will be working on over the next month.

Executive Vice President Miranda: What this budget model is all about is how we spend our resources and make decisions about expenditures. Independent of that, we can also turn our attention to how we collect tuition here, which has been desired by some people as we go through this new budget model process.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Noted that the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning has developed a draft set of values. Feels that ultimately it would need to be the executive sponsors that publish a values document. The draft is a good start, but we need to consult with many different people and groups before we settle on things. Asked if there were any questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked if the rate of return on investment is considered in any way. The College of Liberal Arts has the highest return on investment in the whole institution. Presuming that due to accounting bins, there will not be a higher investment, however.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The formulas are homogenous across all the colleges, at least in most of the models we have seen. You get a certain number of dollars per credit hour and per major, and then adjustments are made with subvention decision points and that would be based on the expenses necessary to run the operation.

Norton: A communication plan was mentioned. Wondering if there is a sense of what the right cadence for that would be.

Executive Vice President Miranda: One way of arriving at a new budget model is for the technical committee to propose models and do experiments with them and present these to the strategic committee, which would have more leadership of the University. Based on reactions, they would go back and make any tweaks to formulas and go back and forth between these two (2) committees. The strategic committee would be charged with doing most of the communication with campus and executive sponsors. Would guess a monthly report to Faculty Council and the University generally about any new developments would be the fastest cadence we could hope for. The slowest cadence might be a couple updates a semester. Think the monthly report to campus would be about right.

Norton: Have heard that President Parsons is interested in moving at a brisk pace with this. Wondering if there is a timeline in mind for when we would want to see this ready.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We have not gotten to that yet. Part of the reason we are hesitant to charge forward is that we do not currently have a permanent Provost or Vice President for Research, both of whom would need to be major champions for this and executive sponsors. We are waiting for those positions to be settled before moving faster on this. We will use this next month to figure out what a sensible timeline might be. It is conceivable that by the end of the academic year, we could have a proposed new model that we could test drive next year in parallel with our incremental model to see if it works.

DiVerdi: There are questions posted on the slide for the RCM model. Asked if those questions were being crafted as part of the design of the model itself.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Yes. Think you would want to start by trying to answer as many of those questions at a high level as possible to start that process. CU used an approach where they fixed a few parameters in the model, so we could maybe fix some parameters and hand those over to the strategic committee to provide instructions to the technical committee.

DiVerdi: Wondering if the overhead and cost recovery we get from research funds also goes into this pool.

Executive Vice President Miranda: This is an additional question we need to answer. With the RCM model, we have a high amount of discretion over these expenditures, and the indirect costs

from grants ought to be spent on supporting the grants and the infrastructure necessary to support the grants. There is a lot of discretion on how you support grants and a lot of ways of how you spend the money. It is constrained a little bit on how that money is supposed to be used and it is audited every few years. One might argue that you might want to put these in phase two (2) of a model like this.

William Sanford: Asked if the RCM model has been a fad recently or is this a model that has been around for a while. Wondering where it has failed and succeeded.

Executive Vice President Miranda: We have some data around that. The RCM model was starting to be implemented around fifteen (15) or twenty (20) years ago. More universities are moving in this direction. It has failed at places, but those places have tended to use the full RCM model rather than a hybrid model. It puts an enormous amount of control with the deans of the colleges, and it tends to create a much more competitive culture rather than a collaborative culture around the University.

Sanford: Asked if the RCM model was the only model being considered.

Executive Vice President Miranda: The hybrid RCM model encompasses many models because the formulas can change and the decisions you make can vary widely.

Chair Smith: Asked about the subvention. Wondering if there will still be subvention once the formulas kick in.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Not necessarily. It will always be the case that it costs more to run an engineering college than it does to run a history department. If you are committed to using one formula for the instructional metrics like credit hours and majors, you are always going to need to support more expensive colleges with grant dollars.

Chair Smith: Asked: Would it lead to greater variability in what amount you get because of this subvention piece?

Executive Vice President Miranda: The idea is that this subvention piece is a smaller amount of a colleges budget than the formula piece. Currently, what we do with the incremental budget is we go to the colleges and ask them the reasons to give them more money, whether it is more students or more majors, or new programs they want to start. The deans do this, and we make decisions based off that feedback. Colleges can grow their resources by coming to central administration and making their case.

Executive Vice President Miranda: What we expect from a hybrid RCM model is that colleges will get most of their money from the formulas and a lesser amount of money from subvention. They will be attracted to using the formulas to grow their programs in the ways that the University has decided we want to grow. What having the stimulating formulas does is align the deans', colleges', and department's attention and drive toward the goals expressed by the formula, rather than having them rely on proposals to central.

Chair Smith: It sounds like it becomes more of a top-down approach rather than a bottom-up approach to the amount of money colleges receive. Asked: Aren't the formulas going to be created by a committee and involve the dean?

Executive Vice President Miranda: At CU, their strategic committee involved all the deans, and there were a few on the technical committee as well. We would need broad buy-in for this to be a successful project.

Chair Smith: Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda. Asked if there were additional questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Have a question that is not regarding the budget. There was a report from the College of Liberal Arts on the workload equity plan regarding the possibility of receiving a 2-2 teaching load. The report indicates that the College of Liberal Arts would require financial assistance to supplement their units to support existing efforts and create efficiency while preserving their high standards for student success, as well as staying within institutional guidelines and accessibility values. The report estimates the cost would be approximately \$380,000 as part of the base budget, and this would affect eighty (80) faculty. Feels this warrants attention and had requested a meeting, which was denied. Asked if Executive Vice President Miranda had met with any faculty regarding any inequities while in this position, and if so, why meet with others and not him.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Stated that he does not tend to meet with faculty on these issues. Have met with one (1) faculty member in the last three (3) months about a salary equity issue. It was not about workload equity issues. That was a personal salary equity issue, not a budget issue of the College of Liberal Arts. Workload issues are centered in the college and the Provost Office.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked who holds the purse. Asked: Does the current Provost have the capacity to financially commit to this, or is it your office?

Executive Vice President Miranda: Worked with President Parsons this last year to finalize the budget and our highest priority was compensation. We did not see addressing differential workload issues as one of the highest priorities around the institution, so we did not put dollars in this budget to address those issues.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed hope that there is an understanding of how it is perceived that your administration is unwilling to engage with departments like his, who happen to have minoritized faculty. Wondering if there is understanding about how this refusal makes us feel, when the need is clear and the demand is only \$380,000, affecting eighty (80) faculty in total.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Had read the memo but was not convinced. It was also submitted after the budget was decided upon.

Pedros-Gason: Have also asked you to be engaged with this at the last Faculty Council meeting. This is not the first time this has been brought to the attention of the institution. They need to address this. We are constantly being denied.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Think there is a misunderstanding. They have listened to you. Would want to hear this recommendation from the dean and the Provost.

Pedros-Gascon: This report was submitted to the Provost, and the Provost promised to meet with the chairs of the departments, which did not happen. Stated that what makes us different is that we do not teach English, and we are being discriminated against on this basis. It is clear that you are unwilling to solve this issue and it is disappointing.

Executive Vice President Miranda: If we received a recommendation from the Provost to make this one of the highest academic investments emerging from academic affairs, we would pay attention to it. That has not happened.

Pedros-Gascon: It speaks volumes about the system and how we are being passed by all the time. This is a blatant and clear situation, and you are not willing to meet with us. This should be addressed before the next person enters this position as a way of facilitating a successful entrance and not to leave them in a situation where they will have to address situations that you were unwilling to.

Chair Smith: Feels this conversation should continue offline. Expressed appreciation for bringing this to the group. Recommendation would be to go to the dean next.

Pedros-Gascon: They are already at the table when it comes to trying to address this issue. The problem is the current administration is unwilling to sit at the table and try to find a solution. May also need to bring this to the Faculty Council floor because the reality is that we are being denied the possibility of meeting with the Executive Vice President and they are meeting with other people to address this issue.

Executive Vice President Miranda: Am not meeting with anyone else about faculty teaching loads. It has not come up.

Pedros-Gascon: There have been meetings about inequity, and you have met with people to discuss inequities. Wondering why there are meetings with other people and not with us, and we are eighty (80) faculty.

Executive Vice President Miranda: All the deans and the Provost stated that salary inequity was a top priority of the budget this past year. Willing to talk about where we see this with salaries, and we put some money in the budget to address salary inequity. Teaching load inequity was almost nonexistent as part of the budget discussions for the year. Understanding that it is a priority for some, but it was not expressed as a high priority by academic affairs or the deans or Provost.

Chair Smith: We do need to move on. Expressed appreciation for Pedros-Gascon's comments.



Pedros-Gascon: Will continue to bring this up.

Chair Smith: There seems to be fingers pointing in opposite directions with this issue. Expressed hope that this can rise to a priority where there can be some resolution about this. Thanked Executive Vice President Miranda for coming and presenting the budget model, as well as addressing the additional questions and comments.

Anderson: Missed part of Executive Vice President Miranda's presentation. Asked what "subvention" means.

Vice Provost James: They will have one (1) formula that will go toward all academic programs, and when you have an academic program that is more expensive to teach, extra money will supplement the formula. They are not sure what that looks like yet, but the desire is to keep the budget model relatively simple and easy to manage.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further business, called the meeting adjourned.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

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