

**MINUTES**  
Executive Committee  
**Tuesday, October 10, 2023**  
**3:00pm – Microsoft Teams**

**Present:** **Melinda Smith**, Chair; **Joseph DiVerdi**, Vice Chair; **Andrew Norton**, BOG Representative; **Sue Doe**, Immediate Past Chair; **Jessica Watkinson** (substituting for Amy Barkley), interim 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

**Guests:** **Brad Goetz**, Chair University Curriculum Committee; **Andrea Duffy**, Assistant Vice Provost

**Absent:** Katriana Popichak, Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Sciences (excused); Amy Barkley, Executive Assistant (excused); Zaid Abdo (substituting for Katriana Popichak), Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences; Janice Nerger, Interim Provost/Executive Vice President; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs

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

**October 10, 2023 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:**

**I. Minutes to be Approved**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes – September 26, 2023**

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from September 26<sup>th</sup>.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

**B. Faculty Council Minutes – October 3, 2023**

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections or changes to be made to the Faculty Council minutes from October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Hearing none, minutes approved as submitted.

**II. Items Pending/Discussion Items**

**A. *Announcements***

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on October 17, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 3:00 p.m.

2. The Next Faculty Council meeting will be held on November 7, 2023 – Microsoft Teams – 4:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Noted that Executive Committee can join in person in the Administration Building 3<sup>rd</sup> floor conference room, or by Teams.

***B. Old Business***

***C. Action Items***

1. UCC Minutes – September 22 & 29, 2023

Chair Smith: Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything in the UCC minutes to bring to EC attention.

Brad Goetz: Indicated that there was nothing of note in this set of minutes.

Chair Smith: Asked for more information about the new course code for climate change in the first set of minutes.

Goetz: Explained that it is an additional subject code similar to GES, Global Environmental Sustainability, and this came highly recommended from upper administration to begin to address climate change studies.

Chair Smith: Thought that was interesting, and part of setting the stage for the climate change initiative to potentially have an interdisciplinary degree and then have coursework that is listed as climate change coursework.

Andrew Norton: Asked who owns the new course code.

Goetz: Explained that intra-university is under the Provost's Office.

Norton: So, it is intra-university and with a new course code of climate.

Goetz: Yes, it's just that four letter subject code. We're going to get more of these, not climate change, but more proposals for additional subject codes because the technology forces us to run out of numbers as class numbers start to fill up and we start to remove classes. Once we remove a class from the catalogue or out of a department, we're going to see more of those. But this one is different; it is probably to address what Chair Smith said earlier.

Goetz: Clarified that sub-topics can be created with letters at the end. There is one department in engineering that is down to three or four numbers left, our suggestion to them has been to establish a new subject code.

Goetz: Explained this is not the case here, this is probably going to lean toward interdisciplinary studies. We already have climate change classes on campus. Does not know how that is going to evolve.

Chair Smith: It will be interesting to see how quickly those courses are created or if courses are starting to move to that code.

Jennifer Martin: Noted that for a topic like this there are going to be multiple colleges wanting to offer courses. Right now, it is being led as an initiative, but there is a college home to that initiative. Even though it is being promoted from the President's Office, wonders about other colleges who may be teaching similar types of courses or courses that would fall in this space. And if they would be allowed to then market themselves accordingly, or if there will be a perception that if they are not given that subject code, then they are not part of that initiative or not part of the efforts in the climate space.

Martin: Wonder how, with a subject code that is very transdisciplinary, we can encourage departments and colleges to use that code versus creating courses that are internally coded for their college or department and may struggle from a marketing perspective. Given the perception that if a course has the subject code, climate change, it may be marketed differently.

Chair Smith: Think that's a great point. Think the idea is to have it be an interdisciplinary degree not housed in any particular college. But, if there are courses proposed right now that use that code, they are going to be housed in a particular college. Wonder if this course code is used, will it be housed in only one college or the Provost's Office.

Martin: This has been a topic in our department, specifically, as we're increasing our sustainability efforts which are happening concurrently, not collaboratively. Worries about creating course constructs that are going to influence how people develop new courses.

Joseph DiVerdi: Agreed. Think we need to be mindful that some department is going to get credit for a course and there will be benefits, but none of that has been worked out yet.

Chair Smith: Wonders if there will be a rush to claim that code if someone is doing a climate change class.

Martin: Specifically for our department, there is a bit of concern as to the courses that already exist in this space that don't have that subject code. If we're creating courses then with that subject code that are part of a university-level initiative, will there be a process to cross list those existing courses. This work has been going on some time across our campus and the people who are doing the work are asking questions about how they can be a part of a climate specific initiative that is coded from a student facing lens, where they can attract more undergraduate or graduate students to their programs.

Chair Smith: These are important points that should be raised in the Faculty Council meeting. When we're thinking about the new task force on interdisciplinary degrees, that will be an important question that we ask. The problem with that task force is that it is tackling the idea of interdisciplinary degrees, not the climate change initiative itself. Expressed that is a different process for who owns that, and it is not clear.

Michael Antolin: Noted a question that needs to be raised besides the code. We ran into this problem with ownership, credit, and how credit hours are counted in biology relative to interdisciplinary programs. Discovered that it is actually a programming issue that at the time Laura Jensen helped to fix. There has to be the ability to program so that the credit goes where it needs to go. Especially if we get into this new budget model, the IT side of this has to be assured to handle how this gets apportioned and where it goes. Think we need to ask if a structure is being created that will allow us to recoup what we put into it. This needs to be asked because things sometimes get created without considering potential or inadvertent consequences.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Happy to take the approach of ask first then vote later. It would make sense to have the Provost explain the plans and how these are being calculated. Asked if we can discuss with the interim Provost Nerger or Vice Provost James next week.

Chair Smith: Will reach out to interim Provost Nerger and Vice Provost James.

Sharon Anderson: Asked if the members of the task force have been announced.

Chair Smith: Not yet, waiting to hear back from one person then will send out the Executive Committee and ask if there are recommendations for additional people.

William Sanford: Concerned about knowing who is in control of this and who decides the criteria for what is actually under climate. Would like to know who sets these guidelines.

Chair Smith: Asked if Goetz could speak to that.

Goetz: Clarified that what we are looking at is only an approval of the subject code. We don't have any programs and don't market subject codes. If a program is constructed, it may or may not use the CLMT subject code or courses from other places. We've done this once with the GES subject code which is an interdisciplinary topic. We don't have a program yet from GES or full major, so think time will tell with a lot of these things.

Goetz: As far as budget, UCC doesn't look at budget lines or who controls the budget around a subject code. Understands that department heads and to some degree deans watch those lines. Somebody from one department can teach in a subject code in another department. Horticulture and Landscape Architecture faculty have taught in the LIFE subject code and the credit goes to the right person. Whatever funding follows goes accordingly in the department and college.

DiVerdi: Asked if CLMT, the code we're referring to, is similar to CHEM or LIFE.

Goetz: Yes, it is one of our subject codes, there are no courses yet.

Chair Smith: If you were to propose a course you would have to have stakeholders that approved that course.

DiVerdi: Think the concerns are about where does this fit in the taxonomy of our courses and departments.

Rob Mitchell: There was a potential task force brought up earlier around the CIM system and processes, which is implicated here. The processes are fairly onerous from the perspective of the time that it takes for a program to be approved.

Chair Smith: Met with Brad Goetz and Tom Siller and understands that the prelude to the CIM process is what tends to lengthen the time of approval for courses and programs.

Mitchell: Thinking about this code, the interdisciplinary programs, what that might mean for departments working together, and how this would enable us to leverage competencies we already have. Asked if Brad could speak this.

Chair Smith: Reminder that we are approving these to go on the Faculty Council agenda. It is up to Faculty Council if they want to approve these minutes.

Goetz: Correct. We can talk about the process, the flow chart for courses, programs, and other credentials, but the bulk of that time is in work that is prior to the visible things that happen, one of those being UCC. So, a two year process for a degree program is tied up in steps prior to and after approvals.

Martin: Appreciative of the opportunity to talk about interdisciplinary programs. There is not a consensus across campus as to how we should approach what we are doing in this space. Specifically, our department has many livestock scientists who work in that space and is not always in alignment with the other work happening on campus. Think that a concern is that if we have courses discouraging activities happening on the other side of campus then we create an interesting dynamic for our students. It is different from chemistry, biology, or some of these more finite sciences because there isn't a clear-cut solution to this challenge. A concern for our department is being inclusive of people who do research specifically on the animal side of the industry.

Pedros-Gascon: Think it is important when discussing new models for the budget to consider the engagement in interdisciplinarity of departments. Departments that engage in a multidisciplinary approach should be considered in the budget model.

Goetz: Noted that some of those concerns across departments and colleges would be addressed in a full program proposal and are reviewed before getting into the curricular process. Discussion about any potential conflicts should occur in that program proposal territory. We do have things that protect faculty in terms of teaching classes in our code. Noted that this is just the subject code, which would be for new courses not courses that currently exist.

Chair Smith: Moved that the UCC minutes from September 22 & 29 be added to the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for November 7<sup>th</sup>.

DiVerdi: Moved.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the consent agenda on the Faculty Council agenda for November 7<sup>th</sup>.

2. Election – Graduate Representative to the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics – Committee on Faculty Governance – Steve Reising, Chair

Chair Smith: This ballot is for Nancy Ghanem on the Committee on Faculty Governance. Requested a motion to place this on the Faculty Council agenda.

Norton: Moved.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for November 7<sup>th</sup>.

#### ***D. Reports***

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith

Chair Smith: Sent invites for the Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Degree Task Force, based on names identified by the Executive Committee. Will send Executive Committee the final makeup and ask for any additional nominations.

Chair Smith: Worked with Pam Jackson on the strategic communications plan, would like to bring it to Executive Committee for feedback next week.

Chair Smith: Met with ASCSU student leadership. Their council voted to get a lobbyist to represent their views at the state level and to work with them in the system as well. Their goal is to focus on tuition increases. They are also working on getting approval to eliminate sales tax on textbooks for students.

Chair Smith: Met with the Graduate Student Council. One of their big pushes is to unionize. We will hear more about that as well.

2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton

Norton: ASCSU President Nick De Salvo has been working with Fort Collins City Council to pass the resolution to change U+2.

Norton: The Graduate Student union spoke during public comment at the Board of Governors meeting and expressed that they are not earning a living wage.

Norton: There were a large number of speakers from the climate divest movement that wants CSU to divest from all fossil fuel holdings in its portfolio.

Norton: The Board of Governors revised the sabbatical policy in response to a state statute that passed. The statute enables institutions of higher learning to grant sabbatical leave to administrators. The Board and Chancellor did not see that granting sabbatical leave to administrators was in the best interest of students or their education and declined to offer that to administrators. Noted that administrators to earn paid time off, and most faculty do not.

Norton: The CSU Fort Collins incremental budget is out. Reminder that last year, there were four different scenarios with a matrix of salary and tuition. This year the matrix is two, which is a 5% increase for State Classified and a 3% SALX increase for faculty. Calculating additional incremental dollars that they are devoting towards merit, market adjustment, step increases, benefits, cost increase, etc., it is about a 5.1% increase to compensation globally. There will be a 3% SALX increase with either a 3% undergraduate tuition increase or a 0% undergraduate tuition increase. With a 3% undergraduate tuition increase and a 3% SALX increase our budget is unbalanced by \$25,237,000. The other scenario is a 0% undergraduate tuition increase and a 3% SALX increase, in which case we are unbalanced by \$35,700,000. We look forward to figuring out how to budget that at some point in the future. Last year, our scenarios were \$15 million to \$40 million, and we brought it back to balance, but it was a bit of a challenge.

Norton: The Governor's budget request to the JBC is due on November 1<sup>st</sup>. We are assuming that we are going to get a 5% increase from the state, but we will see if that comes through.

Norton: CSU Fort Collins enrollment were down a little bit. CSU Pueblo enrollment is up substantially. CSU Pueblo is at the end a president search which was occupying a lot of the board members time during the meeting.

Norton: Positive news from CSU Global in their enrollment. They have a new President, Becky Takeda-Tinker who took over in February. She has been working to reverse that downward spiral they were in. Impressed with the numbers they are turning in. Their business model is very different from our business model. They have a session essentially start every four weeks, so they can see rapid turnarounds and they're very advertising driven in terms of how they enroll students.

Norton: The Board of Governors approved a funding plan for an Allison Hall renovation, which is the resident hall next to the College of Business. If funds can be raised, they will have an entrepreneur resident hall, a sort of lounge classroom space above where the old dining room used to be. Think there is a partnership with the College of Business and that residence hall to have learning centers or residential experiences.

Chair Smith: Thanked Norton.

Pedros-Gascon: Asked for clarification about the discussion of administrators taking sabbatical and what kind of administrators are they talking about, higher administration or state administrators. Thinks this would be good clarification and would see things differently in both cases.

Pedros-Gascon: As a follow up on the discussion last week with Jim Bradeen who spoke about Spur and how the Board of Governors had seeded money to produce that, if we eventually inherit the bill for Spur it will cost around \$20 million. Would rather have the Board of Governors pay for maintaining those, rather than producing new buildings.

Norton: Can relay our concerns about the long term financing of Spur and how that will manage to pay for itself. Think they are still ramping up, they just finished Hydro months ago and hope to bring in more revenue from conferences and community events.

Norton: To answer the first question, the General Assembly language defined this sabbatical leave for staff as an employee who serves in a management position or similar capacity, including a director and up to Vice President.

Mitchell: Noted that although the College of Business is championing this, they don't have a major in entrepreneurship. The entrepreneurship minor is meant to be cross-campus and to complement other programs. Although it is coming from the College of Business, hopefully everybody sees this as a positive opportunity to help their students complement what they're already doing in their current programs.

Norton: Clarified that the funding requests and budget requests for that are completely paid for by Housing and Dining revenues and is not coming out of our general fund or the state.

Chair Smith: Asked if Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin had any updates.

Martin: We are getting closer to the official launch of the budget model redesign project, specifically launching the campus engagement session. Later this week, the website supporting the project as well as the information around those campus sessions will be launched in an email coming from EVP Miranda. CFO Brendan Hanlon, Rob Mitchell, and I will outline the various activities happening over the course of the next four to six weeks. The opportunities for engagement and what the process will look like for engagement, not just the opportunity to meet in person but the various ways that people can become involved in the process whether that is, individual meetings, online, anonymous forms, etc. That email will also give an overview of the governance process for the project itself. As mentioned in the presentation last week, there will be a series of committees that will guide and do the work of identifying the formulas that will influence and inform the budget model and moving toward presentation of a final budget model for approval by the Board of Governors.

Martin: The first of those committees will be announced in the email coming out later this week and the rest of the committee membership will be informed and then decided by the executive level committee.



Mitchell: Please do attend those meetings and let other people know we will be announcing those. There were questions around governance and announcements will happen soon. The executive committee needs to get its charge from President Parsons and then will make decisions. We've tried to enable committee chairs and council chairs to be involved in compelling ways, so from a governance perspective there will be some opportunities for a variety of people to be involved. For example, on the executive committee is Chair Smith, the APC chair, the CPC chair, the CoSFP chair, a number of CoSFP members, and we are recommending student representatives. We need to make clear that shared governance is a part of this.

Martin: The role of these listening sessions is to collect feedback and take it back to the committees. This is a great opportunity for our colleagues to bring questions, concerns, ideas.

Chair Smith: Asked how these would be advertised.

Mitchell: We'll have an email coming out, SOURCE, and then we'll have this on the operations page. Have been working with Pam Jackson and Rachel Baschnagel on strategic communications.

### *E. Discussion Items*

#### 1. CSU's Certificate Policy – Andrea Duffy, Assistant Vice Provost

Andrea Duffy: One of the things I've been working on is looking at our current certificate policy and trying to update it to reflect best practices, innovative learning, and national trends based on my research. The main change that we've been trying to make is to offer certificates to non-degree seeking students and to make certificates accessible to non-degree seeking students.

Duffy: Identified four main changes to the certificate policy that are reflected in this edited certificate policy document under the rationale. To give context, this is an initiative that has support at all levels. There have been some concerns mostly about the logistics of implementing them in an intentional way that supports students pursuing certificates, particularly non-degree seeking students who may be distance learners, adult learners, etc. So those are things that we will need to work out and if this policy is implemented, we'll need to think carefully about the certificate programs that we approve to be standalone and how we do that in an intentional way. Before we can approve any certificate programs or new certificate proposals for standalone offerings, we need to change our policy so that we have the potential to do that, so that's what this policy update aims to do.

Duffy: We've focused mainly on expanding the policy, so certificates are not limited to degree seeking students. To clarify what I mean by certificates, we have certificates at CSU at the undergraduate level, but they are currently limited to degree seeking students enrolled in a major and a bachelor's degree program and then they get the certificate when they get their bachelor's degree. We also have graduate level certificates that are available to non-degree seeking

students, but they require a bachelor's degree. What we're proposing here are certificates that students can enroll in without to being degree seeking at Colorado State University, so rather than enrolling in a degree program, they would apply for and enroll in a certificate program. The application process would be different than the application process for an undergraduate degree.

Duffy: Met with an informal task force of people with various interests and knowledge about different aspects of this policy and this initiative. Brad Goetz has been part of that group and there has also been representation from Admissions, Financial Aid, the Registrar's Office, Laura Jensen, and some different colleges that are pursuing or that are interested in pursuing certificates. There has been enthusiasm at that level and there has been interest and encouragement from executive leadership to make this happen, as well as the Colorado Division of Higher Education, the Higher Learning Commission is also supportive of this initiative at four-year institutions, and a lot of enthusiasm from faculty as well.

Duffy: The standalone certificates are particularly interesting when they are industry oriented, skills based, provide students with applicable skills in a particular industry, or general skills that will improve their marketability for a particular industry or a range of industries.

Chair Smith: Asked to clarify what would be the process and the action potentially needed by Faculty Council with respect to this policy change.

Duffy: Wanted to share this with Executive Committee now, informally, but have also shared it with the deans and gotten some feedback on it as well as a few other stakeholders. Intend to take feedback from this group and potentially tweak the policy or the draft policy as necessary, present it to the UCC, and then the UCC would present it to Faculty Council as a special action. And then hoping that we could get it on the agenda in November for Faculty Council.

DiVerdi: Asked for clarification. It seems like the proposal is embodied in the first three paragraphs of the document, and the rest of it is rationale. It seems like a lot of rationale for a small change, but that may be stylistic.

Duffy: The rationale is based on feedback that has been received so far and is meant to cover all the bases.

DiVerdi: Asked what concerns have been heard about making these changes.

Duffy: Most concerns relate to implementation. So, the Registrar's Office and Admissions are concerned about the impact it's going to have on their offices and it requiring additional bandwidth and potentially additional platforms and support. There are faculty concerns that this is going to be money making and is going to change the direction of higher education. See that as something that could happen if we don't do this mindfully. Another consideration is we need to

have some way of vetting certificates, but we also have a process that we already follow for new program proposals.

DiVerdi: Certificates are much smaller than programs, that would be an onerous process.

Duffy: That is another concern, that certificates are supposed to be flexible, nimble, innovative, and responsive to industry trends. If we follow the same process as graduate certificates, it takes years to implement a graduate certificate from the proposal stage to the implementation stage. Another concern is what kind of support students enrolled in these programs will have. Students who are generally interested in these kinds of programs tend to be adult learners. Think that is the population we want to focus on. They don't necessarily need the level of support as an incoming first year student, but they do need some. We need to make sure we provide advising services that students need, have a contact for information that they need, and that they understand the process for completing the certificate. We also need to make sure that when we build these certificates that they are built in a way that can be completed. So, building flexibility into certificates so that students, particularly non-degree seeking students, aren't waiting to complete a certificate because the courses that they need aren't offered a particular semester and might lose financial aid. That is listed in the rationale as part of our mission of access with creating these.

DiVerdi: Requested that these be itemized in a list that we could look at and try to address them. Another question is the price of these courses and if they are going to be full-ride prices or if they're going to be discounted or what, if anything, special is going to be made.

Mitchell: Asked if there was a process or limit to enable existing undergraduate certificates in this.

Duffy: Think this would be something like a check box in CIM, so it would be a program change but wouldn't need to be resubmitted as a new certificate. Unless we change the current workflow, it would have additional steps in the workflow. Currently, certificates don't have to go past the UCC.

Mitchell: Asked when the is the earliest that would happen and if there is any potential for stackable certificates.

Duffy: That is our hope. Another rationale for removing the upper division requirement that we currently have for undergraduate certificates is that it creates more flexibility for the potential for stackable certificates. You could have an entry level certificate and then an intermediate or advanced certificate and ideally those would stack toward a degree but be sort of lower benchmarks for students and a gateway for students to dip their feet into the college experience without having to commit to a four-year degree. They also potentially provide an off-ramp. Students who need to stop or pause their undergraduate career might be able to walk away with a certificate and still have something that helps them get a job. Also, the stack-ability component

suggests that we might be able to encourage them to come back and get another certificate and build that up to a degree. All of that requires some intentionality so that we build some of those stackable or standalone certificates that make sense for non-degree seeking students.

Duffy: In terms of time frame that kind of depends on Faculty Council. The workflow process is like any other major change or change to the general catalog. It must go through the UCC and through Faculty Council. The deans have expressed support. We have to change the policy before anyone can propose standalone certificates, then there is a process for each of those proposals as well. Once we get the approvals that we need we can implement the logistics pretty quickly.

Sanford: Noted a confusing sentence in the third paragraph of the proposal, suggested revision to say complete the requirements and receive the certificate, rather than receive and complete the certificate requirements.

Sanford: The rationale allows 100 and 200 level courses. Think that 100 level courses don't provide the depth needed for a certificate. Concerned that a certificate that is meant to improve their job only contains introductory material.

Duffy: Agreed with the suggested edit. Think there is value in vertically aligned certificates that build competency in a particular skill area or discipline. Also think there is potential value in interdisciplinary or horizontally aligned certificates that build competency in a range of skills with the opportunity to integrate and apply them in a job. Does not want to limit the potential for developing valuable certificates that may exist at the 100 or 200 level. Particularly with interdisciplinary certificates that are more likely to cross disciplines at lower levels. They still need to be reviewed to make sure that they are giving students the competencies they are supposed to, but don't want to rule out certificates without upper division courses. The upper division course is a barrier to non-degree seeking students who don't have pre-requisites.

Sanford: Asked if someone can get a certificate with just 100 level courses.

Duffy: Correct, this is also the practice at many other peer institutions.

Pedros-Gascon: Agreed with Sanford. Indicated concern relayed from faculty about overflowing the market with certificates. Think this is not a good optic for us. Expressed concern that someone hiring may not have an understanding of certificates. So, we are really capturing something that may not be understood. Gave example that people may think that because you have a certificate in Spanish for healthcare that you can be a certified person for that. Concerned that someone could take, for example, two entrance courses for German, that is 101 and 102, that are five credits each, and they would have a certificate in German with only one year of courses. Doubtful about how much of that can be transferred anywhere.

Chair Smith: Think those are legitimate concerns. Hope that during the vetting and approval process that those concerns would be brought to light and inform whether that certificate is something we want to support at CSU.

Duffy: Gave a potential example of a 100 level lower division certificate that might be of value. The Colorado Division of Higher Education is very interested in creating a core curriculum certificate to allow students who completed part or all of the AUCC requirements to have something that shows the skills they got out of that core curriculum experience. Those are all lower division courses, but that certificate might be of value if they can't continue their education or need to put a pause on it. This could also potentially allow us to better identify the value of our core curriculum, because right now I think a lot of students see it as boxes to check off. Sensitive to these concerns and would not want to give the impression that we are offering highly skilled certifications when we are not. Think that needs to be worked out in the review of certificate proposals that come forth.

## 2. 2016 Resolution on Budget Cuts to Academics – Antonio Pedros-Gascon

Pedros-Gascon: Around the year 2016, we had a resolution on budget cuts to academics signed by multiple heads. The request from Steve Shulman comes in response to the audit from the State of Colorado. One of the main reasons for this resolution to be brought back is that, in the multiple locations in which budget allocation has happened at this institution, administration has said we don't understand the numbers are wrong. It happens that the numbers from the auditors from the State of Colorado are right. Indicated that the administration was providing numbers of the investment that happens in athletics that are not the numbers shown by the auditor from the State of Colorado. As you can see, we are identified as the least sustainable of all the colleges in the state of Colorado. The idea is that the specific acknowledgment by the state merits discussion on the part of faculty and administration about the financial allocation preferences of the institution.

Chair Smith: Asked if there are any questions.

Martin: Asked to clarify that the document in the agenda was the original resolution but not the resolution that was passed. Understands that the resolution that was passed in 2019 is not the same.

Doe: That is correct.

Pedros-Gascon: Remembers there was a robust discussion at the time about whether or not to include figures. When including figures, administration indicated that we did not understand the numbers. We ended up with a more neutral understanding that the institution should follow the mission as stated.

Doe: Noted that Pedros-Gascon is correct, this was a robust conversation that went on for years. Every time there was an effort made to present numbers, the numbers were disputed. There was

almost an implication that we couldn't really understand the numbers and didn't have that expertise. This resolution, which was passed by a significant number of department heads, never saw the light of day because over the course of many semesters, it eroded down to what could be agreed to. What was agreed to was an idea about making sure that our priorities align with our values. Noted that Tony Frank has said that something like 25-27% of the funding for athletics will always be subject to discussion because the revenues that are generated never get past the point of at least a 25% subsidy. Tony Frank has said that 25% should be discussed and that's a values decision, that we decide that we want to invest that amount in athletics and that is a value of the university. Think that is a topic worthy of discussion.

Martin: Think that as we think about fiduciary responsibility and financial sustainability, the report that came out is concerning. Think we should be asking questions about the athletics budget and what is happening to rectify the deficit that exists. Would assume those conversations are occurring. Think that when we have this conversation, really the program we're talking about is football. Given what we're seeing with our neighbor to the south, it's an even bigger conversation this year. They're in the opposite scenario as far as their football program generating substantial revenue for their university and we are arguably going in the opposite direction. Think we should be asking questions around what the plans are to maintain or improve financial sustainability if we are to keep the program at its current state because the numbers in front of us are not sustainable. Don't know what the plan is but assumes that the conversation is happening. Think it is worthwhile for us to ask these questions as a campus after seeing a report where we heard we are in the hole by \$25 million. There should be accountability for having a plan to get us to financial sustainability. It's also concerning what happens to the other sports if we talk about a cut to the athletic budget, specifically sports played by females. Think we should be mindful of the implications and unintended consequences to other programs if we were to remove funding to one program.

Pedros-Gascon: Understands that we want athletic programs to be a part of the institution, especially those that have diverse populations. Think the question is more about the specific amount of money that is being directed to one single program. Think it is also important to ask who is being asked to make these kinds of decisions.

Mitchell: Understands where these questions are coming from a strategy perspective. Think another question would be about how important it is for our students to have these kinds of programs and if it a decider for why they are coming here.

Mitchell: Noted that we spend more money on research than we bring in and have very strong reasons for that. Noted that research is in our mission, and educating students is also in our mission. That's why it's important to make sure we understand the extent to which this drives students here and look at the implications of a different strategy looking very far down the road. It is important to ask questions to understand how the university can remain sustainable, grow enrollment, and align with our mission.

Pedros-Gascon: Agreed that being identified as financially unsustainable merits discussion. Indicated that we are spending a lot of money on athletics. We hired a new coach for basically double the salary of that coach's previous institution. Would like to know how the market

explains that. Think there is a lot of money being spent on athletics and very little accountability when it comes to how it is being spent. Also noted that there are indirect benefits that are going to athletics, for example paid parking on game days.

Chair Smith: Noted that we could ask to see the larger budget, and in that there is athletics. That is the piece we never see with the incremental budget. Asked how we would like to proceed.

DiVerdi: Think that we need to seek a rational discussion with the administration. There are a lot of other programs around the university that don't make money, for example the music department, though that is a different magnitude. Think that we are not able to talk about athletics. People immediately resort to polls and think that is somewhat on the part of the faculty but more so on the part of the administration. Think we should figure out how to break through that conversation.

Anderson: Think we need to ask to see what we like to see or talk about, and not be quiet about it.

Doe: Concur with Anderson. During the height of pandemic, March and April, there were many ideas discussed about the budget and how to keep us afloat. Asked in those meetings, why we were not able to see athletics when we were looking at those spreadsheets. That was not a potential area that could contribute to what was imagined to be a substantial cut that everyone would have to take, but it was not to be discussed.

Mitchell: Think that this is something that we talked about last year as part of our conversations in terms of task forces and making sure that we are looking at the overarching strategic aspect of what we do. We want to think strategically if this is our top issue or some other issue, that we're strategic about moving this forward in a way that fits with our overarching strategy as an Executive Committee and Faculty Council.

Martin: Think an approach could be to ask what they are doing currently. Think it is a fair question given the gravity and implications of this report, what the current administration and Joe Parker are doing and what plan they have from a strategic perspective and financial perspective, to address this report. Hope that if a report of this nature comes out showing the lack of sustainable future we have financially as an athletic program, that we aren't pretending like it didn't happen. Think we should give them the opportunity to share with us what they're doing and provide feedback accordingly.

Chair Smith: Joe Parker is coming to Faculty Council in November. Suggested we could pen request prior to that meeting asking him to specifically speak about that issue.

DiVerdi: Think that is a great idea. If we could possibly have summary budgetary data available, maybe we could assign someone to bring the questions.

Pedros-Gascon: Remembers the last time we had a presentation from Joe Parker, one of the problems was that it didn't include all the items that we are paying for. There were also problems with overextending presentation time and no time for questions.

Norton: For those reasons and others, not sure that Joe Parker is the right person to address this. I think it is probably EVP Miranda or President Parsons that we want to have that conversation with and how we can move forward in a constructive manner and talk about values. Did not think the last time Parker presented to Faculty Council was informative.

Chair Smith: Think we should still ask him to address how he deals with that issue. In our next meeting with President Parsons and Faculty Council leadership, we could tell her this is a concern that has come up and that Faculty Council wants to know what the stance of the administration is.

DiVerdi: Think we should discuss with Parker before President Parsons.

Chair Smith: We have both Parker and President Parsons on our agenda for November.

Mitchell: Think we should come up with suggestions that are constructive, and that it would be productive for the institution to see the extent to which having a football program drives enrollment and enables us to accomplish what we want. Those are strategic questions that should come from data.

Anderson: More concerned about how we keep this visible, and don't want to be dismissed when budget issues impact us all.

Chair Smith: Think we can't ignore it and need to say something, but how to best do that.

Doe: Agreed with Chair Smith. Think that Faculty Council is intended to be a group that asked tough questions like this.

Chair Smith: One option is that we can bring this up in the meeting with President Parsons and the officers. Can also reach out to Parker and meet about this concern and get a sense of what he can speak to. Think we should revisit this issue until we feel like we have acted in due diligence.

DiVerdi: Think we should start by asking Parker what are the biggest problems that we have with the program and working our way in there.

Martin: Think we can also position ourselves as the body willing to help find solutions. We can be part of acknowledging there is a problem and identifying solutions.

Chair Smith: Think we have a way forward and will keep having a dialogue about this.

### 3. Potential Special Faculty Council meeting about budget

Chair Smith: This discussion item is not pressing and is tabled for now.

## *F. Executive Session*



Executive Committee adjourned at 5:54 p.m.

Melinda Smith, Chair  
Joseph DiVerdi, Vice Chair  
Andrew Norton, BOG Representative  
Jessica Watkinson, interim Executive Assistant