

MINUTES
Executive Committee
Tuesday, February 27, 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: Brendan Hanlon, Vice President for University Operations; Susan James, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs; Brad Goetz, Chair University Curriculum Committee; Andrea Duffy, Associate Vice Provost; Lumina Albert, Chair Committee on Teaching and Learning; Steve Shulman, Department of Economics

Absent: none

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

February 27, 2024 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Minutes to be Approved

A. Executive Committee Minutes – February 20, 2024

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any corrections to be made to the Executive Committee minutes from February 20th.

Antonio Pedros-Gascon: Indicated that there are changes to be made in a statement on page 9. Will send these changes via email and posted them in the chat for review.

Chair Smith: Thanked Pedros-Gascon. Hearing no other additions or changes, considered the minutes approved by unanimous consent.

II. Items Pending/Discussion Items

A. *Announcements*

1. The Next Executive Committee Meeting will be held on March 19, 2024– Microsoft Teams/Administration 106 – 3:00 p.m.

Chair Smith: Will not be able to join this meeting due to a trip to South Africa. Vice Chair Joseph DiVerdi will be running the meeting.

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: In the last week, have discussed emerging Provost priorities and have been meeting with more faculty. Have enjoyed the chance to talk about possible curriculum innovation and partnership with faculty. This week, we will meet with a few more college leadership teams to talk about these emerging priorities.

Provost Underwood: Have been engaging in productive discussions about the budget model redesign. Have been involved in meetings with each dean and vice president to discuss their 2%, 4%, and 6% reduction scenarios. We have asked each leader to talk about why they made the choices they made and what other choices they might make. A lot of those conversations have focused on preserving our academic mission, preserving our positions for our people and our filled positions as much as possible. Am encouraged by the way our leaders are thinking about these choices. These meetings also involve Vice President Brendan Hanlon, Senior Vice President Rick Miranda, and Vice President Eric Ray. We have invited each vice president or dean, along with their budget officers to these meetings. These have been good discussions. We hope to get back to people with some initial feedback. We want to make reasonable decisions. We want different proposals to come up with a plan that lets us meet the financial target while preserving our most important missions and protecting our people.

Provost Underwood: Would like to use Provost funds to bring academic analytics to Colorado State University. This is a web-based tool that allows us to compare our programs and our units to other peer comparison groups and to see how we are doing on various scholarly metrics. It helps us make rational decisions about where to invest. Academic analytics also has some nice features that enable us to raise the impact of Colorado State by recognizing where we are excelling and where we could be stronger and where we might invest to be stronger. It also has great features that allow us to invest in our people and to develop our faculty and allows us to know what awards faculty might be eligible for. This is something that we will be rolling out probably starting this summer. Amazing things are happening at this university and more people need to know about it. We need to increase the impact of our academic programs and our research activities. Think this is a tool that will help us do that.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions for Provost Underwood.

Andrew Norton: Am unfamiliar with academic analytics. Asked: How will this interface with or be similar to Interfolio?

Provost Underwood: It is different but can see why people might think they are similar. Interfolio and digital measures are ways that individual faculty members can report their efforts in various domains. That allows the University to roll up that information and see how many books they have and how many grant dollars there are across the whole university. Think Interfolio is great and important for all kinds of reasons.

Provost Underwood: Academic analytics is different because it is not about individuals, it is about groups. It allows us tools to look at departments and see how it compares to other similar departments. We could compare public land grants, other public universities, or could compare to the Association of American Universities. If we want to move Colorado State University toward Association of American Universities membership, this is a tool that will quickly see how units compare. It would never be about an individual. The sole individual feature has to do with awards. You can put a person's name in, and it can tell you what awards they are well-positioned for, because it scrapes the internet for all our scholarly academic accomplishments.

Vice Provost Susan James: Think this is complimentary to Interfolio. Interfolio is a workflow system, and it has a digital measures component, which is about faculty activity reporting, allowing departments to make reports. However, Interfolio does not have any of these features that Provost Underwood just described, where it benchmarks and compares to faculty across the world, especially the United States.

Chair Smith: Hearing no other questions, thanked Provost Underwood and Vice Provost James.

C. Vice President Report – Vice President for University Operations Brendan Hanlon

Chair Smith: At the last Executive Committee meeting, there was discussion about wanting some additional information about the budget. Expressed appreciation for Vice President Hanlon for coming to talk further about the Athletics budget and mandatory costs, particularly debt service.

Vice President Brendan Hanlon: Thanked Chair Smith. Will start with the debt service. Shared a PDF with Executive Committee that showed debt service over time. It shows the aggregate debt service and layers every transaction that we have across the University. Noted that the chart also includes refundings, which typically happen over a ten-year horizon. You typically cannot refund a bond and restructure that bond within a ten-year period because financial institutions want to make sure that they get the interest they were pledged when it came to the original transaction. When we go to the market, we will issue new bonds, but we will also issue some refundings and this lumps some of those together.

Vice President Hanlon: Explained some of the portions of the chart. We see shifts over time as these different transactions are made. They could happen years in advance and then sunset. This because they tend to be structured over time in twenty (20)-, twenty-five (25)-, and thirty (30)-year horizons. This is a chart that evolves over time, it is not static. Some of these structures are in their infancy and could be refinanced, which adds a new layer. It is an evolving structure that we look at annually to see what is available to go back to the market, hopefully for a better interest rate and maybe a better structure over time. Indicated that the stadium transactions are involved in this chart.

Vice President Hanlon: Some of the payments of these bonds come from student fees, some come from the E&G budget. The stadium is paid for by both the revenues for the stadium as well as the reserve. Indicated that he will send this chart to Chair Smith following the meeting.

Joseph DiVerdi: Requested clarification on the aggregate. Asked if it was the principal.

Vice President Hanlon: It involves both the principal and the interest for each of these series, showing the total payment in each given year.

DiVerdi: In the interest of shared governance, wondering how we go about participating in making the decisions and being better informed and better involved.

Vice President Hanlon: Asked if DiVerdi was referring to the structure of debt service itself or projects.

DiVerdi: Was thinking more about projects, but the debt service is an important part of the project.

Chair Smith: Asked: When looking retrospectively, how does this level of debt service compare to the past?

Vice President Hanlon: Understanding is that around 2010 and that period, using debt financing to invest in our capital infrastructure in terms of new projects and major renovations was a tool that was activated. Not sure why it was not a tool used previously, but there was more of an idea of paying as you go, and at that point in time, we may have had greater deferred maintenance and control maintenance allocations in our budget. We might also have had greater state support for our capital projects as well than we currently do. The Clark building is an example of trying to renovate, expand, and catch up on deferred maintenance all at the same time. This is a tool that we have been trying to use thoughtfully and in a more robust fashion than what had maybe occurred prior to 2010. Could get some historical context.

Chair Smith: Asked: Are we able to see the effect of the scoop and toss in 2020 here?

Vice President Hanlon: No, that is getting paid off next month. That was something we pulled down as a financial tool during the pandemic.

Andrew Norton: The 2010 timeline resonates because that was around the time we were working on the University Center for the Arts and some other projects. Think we might have changed how we did things after that and said we could not wait for the state to pay for it all.

Pedros-Gascon: In the 2023 NCAA report that was produced by former Director of Athletics Joe Parker last month, it acknowledged that the total athletics debt was over \$225 million, out of a total institutional debt of \$1.2 billion. One in five of the dollars we are incurring in debt is related to Athletics. It is worth considering the amount of money that an academic institution should be investing in non-academic endeavors. The document also indicates that in 2019, Athletics had institutional support totaling \$25 million, and now it is \$29.4 million. It is a lot of money for a single unit, and it is a point of concern that has been raised constantly. There is \$9 million going to scholarships that we are happy about, but that still leaves \$20 million in the red when it comes to the financial support for Athletics. Asked if Vice President Hanlon could speak to this.

Vice President Hanlon: Happy to go back over the points Parker made at his presentation, in terms of the structure. Think it is correct that a lot of the base funding provided goes directly to scholarship, and that is how we as a University have maintained that academic nexus. It is not an academic program, but financial aid is given as financial support for our students. Athletics overall is an auxiliary where we try to contain their cost within that area. That is in addition to the stadium fund where the dollars from the stadium's activity is then pledged back into that. Understand what is being said in terms of the overall financial commitment but think the University has been trying to be sensitive to the fact that we have an athletics department that is an auxiliary. It is correct that we did issue debt to construct the stadium. The stadium then has to pay for that obligation, and that obligation is not an insignificant part of our overall debt service profile.

Pedros-Gascon: Would also like to know who pays for the parachutes for previous coaches, such as the \$750,000.

Vice President Hanlon: The University would have to pay it. Will have to follow up with whether it is split between the University and Athletics, or whether it is all Athletics or all the University. Happy to follow up via email about where that has traditionally been paid from.

Chair Smith: It was mentioned that there are a number of different sources of that pay for the debt services and am curious to see the breakdown. Wonder if there is a general idea of percentages of what comes from student fees, the E&G budget, or auxiliary funds.

Vice President Hanlon: Currently working with team to get that information. Will follow up with that information.

Chair Smith: Thanked Vice President Hanlon. Asked if there was any additional information to be shared today.

Vice President Hanlon: Have been meeting with Provost Underwood, Senior Vice President Miranda, Angela Nielsen, and Vice President Ray to meet with deans and vice presidents to review their budget reduction proposals and ask about what the impact of those proposals are and the sustainability of the proposals over time. We discuss what kind of university dependencies could be impacted if a proposal is implemented, whether it would impact someone else on campus or looking for impacts in other areas. We have been trying to create a place for dialogue to make sure that we understand impacts, with the goal of having a strategic set of conversations around what impacts we are trying to avoid. We will be looking at all of this and discussing with the President. Thinking that in late March or early April is when we will start communicating with campus.

Chair Smith: It is great to hear that there is communication among the deans and the Provost. Expressed concern with where the faculty voice is in all of this. Indicated that there has been no conversation about scenarios in her department. Would not be surprised if that is the case in other departments on campus. Think that transparency lags behind quite a bit and it is very heterogenous, depending on your chair or dean. Would like to hear thoughts on that kind of engagement.

Vice President Hanlon: Thanked Chair Smith. Had not thought about that there are maybe areas on campus where the dialogue has been lacking or has not been started, because maybe some of those areas have not been under consideration. Silence could mean one of those two things, that there is a communication lag or that they are not engaging since they are not proposing anything that will impact your area. Indicated that Gamze Cavdar requested his presence at the next meeting of the Committee on Strategic and Financial Planning. Will engage that committee on what an engagement process could look like. Happy to discuss this with Chair Smith as well. We are trying to be thoughtful, but there are a lot of impactful trade-offs that we are trying to get through.

DiVerdi: It was mentioned that there have been meetings with the deans and these individual colleges to take a look at the possibilities there. Asked if these meetings were also happening with Athletics.

Vice President Hanlon: Confirmed.

DiVerdi: Second question is that the size of the administration has been pointed out. Asked if that was being discussed in a similar fashion.

Vice President Hanlon: One of the questions we are asking each group is where we can share administrative resources across divisions and colleges. Some people have indicated that there are some opportunities there. Some said they would be willing to look into that. When talking about administration, am thinking about places like Human Resources or Marketing and Communications, or finance functions, and how we look at those pockets of support across campus, as well as those are central. Want to look at whether we are duplicating efforts or whether systems and processes are forcing us to duplicate efforts and how we can maybe revise them, as well as shifting resources that will allow us to have a more efficient structure.

Chair Smith: To go off DiVerdi's question, believe it is being asked whether the President's Office and the Provost's Office are considering cuts.

Vice President Hanlon: Confirmed.

Jennifer Martin: The other thing we are seeing on campus is an optimism bias, where several department heads do not think these cuts will happen and they are interacting with faculty in that manner, that the exercise is not going to result in an actual cut. Expressed concern that they are not adequately preparing and that there are faculty and staff that would be required to make the changes because they do not believe it is going to happen.

Sue Doe: The lack of messaging is not restricted to departments or colleges. The messaging feels casual from some and rather frightening for others. When the messaging is all over the place, it appears that some people are taking it seriously and others are not. To continue Chair Smith's and DiVerdi's comments, there are some optic issues when we see a lot of support positions for higher administration, and we talk about cuts for other people.

Doe: Have also heard about debt service incentives to hire faculty off the tenure-track. This is not just at CSU, but nationally. Wondering about reaction to that type of incentive, and whether Vice President Hanlon had heard of it.

Vice President Hanlon: Have been in briefings with both rating agencies and financial institutions that would be doing the lending, and this concept has never come up. Expressed concern about Doe's first comments regarding taking these exercises seriously.

William Sanford: Am in a department and college where we have no idea what the dean is thinking, so there is no transparency. Did a quick look online, and we have about forty-two (42) people classified as executive leadership positions at this University, and that is about \$13 million worth of salary. Asked: Are leadership positions, or that group, going to be affected by these cuts, and if so, how much of that will actually fall onto the staff? It seems that a lot of people do not seem to be in this equation. We do not see it in the incremental budget. Wondering if leadership positions get raises every year when we do not. It seems to be a perception that only one side of the University is being affected by this and not necessarily people in executive leadership positions.

Vice President Hanlon: Have seen people in leadership positions thinking through the ramifications of their proposals. It spans the gamut, both in terms of one-time funds and base options that they are considering. Expressed appreciation for the thoughtfulness of the conversations and frame of reference that people have brought to this. The leaders will be impacted, because they will be responsible for messaging and communicating the trade-offs that were considered, as well as implementing those proposals. They will also bear the consequences of how to continue to resource each of their organizations as they go through those trade-offs.

Pedros-Gascon: An exercise that has been requested previously, for any office, including the President's Office or similar, is to look at how much that office cost the year before you entered and how much it is costing now. This would be a great question for our current President. We should ask how much the office cost prior to her entrance and how much it is costing now and why, as well as justifying the needs for such a discrepancy and why we are spending that amount of money.

Chair Smith: Think that would be a great question to ask President Amy Parsons at the Faculty Council meeting next week.

Vice President Hanlon: Indicated that he was taking notes on these questions. Even with the budget being proposed, likely in the May time period, anticipating still having budget forums to talk about decisions and the impacts and to go over the thought processes for them. Taking notes on framing some of these things to do some research.

Chair Smith: Something to consider in the future would be to have the colleges do their own budget forums that could inform faculty in those areas and then feed these into the larger budget forums. Expressed appreciation for the transparency that is being brought to your position and the communications going out to the community.

Vice President Hanlon: Am available for team meetings and meetings with small groups of employees, if that would be helpful.

DiVerdi: Thanked Vice President Hanlon. We are asking hard questions, and they are being answered. Will reiterate Chair Smith's comments about getting the faculty voice in these discussions. Faculty Council is here for that purpose and if we can systematically bring Faculty Council into these discussions more deeply, that would be a good thing.

Chair Smith: Hearing no further comments or questions, thanked Vice President Hanlon.

D. Old Business

E. Action Items

1. UCC Minutes – February 16 & 23, 2024

Chair Smith: Reminded members that the additional University Curriculum Committee minutes from February 23rd were sent separately by email. Asked Brad Goetz if there was anything to note in these minutes.

Brad Goetz: Indicated that there was nothing to note in these minutes.

Chair Smith: Hearing no questions or comments, requested a vote to place these two (2) sets of University Curriculum Committee minutes on the Faculty Council agenda.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th.

2. Proposed Revisions to CSU Undergraduate Certificate Definition – University Curriculum Committee – Brad Goetz, Chair & Andrea Duffy, Associate Vice Provost

Goetz: On behalf of the University Curriculum Committee, move that Executive Committee consider the changes to the undergraduate certificate definition and policy.

Goetz: We discussed this in a previous Executive Committee meeting, and it remains much the same, with one change. We have removed the upper limit defining the parameters of undergraduate certificates. It is now a minimum of nine (9) credits, and we have not defined a maximum. That will accommodate a range of other types of certificates and learning experiences.

Associate Vice Provost Andrea Duffy: We added some language at the beginning of the proposal defining certificates, since they are defined in many ways, but this is a broad and inclusive definition that frames them within our University context. We changed the language to indicate that academic units can offer certificates. This is deliberately vague because we recognize that there are some units that technically are not a college or department or Special Academic Unit, but they already offer certificates.

Chair Smith: Asked if there were any questions regarding this motion.

Pedros-Gascon: If you go to the credit range in the document, there is a section specifically dedicated to affordability, and that section indicates a student must be enrolled in an academic program. CSU's current policy would exclude non-degree seeking students pursuing an undergraduate certificate from eligibility for federal aid. Removing the upper credit limit will allow undergraduate certificates to qualify independently for federal aid. However, these decisions may have a negative impact on academic units and undergraduate students who are taking classes, in the sense that they would end up having to compete with people who are going for a full degree. Expressed concern that this may have an impact on retention and access to grants of the students who are currently pursuing whole programs.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: That is a good point. We do not want to create competition with ourselves. Generally, what we are doing with this proposal is broadening the definition of certificates. There is more work to be done, and part of that work is addressing these kinds of questions. We want to make sure we are proceeding carefully and reviewing certificate proposals as they come forward. If this is approved, we can articulate a path of review process and enrollment process for non-degree and standalone undergraduate certificates. We want to make sure that the certificate proposals are broad enough that they are being offered to non-degree seeking students or standalone certificates that are primarily oriented toward students who might not otherwise have access to our services. We have seen nationally that certificates can offer an on-ramp for higher education. Indicated that the point that Pedros-Gascon is something we should keep in mind.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed concern that this has a possibility of cannibalizing ourselves, because we are not creating access to additional money for grants or financial aid for students. We will have the same amount of financial aid available for an increased pool of students who are not interested in pursuing a full degree.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: In terms of financial aid eligibility, federal aid eligibility requires that a student be enrolled half-time and in a program that is at least sixteen (16) credits. Raising the cap on certificates at CSU means we can offer some certificate programs that may qualify for federal aid. Right now, our definition precludes that, so all of those students would be forced to pay out of pocket, and that does not support our access mission.

Vice Provost James: How they award financial aid and who competes with who for financial aid is complicated. Not sure if non-degree seeking students would be competing with degree-seeking students for the same portion of financial aid. That is something we need to understand.

Pedros-Gascon: Feels it would make sense to understand this before we approve anything, so we are not opening the doors for cannibalizing our own students.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: Expressed agreement. It was the Office of Financial Aid that insisted on raising the upper cap for the reasons just mentioned. We have been in conversation with them but will continue to do so.

Pedros-Gascon: It would be good if they could elaborate and confirm that this would be two different parts and would not have a negative transference between the two.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: Will follow up with this.

Sanford: Requested clarification that the changes we are seeing are just for the definition and not policy. The subject states “certificate policy.”

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: It is a terminology issue. We were originally calling it a policy, but what we are really doing is changing the definition. It makes more sense to call this a definition than a policy. The policy involves a process too, but we have not fleshed that out yet. We need to more work on that. Asked Chair Smith if Faculty Council could charge a task force to address that question and look at the process and what the policy should look like and whether we can come to a broader agreement and understanding about the review and approval. Would like them to also look at other considerations associated with offering non-degree certificates at the undergraduate level.

DiVerdi: To clarify, the information we are reviewing and amending is contained in the General Catalog and is not considered policy.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: Correct. Think the policy will have additional components. For example, we will need to look at how many courses students can transfer in and what the enrollment process will look like for non-degree seeking students, or whether there is an application fee. There is a lot of minutiae that does not fit within the General Catalog. These changes are just considered a definition.

Rob Mitchell: Asked: How many other universities are doing this, particularly our peer universities and competitors, that have certificates available for non-degree seeking students? Wondering what it looks like for them.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: Pretty much everyone is doing this, and we are behind the curve. Other four-year institutions have done an effective job of using certificates and other microcredentials to expand their learner base and offer valuable knowledge and training programs to a wider range of learners.

Mitchell: Expressed support for enabling this to happen.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: There is a website available for the “credential as you go” initiative, and it lists affiliated institutions that are doing innovative things in this space.

Jennifer Martin posted the website link in the chat: <https://credentialasyougo.org/>

Mitchell: Asked: The Colorado Department of Higher Education is supportive of this at the state level, correct?

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: Yes, they are. We have actually received a grant from the Colorado Department of Higher Education that we hope will help us pilot some standalone certificates.

Mitchell: Wondering if there is a link between our shrinking budgets and doing things like this that might help us at the state level, or if it is disconnected.

Associate Vice Provost Duffy: The Board of Governors and state want us to do this. Part of the budget crunch at the state level is because the state wants us to do more innovative things, and this is an example of that. Think that the microcredentialing arena is a way for our institution to reach a broader learner base. This is an opportunity to get into that space and serves our access mission, but this is something that the state is very supportive of.

Norton: Believe that this is ready to stand debate at Faculty Council. Recommend that we vote to put this on the agenda for the March meeting.

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

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th.

3. Proposed Revisions to Section E.2.2.7.1 of the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual – Committee on Teaching and Learning – Lumina Albert, Chair

Lumina Albert: Made motion on behalf of the Committee on Teaching and Learning. We had a discussion in the committee, where we realized that the University Distinguished Teaching Scholars title is only open for tenured faculty. The DNA of the University is changing and there are more continuing, contract and adjunct faculty that are doing incredible jobs in the classroom. They are doing a lot of scholarship, research, and teaching. We would like the eligibility criteria to be extended to continuing, contract and adjunct faculty as well.

Chair Smith: Thanked Albert. Asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the motion.

Pedros-Gascon: Expressed support for the motion.

Sanford: Requested a minor edit to spell out the acronym “UDTS” in the motion to say, “University Distinguished Teaching Scholar.”

Vice Provost James: There is at least one (1) University Distinguished Teaching Scholar that is retiring in May. Normally the nominations go out on February 1st, but Vice Provost Tom Siller encouraged us to wait while this discussion was occurring. We may be off-cycle in terms of timing, but we will make sure campus is aware and figure out how to do it. The University Distinguished Teaching Scholars are supportive of this idea.

DiVerdi: Asked how many University Distinguished Teaching Scholars there are. Asked: Is it variable or fixed?

Vice Provost James: Believe it is based on a percentage.

Albert: At this point, it is fixed. Clarified that they usually wait until someone retires.

Vice Provost James: Do not believe this is in the Manual. Believe it is more of a Provost and President budget decision.

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

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th.

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

Chair Smith: On behalf of the Committee on Faculty Governance, move to put this ballot on the Faculty Council agenda. Hearing no discussion, requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda for March 5th.

F. Reports

1. Faculty Council Chair Report – Melinda Smith
2. Board of Governors Report – Andrew Norton
3. Budget Model Update – Rob Mitchell and Jennifer Martin

DiVerdi: Due to time constraints, unless there is critical information to come out in the reports, move to skip these standing reports.

Michael Antolin: Second.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote to defer reports.

Motion approved.

G. Discussion Items

1. Athletics Subsidies Memo – Antonio Pedros-Gason & Steve Shulman

Pedros-Gascon: We had a discussion last week about the possibility of revising the proposal that was approved in 2019. Part of the discussion we had back then was the possibility of retaining

numbers on the document or going for the simplified statement of our priorities. The discussion was around a statement of priorities about the academic mission of the institution and how money should follow. Asked if Steve Shulman could provide some background to provide information around Athletics and how teaching impacts the institution financially, and how much money is produced with regard to our academic mission.

Steve Shulman: Expressed appreciation for ability to come speak to Executive Committee. At the time that this resolution was passed in 2019, it was something of a breakthrough for Faculty Council. It represented Faculty Council's assertion of the support for the academic mission of the institution. Felt Vice President Hanlon's presentation was interesting. The agreement that the budget cuts include Athletics and administration is a striking change, because that has never happened in the past and budget cuts have always been concentrated on the academic side of the institution. As a matter of optics, if Athletics and administration are exempt from the cuts, that will be widely perceived as inequitable.

Shulman: As faculty members, we are all believers in the academic mission of the institution and that the primary purpose of Colorado State University is academics. From a budgetary standpoint, if you look at almost all the dollars that come in to CSU are coming in due to the classes that faculty teach, the funded research that faculty undertake, the donations to support the programs that faculty create and run. When you look at other programs, such as Athletics, you see the opposite. As of last year, Athletics was in the hole around \$30 million. Would like to know what other program on campus would be allowed to continue running with those kinds of deficits year after year. Even if \$10 million of that deficit is for scholarships, that's still \$20 million left, which is a substantial amount of money.

Shulman: To make a point about how central academics is to the budgetary strength of CSU, the total tuition and fee revenues that CSU received in 2022 totaled \$478.8 million. Indicated that this information was retrieved from a federal data depository on higher education. It also provided the number for total instructional costs, which was \$417.9 million. That leaves a surplus of \$69.9 million. The point is that academics are the source of our budgetary strength.

Shulman: When we talk about budget cuts, the question is where we should cut. Think the cuts should be concentrated in Athletics, or at least reduce the Athletics subsidy. This may not be enough and understand it may be necessary to have budget cuts in academics, but think the institution needs to recognize that all of its budgetary strength comes from the academic enterprise and needs to be protected purely from a budgetary standpoint.

Chair Smith: Asked: When you are talking about instructional costs, does that include the mandatory costs?

Shulman: It includes salaries, and everything attributed to instruction. The data does not distinguish or discuss mandatory costs, but they talk about the institution revenues, so that includes tuition and fees. That is where that number comes from. It also talks about expenses. Compared the total instructional expenses to tuition and fee revenues.

DiVerdi: Given that this information is public information, wondering if our leadership at the highest levels are aware of this. This leads to several other questions, such as why they do not agree with this analysis and what are they seeing that causes them to reject the hypothesis that this is where we should cut support and continue to support the athletic program.

Shulman: Would assume that upper leadership is aware of this, since they supply the numbers to this data repository. As to why they are not responding to this information, that is harder to answer.

Martin: Asked what Executive Committee is being asked to consider here, if anything.

DiVerdi: Believe we are being asked to consider a motion to put together a resolution.

Martin: Asked: Did we have a motion for a resolution?

Norton: Believe it is just discussion.

Pedros-Gascon: We are in a discussion to determine if there is agreement to move forward a resolution.

Martin: Would like to see more data and want to be careful that we do not oversimplify the data. We run the risk of oversimplifying a complex structure without asking for those complexities to be described or at least have data presented to help us understand those complexities.

Rob Mitchell: It will be interesting to see where we end up and hopefully the state ends up being generous and we end up in a better position than we are maybe anticipating. As we look at a motion, requested that we look at all parts of our enterprise and try to be strategic. Many students that come here also come here to participate in football games and athletics. Know we have a lot of support for athletics here. This is a complex question and want to make sure we are not oversimplifying it. To Martin's point, would love to see the data as well. As we have engaged in the budget model redesign, there are not a lot of places where there is extra money on campus. If we say athletics, research is another area where we lose money. Teaching subsidizes a lot of our research. If we are to move this conversation forward, would encourage us not to target specific areas, and that we have a strategic and deliberate conversation. Think there may be a time for us to engage in a resolution, but as we are engaging with people like Vice President Hanlon in open dialogue, think we should wait until we have more certainty about where cuts are going to be but also until we feel we have a partner that is listening to us and engaging with us without us needing to do resolutions.

Vice Provost James: Have a question for Shulman. Asked: Do you have any perspective on other land grants and Research I institutions, and whether we are typical or if this is an outlier?

Shulman: Believe we are fairly typical. The biggest money loser in athletics is football, and that is quite typical. There are a small number of football programs that make money and a large number of them that lose money. Am in favor of being careful with the data and expressed

appreciation for the emphasis of getting more faculty involvement in the decision-making process.

Vice Provost James: Think the transparency we are seeing from Vice President Hanlon is refreshing. The agreement to go back and dig into details is an opportunity for us. It is because of these nuances that the resolution in 2019 ended up simplified without any numbers in it.

Pedros-Gascon: The mission of the institution, inspired by its land-grant heritage, is a commitment to excellence in teaching, research, service, and extension. To what extent athletics is understood as one of these categories is worth discussing. We are trying to make a clear statement of faculty values. There would probably be higher support for a resolution that states our values and expectations for this.

Norton: An article from the Chronicle of Higher Education made a point that for faculty to be effective in the budgeting process, it requires a lot of work and a lot of awareness. Have discussed with Chair Smith to create a web resource for faculty members where they can view historic incremental budgets. We can learn a lot from looking at the old incremental budgets, as well as the full budget that the Board of Governors sees every two (2) months. Putting those online as a resource for people can help inform this debate. Think the data-informed approach we are taking is the right one.

Chair Smith: To follow up with Mitchell's and Martin's comments, think the time is right for not just a discussion or stance by Faculty Council, but to look at what we think overall and what our priorities are. That is bigger than the focus on athletics. Would advocate for a broader discussion of what our priorities are. One of those might be to have closer scrutiny of the athletics budget and how we revision that, because we have rarely heard a strategic vision for athletics.

Martin: The best tool that we have is enhancing our financial literacy across the entire campus community. Can appreciate, from the Faculty Council perspective, the way we make progress through a resolution, but a resolution is temporal. If we want to have sustainable impacts on the way in which resources are allocated along our budgets, the best thing we can do is empower ourselves with data and inform ourselves and the processes and be partners in the conversation. We have administration willing to meet us at the table and engage. Think the time is right for us to ask to be partners in the process with them, and recognize that to do so, we need to enhance our financial literacy as members of this campus.

Chair Smith: To that end, Shulman has done a lot of work to try to understand, athletics in particular, and the landscape there. Think we are at a point that we can ask for that information.

DiVerdi: Expressed agreement that the financial literacy is an important part. Have some thoughts from a strategic perspective. It might be better to put out a statement prior to receiving a position statement on budgets. To react after the budget would not be as impactful as doing it before. Expressed appreciation for Vice President Hanlon's transparency, but to assume that there has been a massive switch in the opacity would be premature and a mistake.

Chair Smith: We have heard this desire of transparency from President Parsons.

Martin: Expressed agreement with DiVerdi. Wonder if there would be more value in a resolution that specifically speaks to that versus one that speaks specifically to athletics and recognizes our desire transcends athletics. The desire to have this level of engagement is not just for the athletics program.

DiVerdi: There is a particular issue associated with athletics. We have always had this problem of trying to understand the finances of athletics.

Martin: Understand the sensitivities and nuances of athletics. Wondering if there is a way to repackage the message so we can get a different response.

Pedros-Gascon: Understand that there is not financial literacy at some levels, but it should not be expected that everyone will be financially literate. Expressed agreement that we do not have to specifically name Athletics, but the reality is that there is a clear understanding of what faculty considers to be a priority when it comes to budget. Believe if that question gets presented to Faculty Council, that will be supported easily. Also, eventually the financial decision will not be made by any of us, but the President. Asked: Are we just stating to the President what faculty feels is a priority? We are just stating the priorities for faculty and that is an important thing.

Mitchell: To DiVerdi's point, we do not want to wait until the ship has sailed to say anything. If we want to speak to athletics specifically, think we have to wait and see if they have done anything to athletics to have an impact there. More broadly, would like us to think about the components of our mission. To Martin's point, we have to understand the budget realities and would love to see Shulman's data. If we go into a conversation saying that there is money left on the table, that may not necessarily motivate action, but we could go in with our budget priorities with respect to the University mission and how we need to be thinking about them in the face of budget cuts.

Norton: Think budgets are kind of value statements about what is valuable to the University. We might be dancing around the bigger issue, which is that there is disagreement between many faculty and our President and other administrators about what the value of athletics is to the institution and to the state. Feel this is something the President should speak to. Talking about subsidies to athletics and specific budget numbers seems passive aggressive, and going about the conversation in this manner might be an indirect way to have the conversation we are asking for.

Chair Smith: President Parsons is coming to the next Faculty Council meeting, so that could be asked during that report. Will contact June Griest about this and indicate this is something faculty will want to hear about. Have already conveyed that this is a concern.

Martin: We had a conversation yesterday with the standing committee chairs not only about athletics, but how the landscape around athletics is changing. Wondering what President Parson's view is around the future, especially with Name, Image, Likeness (NIL) and funding. Think this would be valuable for faculty to know.

Vice Provost James: Would also add the changing landscape of our student demographics. The traditionally aged college students are starting to decline and those are probably the ones that

Athletics does a good job of attracting. As we are trying to attract older students, who may not be as interested in football games and more interested in certificates, wondering if investments could be shifted.

Chair Smith: Thanked everyone for the conversation. Asked what Executive Committee members would like to see as next steps, whether it is more discussion or a resolution.

Mitchell: Something this resolution could speak to is making sure that department chairs and deans are transparent and signal that faculty governance starts where faculty can meet with department chairs and can hear from us because we represent Faculty Council. Faculty in departments can represent themselves when they speak to their department chair about what they believe is important and what they see happening in their classrooms and with their research, and that can bubble up so that when deans and department chairs are asked, it reflects the faculty in the departments.

Chair Smith: The train is already down the tracks for this set of cuts. What we can learn from this, whatever the outcome, is that we need to be in on the conversation. We can continue strengthening that connection.

Martin: To echo Mitchell's comments, think the immediate angst as an individual is not necessarily with what is happening with administration and Athletics, but what is happening within department and that decisions are being made that impact daily activity and we do not find out about those decisions until after they are made. As a service to our faculty colleagues, anything we can do to relieve that angst at a local level would be valuable. We certainly need to address the top levels as well, but feel the local level is a part we are missing. Our faculty feel on a daily basis that they are not involved in those conversations.

Chair Smith: We need advocacy at the department level, as well as at the level in which those decisions are made.

Norton: The landscape for higher education across the nation is not looking great over the next decade, and we are going to need to make hard budget decisions over the next several years. Indicating now that we are involved in this is important. Would like to second the idea of formalizing resources or something for us to do that. Impression from conversations with the Board of Governors and the President is that the transparency is coming from the top.

Chair Smith: Think we should continue this discussion at our next meetings.

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

Vice Provost James: Am a member of the Budget Model Redesign Steering Committee, which is a big committee that has all the deans, among others. The update is that our committees have been charged and have started. The Steering Committee has reviewed and evaluated commonalities and uniqueness and models at other institutions and is currently considering key provisions of an overall model for our institution. We have established working groups to work

on setting up major components of the model, such as metrics. There will be an additional open forum on the budget model in March.

DiVerdi: Move that this update appears on the Faculty Council agenda.

Mitchell: Second.

Chair Smith: Requested a vote.

Motion approved. Will be placed on the Faculty Council agenda as a report for March 5th.

Executive Committee adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

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