

**Report by the Faculty Representative to the Board of Governors
To Faculty Council
Faculty Council Meeting of November 3, 2009
Covering the Board Meeting of October 1 & 2**

This report covers regularly scheduled Board of Governors (BoG) Committee and Board meetings which took place on the CSU-Fort Collins campus on October 1 and 2, 2009.

Full minutes of the meetings may be found on the Board of Governors' web site at <http://www.csusystem.edu> from the "Meetings, Agendas, and Minutes" link as soon as they are posted there. I will summarize in this report what I consider some of the more pertinent information. Please contact me or check the official minutes if you want more details or clarification on any issues.

On October 1 the usual Audit Committee, Evaluation Committee (which I am not allowed to attend), and Finance Committee, met, and a Strategic Thinking session was held. On October 2, the formal Board Meeting took place.

One topic the audit committee raised had to do with workload – can workload standards by discipline be determined, so that actual workloads can be compared with these standards. Another question from the committee revolved around whether there was any tracking of the responses to annual evaluations – namely, if recommendations for change were made, was it possible to track the faculty's response to these recommended changes. President Tony Frank responded by saying that it would be very difficult to provide meaningful information on a faculty-by-faculty basis, as it would require seeing data across multiple years in order to assess accurately and fairly what was happening, but agreed that a proposal for reporting workload information at an aggregate level would be made at the December Board meeting.

During the finance committee discussions, several topics of interest came up. In addition to the ongoing discussions about the current budget "crisis", the issue of how some Global Campus programs may be in direct competition with Fort Collins campus programs (both on-site and remotely-offered) was discussed. At present Global Campus has agreed to halt offering of the MSBA degree, since it directly competes with local offerings by the College of Business. However, at the end of this discussion questions still remained as to whether Global Campus might be allowed to pursue degree offerings in the future that would directly compete with Fort Collins campus programs if these offerings had a projected revenue stream that was just too large to ignore. While at present the understanding and belief is that, after the startup loan is repaid, Global Campus revenues are to come back to the campuses, there are still questions about where this might go and how it could affect our campus in the long term.

Based on the October 20 *Denver Post* report, some might say that the finance committee's presentation of the state's revenue forecast, and the surrounding discussion regarding CSU's future funding models, was potentially the most interesting of the day. The *Post* report, however, left the impression that the Board is interested in and moving toward privatizing CSU. This could not be

farther from the truth, and the October 21 Rocky Mountain Collegian article and its included comments by ASCSU president Dan Gearhart (<http://media.www.collegian.com/media/storage/paper864/news/2009/10/20/News/Ascsu.President.Denver.Post.Story.Inaccurate-3808381.shtml>) did a good job clarifying the actual discussion and its purpose. What the Board is doing at this time is grappling with the current budget crisis, and is brainstorming about all types of possible options that might be available for funding CSU in the future. Obviously “privatization” could be one of those possibilities, but at present the Board appears to believe that that is not a good option. It appears that the Board would much prefer an option that includes some combination of 1) the State returning to greater funding than currently exists, 2) looking at other revenue streams (such as Global Campus may be able to provide in the future) to supplement the traditional ones we have used over the years, and 3) moderate increases in tuition (including, but not limited to, reduction of the “credit hour gap”). Basically the Board wonders what new or changed business models might be able to help CSU adapt and go forward successfully as it addresses the current financial challenges, and is brainstorming on how to determine what these new business models might be.

At the same time, the Board is very interested in retaining the good things that CSU is, does, and has stood for over the years. This was the central focus of the Strategic Thinking session that took place on the afternoon of October 1. During this session, Board members were asked to brainstorm and discuss what it is that they would not want to see go away, no matter what, even if CSU has to make changes to its business model to survive the changing financial landscape. Several of the ideas that seemed to be supported by the whole Board included 1) the “Land Grant mission”, 2) access, 3) outreach to our local and state constituency, 4) affordability, and 5) an applied emphasis (along with, and in no way to the exclusion of, emphases on basic research and high quality education). CSU has tended to provide a practical education for working professionals, and we tend to “do” what we teach, not just research it. And we are here in large part to educate “our own” – those from Colorado. Yes, we are happy to have students come from other states and countries, but a core of our mission is to be here for Colorado residents and we don’t want to forget that – both in our student/teacher roles and in our extension/outreach roles. From my perspective, this discussion was possibly the best part of the two days. It seemed that the whole Board was in agreement on these fundamental values and in what they want to retain about CSU’s historical mission and its greatness.

During the meeting on October 2, the Board was reminded of its interest and commitment to set up and help fund a “Board of Governors” Scholarship fund. The intent of this fund is to provide funding for 25 students from Colorado, including 5 “full rides” and 20 for tuition and fees. Chancellor Joe Blake indicated that the System is working on a “STEM” (Science Technology Engineering and Math) initiative for the Fort Collins and Pueblo campuses, and will bring a proposal to the Board in December. Some questions were raised about who our “peer” institutions are, and how the “peer lists” are selected. This was discussed, and the President indicated that these lists would be reviewed, and if any changes seem warranted will present a possible updated list at the December Board meeting. The intent is for this list to provide meaningful measures for CSU to compare itself against, and not be just a historical list with little or confusing bases for comparison.

The next regularly-scheduled meeting of the Board of Governors is scheduled for December 3 and 4 in Denver at the CSU System Office.

If have any questions, or thoughts on how I can better represent Faculty Council to the Board of Governors, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Turk

Faculty Council Representative to the Board of Governors, 2009-10

Phone: (970) 491-0467

E-mail: BoGRep@colostate.edu

Office: 26 Rockwell Hall

Website: <http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu/files/BOGRepresentativeUpdates2009-2010.pdf>

Chair: Richard Eykholt

Office: 18A Administration Building

Phone: (970) 491-5693

E-mail: dmaybon@colostate.edu

Website: <http://facultycouncil.colostate.edu>

CSU System / Board of Governors (BoG) resources:

Chair: Patrick McConathy

Office: 410 17th Street, Suite 2440, Denver, CO 80202

Phone: (303) 534-6290

E-mail: csus_board@mail.colostate.edu

Website: <http://www.csusystem.edu>

BOG Meetings, Agendas, & Minutes: <http://www.csusystem.edu/pages/schedule.asp>