THURSDAY, December 4, 2014

Board of Governors Breakfast (Executive MBA Classroom, 410 17th Street) 7:30 a.m. – 8:00 a.m.

COMMENCE BOARD MEETING – CALL TO ORDER (Executive MBA Classroom) 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT: NON-STADIUM (15 min.) 8:00 a.m. – 8:15 a.m.

2. AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE (3 hrs.) 8:15 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.
   - Audit Plan Update
   - Audit Past Due Recommendations
   - HB14-1319 Higher Education Funding Model
   - CSU-Global Campus Task Force Update (a portion will be in executive session for legal advice)
   - CSU System Overview Slides
   - Quarterly Financial Reports
   - FY 14 Year End Financial Audit
   - Campus Reserve Reports
   - CSU System/CSURF Equipment Leasing/Line of Credit Resolutions (action item)

Break/Working Lunch (15 min.) 11:15 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

3. EVALUATION COMMITTEE (executive session) (1 hr.) 11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

4. ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (1.5 hr.) 12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
   - CSU Sabbatical Requests for 2015-2016
   - CSU Program Review Summary
   - CSU Faculty Manual Changes – Section C.2.3.1.e and Section D.7.20 (consent agenda)
   - CSU Posthumous Degree (consent agenda)
   - CSU-Pueblo Sabbatical Requests for 2015-2016
   - CSU-Pueblo Program Review Summary
   - CSU-Pueblo Academic Calendar – 2015-2016 (consent agenda)
   - CSU, CSU-Pueblo and CSU-Global Campus Enrollment Reports

Break 2:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION (litigation report) (30 min.) 2:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA (5 min.) 2:45 p.m. – 2:50 p.m.
   A. Colorado State University System
      - Minutes of the August 7, 2014 Board and Committee Meetings
      - Minutes of the August 8, 2014 Board Meeting
      - Minutes of the November 19, 2014 CSU-Global Task Force Meeting
   B. Colorado State University
      - Approval of CSU Faculty Manual Change – Section D.7.20
      - Approval of CSU Faculty Manual Change – Section C.2.3.1.e
      - Approval of CSU Posthumous Degree
   C. Colorado State University-Pueblo
      - Approval of 2015-16 Academic Calendar

7. TED PRESENTATION – DR. NORMAN AUGUSTINE (1.5 hrs.) 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

CSU System Holiday Reception (social event), 475 17th, 2nd Floor Atrium 5:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.
CSU System Holiday Dinner (social event), Warwick Hotel, 1776 Grant Street 7:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, December 5th

Board of Governors Breakfast *(Executive MBA Classroom, 410 17th Street)* 7:30 a.m. – 8:00 a.m.

RECONVENE BOARD MEETING *(Executive MBA Classroom)* 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

8. FACULTY AND STUDENT REPORTS *(1 hr.)* 8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.
   A. Faculty Reports
      • CSU-Fort Collins: Faculty Report – Presented by Alexandra Bernasek *(10 min.)*
      • CSU-Global Campus: Faculty Report – Presented by Robert Deemer *(10 min.)*
      • CSU-Pueblo: Faculty Report – Presented by Michael Mincic *(10 min.)*
   B. Student Reports
      • CSU-Fort Collins: Student Report – Presented by Samantha Guinn *(10 min.)*
      • CSU-Global Campus: Student Report – Presented by Brad Schiffelbein *(10 min.)*
      • CSU-Pueblo: Student Report – Presented by Timothy Zercher *(10 min.)*

9. APPROVAL OF REVISED BOARD POLICIES *(action item)*(15 min.) 9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.

10. CSU-PUEBLO STRATEGIC PLAN – President Lesley Di Mare *(25 min.)* 9:15 a.m. – 9:40 a.m.

11. CSU SYSTEM CHANCELLOR’S AND PRESIDENTS’ REPORTS *(20 min.)* 9:40 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
      • Chancellor’s Report – Presented by Chancellor Michael Martin
      • Venture Capital Fund Update: Enterprise Project – Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations

12. REAL ESTATE/FACILITIES COMMITTEE *(1 hr. 15 min.)* 10:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.
      • Executive Session *(10 min.)*
      • Approval of CSU Oil and Gas Lease *(action item)*(5 min.)
      • Master Plan Discussion – Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations *(20 min.)*
      • National Western Center Redevelopment – Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations *(40 min.)*

Lunch/Relocate to 475 17th Street, 2nd Floor Atrium 11:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

RECONVENE BOARD MEETING *(475 17th Street, 2nd Floor Atrium)* 12:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
*(As a special one-time arrangement, the stadium discussion will live-stream from the CSU website and broadcast on the Fort Collins City Cable Channel 14)*

13. PRESIDENT FRANK’S STADIUM REPORT *(1 hr. 15 min.)* 12:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.

14. PUBLIC COMMENT: STADIUM-RELATED *(2 hrs.)* 1:15 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.

15. STADIUM DISCUSSION/ACTION *(1 hr. 15 min.)* 3:15 p.m. – 4:25 p.m.

16. BOARD MEETING EVALUATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS 4:25 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT 4:30 p.m.

Next Board of Governors Board Meeting: February 4-6, 2015, CSU-Global Campus

APPENDICES
I. Board Correspondence
II. Construction Status Reports
III. Higher Education Readings
Section 1

Public Comment

Non-Stadium-Related
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Section 2

Audit and Finance Committee
Audit

1. **Discussion/Presentation** – Status of Audit Plan and current Audit summaries 10 min

2. **Discussion/Presentation** – Past due recommendations 5 min

Finance

3. **Discussion/Presentation** HB-1319 Higher Education Funding Model update 15 min

4. **Discussion/Presentation** CSU-Global Campus Task Force update Carry-In 45 min

5. **Discussion/Presentation** CSU System Overview slides 15 min

6. **Discussion/Presentation** Quarterly Financial Reports 15 min

7. **Discussion/Presentation** Review of CSU, CSU-Pueblo, CSU-GC year-end Financial audit findings 30 min

8. **Discussion/Presentation** Campus reserve reports 15 min

9. **Approval of Equipment Leasing Line of Credit Resolution**
Board of Governors
Audit/Finance Committee
December 4, 2014
Items #1 and 2
Audit Issues

- Executive Summaries
- Overdue Recommendations
# Colorado State University System
## Department of Internal Audit
### Status of FY 2014-2015 Audit Plan
#### As of November 21, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Area to be Audited</th>
<th>Reporting Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>B&amp;FS</td>
<td>Report 15-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Report 15-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Data Centers</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>IT/Provost</td>
<td>Report 15-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>B&amp;FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Disaster Preparedness</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUP</td>
<td>Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>VPFA</td>
<td>Exit 11-14-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUGC</td>
<td>Financial Aid/Accounts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Report 15-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Carried Forward from FY 2013-2014**

**New for 2014-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Area to be Audited</th>
<th>Reporting Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>NCAA Compliance Areas</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>OSP Cost Transfers</td>
<td>OVPR</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>External Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>VPEA</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>B&amp;FS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Ag Experiment Station</td>
<td>VP Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Equine Reproduction Lab</td>
<td>CVMBS/Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Extension Field Offices</td>
<td>VP Engagement</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Center for Advising and Student Achievement</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Continuous Auditing</td>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Special Projects (all locations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUP</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUP</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUP</td>
<td>Cashier Operations</td>
<td>VPFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background Information

Institutional Research (IR) is a service office for the Colorado State University (CSU) community designated as the official reporting unit to federal and state agencies. Its primary mission is to support reporting, strategic-planning and continuous quality improvement activities at the institution. It does this by collecting and preserving institutional data; providing analysis to inform executive decision-making; responding to external government agency mandated reporting requirements; supporting accreditation activities; and ensuring the validity and reliability of reported data. The University community relies on the external agency data reporting expertise it has developed and IR’s sound research methodologies.

To facilitate reporting, IR captures data in a series of “snapshots” at specific defined times from a variety of institutional systems. The University’s “official reporting” data is archived in databases managed by IR. Recently, IR enhanced its services to encourage the University community to access and interact with the captured reporting data. The IR website offers a tool (Business Intelligence Publisher) that makes this functionality possible. The interactive tool enables users to “drill down” and define differing views. It also allows data to be exported and shared with the University community.

Scope and Objectives

The audit covered administrative, financial and operational activities for the period January 2013 through June 2014. The objectives of the audit were to:

1. Determine whether procedures were in place to ensure that accurate and complete data was provided to the University community and external parties in a timely manner.
2. Determine whether collected data is adequately secured to protect the interests of the University and its constituents.
3. Perform a general review of financial and administrative procedures.

To accomplish these objectives, we reviewed the IR annual report, interviewed staff, assessed the adequacy of internal controls, performed detailed testing over administrative and financial procedures, examined and analyzed documentation and performed other audit procedures we considered necessary.

Results and Conclusions

The initial risk assessment process calculated this as HIGH risk operation. During the audit, we assessed controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate risks.

Based on the audit, we concluded that the risk mitigation activities provide a HIGH residual risk level.

Based on the audit objectives listed above, we made the following recommendations, based on the audit findings:

1. Create an inventory of data requests. The inventory should include at least a brief description of the data request; the request date; the source of the data; who is responsible for the creation and quality review; whether it is recurring in nature; and the requestor.
2. Create and make available to the University community a reference or “Code Book” of external reporting agency terms highlighting ambiguities and codifying its interpretations in order to mitigate the risk of misunderstanding.
3. Ensure that the new information systems environment is compliant with the University Information Security Policy ID# 4-1018-009 especially the provisions for mitigating sensitive data risk.
4. Document in writing the procedures that prevent unauthorized change to both its data and its scripts. The responsibility for the functioning of the procedures should be assigned and monitored for effectiveness.
5. Segregate duties of the Information Technology Manager and Database Administrator positions. If segregation is not possible, then supervisory monitoring of their activities should be increased.
6. Develop a process to ensure separated employees’ computer system access is immediately terminated.
7. Document in writing processes and procedures that are vital to create its mandated and high profile reports.

We have discussed all findings and recommendations with management, and are satisfied that completion of the proposed actions will mitigate the issues noted. Implementation has been already completed for recommendations 2 and 6.

Details may be found in Audit Report 15-04 issued the same date as this Executive Summary.

We would like to express our appreciation to CSU management and staff for their assistance and cooperation during the audit.

Allison A. Horn – Director, Internal Auditing
Background Information

The Residence Life and Apartment Life Divisions (Housing) of Housing and Dining Services (HDS) provides an essential, integral part of the “college experience” for Colorado State University students. Most freshmen are required to live in University housing, and many upper classmen choose to reside in University residence halls or apartments as they continue their studies. There are over 5,400 residents living in thirteen residence halls and there are more than 800 apartments in three apartment communities occupied by 1,100 students and 1,500 family members. The focus on students, with an emphasis on Housing’s active role in their development and education is demonstrated in the plans, organization, and activities of Housing. One of its stated key priorities is to “develop and enhance innovative programs, experiences, and residential learning communities in support of University priorities.”

Scope and Objectives

This review of Housing (Residence Life & Apartment Life Divisions of HDS) evaluated compliance with administrative, financial and operational controls. It covered activity that occurred during the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014.

The objectives of the audit were to:

1. Determine if a Strategic Plan exists that is regularly evaluated and is integrated with the University plan.
2. Determine if financial and administrative policies exist, are followed and are in compliance with University policy.
3. Evaluate whether an internal control system exists and is operating effectively to assure compliance with applicable laws, regulations and policies.

Results and Conclusions

The initial risk assessment process calculated this as HIGH risk operation. During the audit, we assessed controls, processes and procedures designed to mitigate risks. Based on the audit, we concluded that the risk mitigation activities provide a MEDIUM residual risk level.

Based on the audit objectives listed above, we made the following recommendations, based on the audit findings:

1. On a quarterly basis, written explanations for projected significant budget variances as well as variances from previous year’s numbers should be included with the monthly financial statements and occupancy rate reports in Sharepoint.
2. To ensure proper dispositions of possible conflicts of interest, the reason for a “no management plan” decision should be documented on the Annual Role and Responsibility disclosure form.
3. The authorized reviewer of the HDS Executive Director’s purchasing card purchases should be the HDS Executive Director’s supervisor to reduce the risk of undetected inappropriate purchases.

We have discussed all findings and recommendations with management, and are satisfied that completion of the proposed actions will mitigate the issues noted.

Details may be found in Audit Report 15-05 issued the same date as this Executive Summary.

We would like to express our appreciation to CSU management and staff for their assistance and cooperation during the audit.

Allison A. Horn – Director, Internal Auditing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Number</th>
<th>Audit Name</th>
<th>Rec No</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Audit Report Response</th>
<th>Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Revised Target Completion Date</th>
<th>Current Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-07</td>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Update the WCNR strategic plan.</td>
<td>Agree. WCNR will begin strategic planning in Fall 2013 and intend to have a plan completed by June 2014.</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-07</td>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oversee and provide instruction to CEMML in regard to the preparation of account reconciliation documentation.</td>
<td>Agree. Assistant to the Dean for Finance has been meeting with CEMML including their Director, Financial Manager, staff and PIs to update their current systems, manuals and processes.</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-07</td>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Require the description of the reconciliation process to be consistent across all WCNR departments including accounts that do not require budgets, specification of documents for reconciliation, and analysis demonstrating whether accounts are in a deficit.</td>
<td>Agree. NREL/ESS has implemented changes already. COOP to be completed by July 1, 2013 and CEMML by June 30, 2014.</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop a methodology to identify the amount of RI tuition revenue for CE programs in order to analyze and report CE course information accurately. BFS policies and procedures should be updated accordingly.</td>
<td>Agree. The controller will develop a methodology to identify the amount of RI tuition revenue for CE programs in order to analyze and report CE course information accurately. Policies and procedures will be created for this process.</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Match RI revenue with program expenses to accurately report and evaluate the performance of the program. Evaluate whether this revenue should be included in the annual SES report. CE policies and procedures should be updated accordingly.</td>
<td>Agree. CE will implement within 90 days upon successful completion of Recommendation 1 by the University controller.</td>
<td>8/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Number</td>
<td>Audit Name</td>
<td>Rec No</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Audit Report Response</td>
<td>Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Revised Target Completion Date</td>
<td>Current Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and update non-student accounts receivable policies/procedures to eliminate inconsistencies; review procedures for calculating bad debt to ensure actual calculation is consistent with documented policies/procedures; staff training on A/R policies.</td>
<td>Agree. The controller will review and update non-student accounts receivable policies/procedures, review procedures for calculating bad debt to ensure the calculation is consistent with documented policies/procedures, and continue staff training.</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Review the instructor job offer process for opportunities to streamline as well as to ensure agreements are approved before work commences. Policies and procedures should be updated accordingly.</td>
<td>Agree. CE will implement revisions to the job offer process and document them once approved by the University. The HR Department will work with CE to find a way to ensure timely completion of the agreements.</td>
<td>8/31/2014</td>
<td>12/30/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Identify a methodology to obtain the necessary information for CE to monitor the amount of approved COF hours. BFS policies and procedures should be developed accordingly.</td>
<td>Agree. The controller will identify a methodology to obtain the necessary information for CE to monitor the amount of approved COF hours. Policies and procedures will be developed accordingly.</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Develop policies and procedures necessary to ensure the actual amount of COF credit hours used is compliant with the amount approved.</td>
<td>Agree. CE will follow the process given by the controller to monitor COF hours. The CE dean will correspond with DHE/CCHE when necessary to ensure compliance.</td>
<td>7/1/2014</td>
<td>12/30/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-06</td>
<td>Continuing Education CSUP</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ensure conflict of interest policies and procedures for faculty, administrative and professional staff are reviewed and updated. The policies and procedures should clearly address where completed disclosure forms should be maintained.</td>
<td>Agree that the conflict of interest policies and procedures should be reviewed and updated.</td>
<td>5/31/2014</td>
<td>12/31/2014</td>
<td>Waiting for policies and procedures to go to BOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-13</td>
<td>College of Engineering - Dean's Transition Review</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure that personnel responsible for property in the college are compliant with CSU property tracking requirements, including, if necessary, periodic checks.</td>
<td>Agree. The Dean will work with each Dept Head to identify a person whose responsibility will be to track capital equipment.</td>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>10/2/2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On November 20th the higher education CFO’s came to agreement on a hybrid model to fund higher education for FY 2015-2016.

The model was approved by the Executive Advisory Group on November 22.

On December 4th the Colorado Commission on Higher Education is scheduled to adopt the model.

Attached are the summary slides from the exercise which show the various parts of the adopted model.

The model does not reflect what is in the law of HB-1319, but is more a compromise model in order to gain support from all institutions.

The Governor has suggested that $60m be added to higher education operations and an additional $15m be set aside for “transitional” issues in the model.

The CSU system typically gets 20% of any new money or $12m of the proposed $60m.

Added to our current base of $121m our goal has been to reach about $134m in the new model.

Under the new model the system would receive $133.4m in the model and $500k from transitional funds so we have met our goal.
# FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

## Total Appropriations for Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Appropriations</td>
<td>$665,855,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Appropriations plus SEP only</td>
<td>$640,523,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Total State Appropriations for Model (TSA)</td>
<td>$525,682,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Ed Programs New</td>
<td>$114,841,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local District Junior College Amount</td>
<td>$15,449,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Vocational Schools Amount</td>
<td>$9,882,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Budget Percentage Increase

- **10.00%**

## SEP Additional Increase

- **0.00%**

## COF Stipend

- **Total Awarded from COF Stipend**: $294,582,075

## Percent of Appropriation Dedicated to COF Stipend

- **56.0%**

COF Stipend must be 52.5% or greater.

## Role & Mission and Performance Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total in Role and Mission Allocation</td>
<td>$138,660,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Performance</td>
<td>$92,440,008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Role and Mission Split Percentage

- **60%**

## Performance Split Percentage

- **40%**
### Role and Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Pell</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to URM</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Tuition Stability Factor</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Weighted Credit Hours</th>
<th>Total Awarded from Role and Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University Board</td>
<td>$211,403</td>
<td>$76,041</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>1,685,890</td>
<td>5,973,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa Board</td>
<td>$683,813</td>
<td>$125,348</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>3,301,272</td>
<td>5,110,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines Board</td>
<td>$156,315</td>
<td>$39,536</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>5,936,977</td>
<td>8,382,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University Board</td>
<td>$1,502,228</td>
<td>$420,964</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>19,104,332</td>
<td>22,027,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College System Board</td>
<td>$6,049,651</td>
<td>$1,457,556</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>19,118,805</td>
<td>27,626,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College Board</td>
<td>$170,085</td>
<td>$42,694</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2,344,325</td>
<td>2,557,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro State University Board</td>
<td>$1,603,703</td>
<td>$478,489</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>8,268,946</td>
<td>10,351,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Board</td>
<td>$2,168,768</td>
<td>$602,025</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>34,695,166</td>
<td>38,965,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado Board</td>
<td>$668,858</td>
<td>$197,914</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>6,701,735</td>
<td>13,568,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State Board</td>
<td>$113,426</td>
<td>$17,936</td>
<td>$2,750,000</td>
<td>1,215,815</td>
<td>4,097,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,328,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,458,502</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,373,264</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,860,012</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pell and URM Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board</th>
<th>Pell Share</th>
<th>URM Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University Board</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa Board</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines Board</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University Board</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College System Board</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College Board</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro State</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weighted Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board</th>
<th>Unweighted Hours</th>
<th>Weighted Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University Board</td>
<td>83,228</td>
<td>175,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa Board</td>
<td>180,479</td>
<td>342,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines Board</td>
<td>215,648</td>
<td>616,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University Board</td>
<td>585,842</td>
<td>1,984,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College System Board</td>
<td>1,519,589</td>
<td>1,985,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College Board</td>
<td>129,979</td>
<td>243,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro State</td>
<td>448,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Completion and Retention</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Volume Adjusted Awards</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University Board</td>
<td>$886,918</td>
<td>$4,084,926</td>
<td>$4,971,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa Board</td>
<td>$1,763,202</td>
<td>$2,958,490</td>
<td>$4,721,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines Board</td>
<td>$1,843,221</td>
<td>$4,092,928</td>
<td>$5,936,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University Board</td>
<td>$10,106,570</td>
<td>$4,019,374</td>
<td>$14,125,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College System Board</td>
<td>$12,790,857</td>
<td>$2,365,758</td>
<td>$15,156,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College Board</td>
<td>$1,117,738</td>
<td>$3,772,986</td>
<td>$4,890,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro State University Board</td>
<td>$5,215,357</td>
<td>$3,657,082</td>
<td>$8,872,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Board</td>
<td>$17,432,939</td>
<td>$3,999,761</td>
<td>$21,432,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado Board</td>
<td>$3,674,925</td>
<td>$4,035,815</td>
<td>$7,710,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State Board</td>
<td>$632,278</td>
<td>$3,988,884</td>
<td>$4,621,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Volume Adjustment Factors

| Awards per SFTE                           | $36,976,003 |
| Completion & Retention                    | $55,464,005 |
| Total: Performance                        | $92,440,008 |

Two-Pass Total on SFTE  
100.27307

#### Total Weighted Completions

- Adams State University Board
- Colorado Mesa Board
- Colorado School of Mines Board
- Colorado State University Board
- Community College System Board
- Fort Lewis College Board
- Metro State University Board
- University of Colorado Board
- University of Northern Colorado Board
- Western State Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board</th>
<th>Total Awarded from COF Stipend</th>
<th>Total Awarded from Role and Mission</th>
<th>Dollars Awarded to Performance</th>
<th>Total Allocation from Model</th>
<th>Total Allocation with SEP</th>
<th>Previous Year's Allocation</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University Board</td>
<td>$3,014,775</td>
<td>$5,973,333</td>
<td>$4,971,844</td>
<td>$13,959,952</td>
<td>$13,959,952</td>
<td>$12,837,321</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa Board</td>
<td>$14,609,400</td>
<td>$5,110,432</td>
<td>$4,721,692</td>
<td>$24,441,524</td>
<td>$24,441,524</td>
<td>$22,027,253</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines Board</td>
<td>$6,291,600</td>
<td>$8,382,828</td>
<td>$5,936,149</td>
<td>$20,610,577</td>
<td>$20,610,577</td>
<td>$18,669,466</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University Board</td>
<td>$44,015,100</td>
<td>$22,027,524</td>
<td>$14,125,944</td>
<td>$80,168,567</td>
<td>$133,499,085</td>
<td>$73,496,160</td>
<td>9.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College System Board</td>
<td>$109,407,525</td>
<td>$27,626,012</td>
<td>$15,156,616</td>
<td>$152,190,153</td>
<td>$152,190,153</td>
<td>$137,465,917</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College Board</td>
<td>$4,545,825</td>
<td>$2,557,104</td>
<td>$4,890,724</td>
<td>$11,993,653</td>
<td>$11,993,653</td>
<td>$10,594,613</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro State University Board</td>
<td>$31,613,100</td>
<td>$10,351,137</td>
<td>$8,872,438</td>
<td>$50,836,675</td>
<td>$50,836,675</td>
<td>$43,681,225</td>
<td>16.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Board</td>
<td>$61,134,600</td>
<td>$38,965,959</td>
<td>$21,432,700</td>
<td>$121,533,258</td>
<td>$183,044,608</td>
<td>$111,178,395</td>
<td>9.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado Board</td>
<td>$17,177,550</td>
<td>$13,568,506</td>
<td>$7,710,740</td>
<td>$38,456,796</td>
<td>$38,456,796</td>
<td>$37,357,034</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State Board</td>
<td>$2,772,600</td>
<td>$4,097,178</td>
<td>$4,621,162</td>
<td>$11,490,940</td>
<td>$11,490,940</td>
<td>$10,585,430</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bar Chart

- Adams State University Board: 8.75%
- Colorado Mesa Board: 10.96%
- Colorado School of Mines Board: 10.40%
- Colorado State University Board: 9.08%
- Community College System Board: 10.71%
- Fort Lewis College Board: 13.21%
- Metro State University Board: 16.38%
- University of Colorado Board: 9.31%
- University of Northern Colorado Board: 2.94%
- Western State Board: 8.55%
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CSU Global Campus Taskforce Update

• Carry In
Recap on NewCo Task Force Meeting
Today’s Line-up on NewCo

I. What it is
II. Executive Session
III. What we would like to accomplish today, and what in the future we propose to present to the Board for approval.
NewCo: leverage and monetize CSU-Global’s intellectual property, and technologies in higher education innovation to provide technology, consulting, outsource services to businesses, government agencies, and other institutions (e.g. online course creation, instructor management, student lead provision, student services, marketing support, technology support).

Examples of universities using tech transfer for societal contribution and revenue generation:

• Stanford University licensed its gene splicing tools for the creation of the biotech industry.
• Columbia University created and licensed its the most advanced atomic microscope in existence.
• Univ. of CA, SF developed and licensed its technology for Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI).
Business Sectors for NewCo

• **Corporate Training**: online, F2F, hybrid
• **Education Facilitation**: e.g., ASU and Southern New Hampshire utilize outsource providers for student lead generation & support
• **Technology licensing**: student, faculty, staff portals; faculty management system
• **Consulting**: all sectors that provide education
Benefits Generated by NewCo

- **CSU System**: facilitate growth of CSU-Global and that of the System through its services and potential cash flow/dividends.
- **CSU-Global**: allow it to focus on its provision of high quality, regionally-accredited, degree-based education while gaining the assistance of an entity that can drive its ongoing growth & efficiency.
- **Government Agencies & Businesses**: flexible, customized training.
- **Other education providers & institutions**: flexible, customized services for all areas of its educational delivery to students.
Executive Session

• Legal advice on structure
Next Steps

• **Today’s Approval Request**
  – Approval for Becky and Mike to proceed with the necessary organizational actions to establish a System owned Foundation for the purpose of owning NEWCO.

• **Future Approval/ Reports**
  – NewCo Operating Agreement
  – NewCo Funding plan
Item #5
CSU System Overview slides
Total State Budget FY2014-15
$24.58 Billion

Total Operating Appropriations by Program

- Human Services/Health Care (21%)
- Higher Ed. (14%)
- Corrections/Judicial (12%)
- Transportation (6%)
- Other (5%)
- Education K-12 (2%)
State General Fund Revenue FY14-15
$9.4 Billion

Total General Fund Revenue
- Individual Income taxes
- Sales and Use Taxes
- Corporate Income Tax
- Cigarette, Tobacco & Liquor Tax
- Insurance Premium Taxes
- Other Revenues
General Fund History - 45 years

(inflation adjusted)
Colorado Colleges and Universities

• Public 2-year and 4-year
  – 31 Total Institutions with 256,000 students
    • 13 4-year institutions
      – 153,000 students
        » Degrees/certificates awarded Academic Year 2012-13
          » 24,700 bachelor degrees
          » 9,100 graduate degrees
          » TOTAL 33,800 or 22% of students
          » 6-year average cohort graduation rate 57% (72% CSU and 32% CSU-Pueblo)

• 18 Community College 2-year institutions
  – 103,000 students
    » Degrees/certificates awarded Academic Tear 2012-13
      » 10,136 certificates
      » 8,700 degrees
      » TOTAL 18,836 or 18% of students
      » 3-year average cohort graduation rate 21%
Private, Seminary, and Occupational Schools

• Private and Seminary
  – 103 Institutions
  – 123,000 students
  – 16,217 Awards (maybe a degree) or 13% of students

• Occupational
  – 376 schools
    • 30,000 + students

• Total Students in Higher Education
  – 410,000 +
Request for FY 2014-15 would increase state investment in operating funds by 11.0%. 
Average Resident Student Tuition and General Fund
(Based on Resident Tuition and General Fund revenues divided by resident student FTE)
All Governing Boards
(adjusted for inflation in 2013 dollars)

Fiscal Year


Student Share (Resident Tuition)  State Share (General Fund)
CSU Fort Collins Total Revenue

- Tuition And Fees: 32%
- Grants & Contracts: 25%
- Auxiliary Operations: 14%
- State Support: 10%
- Self Funded Activities: 9%
- Indirect Cost Recoveries: 5%
- Miscellaneous Revenue: 4%
- Federal Restricted Funds: 1%
CSU Pueblo Total Revenues

- Tuition And Fees: 43%
- Grants & Contracts: 27%
- Auxiliary Operations: 16%
- State Support: 10%
- State Capital Funds: 1%
- Gifts: 3%
- Interest Earnings: 1%
CSU Global Campus Total Revenues

Federal Financial Aid
10%

Tuition
90%
Percent of Total Revenues Generated By Campus

2014

CSU
87.2% of Total Revenues

CSU-Pueblo
7.7% of Total Revenues

CSU Global Campus
5.1% of Total Revenues
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Quarterly Financial Reports
### Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position

#### Three Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>306,238,401</td>
<td>322,374,897</td>
<td>354,000,000</td>
<td>194,847,902</td>
<td>192,468,518</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State fee for service revenue</td>
<td>60,531,592</td>
<td>65,420,240</td>
<td>71,300,000</td>
<td>17,815,635</td>
<td>17,825,000</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>258,366,975</td>
<td>260,314,497</td>
<td>265,500,000</td>
<td>64,618,406</td>
<td>65,240,000</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>30,259,510</td>
<td>33,870,326</td>
<td>38,000,000</td>
<td>10,463,667</td>
<td>10,260,000</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>126,046,085</td>
<td>133,329,255</td>
<td>131,600,000</td>
<td>55,541,321</td>
<td>54,990,852</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>6,456,728</td>
<td>6,335,320</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>1,409,959</td>
<td>1,397,500</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>787,917,291</td>
<td>831,644,535</td>
<td>866,900,000</td>
<td>344,668,891</td>
<td>342,181,870</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>218,867,165</td>
<td>239,212,135</td>
<td>255,000,000</td>
<td>53,036,282</td>
<td>51,832,724</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>189,602,681</td>
<td>181,970,518</td>
<td>183,000,000</td>
<td>44,511,382</td>
<td>43,920,000</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>69,065,286</td>
<td>82,702,890</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
<td>17,086,401</td>
<td>17,120,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>60,055,968</td>
<td>67,375,071</td>
<td>71,000,000</td>
<td>16,974,506</td>
<td>17,040,000</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>25,154,142</td>
<td>26,940,458</td>
<td>26,500,000</td>
<td>5,893,811</td>
<td>5,863,233</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>38,824,790</td>
<td>45,408,022</td>
<td>48,000,000</td>
<td>15,532,385</td>
<td>15,408,000</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>52,768,310</td>
<td>59,157,759</td>
<td>59,000,000</td>
<td>12,953,187</td>
<td>12,980,000</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>9,413,888</td>
<td>9,811,610</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>3,865,411</td>
<td>3,865,411</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>120,785,219</td>
<td>126,365,574</td>
<td>127,600,000</td>
<td>33,613,981</td>
<td>33,450,053</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>66,087,831</td>
<td>70,883,954</td>
<td>75,174,374</td>
<td>18,384,040</td>
<td>18,355,205</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>850,625,280</td>
<td>905,877,991</td>
<td>935,274,374</td>
<td>221,876,845</td>
<td>219,634,626</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>(62,707,999)</td>
<td>(74,233,456)</td>
<td>(68,374,374)</td>
<td>143,600,707</td>
<td>143,128,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-operating revenues (expenses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>1,753,642</td>
<td>2,472,452</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>980,000</td>
<td>980,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>34,596,363</td>
<td>40,828,396</td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
<td>10,473,865</td>
<td>10,474,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>(1,401,360)</td>
<td>4,694,643</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>1,223,865</td>
<td>1,224,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense on capital debt</td>
<td>(16,622,295)</td>
<td>(19,652,589)</td>
<td>(22,550,000)</td>
<td>(4,626,003)</td>
<td>(4,626,000)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>24,620,820</td>
<td>24,491,942</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>11,353,913</td>
<td>11,354,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>6,253,809</td>
<td>6,335,320</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>1,409,959</td>
<td>1,397,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net nonoperating revenues</strong></td>
<td>49,201,015</td>
<td>55,786,076</td>
<td>59,450,000</td>
<td>20,780,661</td>
<td>20,781,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Loss) Before other revenues</td>
<td>(13,506,974)</td>
<td>(18,447,380)</td>
<td>(8,924,374)</td>
<td>143,600,707</td>
<td>143,128,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other revenues (expenses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State capital contributions</td>
<td>851,988</td>
<td>1,822,451</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants</td>
<td>10,459,379</td>
<td>4,513,900</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>1,407,659</td>
<td>1,408,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital gifts</td>
<td>22,411,107</td>
<td>21,171,264</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (to)/from governing boards or other institutions</td>
<td>(3,848,887)</td>
<td>(2,830,773)</td>
<td>(4,400,000)</td>
<td>(627,039)</td>
<td>(627,000)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to permanent endowments</td>
<td>1,434,183</td>
<td>1,838,405</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other revenues</strong></td>
<td>31,307,970</td>
<td>26,515,247</td>
<td>17,600,000</td>
<td>780,619</td>
<td>781,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer fire activities to DPS / OPEB to external trust</td>
<td>(6,535,775)</td>
<td>(22,185,126)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total special items</strong></td>
<td>(6,535,775)</td>
<td>(22,185,126)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraordinary items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on insurance recovery</td>
<td>2,191,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total extraordinary items</strong></td>
<td>2,191,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase (decrease) in net position</strong></td>
<td>13,457,008</td>
<td>(14,117,259)</td>
<td>8,675,626</td>
<td>144,381,326</td>
<td>143,909,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The increase in depreciation expense between FY13 actual and the FY14 budget amount is primarily attributable to the following:
   - Normal yearly increase in depreciation expense, attributable to increase in depreciable base, for assets placed in service in FY13 and prior years - $71M;
   - FY14 depreciation for buildings to be cap’d in FY14 - $400k; new equipment, software, and library materials placed in service in FY14 - $3.8M;
   - Total FY14 Depreciation expense estimate -$75.2M.

2. This is a restatement per GASB65 which requires COI to be expensed in the year of the bond issue.
## Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position
### Three Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>34,764,209</td>
<td>48,454,218</td>
<td>70,228,281</td>
<td>13,834,946</td>
<td>70,228,281</td>
<td>-80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>452,281</td>
<td>1,192,425</td>
<td>1,820,000</td>
<td>266,766</td>
<td>1,820,000</td>
<td>-85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>35,253,240</td>
<td>49,646,643</td>
<td>72,048,281</td>
<td>14,101,712</td>
<td>72,048,281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>6,769,973</td>
<td>10,232,984</td>
<td>14,189,469</td>
<td>3,115,422</td>
<td>14,189,469</td>
<td>-78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>2,624,554</td>
<td>2,960,592</td>
<td>4,437,565</td>
<td>696,232</td>
<td>4,437,565</td>
<td>-84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>7,679,439</td>
<td>13,196,369</td>
<td>22,271,797</td>
<td>4,342,271</td>
<td>22,271,797</td>
<td>-80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>5,981,367</td>
<td>13,196,369</td>
<td>22,271,797</td>
<td>1,375,155</td>
<td>22,271,797</td>
<td>-75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>182,158</td>
<td>418,996</td>
<td>499,432</td>
<td>122,617</td>
<td>499,432</td>
<td>-75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>4,728,181</td>
<td>6,551,036</td>
<td>8,773,909</td>
<td>2,055,661</td>
<td>8,773,909</td>
<td>-76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93,291</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>51,127</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>27,965,672</td>
<td>38,728,214</td>
<td>55,995,662</td>
<td>11,758,485</td>
<td>55,995,662</td>
<td>-75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income (Loss)</strong></td>
<td>7,287,568</td>
<td>10,918,429</td>
<td>16,052,619</td>
<td>2,343,227</td>
<td>16,052,619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-operating revenues (expenses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>7,707</td>
<td>247,931</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>4,728,181</td>
<td>6,551,036</td>
<td>8,773,909</td>
<td>2,055,661</td>
<td>8,773,909</td>
<td>-76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(168,750)</td>
<td>(161,250)</td>
<td>(161,250)</td>
<td>(161,250)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net nonoperating revenues</strong></td>
<td>4,735,888</td>
<td>6,630,217</td>
<td>8,712,659</td>
<td>1,957,411</td>
<td>8,712,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (Loss) Before other revenues</strong></td>
<td>12,023,456</td>
<td>17,548,646</td>
<td>24,765,278</td>
<td>4,300,638</td>
<td>24,765,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other revenues (expenses)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (to)/from governing boards or other institutions</td>
<td>(543,835)</td>
<td>(7,012,389)</td>
<td>(720,000)</td>
<td>(193,371)</td>
<td>(720,000)</td>
<td>-73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other revenues</strong></td>
<td>(543,835)</td>
<td>(7,012,389)</td>
<td>(720,000)</td>
<td>(193,371)</td>
<td>(720,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in Net Position</strong></td>
<td>11,479,621</td>
<td>10,536,257</td>
<td>24,045,278</td>
<td>4,107,267</td>
<td>24,045,278</td>
<td>-82.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Colorado State University - Pueblo
### Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position

#### Three Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>30,320,765</td>
<td>28,787,507</td>
<td>30,686,126</td>
<td>16,601,847</td>
<td>15,343,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State fee for service revenue</td>
<td>7,498,083</td>
<td>6,604,718</td>
<td>6,700,807</td>
<td>1,675,202</td>
<td>1,675,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>10,843,407</td>
<td>9,650,971</td>
<td>9,841,978</td>
<td>2,360,358</td>
<td>2,460,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>320,028</td>
<td>307,295</td>
<td>337,950</td>
<td>139,371</td>
<td>135,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>11,758,376</td>
<td>11,070,956</td>
<td>13,372,156</td>
<td>3,357,643</td>
<td>3,343,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>564,120</td>
<td>600,021</td>
<td>684,849</td>
<td>389,635</td>
<td>342,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenues</td>
<td>61,304,779</td>
<td>57,021,468</td>
<td>61,623,866</td>
<td>24,524,057</td>
<td>23,299,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating expenses |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| Instruction | 22,596,665 | 22,603,811 | 21,464,685 | 3,189,091 | 5,366,171 | -40.6% |
| Research | 181,976 | 123,966 | 301,468 | 461,890 | 75,367 | 512.9% |
| Public service | 1,286,418 | 999,796 | 1,008,915 | 82,633 | 252,223 | -67.2% |
| Academic support | 7,075,287 | 8,468,091 | 8,455,289 | 1,520,913 | 1,331,241 | 36.6% |
| Student services | 6,879,979 | 5,882,091 | 5,872,226 | 1,520,913 | 2,113,957 | -28.1% |
| Institutional support | 8,189,745 | 8,468,091 | 8,455,289 | 1,520,913 | 2,113,957 | -28.1% |
| Operation and maintenance of plant | 5,884,295 | 5,915,807 | 7,427,412 | 1,684,201 | 1,856,853 | -9.3% |
| Scholarships and fellowships | 8,613,118 | 8,190,667 | 8,885,031 | 4,282,690 | 4,442,516 | 16.3% |
| Auxiliary enterprises | 10,897,432 | 11,093,110 | 11,062,313 | 3,216,743 | 3,216,743 | -9.9% |
| Total operating expenses | 73,077,359 | 74,724,280 | 77,864,775 | 19,296,796 | 21,687,452 | 16.3% |

| Operating Income (Loss) |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| (3,444,640) | (8,395,041) | (9,615,584) | 5,903,677 | 4,373,465 |            |

| Non-operating revenues (expenses) |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| State appropriations | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gifts | 1,865,968 | 1,976,136 | 1,985,995 | 900,831 | 496,499 | 81.4% |
| Investment income | (44,913) | (286,733) | 218,600 | 187 | 54,650 | -99.7% |
| Interest expense on capital debt | (3,338,716) | (4,395,507) | (4,579,270) | (2,245,330) | (2,289,635) | -1.9% |
| Federal nonoperating grants and contracts | 9,248,265 | 8,977,030 | 9,000,000 | 4,501,500 | 4,500,000 | 0.0% |
| Other nonoperating revenues (expenses) | 597,336 | 2,463,379 | - | (2,480,771) | - |
| Total nonoperating revenues | 8,327,940 | 9,307,771 | 6,625,325 | 676,417 | 2,761,514 |

| Income (Loss) Before other revenues |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| (3,444,640) | (8,395,041) | (9,615,584) | 5,903,677 | 4,373,465 |            |

| Other revenues (expenses) |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| State capital contributions | 1,028,354 | 1,797,898 | - | - | - |
| Capital grants | - | - | - | 28,323 | - |
| Capital gifts | - | 21,498 | - | - | - |
| Payments (to)/from governing boards or other institutions | (474,843) | 4,937,684 | (605,000) | (151,250) | (151,250) | 0.0% |
| Additions to permanent endowments | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total other revenues | 553,511 | 6,757,080 | (605,000) | (122,927) | (151,250) |            |

| Special items |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| Transfer of fire suppression activities to DPS | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total special items | - | - | - | - | - |

| Extraordinary items |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| Gain on insurance recovery | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total extraordinary items | - | - | - | - | - |

| Increase (decrease) in net position |         |                |                      |                             |            |
| (2,891,129) | (1,637,961) | (10,220,584) | 5,780,750 | 4,222,215 |            |
Colorado State University - Board of Governors
Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position
Three Year Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State fee for service revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>5,013,665</td>
<td>5,579,035</td>
<td>5,439,680</td>
<td>1,265,999</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>5,013,665</td>
<td>5,583,239</td>
<td>5,439,680</td>
<td>1,265,999</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss)</td>
<td>(5,013,665)</td>
<td>(5,583,239)</td>
<td>(5,439,680)</td>
<td>(1,265,999)</td>
<td>(1,300,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>(370,056)</td>
<td>43,153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense on capital debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net nonoperating revenues</td>
<td>(370,056)</td>
<td>43,153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Loss) Before other revenues</td>
<td>(5,383,721)</td>
<td>(5,540,086)</td>
<td>(5,439,680)</td>
<td>(1,265,999)</td>
<td>(1,300,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues (expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State capital contributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital gifts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (to)/from governing boards or other institutions</td>
<td>5,104,083</td>
<td>5,163,512</td>
<td>5,439,680</td>
<td>(8,511)</td>
<td>(8,500)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to permanent endowments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other revenues</td>
<td>5,104,083</td>
<td>5,163,512</td>
<td>5,439,680</td>
<td>(8,511)</td>
<td>(8,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer fire activities to DPS / OPEB to external trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total special items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on insurance recovery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total extraordinary items</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in net position</td>
<td>(279,638)</td>
<td>(376,574)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,274,510)</td>
<td>(1,308,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Year-end Financial Audit Findings

- BKD performs an annual financial audit for the State Auditor’s Office
- The State Auditor works for the Colorado General Assembly
- BKD is hired on a contractual basis and are auditing for the state, not the board.
- The purpose of the audits are to confirm to the Legislature that state entities are operating in a financially prudent manner.
- This year the CSU System has been called before the Legislative Audit Committee to review findings so actual audits are not available until December 9th.
- Audits were completed for the System, Pueblo, and Global Campus.
- Audit recommendations from BKD are on the next several pages but as of this writing are still in draft form.
Year-end Audit continued

• CSU-Global Campus
  – No audit findings
• CSU
  – 1 finding
• CSU-Pueblo
  – 2 findings
Colorado State University – Global Campus
(A University within the Colorado State University System)
Financial Statements and Independent Auditor’s Reports
Financial Audit
Years Ended June 30, 2014 and 2013
There are no findings and recommendations for the year ended June 30, 2014.
Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position

The statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net position presents the financial operating results of CSU – Global for the reporting period. Operating and nonoperating revenues and expenses and the resulting increase/decrease (changes in net position) during the year are shown in this statement.

Summary of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended June 30</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>$48,454,218</td>
<td>$34,683,974</td>
<td>$24,433,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$36,750</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>1,192,425</td>
<td>452,281</td>
<td>46,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenues</td>
<td>49,646,643</td>
<td>35,173,005</td>
<td>24,479,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>10,232,984</td>
<td>6,769,971</td>
<td>4,165,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>2,960,592</td>
<td>2,598,913</td>
<td>2,050,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>13,196,369</td>
<td>7,303,544</td>
<td>5,869,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>5,274,946</td>
<td>5,820,294</td>
<td>3,364,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>418,996</td>
<td>182,158</td>
<td>164,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>93,291</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>6,551,036</td>
<td>4,728,181</td>
<td>2,966,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>38,728,214</td>
<td>27,403,061</td>
<td>18,582,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income</td>
<td>10,918,429</td>
<td>7,769,944</td>
<td>5,897,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income (loss)</td>
<td>247,931</td>
<td>7,707</td>
<td>(8,877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>(168,750)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>6,551,036</td>
<td>4,728,181</td>
<td>2,966,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net nonoperating revenues</td>
<td>6,630,217</td>
<td>4,735,888</td>
<td>2,958,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income before other revenues (expenses) or transfers</td>
<td>17,548,646</td>
<td>12,505,832</td>
<td>8,855,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues (expenses) or transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to governing boards or other institutions</td>
<td>(7,012,389)</td>
<td>(543,835)</td>
<td>(116,765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other revenues, (expenses) or transfers</td>
<td>(7,012,389)</td>
<td>(543,835)</td>
<td>(116,765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net position</td>
<td>10,536,257</td>
<td>11,961,997</td>
<td>8,738,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, beginning of year</td>
<td>14,874,009</td>
<td>2,912,012</td>
<td>(5,826,769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, end of year</td>
<td>$25,410,266</td>
<td>$14,874,009</td>
<td>$2,912,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements of Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU-Pueblo) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2014 in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we considered CSU-Pueblo’s internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of CSU-Pueblo’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of CSU-Pueblo’s internal control.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and, therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses have been identified.

A deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct misstatements of CSU-Pueblo’s financial statements on a timely basis. A deficiency in design exists when a control necessary to meet a control objective is missing or an existing control is not properly designed so that, even if the control operates as designed, a control objective would not be met. A deficiency in operation exists when a properly designed control does not operate as designed or when the person performing the control does not possess the necessary authority or competence to perform the control effectively.

A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of CSU-Pueblo’s financial statements will not be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

We observed the following matter that we consider to be a material weakness.
Material Weakness - Internal Control Over Financial Reporting


Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU-P) is a university within the Colorado State University System with an enrollment of over 4,000 full time equivalents and $57 million in operating revenue. Although part of the CSU System, the accounting for the university operates independently from the other universities within the System, thus it has its own internal controls and accounting processes. Monitoring of account balances contained in the general ledger, as well as reconciliation of the balances to supporting financial records, is integral to ensuring the accuracy of financial information. In addition, these processes are necessary in order to minimize the risk of material misstatement due to error or fraud.

What was the purpose of the audit work?

The purpose of the audit work was to determine whether CSU-P had adequate internal controls and processes in place to prepare materially accurate financial statements in a timely manner.

What audit work was performed and how were results measured?

We tested material account reconciliations for accounts including receivables, accounts payable, accrued interest, deferred revenue and fixed assets to determine whether the reconciliations were performed timely and accurately.

In addition, we reviewed journal entries recorded during Fiscal Year 2014 to determine whether those entries were recorded appropriately and in a timely manner, and whether they were reviewed by a supervisor.

We also performed testwork to determine whether CSU-P implemented our Fiscal Year 2013 audit recommendation related to inadequate accounting controls. Our Fiscal Year 2013 audit recommendation was identified as a material weakness. During our Fiscal Year 2013 audit, CSU-P staff made 37 journal entries after fiscal year-end closing, including twenty entries individually affecting at least one account in excess of $100,000.

CSU-P’s policy requires that quarterly financial statements are reviewed by the controller and director of finance quarterly. This review should be done in enough detail to identify any material misstatements in a timely manner. The results of our testing were measured by the amount of post-closing entries proposed by management and the amount of journal entries we proposed during the audit. If internal controls are working correctly, the only material entries required after the original close should be limited to items that require data from third parties and no entries should be identified by the auditors. Management’s review identified seventeen journal entries after the original closing of the financial statements. In addition to the seventeen entries proposed by management, our audit procedures identified five journal entries that had they not been recorded would have resulted in material misstatements in the financial statements.

What problem did the audit work identify?

We noted during our testing that reconciliations selected for review did not have documentation of review by the appropriate level of management. Based on further discussions with CSU-P management and performance of further audit procedures, we noted the following:

(Continued)
CSU-P recorded seventeen entries after fiscal year closing of the financial statements totaling $20,000,000, including fourteen that individually affected at least one account by over $100,000. These entries adjusted federal grant revenue, accounts receivable, bad debt expense, allowance for student loans receivable, capital assets, construction in process, depreciation expense, accumulated depreciation, allowance for bad debts, cash, gain/loss on refunding, and tuition to their reconciled amounts as of June 30, 2014. Of the $20,000,000 in entries recorded after the original closing, $6,800,000 of the adjustments were proposed as a result of the audit.

45 journal entries were deleted in the accounting system, instead of being corrected with a reversing journal entries when it was determined that information in the original entry needed to be corrected.

The following five proposed journal entries that management recorded as part of the audit process:

- $250,000 in bond issuance costs were not expensed, as required by GASB Statement No. 65, Items Previously Reported as Assets and Liabilities.
- A $5,000,000 transfer from CSU-Global was incorrectly recorded in a fee-for-service account.
- Accrued interest of $890,000 was incorrectly recorded twice.
- $250,000 in net entries to accounts receivable.
- Revenue earned for technology fees totaling $683,000 was incorrectly recorded as deferred when it had been earned.

In addition, we found that during the year there appeared to be an overall lack of monitoring for collectability of receivables. Specifically, management was unable to provide support of internal controls and processes related to the collection of commercial accounts receivables.

**Why did the problem occur?**

This problem occurred due to CSU-P staff's lack of adherence to existing policies and procedures relating to the review and oversight of account reconciliations, including a lack of effective supervisory review by both direct supervisors and management in the accounting department and failure to complete reconciliations timely. CSU-P staff indicated that, in part, policies and procedures were not followed during Fiscal Year 2014 due to turnover in the accounting department and a lack of proper training for new staff on required procedures.

The School's resources were also limited during the fiscal year because there was no CPA employed in CSU-P's accounting department. With the lack of a CPA in the accounting department, the department lacks the more technical knowledge over internal controls and accounting issues.

Additionally, the base accounting system (AIS) used by CSU-P is a proprietary system that lacks controls that are common in most software systems. These controls would include not allowing journal entries to be deleted after they had been recorded and maintaining detail of general ledger accounts that agree to the general ledger balance.

**Why does this problem matter?**

Reconciling and monitoring of financial records is crucial for detecting and preventing misappropriation of funds, misstatements, errors, or fraud on the financial statements. Establishing and maintaining internal
controls, such as supervisory review, ensures that the reconciliations will be performed in a timely manner to lower the potential risk of misstatements due to error or fraud on the financial statements.

Timely and accurate financial information is integral to business decision-making. Lack of timely and accurate reconciliations and monitoring can lead to journal entries that may not be recorded into the accounting system and failure to identify incorrect entries. This also leads to material year-end adjustments. This can cause inaccurate financial reporting at the CSU-P and statewide levels.

Recommendation No. 1:

Colorado State University – Pueblo should improve its internal controls over financial activities by:

1) Ensuring through training and oversight that existing policies and procedures related to the review of account reconciliations and monitoring of financial information is done in a timely and accurate manner such that the financial statements prepared accurately and timely.

2) Considering the hiring an experienced CPA within its accounting department to assist with financial statement preparation and design of internal controls and processes. A CPA would also be able to provide assistance with technical issues, such as the adoption of new accounting pronouncements.

3) Implementing an improved software system with strong built in IT general controls would improve the overall control environment.

Colorado State University – Pueblo Response

Implementation Date:

Colorado State University – Pueblo Response

Implementation Date:
INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

In planning and performing our audit, we considered the System’s internal control over compliance with the requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures and to test internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and, therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses have been identified.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis.

A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

We observed the following matter that we consider to be a material weakness.

**Material Weakness – Internal Control Over Compliance**

**Enrollment Reporting (Student Financial Aid Cluster): Colorado State University System – Pueblo Campus**

Federal regulations mandate that when a student receives Federal student financial aid and subsequently changes enrollment status, the school must report the enrollment change to the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS). Specifically, enrollment reporting assists the federal government in management of the Pell and Direct Loan programs, which are programs within the Student Financial Aid Cluster. In addition, the NSLDS assists lenders in the determination of whether a student, whose enrollment status changed subsequent to a Direct Loan disbursement and who received Direct Loan program loans, should be moved into loan repayment status or if they are eligible for an in-school deferment. During Fiscal Year 2014, Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU-P) issued approximately $34 million Student Financial Aid during the year, which included approximately $30 million of Pell and Direct Loan funding.

**What was the purpose of the audit work?**

We performed procedures required by the federal Office of Management and Budget *Circular A-133* and related 2014 Compliance Supplement for the Student Financial Aid Cluster. Specifically, we performed testing related to special tests and provisions compliance requirements to determine whether the CSU-P complied with enrollment reporting requirements regarding student attendance status changes.
What audit work was performed and how were results measured?

We reviewed a sample of 25 out of 351 CSU-P students awarded Pell and Direct Loans during the current year who were reported to NSLDS for compliance with enrollment reporting requirements. Under the Pell grant and Direct Loan program requirements, 34 CFR 690.83(b)(2) and 34 CFR 685.309, a school must report within 30 days whenever enrollment changes for students, unless a roster will be submitted within 60 days to the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS), or directly to a guaranty agency. Changes in enrollment status which must be reported to, and received by, NSLDS include (a) withdrawal, (b) graduation, (c) a student who has ceased to be enrolled on at least a half-time basis, and/or (d) a student who has been accepted for enrollment but never attended. Results were measured against the 60-day criteria as CSU-P transmits rosters for its graduating students. Colleges and universities either have an automated or manual process that determines student enrollment changes. Currently, CSU-P manually determines a student’s graduate status before officially reporting the status change to NSLDS.

What problem did the audit work identify?

We determined that CSU-P did not report status changes timely to NSLDS for 14 of the 25 students (56 percent) tested. The scheduled enrollment reporting roster files were not transmitted to the National Student Clearinghouse in order to ensure timely receipt, within 60 days of status change, by NSLDS. The exceptions consisted of students with December and May graduation dates whose enrollment status was submitted 28 to 43 days beyond the 60-day due date.

Why did the problem occur?

CSU-P did not submit roster files to NSLDS timely in accordance with federal policies. The process to determine if a student met the degree requirements to be graduated are calculated manually, sometimes taking up to two months to determine after the official graduation date. Once students are determined to have officially graduated, the dates submitted to NSLDS, through the National Student Clearinghouse, are back-dated to the term graduation date. CSU-P operated under the assumption that transmitting student enrollment status changes to the National Student Clearinghouse met the 60-day requirement. Per OMB Circular A-133, regardless if a school uses a third-party processor, such as the National Student Clearinghouse, responsibility ultimately lies with the school to meet required submission deadlines. CSU-P misunderstood the required deadlines for receipt of enrollment status changes by the NSLDS. CSU-P needs to update its determination process to meet the 60-day timeframe as required by Federal compliance requirements. Additionally, communication between Student Financial Aid and the Registrar’s Office should be enhanced to ensure all employees involved in the submission process are aware of the Federal deadlines.

Why does this problem matter?

Enrollment reporting assists lenders in the determination of whether a borrower should be moved into loan repayment status or if they are eligible for an in-school deferment. Thus, if CSU-P fails to meet the required reporting timelines or submits inaccurate information to NSLDS, the borrowers’ repayment responsibilities may be reported incorrectly resulting in either a lack of timely repayments by the borrower or the student being inappropriately moved into loan repayment status.

Federal Direct Student Loans (CFDA No. 84.268; Federal Pell Grant Program (CFDA No. 84.063)
Recommendation No. 2:

We recommend calculation of graduation status procedures be updated to ensure the enrollment reporting roster file is received by NSLDS within the required 60-day deadlines for roster submission. Additionally, a review process needs to be implemented where a supervisor ensures submission of roster dates is being performed in order to meet Federal requirements.

We also recommend CSU-P attend student financial aid training regarding the submission process and clarifying guidance on required submission dates. Additionally, CSU-P should seek further guidance and clarification regarding the timing of submission to the NSLDS by the National Student Clearinghouse.

Colorado State University – Pueblo Response
Summary of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year Ended June 30, 2014</th>
<th>Year Ended June 30, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
<td>$28,787,507</td>
<td>$30,320,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental grants</td>
<td>9,735,588</td>
<td>10,843,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenue</td>
<td>18,582,991</td>
<td>20,140,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,106,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,304,779</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>22,603,811</td>
<td>22,596,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>8,468,091</td>
<td>7,075,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>6,776,334</td>
<td>6,879,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>3,882,002</td>
<td>2,859,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>5,915,807</td>
<td>5,884,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships</td>
<td>8,190,667</td>
<td>8,613,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>123,966</td>
<td>181,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>999,796</td>
<td>1,286,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>11,093,110</td>
<td>10,897,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>6,670,696</td>
<td>6,802,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,724,280</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,077,359</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>(17,618,194)</td>
<td>(11,772,580)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net non-operating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>9,081,053</td>
<td>8,493,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>6,757,080</td>
<td>201,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in net position</td>
<td>(1,780,061)</td>
<td>(3,076,785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, beginning of year</td>
<td>82,739,868</td>
<td>85,816,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, end of year</td>
<td>$80,959,807</td>
<td>$82,739,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From June 30, 2013 through June 30, 2014, total student enrollment decreased by 4.1 percent. During this same period, tuition revenue decreased from approximately $30.3 million to approximately $28.8 million, a decrease of approximately $1.5 million or 5 percent. Grant and contracts revenue also decreased by 11.0 percent or approximately $1.1 million. CSU-Pueblo's share of the fee for service revenues also decreased by 11.9 percent or approximately $0.9 million. Tuition rates were unchanged between the period of June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014. Total operating revenue decreased 6.9 percent or approximately $4.2 million.
Colorado State University System
Financial Statements and Independent Auditor’s Reports
Financial Audit
Years Ended June 30, 2014 and 2013
Compliance Audit
Year Ended June 30, 2014
INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements of the Colorado State University System (the System) as of and for the year ended June 30, 2014 in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we considered the System’s internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the System’s internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the System’s internal control.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and, therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses have been identified.

A deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct misstatements of the System’s financial statements on a timely basis. A deficiency in design exists when a control necessary to meet a control objective is missing or an existing control is not properly designed so that, even if the control operates as designed, a control objective would not be met. A deficiency in operation exists when a properly designed control does not operate as designed or when the person performing the control does not possess the necessary authority or competence to perform the control effectively.

A material weakness is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the System’s financial statements will not be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

A significant deficiency is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

We observed the following matter that we consider to be a material weakness.

Material Weakness—Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

Account Reconciliations and Review of Financial Records: Colorado State University – Pueblo (CSU-P)

See page ____ of CSU-Pueblo report issued under a separate cover.
INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE

In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered the System’s internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program in order to determine our auditing procedures and to test internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses and, therefore, there can be no assurance that all deficiencies, significant deficiencies or material weaknesses have been identified.

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis.

A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented or detected and corrected on a timely basis.

A significant deficiency in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control over compliance that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

We observed the following matters that we consider to be a material weakness and a significant deficiency.

*Enrollment Reporting (Student Financial Aid Cluster): Colorado State University System – Pueblo Campus*

See page ____ of CSU Pueblo report issued under a separate cover.

*Compliance with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act*

Recipients (i.e. direct recipient), such as Colorado State University System (the System), of grants or cooperative agreements who make first-tier subawards to other entities are subject to subaward reporting requirements under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (Transparency Act). In this case, first-tier subawards would be those awards made directly from the System (direct recipient) to other organizations (first-tier sub-recipients). During Fiscal Year 2014, the System passed-through to subrecipients approximately $15 million of Research and Development Cluster Grants funding. The Transparency Act required the OMB to maintain a single, searchable website that contains specific information on all federal spending awards, including required data fields. OMB collects this information from recipients through an electronic reporting system.

**What was the purpose of the audit work?**

The purpose of the audit work was to test the System’s compliance with federal Transparency Act grant requirements.
What audit work was performed and how were results measured?

- Per 2 CFR Part 170.320, each grant, cooperative agreement, loan, or loan guarantee made by a non-federal entity is subject to the Federal Financial Assistance Transparency Act (Transparency Act). The Transparency Act requires any newly-awarded subawards, or subaward amendments of $25,000 or more, to be reported. Recipients are required to register in the Federal Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) and report subaward data through FSRS.

- Required reports are to be submitted by the end of the month following the award date. There are six required data fields of the report. The six required fields are:
  - Subaward Date- Represents the time period (by month and year) for subawards made against the Federal Award Identification Number
  - Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number - The subawardee organization's 9-digit DUNS number
  - Amount of Subaward - The net dollar amount of Federal funds awarded to the subawardee including modifications
  - Subaward Obligation/Action Date - Date the subaward agreement was signed
  - Date of Report Submission - Date the recipient or contractor entered the action/obligation into FSRS
  - Subaward Number - Subaward number or other identifying number assigned by the prime awardee organization to facilitate the tracking of its subawards

We reviewed twenty-nine of the System's subawards made during Fiscal Year 2014 to determine whether the subawards were appropriately reported through FSRS. The System has numerous controls in the initial submission of information to FSRS to help ensure that newly awarded subaward or subaward amendments are reviewed to determine if they should be reported through FSRS. Some of these controls consist of the following:

- A system-generated report showing all new subawards is generated each month; the report is reviewed on a monthly basis by the Director of Sponsored Programs.
- New subaward files are manually reviewed by the Subaward Administrator to determine if a grant is subject to Transparency Act regulations.

What problem did the audit work identify?

During our testwork we found that the System did not report the required subrecipient information under the Transparency Act for the Research and Development Cluster grants program for four of the 29 subawards reviewed (14 percent). We specifically noted the following:

- One subaward report that was due one month prior to our review had not been submitted as of the time of our audit. System staff reported the subaward after we identified the omission.
- One subaward report was submitted ten months after the required deadline.
- Two subaward reports were submitted with incorrect dates in the Subaward Obligation/ Action Date fields of the report.

Why did the problem occur?

The System currently lacks a review process to ensure that the Transparency Act reporting for applicable subawards was successfully completed and that reported information was accurate and agreed to the subaward files.
Why does this problem matter?

By not meeting the reporting requirements under the Transparency Act, the System is in violation of federal requirements. This problem also creates gaps in the information reported on the OMB website.

(R&D Cluster. Classification of Finding: Significant Deficiency Over Compliance; Total known questioned costs of $0)

Recommendation No.3

The Colorado State University System should comply with the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (Transparency Act) by creating a review process over all Transparency Act reports prior to submission. This final review should compare reported information to the information contained in the subaward file, including Subaward Obligation/Action Date, and should be performed by a secondary employee who does not perform the initial entry into FSRS on the OMB website.

**Colorado State University Response:** The University will institute a secondary review of the FSRS report. The review will be conducted by the Subcontract Administrator who is not responsible for entering the information into FSRS and will verify that the FSRS report properly reflects the information in the sub-award file.
Summary of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Position
(Amounts expressed in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013*</th>
<th>2012*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees, net</td>
<td>$409,617</td>
<td>371,323</td>
<td>339,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State fee for service</td>
<td>72,025</td>
<td>68,030</td>
<td>67,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>269,965</td>
<td>269,247</td>
<td>329,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>144,400</td>
<td>137,822</td>
<td>139,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42,306</td>
<td>38,053</td>
<td>31,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenues</td>
<td>928,313</td>
<td>884,475</td>
<td>906,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>272,049</td>
<td>248,234</td>
<td>232,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>182,094</td>
<td>189,785</td>
<td>186,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>83,703</td>
<td>70,352</td>
<td>133,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>78,804</td>
<td>69,756</td>
<td>62,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>46,913</td>
<td>39,713</td>
<td>36,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>56,194</td>
<td>51,411</td>
<td>46,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance</td>
<td>65,493</td>
<td>58,835</td>
<td>59,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of plant</td>
<td>24,557</td>
<td>22,755</td>
<td>16,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and</td>
<td>137,459</td>
<td>131,683</td>
<td>125,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>77,648</td>
<td>72,890</td>
<td>66,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>1,024,914</td>
<td>955,414</td>
<td>965,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>(86,601)</td>
<td>(70,939)</td>
<td>(59,045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal nonoperating grants and contracts</td>
<td>40,020</td>
<td>38,597</td>
<td>37,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenues, net</td>
<td>29,275</td>
<td>20,276</td>
<td>21,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net nonoperating revenues</td>
<td>71,767</td>
<td>60,627</td>
<td>61,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain (loss) before other</td>
<td>(14,834)</td>
<td>(10,312)</td>
<td>2,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenues (expenses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues (expenses):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State capital contributions</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants</td>
<td>4,514</td>
<td>10,460</td>
<td>10,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital gifts</td>
<td>21,193</td>
<td>22,411</td>
<td>51,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments (to) from governing boards or other institutions</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>(220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions (reductions) to permanent endowments</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other revenues</td>
<td>31,423</td>
<td>36,422</td>
<td>65,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of Fire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,536)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression Activities to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to OPEB Trust</td>
<td>(22,185)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain on insurance recovery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (decrease) in net position</td>
<td>(5,596)</td>
<td>21,766</td>
<td>69,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, beginning of year</td>
<td>905,207</td>
<td>883,441</td>
<td>814,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net position, end of year</td>
<td>$899,611</td>
<td>905,207</td>
<td>883,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Restated

- The System experienced an $86.6 million, $70.9 million, and $59.0 million loss from operations in fiscal years ended 2014, 2013, and 2012, respectively. The operating loss in 2014 was offset by net nonoperating and other revenues of $103.2 million which primarily included $2.5 million in state appropriations, $64.0 million in gifts and capital gifts, $8.1 million in state capital contributions and capital grants, $40.0 million in federal nonoperating grants and contracts, $1.8 million in permanent endowments, $5.3 million in...
Item #8
Campus Reserve Reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; General Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>88,058,753</strong></td>
<td><strong>(23,087,439)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,583,198)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EG 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,131,701</strong></td>
<td><strong>(11,074)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,739)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EG Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>78,927,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>(258,317)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(54,337)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PVM 14</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,317</strong></td>
<td><strong>(258,317)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(258,317)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXPST 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,337</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RARS 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,799</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CSFS 19</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,098,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,098,726)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,098,726)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COURSE 25</strong></td>
<td><strong>431,127</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WORKST 40</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,921</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPONPR 53</strong></td>
<td><strong>671,470</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GOVTRF 33</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,176,228</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,893,292</strong></td>
<td><strong>(23,629,487)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,583,198)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Funded/Auxiliaries Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONTED 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,050,241</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ONLPL</strong></td>
<td><strong>671,470</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RECHAR 21</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,064,742</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GENOP 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,580,064</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STUOOG 23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,766,502</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>POOLED 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,806</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INSURE 28</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,667,897</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ENTERP 29</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,981,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DCESUP 32</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,353,209</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXPSF 35</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,176,228</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EXTSF 37</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,710,013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CSIFFS 39</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,710,013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INTLPR 63</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,898</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SPWIP 88</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,898</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WIP 89</strong></td>
<td><strong>WIP 89</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self Funded - Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,155,742</strong></td>
<td><strong>(30,382,544)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONFER 62</strong></td>
<td><strong>(32,719)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUX 62</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,546,065</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUXILIARIES - STUDENT HOUSING</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,259,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>(11,259,210)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUXILIARIES - STUDENT CENTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,149,203</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUXILIARIES - STUDENT HEALTH CENTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,329,612</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AUXILIARIES - STUDENT REC CENTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,699,201</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,159,266</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted Plant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Self Funded/Auxiliaries - Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,315,007</strong></td>
<td><strong>(30,382,544)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AEP 18</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,605,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4,100,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,583,198)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RESERV 75</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,694,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>(6,721,015)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(6,721,015)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GASB 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,843,492</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted Plant - CSU-FC</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,143,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>(22,691,807)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Unrestricted Net Position - CSU-FC</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,352,239</strong></td>
<td><strong>(76,703,838)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(5,583,198)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colorado State University - Global Campus
Unrestricted Net Assets
Excluding Compensated Absences
as of June 30, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education &amp; General Funds</th>
<th>June 30, 2014 Unrestricted Net Assets with Compensated Absences</th>
<th>June 30, 2014 Unrestricted Net Assets without Compensated Absences</th>
<th>Commitments &amp; Encumbrances</th>
<th>Current Unrestricted Net Assets @ 06/30/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Fund</td>
<td>$24,386,873</td>
<td>$343,757</td>
<td>$24,730,630</td>
<td>$17,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; General Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,386,873</strong></td>
<td><strong>$343,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,730,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted Net Assets before adjustments</td>
<td>$24,386,873</td>
<td>$343,757</td>
<td>$24,730,630</td>
<td>$17,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 31 Adjustment for Unrealized Gain on Investments</td>
<td>$113,536</td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNRESTRICTED NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,273,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>$343,757</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,617,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
[1] Commitments & Encumbrances includes the $5.4 million transfer to CSU-Pueblo and $11.8 million as part of the accepted Higher Learning Commission financial viability strategy of maintaining a minimum of 3 months of annual expenses as a reserve.
Colorado State University - Pueblo
Unrestricted Net Assets
Excluding Compensated Absences
as of June 30, 2014 UNAUDITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30, 2014 Unrestricted Net Assets with Compensated Absences</th>
<th>June 30, 2014 Unrestricted Net Assets without Compensated Absences</th>
<th>Commitments &amp; Encumbrances</th>
<th>Current Unrestricted Net Assets @ 06/30/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Funds</td>
<td>$1,845,831</td>
<td>$1,215,926</td>
<td>$629,905</td>
<td>$629,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Technology Fees</td>
<td>$306,616</td>
<td>$306,616</td>
<td>$306,616</td>
<td>$306,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education &amp; General Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,152,447</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,215,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>$936,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>$936,521</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Funded/Auxiliary Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Funds, Mandatory Student Fees</td>
<td>$2,023,624</td>
<td>$47,331</td>
<td>$2,070,955</td>
<td>$993,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Funds - Self-Funded, Auxiliary</td>
<td>$3,540,181</td>
<td>$72,379</td>
<td>$3,612,560</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Funds - Self-Funded, Continuing Education</td>
<td>$1,291,870</td>
<td>$45,427</td>
<td>$1,297,297</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Funded/Auxiliary Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,815,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,137</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,980,812</strong></td>
<td>$993,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Endowment Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Stick</td>
<td>$5,300,795</td>
<td>$5,300,795</td>
<td>$5,300,795</td>
<td>$5,300,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTSC</td>
<td>$2,571,022</td>
<td>$2,571,022</td>
<td>$2,571,022</td>
<td>$2,571,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internally Restricted Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,871,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,871,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Plant Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital &amp; Renewal/Replacement Funds</td>
<td>$157,838</td>
<td>$157,838</td>
<td>$157,838</td>
<td>$157,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Plant Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$157,838</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$157,838</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Service Center Accounts</td>
<td>$998,685</td>
<td>$30,767</td>
<td>$1,029,452</td>
<td>$1,029,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal, State, Private, &amp; Scholarship Accounts</td>
<td>$(20,396)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(20,396)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service Accounts</td>
<td>$198,551</td>
<td>$198,551</td>
<td>$198,551</td>
<td>$198,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Auxiliary Accounts</td>
<td>$3,003,319</td>
<td>$4,429</td>
<td>$3,007,748</td>
<td>$3,007,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Construction Project Accounts</td>
<td>$14,289,745</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14,289,745</td>
<td>$14,289,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Accounts</td>
<td>$(243,568)</td>
<td>$89,631</td>
<td>$(153,937)</td>
<td>$(153,937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Clearing Accounts</td>
<td>$3,111</td>
<td>$3,111</td>
<td>$3,111</td>
<td>$3,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14 Audit Adjustment</td>
<td>$125,385</td>
<td>- $125,385</td>
<td>$125,385</td>
<td>- $125,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted Institutional Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,957,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>$124,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,082,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,082,557</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unrestricted Net Assets before adjustments</td>
<td>$30,650,613</td>
<td>$1,505,890</td>
<td>$32,156,503</td>
<td>$18,768,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 31 Adjustment for Unrealized Gain on Investments</td>
<td>$162,516</td>
<td>$162,516</td>
<td>$162,516</td>
<td>$162,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNRESTRICTED NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,488,097</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,505,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,993,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,768,941</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System (the "Board") of the State of Colorado met in regular open session, pursuant to due notice and call, at _____________ in Denver, Colorado, on December 4-5, 2014.

The following members of the Board were present constituting a quorum:

Chair: Dorothy Horrell

Voting Members: Dennis E. Flores
Mark A. Gustafson
Scott C. Johnson
William E. Mosher
Demetri E. “Rico” Munn
Jane Robbe Rhodes
Nancy R. Tuor
Joseph C. Zimlich

Non-Voting Members: Alexandra Bernasek
Robert Deemer
Samantha Guinn
Michael A. Mincic
Brad Schiffelbein
Timothy Zercher

Absent:

Also present:

Secretary: Scott C. Johnson

Thereupon the following proceedings, among others, were had and taken.

Member ________________ introduced and moved the adoption of the following resolution:
A RESOLUTION, FOR PURPOSES OF COMPLYING WITH REVENUE RULING 63-20, APPROVING THE PURPOSES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND APPROVING CERTAIN BORROWING TRANSACTIONS BY SAID FOUNDATION ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING EQUIPMENT TO BE USED BY AND FOR COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY - PUEBLO AND COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY – GLOBAL CAMPUS (THE "INSTITUTIONS"); AUTHORIZING CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INSTITUTIONS TO EXECUTE AND DELIVER LEASE AGREEMENTS RELATING TO SUCH EQUIPMENT; AND AUTHORIZING, APPROVING AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER DETAILS RELATING TO THE FOREGOING.

WHEREAS, the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System (the "Board") of the State of Colorado (the "State") is the body corporate under the Constitution and laws of the State, and pursuant to said Constitution and Article 30 of Title 23, Colorado Revised Statutes, as amended, the Board has the power to take, hold and sell personal property and to contract and be contracted with and cause to be done all things necessary to carry out the provisions of such statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Board has general control and supervision of Colorado State University ("CSU"), in Fort Collins, Colorado, Colorado State University – Pueblo ("CSU-Pueblo") in Pueblo, Colorado and Colorado State University – Global Campus ("CSU-Global") in Greenwood Village, Colorado (together, CSU, CSU-Pueblo and CSU-Global are herein referred to as the "Institutions"); and

WHEREAS, the Colorado State University Research Foundation (the "Foundation") is a non-profit corporation organized for charitable, educational and scientific purposes, including among other purposes, entering into agreements relating to the physical plants of the Institutions and for that purpose lending its credit and evidencing the same by such obligations or forms of indebtedness as may be approved by the Foundation's Board of Trustees (the "Trustees"); and

WHEREAS, the Trustees have authorized, or, prior to the making of any draw thereunder, will authorize, the Foundation to enter into a line of credit agreement with First National Bank of Fort Collins, N.A., Fort Collins, Colorado (the "Bank") to obtain a line of credit (the "Line of Credit") in order for the Foundation to finance the acquisition of equipment to be used by and for the Institutions; and

WHEREAS, there have been filed with the Secretary of the Board:

(i) The articles of incorporation and bylaws of the Foundation;
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(ii) Proposed forms of "Business Loan Agreement: Line of Credit" and "Revolving Loan Committal Agreement" (collectively, the "Line of Credit Agreements") between the Foundation and the Bank;

(iii) A proposed form of security agreement (the "Security Agreement") between the Foundation and the Bank;

(iv) A proposed form of Promissory Note (together with any extension or renewals thereof, the "Note") from the Foundation to the Bank; and

(v) A proposed form of lease agreement ("Lease Agreement") between the Board as lessee and the Foundation as lessor.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF THE STATE OF COLORADO:

Section 1. The Board hereby approves the purposes and activities of the Foundation.

Section 2. For purposes of satisfying the requirements of Revenue Ruling 63-20, 1963-1 C.B. 24, the Board hereby approves the Line of Credit Agreements, the Security Agreement and the Note, in substantially the forms filed with the Secretary, and the Board hereby approves the execution and delivery by the Foundation of the Line of Credit Agreements, the Security Agreement and the Note and the issuance by the Foundation, on behalf of the Board, of the Note (provided, however, that the Board shall have no obligation to make any payment on the Note, which shall be solely the obligation of the Foundation, and the Board shall be obligated only to the extent provided under Lease Agreements entered into by the Board as provided in Section 3 hereof). The Foundation may make draws on the Line of Credit and thereby incur obligations to make payments on the Note from time to time, within one calendar year following the adoption of this resolution by the Board, but only for purposes of acquiring tangible personal property consisting of scientific, administrative support and research equipment to be used by and for the Institutions (the "Equipment"), and only with the written approval of the President or authorized delegate of CSU for Lease Agreements relating to CSU, the President or authorized delegate of CSU-Pueblo for Lease Agreements relating to CSU-Pueblo and the President or authorized delegate of CSU-Global Campus for Lease Agreements relating to CSU-Global Campus (together, referred to herein as the "Representatives" or, individually, a "Representative"), which written approval may be made by the execution of the corresponding Lease Agreement or in such other manner as the respective Representative may deem appropriate. Subject to the foregoing provision, the Note is hereby approved in a total principal amount not to exceed $1,000,000 outstanding at any time (the unused loan commitment being increased by repayments on the Note as provided therein), bearing interest at a rate determined in accordance with the provisions of the Note and the Line of Credit Agreements but in no event to exceed eighteen percent (18%) per annum, and maturing on the calendar anniversary of the date on which it is executed and delivered by the Foundation (but no later than December 31, 2015).
Section 3. Requests for Equipment to be financed through the Line of Credit shall be submitted to the respective Representative of the Institution requesting the Equipment. Upon approval of any such request, such Representative is authorized and directed to cause a Lease Agreement to be entered into for such Equipment on behalf of the respective Institution. Upon execution and delivery of such Lease Agreement to the Foundation, the Foundation shall draw on the Line of Credit for the amount necessary to acquire such Equipment, which moneys shall be used to acquire such Equipment as soon as practicable; and the Board shall pay to the Foundation, from legally available moneys of the Board (but not from moneys drawn under the Line of Credit) an amount equal to the greater of $800 or 4% of the amount so drawn, as compensation for the Foundation's administrative expenses and services in connection with the Line of Credit. Payments under a Lease Agreement shall be made from the Board to the Foundation either quarterly or semiannually, as negotiated between the Representative of the Institution on behalf of which the Lease Agreement has been entered and the Foundation, over a term to be negotiated between such Representative and the Foundation, but not exceeding the useful life of the Equipment (as determined by such Representative), and in no event to exceed five (5) years (subject, however, to the provisions of Section 7 of the Lease Agreement), and in such amounts as to provide for repayment of the principal amount drawn under the Line of Credit for such equipment, plus interest at rates to be determined as follows:

(a) The initial rate of interest for Lease Agreements to be entered into during calendar year 2014, which rate shall be effective for each such Lease Agreement from the date of delivery thereof through December 31, 2015, shall be 4.75% per annum (subject to increase as provided in paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) below).

(b) During the month of December in 2014 and in each subsequent year while any Lease Agreements are in effect, the Foundation shall, based upon information furnished to it by the Bank and such other information as the Foundation may deem relevant, estimate the Average Rate of interest expected to accrue on the Note, in accordance with the current or anticipated terms of the Line of Credit Agreements, during the following calendar year. The Foundation shall notify the Board of such estimated average rate of interest on the Note, and the rate of interest for Lease Agreements to be effective during the following calendar year shall be such estimated average rate of interest on the Note plus .5% per annum (the .5% increment being added to provide for the possibility that interest on the Note will be higher than estimated).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of (b) above, the increment which is to be added to the estimated average interest on the Note to determine the rate of interest on Lease Agreements may be higher than .5% per annum to the extent that the Foundation certifies to the Board that such higher increment is necessary to make up, over the course of the following calendar year or such longer period as the Foundation may agree to, any excess of interest actually paid by the Foundation on the Note over the total interest received by the Foundation on the Lease Agreements; provided, however, that the higher increment certified to the Board shall not exceed 1.5% per annum.
(d) In the event that the rate of interest on the Note is increased as the result of a determination that such interest has lost its exclusion from gross income for federal income tax purposes under the Code (as defined in Section 7 hereof), or is treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals and corporations (except with respect to corporations, as such interest is required to be taken into account in determining "adjusted current earnings" for the purpose of computing the alternative minimum tax imposed on such corporations), the rate of interest on the Lease Agreements shall immediately be further increased to the average rate of interest expected to accrue on the Note for the remainder of such calendar year on such "taxable" basis, as estimated by the Foundation in substantially the same manner as provided in paragraph (a) above, plus the increment in effect immediately prior to such increase as determined pursuant to paragraphs (b) and (c) above, plus any additional increment necessary to make up, over the course of the remaining calendar year or such longer period as the Foundation may agree to, any retroactive additional interest owed or paid by the Foundation to the Bank pursuant to the Note as a result of such determination.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the rate of interest on the Lease Agreement shall not exceed eighteen percent (18%) per annum. Notwithstanding any other provision thereof, all payment obligations of the Board under any Lease Agreement shall be subject to renewal and appropriation or availability of funds as provided in Sections 7 and 10 of the Lease Agreement. The Lease Agreements shall be in substantially the form filed with the Secretary, and the appropriate Officers of the Board, the Institutions and the State are hereby authorized to execute and deliver such Lease Agreements as may be approved by the Representatives or any one thereof. Any other obligations issued by the Foundation either to make improvements to the Equipment or to pay principal or interest on the Note will be discharged no later than the latest maturity date of the Note (including renewals).

Section 4. The Board shall have the exclusive beneficial possession and use of any Equipment financed through the Line of Credit (except to the extent that the Bank may enforce its security interest in the Equipment in the event of a default by the Foundation under the Line of Credit Agreements, the Security Agreement, or the Note, and subject to the Bank's right to inspect the Equipment at any reasonable time as provided in the Line of Credit Agreements). When all payments due under a Lease Agreement have been made by the Board, or when payments on the Note allocable to the draw on the Line of Credit for the related Equipment have otherwise been made, full and unencumbered legal title to such Equipment shall be conveyed by the Foundation to the Board, without demand or further action on the part of the Board, and the Board shall then accept such title to any Equipment (including any additions thereto). This Section 4 shall operate independently of the Lease Agreements and notwithstanding any failure to enter validly into any Lease Agreement. Prior to making any draw under the Line of Credit, the Foundation shall furnish to the respective Representative an instrument of grant from the Foundation to the Board confirming the provisions of this Section 4.
Section 5. All proceeds of the Line of Credit, and investment income thereon (if any), shall be used to provide tangible personal property for use by the Board. If any excess proceeds of the Line of Credit or investment income thereon, if any, remain after full payment of the costs of acquiring the related Equipment, such excess proceeds shall be applied to make payments or prepayments on the Note as soon as practicable, and the schedule of rental payments under the corresponding Lease Agreement shall be adjusted accordingly. Prior to making any draw under the Line of Credit, the Foundation shall furnish to the respective Representative a certification confirming the provisions of this Section 5.

Section 6. The proceeds of any fire or other casualty insurance policies received in connection with damage to or destruction of any Equipment financed through the Line of Credit, including any additions thereto, will, subject to any claims of the Bank, at the direction of the respective Representative, either (a) be used to repair or replace the Equipment, regardless of whether the insurance proceeds are sufficient for such repair or replacement, or (b) be remitted to the Board.

Section 7. The Board acknowledges that one of the purposes of this resolution is to establish that interest paid by the Foundation on the Note is not included in gross income under present federal income tax laws pursuant to the Code (as defined below), subject to certain exceptions, conditions and limitations as further set forth below, thereby resulting in more favorable interest rates on the Note and more favorable payment terms to the Board under the Lease Agreements. Accordingly, the Board hereby covenants for the benefit of the Bank and its successor and assigns that it will not (i) make any use of the proceeds of the Line of Credit or any other funds of the Foundation; (ii) make any use of the Equipment; or (iii) take (or omit to take) any action with respect to the Note, the proceeds of the Line of Credit, any other funds of the Foundation, or the equipment, or otherwise, if such use, action or omission would, under the Code, cause the interest on the Note to be included in gross income for federal income tax purposes or be treated as an item of tax preference for purposes of the federal alternative minimum tax imposed on individuals, trusts, estates and corporations (except, with respect to corporations as defined for federal alternative minimum tax purposes, as such interest is taken into account in determining adjusted current earnings for purposes of computing the alternative minimum tax imposed on such corporations). The Board further covenants, represents and warrants that the procedures set forth in a Federal Tax Exemption certificate hereby authorized to be signed by an Officer of the Board or Representative of the Institution implementing the above covenant shall be complied with to the extent necessary to maintain the above-described exclusions from gross income and alternative minimum taxable income or to avoid the application of any penalties under the Code (except to the extent noted in the foregoing provisions of this Section). The foregoing covenants shall remain in full force and effect notwithstanding the payment in full or defeasance of the Note until the date on which all obligations of the Board in fulfilling the above covenants under the Code and Colorado law have been met. References to the "Code" in the foregoing covenant and in Section 3(d) hereof shall mean the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and all regulations and rulings promulgated or proposed thereunder or (to the extent the same remain applicable) under any predecessor thereto.
Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, this Section 7 shall be in all respects subject to the Board's right to decline to renew any Lease Agreement as provided in Sections 7 and 10 of the Lease Agreement. Prior to making any draw under the Line of Credit, the Foundation shall have received from the respective Representative a certification confirming the provisions of this Section 7.

Section 8. Appropriate Officers of the Board, the Institutions, the State and the Foundation are hereby authorized and directed to execute such documents and instruments and generally to take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the transactions contemplated by this resolution. The Officers of the Board, the Institutions and the Foundation with the advice of counsel executing the Line of Credit Agreements and the Lease Agreements hereby approved may make such necessary or appropriate variations, omissions and insertions in such documents as may be required or appropriate under the circumstances, so long as such variations, omissions and insertions are not inconsistent with this resolution. In the event of any inconsistency between this resolution and any document or instrument hereby approved, the provision of this resolution shall be controlling.

Section 9. If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this resolution.

Section 10. All bylaws, orders and resolutions, or parts thereof, inconsistent with this resolution or with any of the documents hereby approved, are hereby repealed only to the extent of such inconsistency. This repealer shall not be construed as reviving any bylaw, order or resolution, or part thereof, heretofore repealed.

Section 11. This resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage and adoption.

PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED this December ________, 2014.

(SEAL) THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

______________________________
Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Secretary
The motion was duly seconded by Member ________________ and put to a vote, the members of the Board as follows:

Those voting YES:

Voting Members:  

Those voting NO:

Thereupon the Chairman declared the motion carried and the resolution adopted, and the Secretary was directed to enter the foregoing proceedings and resolution upon the minutes of the Board.

After consideration of other unrelated matters, the meeting was adjourned.

(SEAL)  

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
OF THE COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM  

______________________________  
Chair  

ATTEST:  

Secretary  

STATE OF COLORADO  )   ) ss.  
COUNTY OF LARIMER  )
I, Scott C. Johnson, Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System of the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 8, inclusive, constitute a true, correct and complete copy of the resolution and proceedings set forth therein; that such resolution was adopted and such proceedings occurred at a regular meeting of the Board held at ________________ in Denver, Colorado on December 4-5, 2014 as recorded in the regular official records of proceedings of the Board, kept in my office; that said proceedings were duly had and taken; and that said meeting was duly held in compliance with Section 24-6-402 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, as amended, and the persons therein named were present and voted at said meeting, all as therein shown.

WITNESS, my hand and the seal of the Board this December _____, 2014.

______________________________
Secretary
Board of Governors of the
Colorado State University System
(SEAL)
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

EQUIPMENT LEASING-COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM/COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH FOUNDATION LINE OF CREDIT PROGRAM

Approval of resolution for Colorado State University Research Foundation to Undertake Certain Borrowing and Equipment Lease/Purchase Transactions on Behalf of the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System to Acquire Equipment at Colorado State University, Colorado State University – Pueblo and Colorado State University – Global Campus.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approval of the attached resolution.

EXPLANATION:

Submitted by: Dr. Anthony A. Frank, President

For several years Colorado State University Research Foundation (CSURF) has held a Line of Credit (with a tax-exempt interest rate) with First National Bank of Fort Collins, for the purpose of providing a lease/purchase mechanism for the Board of Governor's to acquire much needed equipment for use in departments/programs at Colorado State University, Colorado State University – Pueblo and CSU-Global Campus. CSURF acquires the equipment (valued at $50,000 or less) (specified by a particular department or program) and leases it to the Board of Governors on an annual appropriation basis for a term of not more than five (5) 1-year periods. The Board of Governors makes lease payments to CSURF which CSURF then uses to repay First National Bank. When the lease is retired, and the equipment amount has been fully paid, CSURF conveys title on the equipment to the Board of Governors. The Board of Governors has been provided a quarterly activity report on the CSURF leases since the program's inception. Such reporting will continue in the future.

Approval to continue the lease/purchase arrangements through the line of credit must be obtained from the Board of Governors yearly. The total amount of the line of credit permitted to be outstanding at any time is $1,000,000. Amounts previously drawn under the Line and currently outstanding total approximately $274,452. Therefore, moneys available under the Line for calendar year 2015 are approximately $725,548. CSURF will consult with the respective representatives of each Institution to discuss needs and allocations of available amounts.
The total amount financed through the Leasing Program in thousands of dollars by year is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Dave Scott of Hogan Lovells will be providing the tax exempt opinion on the 2015 Line of Credit. In order to comply with the applicable federal tax requirements for an "on behalf of" financing in support of the tax exempt opinion, the attached resolution must be approved by the Board of Governors. The attached resolution and accompanying documents referenced in the resolution have been reviewed by the Board of Governors General Counsel.
Section 3

Evaluation Committee

This section intentionally left blank
Section 4

Academic and Student Affairs Committee
I. New Degree Programs

Colorado State University
  • none

Colorado State University-Global Campus
  • none

Colorado State University-Pueblo
  • none

II. Miscellaneous Items

Colorado State University
  • Sabbatical Requests for 2015-2016
  • Program Review Summary
  • Faculty Manual Change – Section C.2.3.1.e (consent)
  • Faculty Manual Change – Section D.7.20 (consent)
  • Posthumous Degree (consent)

Colorado State University-Global Campus
  • none

Colorado State University-Pueblo
  • Sabbatical Requests for 2015-2016
  • Program Review Summary
  • Academic Calendar – 2015-2016 (consent)

III. Campus Reports

Colorado State University-Fort Collins
  • Enrollment Report

Colorado State University-Global Campus
  • Enrollment Report

Colorado State University-Pueblo
  • Enrollment Report
REPORT ITEM:

Report: Sabbatical Requests Approved for AY 2015-2016

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Rick Miranda, Provost and Executive Vice President

The purpose of sabbatical leave is to enhance the faculty member’s professional growth, enhance the institution’s reputation and the students’ educational experience at the institution, and increase the overall level of knowledge in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

The recommendations for sabbatical leave have been reviewed at the Department, College, and University levels and have received approval at each level. In every case, the proposal has been evaluated and judged appropriate with strict adherence to CCHE guidelines. As delegated by the Board of Governors, Dr. Tony Frank, President, has approved all of these sabbatical leaves.
Requests were received for 63 Sabbatical Leaves to be taken during the academic year 2015-2016.

The College of Agricultural Sciences had four requests. One of them is for a full year sabbatical, two are for fall semester only, and one is for the spring semester only. One of the sabbaticals will be conducted on campus, two will be conducted off campus, and one will take place both on and off campus.

The College of Business had eleven requests. Three of these are for full year sabbaticals, three are for the fall semester only, and five are for the spring semester only. Eight of the sabbaticals will be conducted off-campus and three will take place in part on campus and in part off campus.

The College of Engineering had ten requests. Eight of these are for the full academic year, one is for the fall semester only, and one is for the spring semester only. Nine of the sabbaticals will take place off-campus and one will take place in part on campus and in part off campus.

The College of Health and Human Sciences had three requests. Two of these are for the full academic year and one is for the fall semester only. Two will take place off campus and one will be conducted both on and off campus.

The College of Liberal Arts had sixteen requests. Two of these are for the full academic year, seven are for the fall semester only, and seven are for the spring semester only. Fourteen sabbaticals will be off campus and two will have time spent both on and off campus.

The College of Natural Sciences had fifteen requests. Ten of these are for the full academic year, four are for fall semester only, and one is for spring semester only. All of these sabbaticals will be off campus.

Warner College of Natural Resources had three requests. All three of these are for the full academic year. All of these sabbaticals will be off campus.

The College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences had one request. This request is for the full academic year and will be spent off campus.

This number of sabbatical leave requests is slightly less than last year, but is somewhat higher than in the past as indicated in the table below. This might be attributable to the timing of faculty hires over the past several years. Another factor might be the change in the economic climate of the state and the university.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVMBS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCNR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following sabbatical requests have been approved for the 2015-2016 Academic Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bauerle, William</td>
<td>Horticulture and Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enns, R. Mark</td>
<td>Animal Sciences</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graff, Gregory</td>
<td>Agricultural and Resource Economics</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham, Jay</td>
<td>Soil and Crop Sciences</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Thomas</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder, John</td>
<td>Finance and Real Estate</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugate, Brian</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxmeier, John</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Kathleen</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutcher, Lisa</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miao, Hong</td>
<td>Finance and Real Estate</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumford, Troy</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Patricia</td>
<td>Finance and Real Estate</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarason, Yolanda</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Charles</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Proposed Leave Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Travis</td>
<td>Chemical and Biological Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bledsoe, Brian</td>
<td>Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchese, Anthony</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notaros, Branislav</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasad, Ashok</td>
<td>Chemical and Biological Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puttlitz, Christian</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, David</td>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van den Heever, Susan</td>
<td>Atmospheric Science</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venayagamoorthy, Subhas</td>
<td>Civil and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Peter</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Health and Human Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daunhauer, Lisa</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Studies</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Juyeon</td>
<td>Design and Merchandising</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Wendy</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Liberal Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Karrin</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon, Joel</td>
<td>Music, Theatre, and Dance</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bubar, Roe</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delahunty, Gerald</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMirjyn, Maricela</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Proposed Leave Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiege, Mark</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glantz, Michelle</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallahan, Kirk</td>
<td>Journalism and Technical Communication</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hentschell, Roze</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Price</td>
<td>Music, Theatre, and Dance</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenney, Wes</td>
<td>Music, Theatre, and Dance</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGasse, Blythe</td>
<td>Music, Theatre, and Dance</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald, Bradley</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opp, Jaclyn Susan Marie</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavanik, Daniele</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasudevan, Ramaa</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Natural Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloise-Young, Patricia</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Charles</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalieri, Renzo</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Chaoping</td>
<td>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funk, W. Chris</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry, Kimberly</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Chihoon</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Myung Hee</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
### Meeting Date – December 5, 2014
### Report Item

#### Colorado State University Fort Collins – Sabbatical Leave Request Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medford, June</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papadopoulos, Christos</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilon, Marinus</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilon-Smits, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szamel, Grzegorz</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volbrecht, Vicki</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Warner College of Natural Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Larissa</td>
<td>Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronayne, Michael</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittemyer, George</td>
<td>Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duncan, Colleen</td>
<td>Microbiology, Immunology, and Pathology</td>
<td>AY 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sabbatical Leave Requests for AY 2014-2015

The following sabbatical request has been approved for the 2014-2015 Academic Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Proposed Leave Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troxell, Wade</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>AY 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Report Item: Program Review Summary

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President

Colorado State University, as per the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (section C.2.4.2.2.d) and in accordance with expectations set forth by the Higher Learning Commission (our regional accreditor), conducts periodic quality reviews of our academic degree/certificate programs. The purpose of the academic program reviews is twofold: 1) to assess the quality of the degree/certificate program and 2) to assess the operation efficiency and effectiveness of the program in order to maintain and improve productivity.
Colorado State University Academic Program Reviews: 2013-14

Academic degree/certificate programs are reviewed at six-to-seven year intervals on a rotating basis. In 2013-14, the following ten programs, including 30 academic degrees, were reviewed:

- College of Agriculture
  - Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management
- College of Liberal Arts
  - Interdisciplinary and International Liberal Arts Interdepartmental degrees
- College of Natural Sciences
  - Chemistry
  - Physics
  - Psychology
  - Natural Sciences Interdepartmental degree
- Warner College of Natural Resources
  - Ecosystem Science and Sustainability
  - Fish, Wildlife and Conservation Biology
  - Geosciences
  - Human Dimensions of Natural Resources

Process

In order to assess program quality, evidence of student learning is foundational to every program review. Each degree/certificate program is requested to identify a minimum of four student-learning outcome goals that identify the knowledge, skills, and behaviors that students are expected to acquire by the time of graduation. A combination of direct and indirect measures is assembled and results are analyzed as evidence of student learning. Additionally, each program identifies outcome objectives (aka placement outcomes) in order to demonstrate the contributions that graduates are making to the workforce and society at large. The contribution of co-curricular experiences on student learning is also evaluated as part of the review. All of the degree programs reviewed in this cycle provided evidence to validate that they provide high quality educational opportunities. Further, each program has thoughtful ideas of how to use their results to inform their continuous improvement.

Review of operational characteristics of each department or program is supported with comprehensive data from the Office of Institutional Research. These data are related to student success (retention and graduation); staffing; teaching effort (course, credits, and enrollment); research accomplishments; outreach and service activities; budgets; and student demographics (http://www.ir.colostate.edu/). Programs are encouraged to supplement these data with peer comparisons and qualitative approaches.
For the 2013-14 cycle of program reviews, the University licensed Campus Labs’ Program Review application to provide a common template and reporting platform, replacing PRISM which had been utilized for 10 years. The template was evaluated and updated by an ad hoc committee to make the process more efficient and effective for programs to use.

Each program appointed a Review Committee of no less than three faculty members to draft a self-study. After completing the self-study, a unique University Review Committee was appointed for each program, consisting of three faculty members from outside the college of the program undergoing review and several administrators, as appropriate, representing the Offices of the Provost, Vice President for Research, and Vice President for Engagement. University Review Committee members provided comments and sought clarification of the self-study. A discussion was held to focus on strategies to improve the effectiveness of the program.

Provost’s Program Review Awards

Beginning in Spring 2012, the Provost initiated an awards program to recognize and incentivize continuous improvement by providing one-time funds to support quality initiatives that emerge from the process. In this review cycle, departments submitted two-page proposals that were reviewed by the Office of the Provost. The Provost awarded $149,216 in FY15 as follows:

- **Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management:** Expanding the 4+1 B.S.+M.S. Program in Pest Management. $20,000
- **Interdisciplinary and International Liberal Arts Interdepartmental degrees:** Course development, redesign, and programmatic changes. $19,500
- **Chemistry:** CHEM112/114 laboratory course modifications, instructor or GTA salary; Undergraduate course development, salary and supplies. $19,000
- **Physics:** GTA Support, Improved GTA training. $5,000
- **Natural Sciences Interdepartmental degree:** Develop a STEM Teacher Club and Alumni Relations System. $16,500
- **Ecosystem Science and Sustainability:** Integration of co-curricular learning experiences. $17,000
- **Fish, Wildlife and Conservation Biology:** Increasing Student Diversity in the Department. $23,716
- **Geosciences:** Development of a Highly Interactive, Media-Rich, and Broad-appeal Introductory Geology On-Line Course (video equipment and production costs). $15,000
- **Human Dimensions of Natural Resources:** GRA support for instructional innovation. $13,500

Colorado State University Fort Collins – Program Review Summary
The Executive Summaries of the 2013-2014 Program Reviews follow.

Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management

Mission

The Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management focuses its teaching, research and outreach missions in four program areas each of which involves all three of the Department’s disciplinary roots in entomology, plant pathology, and weed science. These programs are: 1) Genomics and Molecular Biology, 2) Ecology and Biodiversity, 3) Biology and Management of Invasive Species, and 4) Integrated Pest Management. We emphasize knowledge of pests and related organisms and the roles that they play in ecological, economic and social systems and the application of such knowledge to developing economically and environmentally sound solutions for practical problems. Being interdisciplinary in nature, the Department values cooperative and collaborative efforts with other units within the University, as well as other relevant entities in the State and beyond. The Department plays a critical role in addressing many of the College of Agricultural Sciences priorities, particularly those in: 1) Fundamental research in the mechanisms of plant biology, biotechnology, molecular biology, plant genetics, and genomics of crop plants, and their pests and pathogens. 2) Fundamental and applied research and outreach on cropping systems. And 3) Fundamental and applied research and outreach related to landscapes designed and managed to enhance the environment in and around where people live, work, and recreate. In addition, the Department is heavily involved in supporting the broader life sciences curriculum at Colorado State University. In the broadest sense we teach and serve all of those affected by insects, plant pathogens, and weeds and those desiring knowledge of their biology, ecology, and management. Those served include Colorado State University students, other faculty, extension personnel, commodity groups, agricultural industries, and many other state and regional entities.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Bioagricultural Sciences - M.S.
  - Entomology Specialization
  - Pest Management Specialization (Plan B only)
  - Plant Pathology Specialization
  - Weed Science Specialization
- Bioagricultural Sciences - Ph.D.
  - Entomology Specialization
  - Plant Pathology Specialization
  - Weed Science Specialization
Program challenges and opportunities:

The department continues to strive for a balanced undergraduate and graduate education /research/outreach/engagement effort based in the department’s disciplinary roots of entomology, plant pathology, and weed science and focused in the four crosscutting areas of program emphasis: 1) Genomics and Molecular Biology, 2) Ecology and Biodiversity, 3) Biology and Management of Invasive Species, and 4) Integrated Pest Management. The department has 13 faculty who are 59 and older. This group contains some of the best, most experienced teachers, research leaders, and engagement professionals. Many play key roles in the undergraduate teaching program. Careful attention to recruiting, hiring, and mentoring the next generation of outstanding, committed department faculty members is critical. Of special concern in striving for balance is access to funding through the differential tuition model, to sustain and enhance undergraduate programming. Currently, there is uncertainty about the distribution of these funds back to departments that have made heavy commitments (such as BSPM) to teach large numbers of first and second year undergraduates who are not majoring within the department. While BSPM is committed to enhancing performance in aspects of its mission, special emphasis is focused on engaging additional students in the Plan B Masters program in pest management. The target is to graduate 20 students per year within 5 years. Students in this program pursue B.S. degrees in either Soil and Crop Sciences or Horticulture and Landscape Architecture. They also begin taking graduate courses while still working on their B.S. degrees. Through careful course selection, they can attain both a B.S. and a M.S. in 5 years. Challenges include: communicating the unique opportunities provided by this program to potential students, successfully encouraging them to enroll, and finding ways to devote sufficient personnel time to advising the additional students. BSPM has substantial unmet facilities needs including: 1) adequate, permanent facilities for the C. P. Gillette Museum of Arthropod Diversity, 2) replacement or renovation of the Weed Research Laboratory and the Insectary (both faculty offices and research laboratories), and 3) expanded faculty office and research laboratory space, generally.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
College of Liberal Arts interdepartmental majors

Mission:

The Liberal Arts interdepartmental majors conform exactly to the College of Liberal Arts’ mission to offer instructional programs that "provide an understanding of people, their cultures, histories, literatures, philosophies, media, and arts; knowledge of their social, political, economic, and environmental systems; skills of critical thinking and communication; and attitudes appropriate to its academic disciplines." The College mission specifically calls for interdisciplinary programs, such as Interdisciplinary Studies and International Studies that enhance student recruitment and retention.

The Liberal Arts interdepartmental academic programs are as follows:

- Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts - B.A.
  - Arts and Humanities and Engineering Science Concentration
  - Social Sciences and Engineering Science Concentration
- International Studies - B.A.
  - Asian Studies Concentration
  - European Studies Concentration
  - Latin American Studies Concentration
  - Middle East and North African Studies Concentration

Program challenges and opportunities:

Interdisciplinary Liberal Arts program:

- Institute Outcomes Mechanisms for (a) post graduation success and (b) program satisfaction.
- Build a stronger and more lasting relationship with students in the major after graduation.
- Re-investing our current curriculum with a stronger (and clearer) presence (and identity) revolving around the value and benefit of an interdisciplinary approach to knowledge, practice, problem-solving and policy.
- Identifying courses now being offered by Liberal Arts departments that focus on interdisciplinary approaches and practices from inside a disciplinary boundary.
- Create a process for establishing a greater presence of our major among existing departments while building more formalized associations with each, where appropriate or beneficial.
- Introduce into our curriculum a student portfolio model that (a) identifies and lists milestones and (b) tracks a student's progress and performance (of core liberal arts skill-sets) in the capstone seminar.
International Studies program:

- Improve outcomes mechanisms for post-graduation success and program satisfaction.
- Build alumni relations.
- Update and expand International Studies course offerings and curriculum, and ensure regular and consistent course scheduling.
- Create collaborative initiatives and joint degree programs with other departments, colleges and programs throughout the University.
- Add a non-concentration International / Global Studies major option.
- Add an “Education Abroad or Service-Learning” requirement for INST majors.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Chemistry

Mission:

The Chemistry Department’s mission is to provide a central asset in chemistry education, chemical and molecular research, and service to the University and the broader community. We accomplish this mission by engaging in innovative activities that drive world-class basic and translational chemical research, and by training the next generation of chemistry-based innovators. We also seek to position ourselves as a premier center for chemistry education in the Rocky Mountain region.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Chemistry - M.S.
  - ACS Certified Concentration
  - Non-ACS Certified Concentration
- Chemistry - M.S.
- Chemistry - Ph.D.

Program challenges and opportunities:

- **Expand and improve undergraduate course offerings**, both lecture and laboratory. We seek to continue recently developed courses in the chemistry of addictions, nanoscience, and the environment, while adding those in chemical biology and sustainability. We also aim to improve the experience in existing courses by increasing GTA support for things like recitation sections (General Chemistry, Organic Chemistry) and curriculum development (lab offerings, online courses). Accomplishing this will require adding tenure track faculty (both in general and specifically in emerging areas like Chemical Biology and Materials Chemistry) and increasing the GTA base to allow for additional assignments.

- **Increase assignable research space.** Our building is old, crowded, and staggeringly energy inefficient. A 2013 survey of 13 regional departments from the Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA) reported an average research space allocation of 3,737 feet per tenure-track faculty member, which is 17% higher than our current number of 3,185. Average total space was 29% higher than ours. What is required, simply put, is the political and financial commitment to a new Chemistry building.

- **Hire tenure track faculty in emerging areas.** In addition to supporting curriculum diversification, faculty hiring in emerging disciplines (e.g., chemical biology, environmental/sustainability) will allow us to keep up with modern trends in research funding and market opportunities for graduates. Given the parallel need for maintaining a firm fundamental foundation, we anticipate that new faculty lines will be required.
• **Increase the graduate student population and associated GTA support.** Examination of recent MASUA data demonstrates a strong (and intuitively unsurprising) correlation between the number of graduate students per tenure-track faculty member and the associated per-capita research grant dollars. Meanwhile, the average weekly commitment per GTA assignment is 15.9 hours across the entire dataset, and only 13.3 hours amongst schools also on the Board of Governors CSU peer institution list. Our average commitment is 20.0 hours, meaning our GTAs are significantly overworked compared to field norms. Thus there is a dramatic need to increase the graduate student population.

• **Increase research productivity.** Although this is a clear department strength, we seek to continue and improve upon our research productivity. This will require increasing the graduate student population, stretching increasingly precious research dollars by increasing GTA support (MASUA departments have ~55-60% of grad students supported as GTAs on average), hiring more administrative support staff, and reducing the student credit hours per faculty member.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Physics

The Mission of the Department of Physics is:

- to conduct high-quality research and to increase national and international recognition as a department committed to excellence in research,
- to graduate highly competent, well-educated students at all degree levels,
- to teach high-quality service courses matched to the needs of students in other disciplines, and
- to provide professional services to the people of Colorado.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Physics - B.S.
  - Applied Physics Concentration
  - Physics Concentration
- Physics - M.S.
- Physics - Ph.D.

Program challenges and opportunities:

Current enrollments put us at the limit of our capacity in the service courses. Accommodating the expected enrollment growth in the University will require significant additional faculty, teaching assistants, and space for classrooms, teaching laboratories and research laboratories. The laboratory nature of most of our courses exacerbates the challenges. Hiring additional faculty as retirements occur and for expansion will require millions of dollars of startup packages as well as salary money. The Department is developing faculty hiring plans that will build on these strengths.

New initiatives:

1. new, enlarged undergraduate study area,
2. increase support of undergraduate Women in Physics Organization,
3. send representatives, students and faculty, to Women in Physics conferences,
4. improve the lecture demonstration room,
5. improve tracking of alums, and
6. introduce two new undergraduate classes: Analytic Techniques for Problem Solving, and Chaos.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Psychology

Mission:

- The Department of Psychology at Colorado State University is committed to offering psychology-related education, research, and outreach in response to the needs of the people of Colorado, the nation and the world. The Department teaches the methodology and core knowledge of academic psychology to undergraduates. It educates and trains graduate students in the general principles and concepts of psychology and also provides them with specialized expertise in applied social and health psychology, cognitive psychology, counseling psychology, industrial/organizational psychology, or cognitive neuroscience.
- The undergraduate curriculum covers the primary topic areas of psychology. Teaching methods include classroom presentations, experiential learning, and supervised independent study. The Department provides undergraduates experiences in the areas of psychological research and professional skill development. Department faculty members strive to provide personal support and quality advising to students. Psychology baccalaureate graduates receive a sound, liberal arts education grounded in the natural sciences, including preparation for graduate training in psychology. Graduates are expected to demonstrate historical literacy of psychology in the form of knowledge of major historical figures, theories, events, and systems; written communication skills in the form of clear outline, logical composition, good grammar, and accurate punctuation; and abilities to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate material in written reports related to psychology topics.
- Graduate education in the Department of Psychology is responsive to the general educational guidelines outlined by the American Psychological Association. Each graduate training program is primarily designed and executed by that program’s faculty, but all graduate students are required to demonstrate broad core competence in the field of psychology. Graduate training emphasizes providing a strong foundation in psychology as a science for students aiming to become researchers, academicians, and/or practitioners. The Department encourages and supports innovative research and scholarship by faculty and students. Conducting research on basic and applied questions relevant to the biological, social, and psychological functioning and well-being of humans and nonhumans is critical to our mission. Such research occurs in an atmosphere of free inquiry, rigorous science, and adherence to ethical guidelines.
- The Department recruits faculty who demonstrate a high degree of professional promise. It maintains a climate conducive to personal and departmental advancement. Department faculty members strive for excellence in teaching, research, and outreach that supports the success of all individuals in a global and multicultural society. Faculty strive for positions of leadership and for betterment of the community at a multitude of levels: the University, the state, the profession, the nation, and the world.
The department offers the following academic programs:

- Psychology - B.S.
  - General Psychology Concentration
  - Industrial/Organizational Psychology Concentration
  - Mind, Brain, and Behavior Concentration
- Psychology - M.S.
- Applied Industrial/Organizational Psychology - M.A.I.O.P.
- Psychology - Ph.D.

Program challenges and opportunities:

1. Effectively manage the number of new majors given space and budget constraints; improve overall student:faculty ratios.
2. Grow the online B.S. and M.S. programs both in terms of quantity and quality.
3. Continue to recruit and hire research faculty who have a demonstrated capacity to obtain external funding.
4. Continue to develop the Science of Learning initiative in a way that supports the university core curriculum and student retention initiatives.
5. Expand alumni network and create an endowed chair or professorship.
Executive Summary

Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
College of Natural Sciences Interdepartmental Major

Mission:

The Bachelors of Science in Natural Sciences is an undergraduate degree with five concentration options. Students graduating with an education concentration under the BSNS degree will be recommended to the State of Colorado for a teaching license to teach secondary science. Students graduating with the physical sciences concentration under the BSNS degree will be prepared for going on to professional schools such as medical or law or graduate programs in the basic or applied sciences or directly entering the workforce in a variety of STEM areas such as a laboratory technician.

The Natural Sciences interdepartmental academic programs are:

- Natural Sciences - B.S.
  - Biology Education Concentration
  - Chemistry Education Concentration
  - Geology Education Concentration
  - Physical Science Concentration
  - Physics Education Concentration

Program challenges and opportunities:

The CNS Education and Outreach Center is recommending creating a STEM Education student organization that is not only for students in the BSNS degree, but for math education majors, agricultural education majors, and other who may simply be interested in teaching as a possible career, but haven't decided yet. The main focus of this group will be volunteering for STEM outreach events that involve K-12 students such as El Centro's Math-Science-Tech Day, World Water Day, Colorado Science and Engineering Fair, CNS Education & Outreach's STEM Friday Expeditions, etc.

As an Education & Outreach Center that focuses on STEM outreach to in-service teachers, it is our desire to better track the graduates of the BSNS degree in order to add them to our list of potential professional development participants by requesting a non-CSU email address from them before they graduate in order to keep in touch with them and to find out where they eventually end up teaching in the future.

Due to the special nature of the licensure program, each of the education concentrations needs to be mapped out better by semester to balance the number of credits taken. It is unclear if the fact that student teaching (12 credits) must be the very last semester and the only coursework taken is taken into account with the current general catalog entries.
The Chemistry Education concentration curriculum MUST be redone to take into account that several courses have changed in the last few years (i.e.: CHEM471 is now CHEM473 and CHEM331 is now CHEM335).
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability

Mission

The Department of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability (ESS) was established in 2011 within the Warner College of Natural Resources (WCNR). The mission of the Department of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability at Colorado State University is to understand the function of ecosystems and watersheds across space and over time. We assess ecosystem sustainability by examining interactions within and between natural and human systems in the context of current stresses such as changing climate, species introductions, land-use change, and increased demand for water. The department will use state of the art technologies and approaches to provide quality education to future scientists, educators and decision makers, conduct cutting edge interdisciplinary research, and deliver culturally relevant outreach programs that empower our students and the general public locally, nationally, and internationally.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Ecosystem Science and Sustainability - B.S.
- Watershed Science - B.S.
  - Minor in Watershed Science
- Watershed Science - M.S.

Program challenges and opportunities:

- Strengths: High quality faculty, enthusiasm of new department, development of a novel hybrid structure that integrates teaching and research, innovative space sharing arrangement, innovative sharing of support staff that has resulted in strong administrative support (stronger once commitments are in place).
- Challenges: Space remains a critical challenge. While we have adopted an innovative space sharing arrangement with existing space in the NESB building and space in the NR building, and view this as a strength, we have identified several areas that need to be addressed. We need space for students in general, space conducive to promote student research, collaborative working space, teaching computer lab space, teaching assistants, support for classes and development of materials for new classes being developed.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology

Mission:

The Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology serves students and varied constituencies through learning, research and service/outreach. We teach students to think critically about environmental issues, and become ecologically literate citizens with the training to be successful in graduate school and in careers with natural resources agencies, firms, and NGOs. We expand the frontiers of knowledge through our broad-based expertise in applied ecology, quantitative methods, conservation biology, and human dimensions in the conservation and management of natural systems to support fish and wildlife populations. Our outreach efforts contribute significantly to life-long learning by assisting individuals and agencies to solve complex environmental problems and to be good stewards of our nation's natural resources.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology - B.S.
  - Conservation Biology Concentration
  - Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences Concentration
  - Wildlife Biology Concentration
- Minor in Fishery Biology
- Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology - M.S.
- Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology - M.F.W.C.B.
- Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology - Ph.D.

The department is unique in being the only department in the state focusing on fish, wildlife, and conservation biology, student demand remains high, in large part due to the strong reputation of the department and Colorado’s natural environment.

Program challenges and opportunities:

As the only department in the state focusing on fish, wildlife, and conservation biology, student demand remains high, in large part due to the strong reputation of the department and Colorado’s natural environment. With the large increase in undergraduate numbers, a key challenge will be maintaining quality in light of decreased budgets and the need to replace and enhance faculty lines. Key opportunities will exist:

1. For Undergraduate Students: a) finalize our new advising model that links with the university’s initiatives for academic support coordinators to enhance recruitment and retention; b) with increased numbers of good students, especially Honors students, developing additional independent study (research) opportunities, especially local
opportunities within faculty labs, and with local research partners, e.g., state and federal agencies and NGOs.

2. For Graduate Students: increase the number of fellowships especially those that provide full-year support by working with CSU Advancement/Development to engage alumni and friends of the department.

3. For Faculty: seek opportunities to hire faculty in identified priority areas of spatial ecology, conservation genetics (replacement for past position), stream fish ecology (replacement for transitional faculty appointment), ecohydrology (a cross-disciplinary need identified with Engineering that will fit well with the “Revised” Water Center’s recommendation to the Provost for cluster hires to address local, national, and international water needs), and human-wildlife conflicts (replacement for past position and a need that will continue to grow).

4. For Development: a) leverage existing Foundation funds in development of an Endowed Chair in Wildlife Ecology, b) seek funds for the Robert Behnke (former faculty in FWCB with a national and international reputation) Endowed Chair in Cold-Water Fish Ecology, c) Increase funds for Undergraduate and Graduate scholarships and fellowships (larger fellowships have the potential to help support international students), and d) seek funds for a Research Support Facility for consolidation of aquatic research and support of (foothills campus) aquatic and terrestrial research.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Geosciences

Mission

The mission of the Geosciences Department at Colorado State University, as articulated in our 2013 Strategic Plan, is to provide high-quality education to geoscience students at the undergraduate and graduate level, to train professionals for the broad spectrum of geoscience careers, to catalyze and support scholarly research in applied and theoretical realms of geosciences and its many allied fields, and to provide geoscience-associated and broader service to the university, the State of Colorado, the nation, and the international community.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Geology - B.S.
  - Environmental Geology Concentration
  - Geophysics Concentration
  - Hydrogeology Concentration
  - Minor in Geology
- Geosciences - M.S.
- Earth Sciences - Ph.D.
  - Geosciences Specialization

Program challenges and opportunities:

Ongoing initiatives include:

- Establishing enhanced professional resources for advising the undergraduate population.
- Enhancing faculty critical mass targeting areas such as energy geosciences, geomorphology, tectonics, petrology, volcanology, hydrogeology, aqueous geochemistry and seismology.
- Enhancing seminar, visiting professor, student recruitment, internship, and other exchange programs.
- Improving the physical environment of our department.
- Approaching the limit of space and teaching equipment to handle the growing enrollment.

In this, the Strategic Plan and review process has identified the following key challenges:

- Lack of in-house modern geoscience analytical equipment.
- Lack of space for laboratories and student offices.
- Antiquated furnishings in classes, offices, and labs.
- Low GTA stipends (approximately $400/month lower than peers).
- Strained faculty and office staff numbers and capacity for optimally responding to developments in the field, growing research programs, mentoring of graduate students, improving assessment procedures, and developing and teaching (particularly graduate-level) classes.
Executive Summary
Colorado State University Program Review 2013-14
Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources

Mission:

The mission of the department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources is to contribute to the conservation, stewardship and enjoyment of natural and cultural resources and the management of those resources in a way that produces both land health and sustainable human benefits. Our focus is to strengthen the human dimensions of natural resource management and integrate it with the biophysical elements of management. Our efforts are directed locally, nationally and internationally, across a landscape that includes both public and private lands and resources.

The department offers the following academic programs:

- Natural Resource Recreation and Tourism - B.S.
  - Environmental Communication Concentration
  - Global Tourism Concentration
  - Natural Resource Tourism Concentration
  - Parks and Protected Area Management Concentration
  - Minor in Wilderness Management
- Conservation Leadership - M.S.
- Human Dimensions of Natural Resources - M.S.
  - Conservation Leadership Specialization
- Master of Tourism Management - M.T.M.
- Human Dimensions of Natural Resources - Ph.D.

Program challenges and opportunities:

Our goals do not require so much new capacity as they do a re-allocation and refocus of existing capacity, and we have made progress toward achieving these goals already.

In the past two years we have added three faculty (two permanent tenure-track, and one temporary faculty which we have since converted to tenure-track) with expertise and backgrounds in areas related to governance, sustainable livelihoods, traditional knowledge, and collaborative resource management. In addition, we are currently in a search for a new faculty member (to start Fall 2014) with a focus in economics and environmental services. Faculty positions in the following areas are high priorities: the ski area management master's program; four to six U.S.-based tenure-track faculty to support the expansion in the Masters in Tourism Management program, including one faculty member based at one of our Chinese university partners. In addition, we would add up to four faculty based with our Chinese university partners.
With the addition of these faculty positions and strategic support by the department and administration, we are in a position to accomplish our research/scholarship goals.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

2014-15 Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual Revisions: Section C.2.3.1.e College of Liberal Arts

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the proposed revisions to the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section C.2.3.1.e College of Liberal Arts.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President.

The proposed revision for the 2014-2015 edition of the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual had been adopted by the Colorado State University Faculty Council. A brief explanation for the revision follows:

The field of journalism and communication has changed drastically since the department was originally created. A study conducted by the department indicated that potential students did not understand what “technical communication” meant. The name change from Journalism and Technical Communication to Journalism and Media Communication reflects more accurately what the department has to offer students.

Relative to the Music, Theatre, and Dance change, the term “School” connotes the full range of performing arts activities in the discipline, from the skills and theory to a full complement of the practical application of those skills in a full season of public performances. The term “School” is also consistent with competing programs at other Universities.
NOTE: Revisions are noted in the following manner:
Additions - underlined  Deletions - overscored

ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL
REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS – 2014-15

e. College of Liberal Arts (last revised February 14, 2014)

Comprising the Departments of Anthropology; Art and Art History; Communication Studies; Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; Foreign Languages and Literatures; History; Journalism and Technical Media Communication; Music, Theater, and Dance; Philosophy; Political Science; and Sociology, and School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

Note: Music, Theater, and Dance shall be changed to School of Music, Theatre, and Dance wherever it appears in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Journalism and Technical Communication shall be changed to Journalism and Media Communication wherever it appears in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

2014-15 Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual Revisions: Section D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the proposed revisions to the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President.

The proposed revision for the 2014-2015 edition of the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual had been adopted by the Colorado State University Faculty Council. A brief explanation for the revision follows:

Administrative Professional employees at CSU have played a significant and positive role throughout the history of CSU and currently help to shape the institution in several arenas outside of faculty appointments. These activities continually and directly support the mission of CSU as a land-grant institution in the areas of instruction, research, service and outreach. Furthermore, upon retirement, many of these distinguished AP employees support the university through transitioning important development and donor relationships; sharing institutional knowledge about process and partnerships; continuing to participate in classroom instruction and research; and give back to the University with their time, talents, and financial support. Yet, these dedicated and influential employees are excluded from applying for special recognition upon retirement. CSU Faculty and Administrative Professional employees share the same retiree benefits with this one exception.

Compared to other academic institutions, CSU may be behind the times, because Emeritus status is available to non-faculty at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, University of California-Davis, Minnesota State College and Universities, University of Wisconsin, University of Arkansas, University of Montana, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, North Carolina State University, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, Texas A&M University, Tennessee State University, Virginia Tech University, University of Tennessee, and University of
Connecticut – to name a few. In fact, 10 of the 15 universities that we consider peers allow either high-level non-faculty or anyone to be awarded emeritus status.

As with Faculty, Administrative Professional employees seeking Emeritus status would involve a rigorous and formal nomination and review process before being submitted to the Provost and Board of Governors for approval. Only cases with merit and having full support at all levels would make it through the process. This process will follow the same nomination, review, and approval steps as indicated in Section E.3.1, so as to not create a new system.

Those AP employees seeking Emeritus status would need to show extraordinary and meritorious work to the fulfillment of the mission and programs of CSU. The goal is to recognize the full impact of a career, not the title given. These contributions should have resulted in a transformational difference in their field through significant discoveries or greatly enhanced student successes, public recognition of remarkable accomplishments and leadership, or a substantial increase in resource development, with a lasting positive impact for the University.
NOTE: Revisions are noted in the following manner:
Additions - underlined  Deletions - overscored

ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL
REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS – 2014-15

D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status

Administrative Professionals who have completed ten (10) years or more of outstanding
and distinguished full-time or part-time service to Colorado State University shall be
eligible, at the time of their retirement from Colorado State University, for an
emeritus/emerita title equivalent to their highest rank.

Candidates must hold a senior or other advanced rank within Administrative Professional
positions at Colorado State University, which may include, but not be limited to
Academic Advisor/Support Coordinator, Research Scientist/Associate, Extension
Agent/Specialist, Forester, Manager, Director, Executive Director, or Vice President, and
must have honorably and consistently demonstrated extraordinary and meritorious
contributions to the fulfillment of the mission and programs of the University. These
contributions should have resulted in a transformational difference in their field through
significant discoveries or enhanced student support and successes, public recognition of
remarkable accomplishments and leadership, or a substantial increase in resource
development, with a lasting positive impact for the University. In rare occurrences, a
deserving candidate may qualify outside of the criteria above. Exceptions may be made
with the approval of the Provost.

An eligible administrative professional may request emeritus/emerita status from their
college or unit at the same time of retirement from the University, or candidates may be
directly nominated by their director, department head, dean, or vice president. The
nomination shall be routed for approval by the employee’s department head/director
through the dean/vice president and then to the Provost. The final decision on granting
emeritus/emerita status will be made by the Board.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

CSU: Posthumous Degree Candidate

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the presented candidate to receive a B.S. degree for his major in Natural Resource Management with a minor in Conservation Biology posthumously. The posthumous degree is to be conferred in conjunction with the May 2015 commencement ceremonies.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President

In May 2005, the Board of Governors approved the policy stating that “In exceptional circumstances, the Board may award degrees posthumously. Recommendations for such an award will only be considered when the student had completed nearly all of the requirements for his or her degree before dying, and when the student’s academic record clearly indicates that the degree would have been successfully completed had death not intervened. Nominations for posthumous awards of degree will be initiated by the student’s department and approved internally by the relevant college dean and the Provost. The posthumous nature of the recommended degree award shall be made explicit when the recommendation is forwarded to the Board. The Provost’s office shall be responsible for presenting the degree to appropriate survivors”.

Colorado State University Fort Collins – Posthumous Degree
MATTERS FOR ACTION:


EXPLANATION:

Presented by Carl N. Wright, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

REPORT ON APPROVED SABBATICAL LEAVES FOR AY2015-2016

Sabbatical leave requests for AY2015-2016 were submitted in October 2014. Per section 2.11.2 (Sabbatical Leaves) of the Faculty Handbook,

“The purpose of sabbatical leave is to provide tenured faculty an opportunity to engage in research, scholarly or creative activity, or otherwise enhance professional stature as teachers and scholars.” 2.11.2.2.i states in part that “Sabbatical leaves will be granted on the merits of the faculty member's application, the availability of funds, and institutional priorities… Faculty members must demonstrate in writing, as part of their application, a well-structured plan involving research, scholarly or creative activity, study for advanced degrees outside their primary discipline, or other activities which will result in the faculty member's professional growth, increase the overall level of knowledge in the leave holder's area of expertise, and enhance the institution's reputation, and the students' educational experience.”

Pursuant to the Faculty Handbook, faculty may submit an application for sabbatical prior to completing 12 academic semesters of service. Therefore, those applicants’ approval is contingent on their completion of 12 academic semesters.

The following individuals submitted proposals that were reviewed and approved at the department, college and university levels.

Dr. Sandra Bonetti  Professor of Chemistry  academic year 2015-16
Dr. Ian Gomme  Professor of Sociology and Anthropology  academic year 2015-16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris Piccici</td>
<td>Associate Professor of English and Foreign Languages</td>
<td>academic year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kristy Proctor</td>
<td>Professor of Chemistry</td>
<td>academic year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jacob Chi</td>
<td>Professor of Music</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Darren Funk-Neubauer</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Math</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brad Gilbreath</td>
<td>Professor of Management</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Timothy P. McGettigan</td>
<td>Professor of Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Marc Pratarelli</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ahmad Ahmadian</td>
<td>Professor of Management</td>
<td>fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dave Lehmpuhl</td>
<td>Professor of Chemistry</td>
<td>fall 2015 or spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joey Cho</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dennis Dalton</td>
<td>Professor of Art</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin Duncan</td>
<td>Professor of Economics</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Fowler</td>
<td>Professor of Management</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patricia Levy</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Fawn-Amber Montoya</td>
<td>Associate Professor of History and Political Science</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steve Norman</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sue Pettit</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christine Rochester</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Exercise Science, Health Promotion, and Recreation</td>
<td>spring 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATTERS FOR ACTION:


EXPLANATION:

Presented by Carl N. Wright, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

This report consists of the outcome of our program review process in AY2013-2014.

REPORT ON PROGRAM REVIEWS COMPLETED IN AY2013-14

As outlined in 1.2.6.2 of the Faculty Handbook, the duties of the Curriculum and Academic Programs (CAP) Board include being responsible for review of existing academic programs. A new self-study process was implemented for those programs undergoing review in AY2011-2012. From the “Guideline for Academic Program Self-study” maintained by the CAP Board,

“The primary purpose of systematic self-study is to maintain and support academic departments: teaching and learning; research, professional, and creative activity; and university service, community service, and outreach. It’s a vehicle by which departments can better understand if and how well programs are achieving their purpose and if not, what courses of action to take to make them more successful. The program review process … represents a shift away from input-based evidence to a learning centered, outcomes-based approach to on-going improvement and planning. It is a conceptual and practical change in emphasis from conducting a program review to a useful meaningful inquiry into the program’s purpose and its effectiveness in achieving that purpose. The results of the program review should be integrated into the department and campus process of planning and budgeting. It also represents a shift from an episodic snapshot of the program’s effectiveness to a more relevant and useful on-going, continuous plan of action the department can use for renewal and improvement. The conclusions drawn from the program review are to be informed by evidence; that is, all claims about a program’s strengths, weaknesses, and proposed improvements are to be supported by relevant, valid qualitative and quantitative evidence. This contrasts with program reviews that are largely descriptive and based on advocacy of the program.”

The timeline for self-study development begins in the fall semester with a data-driven self-study draft submitted to the dean, an external reviewer selected in consultation with dean and CSU-Pueblo AY2013-14 program review report
chair, a report prepared by the external evaluator after a site visit and examination of the self-study, the convening of a campus seminar panel, with the CAP Board final analysis sent to the Faculty Senate for approval at the last Senate meeting in the spring semester. The explicit contents of the self-study report are:

I. Cover Page
   A. Program name
   B. Program college/school
   C. Year of review
   D. Date self-study submitted
   E. Name of program chair

II. Executive Summary (maximum of two pages)
   A. Key findings
   B. Planned action steps

III. Response to Review Standards*
   A. Response to each review standard
   B. Supporting documents and data

IV. Supporting Documents
   A. External Reviewers Report
      1. Program strengths
      2. Program challenges, areas for improvement
      3. Summary of recommendations
   B. Dean’s Seminar Review Panel results summary

V. Program Development Plan

*-standards are listed at the end of this document

All documents are maintained on the University’s internal (I) drive, accessible by all campus faculty.

Programs within the following departments were reviewed by the CAP Board in spring 2014:

Master of Science in Industrial and Systems Engineering
Art
History
Psychology
Biology
Physics
Computer Information Systems
Seven standards are addressed in the program review self-study narrative; departments provide information as follows:

Standard 1. The purpose of the program reflects and supports the mission and strategic vision of Colorado State University-Pueblo and the mission of its school or college.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Purpose of the program
2. Alignment of the purpose with the campus mission and the program’s school or college
3. Distinctive aspects of the program
4. The primary strengths and challenges of the program

Required documentation:
1. Mission/purpose of the program
2. Campus mission statement
3. Campus strategic plan

Standard 2. The program engages in on-going, systematic planning that reflects the campus strategic priorities.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Program’s goals (desired big-picture results or purposes) and objectives (specific, measurable things the program will accomplish, at least one of which will be related to teaching and learning)
2. Process for developing and revising the goals and objectives
3. Relationship of the programs goals and objectives to program activities (i.e., describe the activities that accomplish the goals and objectives of the program)
4. Process of implementing the program goals and objectives

Required documentation:
1. Description of the program’s ongoing planning process
2. Program’s strategic plan

Standard 3. The program provides and evaluates a high quality curriculum that emphasizes student learning as its primary purpose.

Please reflect on the following: Curriculum
1. Alignment of the curriculum with disciplinary standards
   A. Establishment of and adherence to pre- and co-requisite courses
   B. Rationale for selection and organization of courses in the curriculum
   C. Logic, sequence, and coherence of the curriculum
2. Amount of time needed to complete the program
3. Multi-or interdisciplinary strengths of the programs
4. Alignment of curriculum to meet general education needs
5. Role of service course offerings that support other programs
6. Statement of course objectives that reflect the expected student learning outcomes of the program in all syllabi, including general education course offerings
7. Internal processes employed by the program to modify the curriculum

Learning Outcomes Assessment
1. Learning outcomes are observable, measurable statements of what students will know or be able to do upon completion of the program
2. The curriculum (i.e., course objectives) is aligned with the program’s student learning outcomes
3. Assessment measures effectively evaluate the student learning outcomes and inform curricular decision-making
4. Assessment results are consistently used to make changes to the curriculum
5. The assessment process, including program improvements, is documented

Required documentation:
1. Catalog copy of program curriculum
2. Curriculum and advising checklists
3. Frequency of course offerings and mean class size for each of the previous five years
4. Number of majors and minors for each of the last five years
5. Time to degree for program graduates for each of the previous five years
6. Program’s current assessment plan
7. Program’s assessment reports for the previous five years
8. Current curriculum map
9. Transfer Guide and Four-Year Plans

Faculty Resources, Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Standard 4. The program has sufficient faculty resources to meet its mission and goals.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Credentials of full-time and part-time faculty and instructional staff
2. Appropriateness of background of faculty for teaching in the program
3. Representativeness of faculty in terms of demographics, tenure, and diversity
4. Continuing growth of faculty as teachers and scholars
5. Adequacy of professional and pedagogical development opportunities for faculty
6. Presence of a positive, productive work environment in the department
7. Evidence of equitable distribution of instructional loads among faculty
8. Standards for faculty review, tenure, and promotion
9. Orientation of faculty and instructional staff, including teaching assistants, to goals and student learning outcomes of program

Required documentation:
1. Distribution of age, tenure status, gender, and ethnic origin of faculty
2. Credentials for all full- and part-time faculty for the last academic year
3. Summary of sponsored research activities for all faculty
4. Summary of scholarly and creative activities by tenure-line faculty
5. Summary of service activities by tenure-line faculty
6. Current CV for full-time faculty
7. FTE for program faculty for previous five years
8. SCH production for previous five years
9. Course load by instructor for the past five years

Standard 5. The program attracts, retains, and graduates high-quality students.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Diversity of student populations
2. Enrollment patterns relative to institutional and national enrollment patterns
3. Future viability of the program in terms of enrollment
4. Academic qualifications of students admitted compared to those of all CSU-Pueblo students
5. Accuracy and consistency of student advising, mechanisms to monitor progress toward degree and use of training to provide quality advising
6. Opportunities for students to engage in faculty research, independent study, study abroad, internships, honors courses, student organizations and other enriching activities that promote retention and graduation
7. Processes and activities to recruit and retain students
8. Student performance on licensure or professional exams relative to regional and national standards
9. Adequacy of financial support/opportunities to recruit and retain high-quality students

Required documentation:
1. Five-year program profile to include 1) the number of women, first generation, ethnic minority, and international students in the program; and 2) number of students graduated each year
2. For programs with specified admissions standards, 1) entry requirements for admission to the program, 2) the number of applicants to the program, 3) the number of students admitted to the program, and 4) the academic qualifications of admitted students
3. Number and types of minors completed by students in the past five years
4. Employment or graduate degrees held (or in progress) by graduates
5. Summary of student, alumni, and/or employer survey responses

Administrative Structure and Operational Resources

Standard 6. The program has an administrative structure that facilitates achievement of program goals and objectives.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Processes in place to ensure efficient and effective decision-making, and shared governance
2. Support for department chairs/associate deans and others in department or program
leadership roles
3. Faculty involvement in ongoing program activities such as assessment; curriculum development, review, and revision; and tenure and promotion standards
4. Involvement of students, alumni, and other program stakeholders in program decision-making
5. Evaluation of chairs/associate deans, faculty, and staff

Required documentation
1. Organizational chart
2. Minutes of relevant department meetings

Standard 7. The program has adequate resources to meet its goals and objectives.

Please reflect on the following:
1. Adequacy of the budget to support the mission and goals of the program
2. Currency and adequacy of facilities and laboratories, instructional technology, and library resources to support the mission and goals of the program
3. Documentable program faculty and staffing needs
4. Effective and appropriate use of faculty and staff

Required documentation:
1. Equipment, travel, technology, and operating budgets for the past five years
2. List of major facilities and equipment
3. List of major hardware and software used by the program
4. List of major library resources, databases, and journals
5. List of support personnel, including non-teaching graduate students

SUMMARY REPORT FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS 2013-2014

Master of Science in Industrial and Systems Engineering

Strengths:
- Diversity of student population
- Manufacturing industry need for graduates from the program
- Local community of manufacturing industry members support the program
- Close collaboration with industry resulting in applied industrial research
- Highly qualified and committed faculty with high scholarly productivity.
- Program caters for individual student needs
- Program allows for student choice between thesis & non-thesis options
- Students have access to computers with current industry-standard software.
- MSISE works in close association with the grant–funded Regional Access to Graduate Education (RAGE) program.
- The program is staffed by faculty members who work well together as a group.
Weaknesses:
- High cost of engineering programs
- The Engineering department graduate handbook and policies need a review
- Lack of funding for graduate research
- Large variety of programs spreads the faculty too thin. The Engineering department has seven faculty members who serve four programs (two graduate programs and two undergraduate programs)
- Most of MSISE graduate courses are offered by one faculty member

Recommendations:
- The engineering department should review and reaffirm the mission of the MSISE program, update the handbook and communicate clearly program expectations to internal and external constituencies.
- The Engineering Department and the MSISE program should work towards enhancing the online and hybrid course offerings.
- The applied projects that graduate students have completed for industry, non-profit organizations, government and the community are not seen or understood by anyone outside of the Engineering Department. Efforts should be made to compile these accomplishments with particular attention to activities that are newsworthy to increase the visibility of the department of engineering. The Library’s institutional repository could provide an access point for these materials, as it offers an open access showcase of research, scholarship, and creative works of Colorado State University - Pueblo faculty, staff, and students.
- Use the support of the Admissions Office to market the program.

Department of Art

Strengths:
- “Unstacking” of courses has allowed the department to better serve the needs of students by grouping them at their competence level.
- The Artist-in-Residence program has yielded very good results for students in the program and should be continued. The recent cut back of the Visiting Assistant Professor position will cause some challenges in the immediate future.
- Art instruction is by definition a model of experiential education and the department is poised to make significant contributions to the campus discussion and development of experiential education.
- Since the last program review, the department has hired an art historian and thus solved the problem of having enough art historical expertise to teach courses.
- The department has good scholarship funding with the Cappozolo scholarships.
- Studio problems, in terms of leaking roofs, appears to have a fix in the near future. Physical Plant is moving on a plan to redesign the upper plaza and fix all leakage problems, scheduled for completion fall 2014.
Weaknesses:

- The department is meeting the objectives set for its BA and BFA degrees, and the external reviewer corroborated the quality of the curriculum. However, there are many students interested in Art Education and Graphic Design, and currently the staffing is inadequately handle student demand in these areas. The department should target an area to expand for future enrollment and work to staff that area.
- Ventilation is a continuing problem for the printmaking studio.
- Internet technology improvements are needed to provide adequate access for students in the building.
- Students continue to take courses without fulfilling adequate prerequisites. University administration should try to develop a system whereby students cannot enroll without completing the prerequisites.
- The department needs to find a way to better track and communicate with its alumni.
- The department should consider NASAD accreditation.

Recommendations:

- Develop an Art History minor. There are many students who would probably add such a minor, and the resources to offer it are in place.
- Develop a system for tracking alumni and creating a network of communication. This might be through a web site, Facebook, or an electronic newsletter.
- Increase enrollments by securing a position in Graphic Design and expanding classes in this studio.
- Evaluate the feasibility, then develop and set a multi-year pathway for NASAD accreditation.

Department of History

Strengths:

- The program has a good number of tenured and tenure-track faculty that can offer a diverse variety of expertise in the discipline. Overall these faculty members are active as scholars making them highly qualified to teach their discipline.
- The program sets high expectations for student performance in ability to write, articulate thoughts, and critically argue point-of-view, with documentation and supporting research.
- Faculty in the program are engaged with the community in various ways—History Day, Young Women’s Conference, Bessemer Historical Society, etc.
- Support to the General Education program through teaching of history courses that require students to write, think, and develop critical thinking skills.
- The Program has brought in significant grants to support its teaching, especially the TAH grants which funded the graduate program over the last few years.

Weaknesses:

- Enrollment has not seen a dramatic decline, but has not increased. This mirrors national trends.
• Faculty morale is low among at least some members of the program. Non-tenured faculty members in particular report hostility and non-collegial communication from some senior members of the department. The external reviewer indicates this is affecting teaching and work performance in the program.

• Faculty members are involved in research, but have dwindling resources for faculty development—research, traveling to conferences, publication costs.

• The graduate program is undergoing significant changes with the ending of grant funding, and it future seems unclear.

• The 12 hour teaching load that will begin in Fall semester 2014 will stress and limit the research agenda of most faculty members.

Recommendations:

• The program faculty members, working with the chair and the dean, shall develop and implement processes for improvement of faculty morale and interpersonal communication within the program. The chair will survey, monitor, and report to the dean about faculty morale. (Spring 2014 and continuously)

• The History program faculty should develop a reliable and consistent organization and administration of History Day and try to increase History faculty involvement. Recruitment and community connection opportunities could be expanded through History Day and related activities. (two years)

• With the anticipated changes in Extended Studies, the History faculty members should begin planning how and to what extent their program will be involved with online, hybrid, or remote delivery of courses. (two years)

• Continue to revise and improve the curriculum (i.e., African History; Middle Eastern History, etc.) as needed, and revise syllabi to include updated SLOs. (one year, then continuously)

• The Program faculty should revisit and rewrite the mission and vision of the MA graduate program. (two years)

• The program will develop strategies to improve enrollment and retention of majors. (two years)

Department of Psychology

Strengths:

• Albeit small, the department has an experienced faculty that brings a variety of strengths and interests to the program and its students.

• The department has made significant strides in developing and implementing an assessment plan for the BA and BS degrees in the Psychology major. More work will come in the future, but the department now has a real strategy to assess whether its program is effective and students are learning.

• As attested by the self-study and the external reviewer’s report, the department offers a solid, appropriate curriculum to its students that is relevant and appropriate for the university.
The Psychology major attracts many students; the program has seen increases in enrollment while most programs at the university have experienced a loss of enrollment.

The department offers students a variety of professional experiences, such as through summer programs and through undergraduate research projects.

Weaknesses:

- The department has maintained and grown in the number of its majors, yet over the years, the number of faculty has gone down. The department now teaches many sections of 100+ students. Attendant problems with advising, course scheduling, and offering enough diverse expertise and advanced topics have ensued.
- The department does not have the best resources for student learning. In particular, laboratory space, equipment, and especially pedagogical software all need to be improved and updated.
- Student demand for research experiences is not being met, due to lack of staffing of tenure and tenure-track faculty.
- Diversity of faculty to meet the diverse needs of its student majors.

Recommendations:

- The Psychology Department must hire another tenured faculty member, a chair, who can bring experience in overseeing the program, faculty, and contribute to teaching in the department. The department has requested a delay to the currently open search until Fall of 2014. (Hire to be completed by July 1, 2015).
- The department will find a way to make the Psych 207 and 209 courses more available to student majors so that their plans of study are not interrupted or delayed. (By Fall 2016)
- Continue to improve and revise assessment techniques and revise the assessment plan. (By Fall 2016)
- Develop a survey for Psychology Department alumni. (By Fall semester 2015)
- Develop a written resource improvement plan and budget for lab space, materials and software, and then develop a revised student fee proposal to cover the cost. (Plan complete by Spring 2015; Student fee in place by Fall 2015)

Department of Biology

Strengths:

- The department has a very collegial faculty, which entails genuine mutual support within the department but also extends to professional collaborations with colleagues outside biology, most particularly in the department of chemistry. Such collaborations, both within and among departments, and including with CSU Fort Collins, have produced coauthored publications and successful grant applications.
- The department offers a strong curriculum. For instance, results from the Educational Testing Service’s Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT) indicate that the program is doing a solid job in educating students; MFAT scores show that students average above
the 59th percentile nationally. In the past, the department has used MFAT data to make changes to its curriculum.

- The department has strong enrollments. For instance, fall 2013 and spring 2014 combined credit hours were 7,669 (7,592 undergraduate credit hours), comparing favorably with departments such as psychology’s total of 7,308 or sociology’s total of 6,713 (by contrast, mathematics and physics had 12,190 undergraduate credit hours; EXHP, athletic training and recreation had 8,606 combined undergraduate credit hours). Biology is the university’s largest major for new first-time, full-time freshmen; and in fall 2013, biology was the largest major (393), not including pre-nursing and nursing combined (435) nor all the business programs combined (667).

**Weaknesses:**

- Resources are limited, with regard to full-time faculty and staff, equipment, and supporting supplies.
- The department has a large enrollment (noted above) and a relatively small number of tenure-track or tenured faculty (9 in fall 2013), resulting in a relatively large ratio of advisees to faculty member. (Visiting faculty members currently do not have service duties related to formal advising, since visitors typically are individuals who have limited experience at CSU-Pueblo and so would not be as well-informed as tenure-track/tenured faculty.)
- The department currently has no staff member FTE allocation for equipment maintenance.
- The department has limited funding for undergraduate research supply monies.
- The department productivity in scholarly peer-reviewed publications was noted to be a bit on the low side by the external evaluator; over the 2007-2013 period covered by the review, 18 such publications were noted, 15 of which came from just three faculty. (In addition, seven chapters in edited collections were noted; six from one faculty member and one from another. Several faculty members also have been involved with publishing laboratory manuals.)

**Recommendations:**

- Examine all course prerequisites and see which ones are essential, with an eye towards feeding into a campus-wide initiative to automatically enforce course prerequisites within the current Administrative Information System. To be completed by fall 2014.
- Consider efforts to streamline advising, including extending some current group advising as partially undertaken in Biology 171, and considering technological options (such as an advising FAQ that includes short YouTube videos). To be completed by spring 2015.
- Consider proposals from biology to increase lab research space in coordination with the Propel grant and with other departments, by reconfiguring currently used space on the first and second floors of the building (e.g. the taxonomy lab). To be completed by spring 2015.
- Explore further options to keep track of students after graduation, both with regard to those seeking admission to professional programs (e.g. medical school, dental school, veterinary school, etc) as well as those attending graduate school or seeking
employment directly after graduation. [E.g. consider having senior seminar students create or update professional social media pages (e.g. LinkedIn) to help the department track recent graduates, as well as keep in touch with recent alumni.] Suggestions developed/implemented by end of spring 2015 (with some possibly by 2014).

- Consider developing an external advisory committee (in part, this group could assist in a mentorship program). This is currently underway – to be completed by spring 2015.
- Consider converting the visiting line budgeted for FY2014 into a tenure-track line for FY2015, provided funding and any ancillary needs (e.g. lab space) can be accommodated. (This should mitigate some of the relatively large advising loads currently taken on by the department’s tenure-track/tenured faculty.) Also consider proposing an additional tenure-track line, provided enrollments support this. To be submitted in next budget cycle, fall 2014.

Department of Physics

Strengths:

- Program strengths include the following:
- Laboratory courses integrate well with the lecture courses (and upper-level courses have labs, something not always the case with physics programs)
- Students in the program are required to take on the role of lab assistant in the introductory physics sequence (this typically involves 2-3 students/year, who enroll in Phys 480).
- The department now has a half-time staff member devoted to coordinating labs and maintaining equipment.
- Upper-level students believe that the program is rigorous and that there are high expectations within the program.
- Significant new equipment is in the process of being acquired (through the Propel grant).
- There is healthy overall enrollment: the department has a significant service component so that overall enrollments are reasonable [physics had a fall 2013, spring 2014 combined enrollment total of 2,023 credit hours (for some perspective, this compares with Spanish’s 2,235 credit hours, or music’s 2,617 total undergraduate credit hours, or engineering’s 2,391 total undergraduate credit hours; mathematics had 10,167 undergraduate credit hours].

Weaknesses:

- There are just two tenured (and no tenure-track) physics faculty members.
- The number of majors is relatively small: in fall 2013, just two of the first-time, full-time freshmen selected physics as a major; and in fall 2013, there were only 13 physics majors (and 5 second majors). Comparing with national data from the American Institute of Physics annual survey, schools that could be considered rough peers typically have more upper-level students and bachelor’s degree recipients (e.g. fall 2012 undergraduate juniors and seniors combined were 20 at Fort Lewis, 6 at the University of Nebraska-Kearney, 23 at the University of Michigan – Flint, and 58 at Angelo State
University; spring 2012 undergraduates receiving bachelor’s degrees were 12 at Fort Lewis, 2 at University of Nebraska – Kearney, 2 at the University of Nebraska-Flint, 13 at Angelo State University).

- Some lower-level students (e.g. in introductory courses) may express concerns about a perceived rapid pace of these lower-level classes.
- Undergraduate-level research activities are limited.

Recommendations:

- Increase communication with other departments, e.g. engineering and biology and chemistry, for multiple reasons:
  - To increase potential collaborative research activity (both for undergraduate research projects, and perhaps for faculty-based research, e.g. through the existing space grant)
  - Potentially increase possibilities for more majors or second majors or minors in physics,
  - To develop new courses including upper-level courses that may serve other areas (e.g. applied computational methods),
  - Enhance existing courses (e.g. the general studies “Light, Energy and the Atom” course, or the other service courses). Suggested date: ongoing, but at a minimum begin by end of fall 2014.
  - Attempt to maintain contact with graduating and recently graduated students (e.g. through exit interviews and surveys). Consider insuring that students near graduation if not sooner create a professional social media page (e.g. a LinkedIn page) that is shared with the department. Suggested date: by spring 2015 (or possibly spring 2014).
  - Consider collecting more data from Educational Testing Service’s Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT), e.g. disaggregating by subject areas. Suggested date: by spring 2015.
  - Consider a request for a tenure-track hire in physics, to build on recent visiting assistant professor hires over the past few years, if appropriate enrollments exist, as soon as is fiscally possible. Such a new hire would bring a potentially different research interest that would provide more opportunities for students, would allow students to experience a larger variety of instructors, and could potentially enhance recruitment into the program. Suggested date: by mid-fall 2014, or mid-fall 2015 as appropriate.
  - Consider enhancements to courses that emphasize communication (e.g. have students read a paper and report on the contents). Suggested date: by spring 2015.
  - Consider utilizing physics majors as lab assistants (those that have already fulfilled the major Phys 480 requirement). Suggested date: by spring 2015.

Department of Computer Information Systems

Strengths:

- Both the full-time and part-time CIS faculty members hold appropriate qualifications including professional experience and academic preparation, and they maintain their knowledge/skills at a high level in an area where knowledge and practice are advancing rapidly.
• The program has stable enrollments at a time when student interest in computer information systems nationwide is languishing.
• The CIS Advisory Board maintains close relationships with the CIS faculty and provides input and advice, particularly regarding the changing needs of potential employers.
• Graduates in CIS continue to receive entry-level job offers at very attractive salaries in industry, government, and non-profit organizations.
• Many CIS graduates are advancing in their respective companies to managerial positions of responsibility.
• Community and industry projects are an integral part of the CIS program including required senior-level projects for every CIS student.
• The CIS students are enthusiastic about participation in the student computing club, ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) for social and professional activities as well as for hands-on experiences.
• The CIS curriculum is monitored and updated based-on the input of faculty, students, and the CIS advisory board members to provide students with up-to-date knowledge and skills needed to enter the workforce.
• The current HSB dean is familiar with computing industry and the CIS curriculum, and understands that our graduates contribute significantly to the IS/IT field in southeastern Colorado.
• Freshman-to-Sophomore year retention in CIS averages above the campus retention rates.

Weaknesses:
• The thinning of the tenurable faculty ranks in CIS due to historical enrollment reductions and recent budget reductions is a threat to the technical characteristics of the CIS curriculum. Specifically, CIS includes many highly specialized sub-disciplines including computer networking and security that are critical to the success and advancement of CIS graduates. This specialized knowledge is acquired through intense doctoral-level study and research; hence, it is not easily replicable without the required academic and/or professional preparation.
• Funding for professional development, faculty travel and summer research support has declined over the past five years.
• As is true across the nation, CIS enrollments do not include a representative population of female students.
• Student preparation is highly variable in every discipline at CSU-Pueblo. In CIS this characteristic is accentuated by the reality that in high school some students are highly motivated by personal computing and come to the campus with advanced personal computing knowledge including management of high school computer labs, while other CIS students enter the curriculum with little or no knowledge of computers and computing.
• Staying current within a rapidly changing industry, both in terms of curriculum content and faculty skill sets, is an ongoing challenge. New technologies and/or new applications of current technologies occur almost daily in IS/IT and deciding what to add/change/delete within the curriculum and the classroom is a constant challenge. It is
It is not uncommon for entering students to ask for courses and training in emerging areas, i.e. mobile applications development.

Recommendations:

- The CIS program will successfully integrate into the AACSB accreditation held by the Hasan School of Business.
- The CIS faculty will continue their commitment to, and development of, their assessment of learning (AOL) processes in keeping with their entry into the AACSB accreditation umbrella of the Hasan School of Business.
- Enhance coordination with feeder institutions and recruitment of regional high school and community college students.
- In coordination with area high schools and community colleges, develop grant proposals targeting the recruitment and development of Latino students and women into the CIS program.
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
Meeting Date: December 4, 2014
Consent Item

MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Colorado State University-Pueblo – Academic Calendar AY 2015-2016.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the Colorado State University-Pueblo

Academic Calendar for AY2015-16.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Lesley Di Mare, President.

The Colorado State University-Pueblo Academic Calendar for AY2015-2016, recommended by Faculty Senate on November 17, 2014, is as follows.
ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2015-2016

FALL

Graduation Planning Sheets Due Jan. 30 (15)
Registration Begins Mar. 9
Classes Begin Aug. 24
End Add Period (full-term courses) Aug. 28
End Drop Period (full-term courses) Sept. 7
End of Full-term Course Withdrawal Period Oct. 23
Thanksgiving Break Nov. 23-27
Classes End Dec. 4
Final Exams Dec. 7-11

SPRING

Graduation Planning Sheets Due Sept. 11 (15)
Registration Begins Oct. 19 (15)
Classes Begin Jan. 18
End Add Period (full-term courses) Jan. 22
End Drop Period (full-term courses) Feb. 1
End of Full-term Course Withdrawal Period Mar. 18
Spring Break Mar. 21-25 (tentative)
Classes End Apr. 29
Final Exams May 2-6
Commencement May 7

SUMMER

Graduation Planning Sheets Due Feb. 5 (16)
Registration Begins Oct. 19 (15)
First 4, 6 and 12-week Sessions

Classes Begin May 16
Memorial Day (University Closed) May 30
Classes End
First 4-week June 9
First 6-week June 23
12-week Aug. 4

Second 4-week Session
Classes Begin June 13
Independence Day Observed (University Closed) July 4
Classes End July 7

Second 6-week Session
Classes Begin June 27
Independence Day Observed (University Closed) July 4
Classes End Aug. 4

Third 4-week Session
Classes Begin July 11
Classes End Aug. 4
The issue for the Board to consider:

Approve the submitted academic calendar start and end dates of semester course offerings, under the assumption that course meeting times will be adjusted for lecture classes that meet on M, W and F, in accordance with Colorado Commission of Higher Education (CCHE) requirements.

Why some change in course meeting times and/or # of weeks in the academic calendar is necessary:

CSU-Pueblo 3-credit hour lecture classes that meet MWF are not in compliance with CCHE minimum expectations by 10 minutes total each semester offered. Because approximately 25% to 30% of our credit hours each fall and spring are derived from MWF 3-credit hour lecture classes, it is imperative that we address the shortage of minutes. (E.g. in fall 2013, 26.2% of credit hours came from MWF 3-credit hour lecture classes, and 26.9% from TuTh 3-credit hour lecture classes.)

DETAIL: Some background on total number of minutes required:

CCHE expects that a credit hour of lecture-based instruction corresponds to a minimum of 750 minutes/semester of lecture. This is consistent with what is known nationally as the Carnegie unit. [While some of the wording in federal and regional accreditor documents is vague with an intent to allow for some flexibility due to newly evolving/developing instructional delivery models, many state higher education commissions/boards have explicitly adopted this same 750 minute/credit hour standard (e.g. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas,…).] Thus the CCHE (and typical national) expectation is for a minimum of three times this amount, i.e. 2250 minutes during the semester, for a 3-credit-hour lecture-based course.

What the CSU-Pueblo Faculty Senate is recommending regarding course meeting times for MWF lecture classes:

The recommendation from the CSU-Pueblo Faculty Senate proposes adding 5 minutes to each 50-minute lecture class meeting for courses that meet on M, W, and F (14 weeks), resulting in a 15-week semester which includes final exam week. Course meeting times would be adjusted from 8am-8:50am, 9am-9:50am, etc, to 7:45am-8:40am, 8:50am-9:45am, 9:55am-10:50am, 11am-11:55am, etc, on M, W and F, maintaining the current 10-minute break between classes. (There is no change to classes that meet on Tu, Th, Sat or Sun.) These changes will meet and surpass CCHE credit hour requirements.
Comparison with CSU:

CSU’s MWF 3-credit hour classes meet for 15 weeks with one holiday in fall and spring (i.e. Labor Day and Martin Luther King’s birthday) totaling **2200 minutes** prior to final exams. CSU’s final exams are **120 minutes**, yielding **2320 minutes** in total, so CSU’s MWF 3-credit hour classes are 70 minutes in excess of the CCHE standard. CSU’s TuTh 3-credit hour classes meet for 75 minutes each class for 15 weeks (2250 minutes prior to final exams), yielding 2370 minutes in total. That is, CSU’s classes are 120 minutes in excess of the CCHE minimum standard for 3-credit hour TuTh classes.

By comparison, CSU- Pueblo’s proposed Academic Calendar will have MWF 3-credit hour classes meet for 14 weeks with no holidays in fall or spring semesters totaling **2310 minutes** prior to final exams. CSU-Pueblo final exams will continue to be **140 minutes** yielding **2450 minutes** in total, i.e. CSU-Pueblo MWF 3-credit hour classes will be 200 minutes in excess of the CCHE standard. CSU-Pueblo’s TuTh 3-credit hour classes will continue to meet for 80 minutes each class for 14 weeks (2240 minutes prior to final exams), yielding 2380 minutes in total. That is, CSU-Pueblo classes are 130 minutes in excess of the CCHE minimum standard for 3-credit hour TuTh classes.

The following table summarizes the proposed changes and provides a comparison of the two campuses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Class Schedule for Both Campuses</th>
<th>Proposed Class Schedule for CSU-Pueblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 credit hour course meeting times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current class minutes before final exam week</td>
<td>Final exam minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF CSU-Pueblo</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF CSU</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuTh CSU-Pueblo</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuTh CSU</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References

Many university websites indicate the 750 minute/cr hr standard (i.e. a keyword search yields many hits). Below are two links to CCHE and one link to a summary of many issues that relate to the credit hour definition, including some state higher education requirements.


http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Groups/AcademicCouncil/minutes/20121009_MINUTES.pdf

MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Report Item. No action necessary.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Rick Miranda, Provost and Executive Vice President

Report to the Board of Governors that provides an overview of the Colorado State University – Fort Collins enrollment trends from fall 2010 through fall 2014.
Colorado State University: Fort Collins Campus (FA10-FA14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>One Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>6,615</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>6,937</td>
<td>99 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4,334</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>4,676</td>
<td>4,879</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>83 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>19 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.V.M.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-2 -0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Degrees</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>148 6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM Degrees</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>4,666</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>-49 -1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>One Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>349,476</td>
<td>354,229</td>
<td>355,814</td>
<td>358,230</td>
<td>357,648</td>
<td>-582 -0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>26,356</td>
<td>26,735</td>
<td>26,769</td>
<td>27,034</td>
<td>27,086</td>
<td>52 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>21,953</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>22,412</td>
<td>22,565</td>
<td>22,506</td>
<td>-59 -0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>6,039</td>
<td>5,953</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>5,798</td>
<td>5,604</td>
<td>-194 -3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>5,145</td>
<td>139 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>5,177</td>
<td>5,127</td>
<td>-50 -1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>6,153</td>
<td>6,404</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>6,584</td>
<td>6,630</td>
<td>46 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>120 3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate I</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>170 7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate II</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>-50 -3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>-9 -1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>One Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Undergraduate</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>4,544</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>-90 -2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13,526</td>
<td>13,812</td>
<td>13,829</td>
<td>13,909</td>
<td>13,891</td>
<td>-18 -0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12,830</td>
<td>12,923</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>13,125</td>
<td>13,195</td>
<td>70 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident, Non-WUE</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>4,992</td>
<td>5,291</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>6,259</td>
<td>538 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident, WUE</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>52 8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>21,169</td>
<td>21,234</td>
<td>20,911</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>20,162</td>
<td>-538 -2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not First-Generation</td>
<td>20,278</td>
<td>20,446</td>
<td>20,403</td>
<td>20,852</td>
<td>21,038</td>
<td>186 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>6,366</td>
<td>6,182</td>
<td>6,048</td>
<td>-134 -2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Pell</td>
<td>21,194</td>
<td>21,299</td>
<td>21,269</td>
<td>21,687</td>
<td>22,106</td>
<td>419 1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell (preliminary count for FA14)</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>5,436</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>-367 -6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonminority</td>
<td>22,725</td>
<td>22,825</td>
<td>22,584</td>
<td>22,603</td>
<td>22,456</td>
<td>-147 -0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>353 23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>-342 -22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20,311</td>
<td>20,124</td>
<td>19,705</td>
<td>19,564</td>
<td>19,406</td>
<td>-158 -0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>199 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>81 15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>58 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pac. Islander</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5 22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>159 6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>-147 -16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>43 44.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>One Year Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Sciences</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>92 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>21 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>92 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Sciences</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>162 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-University</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>2,908</td>
<td>20 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>5,065</td>
<td>4,786</td>
<td>-279 -5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>3,737</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>4,282</td>
<td>-64 -1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine &amp; Biomedical Sci</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>-7 -0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner College of Natural Resources</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>15 0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unless otherwise specified, all data reflect student headcount; fall 2014 Pell Grant data are not available to date.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Report Item. No action necessary.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Jon Bellum, Provost and Senior Vice President

Report to the Board of Governors that provides an overview of the CSU-Global Campus enrollment trends from fall 2010 through fall 2013. Fall 2014 data are collected after the Winter B term census in December 2014 and will be submitted to SURDS in February 2015.
## Enrollment and Demographic Trends: Fall 2009 - Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>2,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree Seeking</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Undergraduate (%) UG | 335 | 52% | 770 | 48% | 1,002 | 37% | 1,321 | 36% | 1,930 | 37% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Status</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Students</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Students</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>1,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>1,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Residence</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Colorado</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>2,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of Colorado in US</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Generation (%) UG</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% UG</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% UG</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% UG</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% UG</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% UG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not PELL Recipient</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL Recipient</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Loans Recipient</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>NA (7)</td>
<td>3,686</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,282</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Fall 2009(2)</td>
<td>Fall 2010(2)</td>
<td>Fall 2011(2)</td>
<td>Fall 2012(2)</td>
<td>Fall 2013(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>NA(9)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non resident Alien</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 or younger</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,848</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>7,402</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded(1)</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count(1)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Data Source: SURDS Reporting  
(2) Data are reported for each Fall term, as per SURDS reporting, and reflect the period of July 1 - Dec 31 of each given year. Fall 2014 data are not reported here, as this term is not complete, and final enrollment will not be available until after Dec 15, 2014 (after census for the Winter B term).  
(3) Data regarding "New Undergraduates" reflect students new to the institution; at CSU - Global students must have 12 or greater transfer credits, thus these data do not reflect first time undergraduates  
(4) 'Out of Colorado in US' - includes Washington DC, excludes US Commonwealths and Territories. The category of 'Foreign Country' includes US Commonwealths/Territories (e.g. American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico), & may include American Service Members or dependants stationed abroad.  
(5) First Generation Status is self-reported by the student; these data are not reported via SURDS (Source: CampusVue)  
(6) Student Financial Aid Data are not reported via SURDS (Source: CampusVue)  
(7) During these years, CSU-Global did not administer financial aid directly, but rather administered through CSU-Pueblo and CSU-Fort Collins  
(8) Students receiving loans may also have received PELL, that is, these categories are not mutually exclusive, thus percentages do not equal 100%  
(9) The category of 'Two or More Races' was not used in Fall 2009 and prior.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>One year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>-19 -2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19 15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM** Degrees</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>9 7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-STEM** Degrees</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>-9 -1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours</th>
<th>FA10</th>
<th>FA11</th>
<th>FA12</th>
<th>FA13</th>
<th>FA14 Census</th>
<th>One year change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>5,152</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>4,868</td>
<td>4,679</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>-151 -3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>4,394</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>-125 -2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>9 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>-80 -10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>-26 -2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>-42 -3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-42 -17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Undergraduate       | 1,416| 1,443| 1,296| 1,124| 1,248       | 124 9.9%        |
| Female                  | 2,742| 2,803| 2,609| 2,523| 2,413       | -110 -4.6%      |
| Male                    | 2,410| 2,427| 2,259| 2,156| 2,115       | -41 -1.9%       |
| Nonresident, Non-WUE    | 272  | 294  | 296  | 279  | 337         | 58 17.2%        |
| Nonresident, WUE        | 298  | 324  | 310  | 290  | 301         | 11 3.7%         |
| Resident                | 4,582| 4,612| 4,262| 4,110| 3,890       | -220 -5.7%      |

| Not First-Generation*** | 3,155| 3,195| 2,972| 2,921| 2,952       | 31 1.1%         |
| First Generation***     | 1,997| 2,035| 1,896| 1,758| 1,576       | -182 -11.5%     |

| Not Pell****            | 2,832| 2,809| 2,702| 2,626| 2,689       | 63 2.3%         |
| Pell*****               | 2,320| 2,421| 2,166| 2,053| 1,839       | -214 -11.6%     |

| Nonminority            |      |      |      |      |             |
| International*****     | 129  | 111  | 122  | 119  | 135         | 16 11.9%        |
| Unknown                | 259  | 219  | 194  | 165  | 137         | -28 -20.4%      |
| White                  | 2,811| 2,773| 2,513| 2,396| 2,259       | -137 -6.1%      |

| Minority               |      |      |      |      |             |
| Asian                  | 105  | 103  | 82   | 78   | 60          | -18 -30.0%      |
| Black                  | 454  | 423  | 370  | 343  | 333         | -10 -3.0%       |
| Hawaiian/Pac. Islander | 2    | 4    | 6    | 8    | 5           | -3 -60.0%       |
| Hispanic/Latino        | 1,290| 1,448| 1,417| 1,394| 1,405       | 11 0.8%         |
| Multi-Racial           | 37   | 96   | 125  | 144  | 166         | 22 13.3%        |
| Native American        | 65   | 53   | 39   | 32   | 28          | -4 -14.3%       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education, Engineering and Professional Studies</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>-19 1.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>-146 -10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>-28 -5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan School of Business</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>-13 -1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:  *Unless otherwise specified, all data reflect student headcount
**STEM programs as designated per Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
***As reported on student FAFSA forms
****Preliminary count for FA14
*****Based on citizenship
Academic and Student Affairs Committee
Work Plan
Recurring Items and Reports
Faculty-related:
A. Faculty Report: Hiring, Retention, Evaluations, Post-tenure Reviews, Productivity, Salaries
B. Tenure and Promotion
C. Emeritus Designations, Sabbaticals and other leaves
D. Teaching Awards,
E. Faculty Manual/Handbook changes

Student-related:
A. Approval of degrees, Honorary degrees, posthumous degrees
B. Student Handbook, Conduct Code changes
C. Admissions/Enrollment/retention/graduation/diversity reports
D. Tuition/Financial Aid/Student Fees report
Program-related:
A. Program Reviews: schedules, summaries of report; Accreditations
B. Academic Degree Programs: description, approvals for CCHE/DHE, discontinuances
C. Academic Calendar approvals
D. Peer Group analyses

Research/Engagement-related:
A. General research/engagement/economic development reports by VP-Research, VP-Engagement
B. State Agencies: Extension/CSFS/AgExpStations/Water Institute
Academic and Student Affairs Committee Work Plan

Special Topics As Requested
Special Topics as Requested:

A. Campus Safety/Title IX issues (done in October 2014)
B. Faculty Workload Analysis report
C. Student Success Initiatives
D. Distance / Online Program Reports
E. Internationalization Initiatives
F. Tuition/Affordability/Access interplay (joint with Finance?)
G. Changing demographics of our student bodies, how we should respond
H. Statewide Presence of Colorado State
I. Denver South
J. Articulation programs: concurrent/dual enrollment, 2+2 programs, transfers, GTPathways, etc.
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Consent Agenda

A. Colorado State University System
   • Minutes of the August 7, 2014 Board and Committee Meetings
   • Minutes of the August 8, 2014 Board Meeting
   • Minutes of the November 19, 2014 CSU-Global Task Force Meeting

B. Colorado State University
   • Approval of CSU Faculty Manual Change – Section D.7.20
   • Approval of CSU Faculty Manual Change – Section C.2.3.1.e
   • Approval of CSU Posthumous Degree

C. Colorado State University-Pueblo
   • Approval of 2015-16 Academic Calendar
CALL TO ORDER

Chair Dorothy Horrell called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

ROLL

Governors present: Dorothy Horrell, Chair; William Mosher, Vice Chair (via telephone); Joseph Zimlich; Treasurer; Scott Johnson, Secretary; Dennis Flores; Mark Gustafson; Demitri “Rico” Munn; Jane Robbe Rhodes; Nancy Tuor; Samantha Guinn, Student Representative, CSU; Brad Schiffelbein, Student Representative, CSU-Global Campus; Timothy Zercher, Student Representative, CSU-Pueblo; Michael Mincic, Faculty Representative, CSU-Pueblo.

Administrators present: Michael Martin, Chancellor, CSU System; Tony Frank, President, CSU; Lesley Di Mare, President, CSU-Global Campus; Rick Miranda, Chief Academic Officer, CSU System, and Provost and Executive Vice President, CSU; Allison Horn, Director of Internal Auditing, CSU System; Michael Nosler, General Counsel, CSU System; Rich Schweigert, Chief Financial Officer, CSU System.

System Staff present: Adam Fedrid, IT Manager; Melanie Geary, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Allen Sneesby, IT Technician; Sharon Teufel, Executive Assistant to the Board of Governors.

Guests present: Stephanie Chichester, North Slope Capital; Jean Christman, Attorney, Office of General Counsel, CSU; Johnna Doyle, Deputy General Counsel, CSU-Pueblo; Kathleen Henry, President/CEO, CSURF; Blanche Hughes, Vice President, Student Affairs, CSU Nancy Hurt, Managing Director, CSURF Real Estate Office; Jason Johnson, Deputy General Counsel, CSU; Lynn Johnson, CSU CFO, Rick Kreminski Dean, College of Science and Mathematics and Acting Director, Institutional Research and Analysis, CSU-Pueblo; Lance Li Puma, Vice President, ASCSU; Tom Milligan, CSU Vice President for External Relations; Madeline Novey, Education Report, Coloradoan; Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations; Nick Taylor, North Slope Capital; Kwan-Jantiz Yearby, ASCU Senator.

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Governor Zimlich, Committee Chair; Governor Munn, Committee Vice Chair; Rich Schweigert, Chief Financial Officer, CSU System, assigned staff; Allison Horn, Director of Internal Auditing, CSU System, assigned staff

Committee Chair Zimlich convened the meeting and asked Allison Horn, Director of Internal Auditing, for her report.

Status of FY 2014-15 Audit Plan: Ms. Horn indicated the report was an update and there were no red flag issues to report. Executive summaries for three reports issued since the last meeting were provided in the meeting book. The NCAA requires that 15 areas be reviewed every four years which is done on a rotating schedule. Additionally a few sports camps are reviewed each year which is not a NCAA requirement and the report is combined with the compliance review.
Subsequent to the submission of the executive summaries for the meeting book, two additional reports were issued for Accounts Receivable at CSU, and the Student Accounts Receivable and Financial Aid at CSU-Global, the latter of which had no recommendations. Management agreed with the ten recommendations made in all of the reports with implementation already underway for part of the recommendations and reasonable target dates established for new processes and procedures.

**Overdue Recommendations:** Ms. Horn explained that overdue recommendations are from prior audit reports where the initial target date indicated by management was not met. New target implementation dates have been set and no red flags were identified. Three of the overdue recommendations were in the CSU Warner College of Natural Resources and the remaining eight recommendations are for Continuing Education at CSU-Pueblo.

Committee Chair Zimlich asked Rich Schweigert, Chief Financial Officer, CSU System, for his report.

**State Revenue Projections:** Mr. Schweigert reviewed quarterly revenue projections from the Legislative Council and the Governor’s Office of State Planning and Budget (OSPB). Revenues from June to September, 2014 continued to improve. A composite illustration of the state’s General Fund and State Education Fund Budget was provided; higher education receives 7.4% of the budget. Over the past 15 to 20 years more of the cost of higher education has been shifted to the student. In response to a question, Mr. Schweigert confirmed that the additional $100 million for higher education was a commitment for two years.

**HB14-1319 Higher Education Funding Model:** Mr. Schweigert provided an overview of the process to develop a higher education funding model as stipulated in HB14-1319 with three subject matter expert teams. The Funding Modeling team has been working on the allowable funding mechanisms with identified data. The next Funding Modeling meeting is October 19th which is the target date for a draft model. Mr. Schweigert reviewed each of the role and mission funding areas relative to the CSU System institutions and other state institutions.

Discussion followed on the philosophical issue of maximizing funding for the CSU-System versus improving higher education in Colorado. While the Board’s main focus is on the governance and oversight of three institutions based on the role and mission of these institutions, the Board is also charged as trustees for the interest of State of Colorado.

Governor Munn summarized three values identified by the Board in the discussion: 1) recognition and reward for fulfilling the distinct role and mission of all three of the CSU System institutions; 2) recognition for being efficient in performing that role and mission; and 3) flexibility in governance including tuition to be able to operate the institutions in a dynamic environment without restrictions in the funding formula.

Mr. Schweigert reported the recommendations of the three subject matter expert teams will be reviewed by an Executive Advisory Group before submission to the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. The timeline for the funding model includes a draft by mid-October; the final draft model submitted to the Governor’s Office by early November and finalized in early December; and then the funding model will be submitted to the General Assembly.

**Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) #68:** Mr. Schweigert provided an overview of the GASB’s research project on the unfunded liability of the Public Employees Retirement Association (PERA), the state’s contribution, and the requirements for employers to fund the gap. The GASB
Statement No. 68 replaces the existing requirements and next year employers will need to begin booking the net pension liability on balance sheets. When asked about potential impact on cash flow for the System, Mr. Schweigert asked Lynn Johnson, CSU Associate Vice President of Finance, to respond. Ms. Johnson responded that there is not a definitive answer to that question yet and explained that, once an allocation process has been completed by PERA, employers will be billed and be able to book the liability. There is also uncertainty as to whether the amount employers contribute on an annual basis will be changed.

**CSU System Debt Capacity:** Committee Chair Zimlich reported there were no bond issuances being brought to this meeting. Mr. Schweigert introduced Stephanie Chichester, the System’s financial advisor for the past five years.

Ms. Chichester explained the current System debt capacity ratings are Aa3 and A+ by Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s respectively. She reviewed the annual process utilizing financial professionals to provide a range the rating agencies would view favorably without lowering the System’s rating. Based on the recently completed analysis, the range for the System is an additional $75 million to $125 million could be issued at the current ratings before a downgrade would occur. Mr. Schweigert noted the rating is for the CSU System, not individual campuses.

Ms. Chichester reviewed comparisons to academic peer institutions and to similarly rated public universities. She commented on managing to the mission of the institution versus managing to ratings, and diversifying revenues as the balance sheet grows. Mr. Schweigert pointed out the CSU pledged revenue utilization information provided was based on broad categories. With the state intercept program, the System has a large capacity and internally all projects are stress-tested to prove there is a 125% revenue stream available to support the bond payments.

**Audit and Finance Committee Work Plan:** Committee Chair Zimlich explained the work plan was created through input from the System office, the campuses and from previous board meetings. Mr. Schweigert reviewed the annually recurring items and the non-recurring or one-time items on the work plan. Board Chair Horrell noted that all of the committees would be reviewing their work plans at the October meeting. Chancellor Martin would then integrate the plans into a comprehensive document.

**CSU-Global Campus Net Revenues:** Committee Chair Zimlich reported he met previously with President Takeda-Tinker and a suggested process was to have discussion at the October meeting on the strategic opportunities or directions that may impact CSU-Global Campus. At the December meeting the discussion could be focused on the current role and mission to begin to understand how to guide the excess revenues of CSU-Global Campus. There would be follow-up on the December discussion in February.

It was suggested a work group be established to explore the issues, factors and policy parameters relative to the use of CSU-Global Campus’ net revenues. The work group would be composed of President Takeda-Tinker, Chancellor Martin, System staff as needed, Board representation, and campus staff where appropriate or needed. The purpose of the group would not to make policy decisions, but to structure the key points and options that should be considered for further discussion.

In considering guiding operating principles, the work group would need to factor in the annual operating needs that would provide CSU-Global Campus flexibility to continue to innovate and evolve in a rapidly changing, competitive online market; and to determine the appropriate level of reserves for CSU-Global Campus. As excess cash flow is generated, there would need to be consideration of revenues to be used for operating purposes versus innovation and the short-term versus long-term or strategic projects.
Board Chair Horrell confirmed there was a consensus of the Board to form the work group to be led by Committee Chair Zimlich. Governor Tuor agreed to serve on the work group as part of the voting members. Student and faculty representation will be confirmed later.

With no further business to come before the Audit and Finance Committee, the committee meeting was concluded. The Board meeting was recessed for a short break and reconvened at 10:23 a.m.

**REAL ESTATE/FACILITIES COMMITTEE**

*Governor Tuor, Committee Chair; Governor Flores, Committee Vice Chair; Deputy General Counsel Johnson, assigned staff*

Committee Chair Tuor convened the Real Estate/Facilities Committee at 10:23 a.m.

**Real Estate/Facilities Committee Work Plan:** Committee Chair Tuor reviewed the annually recurring items. She then explained that three non-recurring items – the CSU stadium, Denver South, and National Western Center – will have implications for multiple committees; are multi-year projects; involve the community as well as the state; have implications on role and mission; and will require staff work to ensure the Board is aware all of the issues. Given the cross-committee work that will be required, Committee Chair Tuor inquired as to the appropriateness of the Real Estate/Facilities Committee taking the lead for these three projects.

Board Chair Horrell concurred that there were cross-committee implications. With the new meeting structure, the Board is meeting as committees of the whole and there would be value in having the Real Estate/Facilities Committee taking the lead on these three projects. Committee Chair Tuor added this should not be seen as control of the decision-making, but control and organization of the information to ensure the Board will have the ability to make any necessary decisions.

**Executive Session:** General Counsel Nosler read the meeting into executive session for the purposes of discussions relating to the purchase of property for public purpose or sale of property at competitive bidding if premature disclosure of such transaction would give a competitive advantage to the other party, and to receive legal advice on specific legal issues, as set forth in the meeting notice. **Motion/Action:** The motion was made, seconded and carried. The meeting convened in executive session at 10:32 p.m. The committee recessed for lunch at 11:20 a.m. and then reconvened in open public session at 1:15 p.m.

**Action Items:** Committee Chair Tuor asked President Frank to review the three action items.

**Aggie Village Easement:** President Frank explained the action item was for an easement from the Colorado State University Research Foundation (CSURF) for parking and utilities associated with the redevelopment of Aggie Village North. The $580,000 cost for the easement is covered by the project though Housing and Dining, and bonds have been issued for the project. **Motion/Action:** Governor Zimlich moved to approve, Governor Johnson seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

**Long Term Roof-top Leases:** President Frank reviewed the action item to enter into a lease arrangement on five buildings for the installation of solar panels to generate solar power. A private outside contracting company will do the installation and the power goes to the City of Fort Collins’ grid. **Motion/Action:** Governor Horrell read the matter for action and made the motion to approve. Governor Munn seconded and the motion carried unanimously.
Forest Legacy Conservation Easement: President Frank explained the establishment of the Colorado Forest Service with CSU as the holder of these conservation easements that, in essence, come through the federal government and other matching grant agencies. **Motion/Action:** Governor Robbe Rhodes read the matter for action and made the motion to approve. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

**National Western Center:** Committee Chair Tuor commented the project is more than the National Western Center (NWC) and is a major redevelopment of north Denver with active, high level engagement of the City of Denver and the surrounding neighborhoods. CSU is considered a major partner and the Board will continue to be engaged as the project moves forward. Committee Chair Tuor asked Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations, to present the NWC report.

Ms. Parsons reported a comprehensive presentation on the master plan and financing would be made to the Board in December. The written report provided an overview of the NWC and CSU’s programming priorities. The NWC is a one of six projects in the North Denver Cornerstone Collaborative. There will be an opportunity to phase-in CSU’s activities that will be beneficial from both a financial and programmatic standpoint. Parking will be layered-in and there remain a few land ownership issues to be resolved before the master plan is finalized.

Ms. Parsons explained the financing plan will involve combining the work of the NWC’s finance committee and the City of Denver’s finance committee who are looking at various options. The feasibility study for the redevelopment project was done on a broader basis in concert with Visit Denver for a broad look at tourism in the region and potential utilization of the facilities for more than the NWSS.

When asked about any potential Board action, it was noted there may need to be a policy statement and support by the Board on financing plans and allocation of resources. President Frank recounted that, at the June 2013 Board retreat, he briefed the Board on the NWC and there was a general support for the project with no formal action taken. Since that time, there has been an ongoing effort to keep the Board informed.

With no further business to come before the committee, the motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The Real Estate/Facilities Committee meeting concluded at 1:49 p.m.

**EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**Governor Mosher, Committee Chair; Governor Johnson, Committee Vice Chair; General Counsel Nosler, assigned staff.**

Committee Chair Mosher (via telephone) convened the Evaluation Committee. General Counsel Nosler read the meeting into executive session for the purpose of discussing and evaluating public officials and professional staff employees as set forth in the meeting notice. **Motion/Action:** The motion to convene in executive session was made, seconded and carried unanimously. The meeting convened in executive session at 1:50 p.m.

The Evaluation Committee reconvened in open public session at 3:15 p.m. **Motion/Action:** The motion was made, seconded and carried unanimously to accept the 2014-15 goals for the three campus presidents as submitted and for Chancellor Martin as amended in executive session. The Board meeting was recessed at 3:20 p.m. to move to the North Ballroom for the stadium presentation, public comment and Board discussion.
STADIUM REPORT

Chair Horrell convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. and pointed out there was a sign-up sheet for public comment. Two hours was allocated for the public comment and the amount of time for each speaker would be determined by the number of individuals who sign-up to address the Board. Governor Mosher joined the meeting via telephone. Chair Horrell asked President Frank for his stadium report.

President Frank reported his recommendations were communicated the previous week in an open message to the community. He recapped the history of the stadium process that began in January 2012 and, in October 2012, President Frank presented his recommendation to the Board to move forward with the project at an estimated cost of $220 million with a financing model of 50% through philanthropy and 50% in revenue bonds.

During the next two years active fundraising was undertaken. The schematic design phase was completed, as was the design development phase, including the establishment of a Community Design Development Advisory Committee (CDDAC). A potential criticism for the project from the beginning was potential impact on academic fundraising. To-date, there has been no impact on academic fundraising that has continued to set records. Including gifts, pledges, an assessment of verbal commitments and a routine “retail” fundraising campaign following a decision, President Frank said he was comfortable saying that $50 million has been raised or pledged for the stadium.

President Frank reviewed the four primary options as outlined in his open communication:

- **Option 1: Maintain Hughes Stadium.** While there have been some expenditures on Hughes Stadium over the past two years for safety and equipment failure reasons, there remains approximately $30M of deferred maintenance as determined by CSU facilities staff and in the Cumming Corporation’s report that could potentially be spread out over 10 years. There has been no interest from the donors who pledged to the new stadium at the $50,000 level or higher to fund this option. Without revenue bonds or donor support, an alternative approach would be to issue general obligation bonds for a non-academic project (to President Frank’s knowledge, for the first time in the university’s history) with an impact on the General Fund.

- **Option 2: Hughes 2050.** The second choice would be a substantial renovation of Hughes Stadium to create a modern facility for the next 30 years with a variety of design options that would add substantial costs, but there would be an additional revenue product to support revenue bonds and potential donor interest. If the construction costs escalated at a rate beyond revenue bonds and donor interest, then the project could have a greater impact on the General Fund than Option 1.

- **Option 3: Phased build-out with the current on-campus stadium plans.** The cost of the stadium would be reduced initially by removal of certain features that could be added-back as funding becomes available. This option would rely on the amount of funds raised with careful consideration of donor interest and revenue bond capacity.

- **Option 4: Public-Private Partnership (P3).** The existing process would be stopped and the project would be rebid as a P3 with a long-term land lease to a private partner who would construct the stadium to CSU’s specifications and lease the stadium back to the university. There is a wide spectrum of viable funding models that could be considered.

President Frank commented that an important goal as the options are considered is to create a viable long-term facility for the football program and other athletics. While there have been discussions as to the
future of FBS football, his personal opinion is that football will continue to be played and be important to
the visibility of CSU. Additionally, the facility should be multi-use for the campus community.

Of primary concern is these goals must be met in the context of the impact on the General Fund and
academics. Use of the General Fund to fund areas that are not mission-critical should be avoided if
possible.

President Frank suggested that he and his team be given until the December Board meeting to evaluate at
least these four options to make a recommendation on how to best address these goals. A “blue book”
comparing the options would be developed and available to the public by posting on a website where
additional public comment could be received.

Two additional committees, a Community Leadership Committee and a Campus Leadership Committee,
would be established to examine the blue book and other materials, and present a public set of written
recommendations to President Frank by mid-November. While best efforts have been made throughout
the process to gather and publish input from a wide variety of sources, there continues to be concern that
various constituencies have not been engaged. This additional process of asking representative groups to
weigh-in in a public manner will provide an additional mechanism to address some of those concerns.

During this time period other mechanisms to share information and gain input include community open
houses at Hughes Stadium to allow the public to see the maintenance projects; President Frank’s
upcoming annual work session with the Fort Collins City Council; and a meeting with the editorial board
of the Coloradoan. No additional costs will be incurred through outside expertise. Input on the options
will also be sought from the university’s Facilities staff which has a high level of expertise and has done
an admirable job during the past 2½ years to maintain Hughes Stadium.

President Frank will compile the input by the end of November and make his conclusions available to the
community prior to the December meeting in a similar manner as for the October meeting. At the
December meeting in Denver, President Frank will present his recommendation to the Board. There will
also be an opportunity for public comment, prior to the Board’s discussion and potential action.

Chair Horrell asked that questions from the Board at this point be for clarification of President Frank’s
recommendation with a broader discussion to be held after the public comment. In response to questions,
President Frank confirmed that the work of the CDDAC has been completed and their final report had
been shared with the Board. Should the decision be made to move forward with an on-campus stadium,
efforts will be made to ensure that the important recommendations from the committee are
accommodated. There are models available to assist with implementing mechanisms to address
intergovernmental agreements with the City of Fort Collins and memorandums of understanding with
neighborhood associations.

When asked about private philanthropy, President Frank explained how efforts could be made to decrease
the cost of the stadium while maintaining the functionality and quality of stadium with flexibility to
expand in the future, while maintaining philanthropic support. The possibility to increase fundraising
remains, but it is unlikely this would exceed $75 million.

On the P3 option, President Frank was asked (1) if in the evaluation process would donors be polled on
willingness to create an endowment to help offset the rental cost and (2) at the same time would analysis
be done on alternative uses of the current site, both in terms of service to the institution and generation of
income? He responded there has not been much discussion on alternative uses of Hughes Stadium and
planning would only be done at an appropriate time. There are a variety of P3 business models utilizing
philanthropy including options to use multi-year pledge payments to fund the remaining portion of the stadium or to buy down the upfront cost. Conversations are being held with donors to determine their interests.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Horrell thanked President Frank for his report and indicated the public comment would begin with the individuals who had signed the public comment sheet. The expanded public comment session was scheduled at a time that would allow for working individuals to participate. At 5:30, the audience would be asked if there are any additional individuals who have joined the meeting that would like to address the Board.

Based on the number of individuals, each speaker was allocated five minutes and public comment could be given on the stadium or other matters that an individual wanted to present to the Board. At 5:30 p.m., additional individuals requested the opportunity to address the Board. In total, the following individuals presented public comment on the stadium issue: Linda Vrooman, Michael Rossen, Mel Hilgenberg, Tom Linnell, Carl Wangsvick, Anita Wright, Bob Vangermeersch, Doug Brobst, Jean Yule, John Yule, Ben Morgan, William Clem, George Splittgerber, David Lehman, Gary Clark, Ken Tharp, Richard Livingston, Hal Cochrane, Ruth Hufbauer, Sam Ogden, Loui McCorley, Alex Tangsrud, De Bill Clem, and Lance Li Puma.

At 5:50 p.m., Chair Horrell indicated that the public comment had been concluded and, on behalf of the Board, expressed appreciation for the interest in the stadium issue. The meeting was briefly recessed and re-adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

BOARD STADIUM DISCUSSION

The Board was asked for any additional questions in order to move forward with discussing the recommendation made by President Frank. When asked about timing for the availability of the plan for a modular-based multi-use stadium, President Frank explained the blue book would be available the following week and could be updated during the process. When asked about use of ground stability and engineering technologies to determine if there was an instability issue at Hughes Stadium, Steve Hultin, CSU Director of Facilities, responded that spot testing has been completed and there is no risk of catastrophic sinking. Should the decision be made to move forward with remediating Hughes, ground penetrating radar techniques could be applied.

Governor Guinn commented on how student input may be misrepresented and outdated, and a new survey could be conducted if desired. She noted that only 6 of the 24 individuals presenting public comment mentioned impact on students. There were comments that academics were being devalued while athletics were more valued. However, there were no comments on student-athletes who are on scholarship which is often their only opportunity to receive an education or on the value added to the university by the student-athletes. She also commented on how the impact of traffic on game days is unknown. When President Frank confirmed that tuition is in the General Fund, Governor Guinn noted that students’ views may have been different if they had realized from the beginning that their tuition dollars would be used to renovate Hughes Stadium. Governor Zercher added that attending a university is a whole life experience, not just academics.

Governor Munn commented that the four options offer a range of opportunities and, while the impact on the community needs to be understood, CSU is a state institution. The blue book approach is a good way to get a better understanding of the both short and long-term costs, which is a priority, and the risks. He
remarked that the issue of athletics vs. academics at colleges was a modern idea and provided an historical context from ancient Greece where people were engaged in cultural learning that included not just math and science, but also the capability of the human body. He noted that athletics has a particular impact on communities of color and first generation students where athletics often provides an avenue to education. While there can be an imbalance in the focus on athletics, there is not an imbalance at CSU and the leadership would not allow there to be an imbalance.

Governor Robbe Rhodes commented that, as a parent, an alum and businesswoman in an industry that deals with college athletics, the game day experience can be positive and a boost to the local economy. Governor Tuor commented on the long-term financial investment and the need to build for the future. Governor Johnson expressed potential interest in the P3 option, indicated cost was important, and supported a multi-purpose facility. Governor Zimlich, as a member of the Fort Collins community, remarked on the divisiveness of the issue and the need to reunite the community after a decision has been made. Governor Flores pointed out the need to ensure ADA accessibility. When asked about other uses for Hughes Stadium, President Frank responded that, other than an occasional use for events such as a marching band competition or a peach festival, the stadium is generally only used six times annually.

At the direction of Chair Horrell to elaborate on the next steps, President Frank recounted the process that will culminate in late November with his recommendation available to the public prior to the presentation at the December Board meeting.

Chair Horrell summarized the key discussion points as follows: First and foremost, students should be considered in any decision made by the Board. The consensus is that athletics are a valued part of the total academic experience. The Board is committed to excellence at CSU and the other System institutions. The Board will be responsible on the costs and the impact on the General Fund should be restrained. The Board is mindful of the public comment and is committed to rebuilding and reconnecting with the community.

Chair Horrell recounted that, in October 2012, the Board approved a resolution that stated, if fundraising by the October 2014 meeting was not at 50% of the target as had been defined, President Frank should be prepared to submit a report with recommendations to the Board. Said report was received at this meeting.

Chair Horrell summarized a resolution that would supersede the October 2012 resolution and indicates the Board is supporting President Frank’s recommendation to evaluate at least the four options that have been identified concerning an appropriate venue for a multi-use stadium. At the December, 2014, Board meeting, President Frank will present his recommendation taking into consideration the information discussed at the October meeting.

Motion: Governor Johnson moved to approve the resolution and Governor Tuor seconded. Governor Munn commented on the amount of work that would need to be completed and amended the motion to indicate the intent is to take action in December, but the deadline could be extended to February if necessary. Governor Tuor seconded the amendment. General Counsel Nosler read the proposed resolution and indicated that Governor Mosher had indicated his support for President Frank’s proposal via email. Action: Chair Horrell called for the vote and the motion was carried unanimously.

Chair Horrell thanked everyone for their participation and reviewed the agenda for the next day. The October Board meeting was recessed for the day at approximately 7:00 p.m.
Chair Dorothy Horrell called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Governors present: Dorothy Horrell, Chair; William Mosher, Vice Chair (via telephone); Joseph Zimlich; Treasurer; Scott Johnson, Secretary; Dennis Flores; Mark Gustafson; Demitri “Rico” Munn; Jane Robbe Rhodes; Nancy Tuor; Samantha Guinn, Student Representative, CSU; Brad Schiffelbein, Student Representative, CSU-Global Campus; Timothy Zercher, Student Representative, CSU-Pueblo; Michael Mincic, Faculty Representative, CSU-Pueblo.

Administrators present: Michael Martin, Chancellor, CSU System; Tony Frank, President, CSU; Lesley Di Mare, President, CSU-Pueblo; Becky Takeda-Tinker, President, CSU-Global Campus; Rick Miranda, Chief Academic Officer, CSU System, and Provost and Executive Vice President, CSU; Allison Horn, Director of Internal Auditing, CSU System; Michael Nosler, General Counsel, CSU System; Rich Schweigert, Chief Financial Officer, CSU System.

System Staff present: Adam Fedrid, IT Manager; Melanie Geary, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Allen Sneesby, IT Technician; Sharon Teufel, Executive Assistant to the Board of Governors.

Guests present: Scot Allen, CSU Office of International Programs; Jon Bellum, Provost, CSU-Global Campus; Dwight Burke, CSU Deputy Title IX Coordinator; Craig Chesson, Director of the CSU Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services; Jim Cooney, CSU Vice Provost, International Programs; Johnna Doyle, Deputy General Counsel, CSU-Pueblo; Scott Harris, Chief, CSU Police Department; Rick Kreminski Dean, College of Science and Mathematics and Acting Director, Institutional Research and Analysis, CSU-Pueblo; Kathleen Henry, President/CEO, CSURF; Blanche Hughes, Vice President, Student Affairs, CSU; Jason Johnson, Deputy General Counsel, CSU; Madeline Novey, Education Report, Coloradoan; Amy Parsons, CSU Vice President of Operations; Rajiv Khosla, Assistant Dean of International Programs, College of Agriculture, CSU; Geniphyr Ponce-Pore, Assistant Director, CSU Office of Community and Economic Development; James Pritchett, Professor of Agribusiness and Marketing, CSU; Kathay Rennells, Assistant Vice President, CSU Office of Community and Economic Development; Kathy Sisneros, CSU Women and Gender Advocacy Group; Lou Swanson, CSU Vice President for Engagement; Laura Thones, CSU Office of International Programs; Roosevelt Wilson, Title IX Coordinator and EEOC/AA Officer, CSU-Pueblo; Joshua Zuglish, Attorney, Office of General Counsel, CSU System.

Chair Horrell convened the meeting and thanked President Frank and his staff for the tour of the Laurel Village and the newly renovated Lory Student Center. She reviewed the meeting agenda and then asked Governor Gustafson to convene the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.
ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mark Gustafson, Committee Chair; Jane Robbe Rhodes, Vice Chair; Rick Miranda, CSU System Chief Academic Officer, and CSU Executive Vice President and Provost

Committee Chair Gustafson convened the meeting and noted the committee’s work plan would be the last agenda item. He asked Dr. Rick Miranda, CSUS Chief Academic Officer, to present the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award.

Dr. Miranda introduced Dr. James Pritchett, the CSU recipient who was unable to attend the May meeting due to a sabbatical in New Zealand. Board Chair Horrell, on behalf of the Board, thanked Dr. Pritchett for making a difference. Dr. Miranda added that Dr. Pritchett, whose activities include extensive extension efforts in addition to teaching, has recently accepted the role of Assistant Vice President of Engagement and will be an invaluable asset in getting faculty more involved in engagement.

Dr. Pritchett thanked the Board for the award and commented on how students are changing in the way they embrace knowledge, the way they think about their social mission, the way they take on tasks, and the way they adopt the land-grant mission. Faculty is cognizant of the changes and inspired to meet the challenges in a changing world. Dr. Pritchett expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to teach and now to take on the new engagement role.

CSU Posthumous Degree: Committee Chair Gustafson noted the supporting documentation was provided in the resolutions book and could be discussed in executive session if necessary. Dr. Miranda indicated this was the usual protocol and the posthumous degrees were on the consent agenda.

Motion/Action: Governor Johnson moved to approve, Governor Flores seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

CSU-Global Campus Posthumous Degree: Committee Chair Gustafson noted the supporting documentation was included in the resolutions book and could be discussed in executive session if necessary. Motion/Action: Board Chair Horrell made the motion to approve, Governor Robbe Rhodes seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

CSU-Global Campus HLC Reaffirmation Update: Dr. Jon Bellum, Provost, CSU-Global Campus, explained the reaffirmation process began in early 2014 as the leadership team along with key staff members including faculty and programming coordinators implemented a four-phase process. The first phase is the data and evidence collection to demonstrate CSU-Global Campus meets the HLC’s criteria for accreditation. The second phase is an action planning phase to utilize the evidence to identify and address any gaps, and to develop plans to bring the institution into greater alignment with the accreditation criteria. The third phase is report preparation and the fourth phase is planning for the site visit.

The reaffirmation began with presenting the information to faculty, students and staff with an all staff meeting in May. The first round of evidence gathering was completed during the summer with teams composed of staff, faculty and administrators assigned to each of the five criteria. Generally the progress made indicates that the criteria are being met and additional documentation, both internal and external, is needed. The action planning phase will continue through the fall and the teams will meet again in November to determine progress that has been made. A second round of action planning will continue through March and then the report will be written.
President Takeda-Tinker explained the accreditation process is lengthy and the report will be filed in summer 2015. After the February 2016 site visit, the site reviewers will prepare a report for panel review and presentation to the HLC board. CSU-Global Campus should receive the accreditation results by summer 2016.

**Academic and Student Affairs Committee Work Plan:** Committee Chair Gustafson reported a list of topics and initiatives has been prepared to begin setting priorities for presentations at upcoming meetings. He asked Dr. Miranda for his comments.

Dr. Miranda explained how the twelve topics were developed and included requests from the Board at previous meetings. The Title IX reports were to be presented at this meeting. Enrollment reports were deemed to be appropriate for the December meeting due to the census dates. The faculty workload analysis report was proposed for the February meeting and is in response to the questions raised at the August meeting based on the faculty activity reports.

In conjunction with the Audit and Finance Committee, a discussion on tuition, affordability and access can be conducted at some point during the year. Other areas identified to be of potential interest to the Board included student success initiatives and new tools on predictive analytics; changing demographics/profile of students that would provide an opportunity for Student Affairs to report on what is happening at each of the campuses; international education; accreditation; research; extension/ag experiment stations and the statewide presence; online education; and articulation programs in concert with high school programs and other four-year and community colleges.

Board Chair Horrell suggested grouping the items by those that are updates and those in which the Board would be engaged to provide feedback. Committee Chair Gustafson concurred and indicated the topics will be refined by categories including recurring, report only or action. Dr. Miranda added that many of the annually recurring regular reports, i.e., sabbaticals and emeritus designation, were not included on the list.

With no further discussion, the meeting then moved to the campus safety and Title IX reports. General Counsel Nosler was asked to begin the discussion.

**CAMPUS SAFETY AND TITLE IX REPORTS**

General Counsel Nosler commented on the importance of the reports and explained the first presentation will be the safety reports for CSU and CSU-Pueblo. CSU-Global Campus is not required to respond to the Clery Act because it does not have a physical campus. The second presentation would be focused on Title IX compliance; new legislative developments and initiatives, both on the federal and state level; and an update on how the campuses are acting in a proactive manner on sexual assault prevention, victim counseling and support, and protecting due process rights for the accused.

**Clery and Campus Safety Reports:** Deputy General Counsel Johnson reported campus safety is a priority at CSU and is a coordinated effort that begins with the Public Safety Team (PST). The PST has an executive committee that convenes in the event of a campus emergency and coordinates with the CSU Police Department (CSUPD) and other law enforcement agencies. An overview was provided of the CSUPD organization and the Campus Public Safety Team structure and activities which includes trainings, welfare checks and risk assessment. There are also student and employee consult teams that examine issues and provide intervention in the case of risk or threat of harm to one’s self or others.
Deputy General Counsel Doyle explained law enforcement for CSU-Pueblo is contracted through the Pueblo County Sheriff’s Office that provides 24/7 coverage, and training and consults when requested. There is also a campus safety team that includes the Associate Vice President of Facilities, the Dean of Residence Life, the Judicial Conduct Officer, the Director of External Affairs, the Sheriff’s Dept. and the Deputy General Counsel.

Deputy General Counsel Johnson provided an historical overview of the Clery Act that requires campuses to publish annual security reports with three main requirements: disclosures of policies; record retention and reporting; and issuance of campus alerts for emergency notification or a serious continuing threat to the campus. Notification of the alerts is generally done by campus-wide texts or emails. He reviewed the statistics in the annual security report for Colorado State University.

Deputy General Counsel Doyle explained the Clery report is due on October 1st and the campus’s statistics are due to the U.S. Dept. of Education by October 15th. Preparation of the reports is a year-long process that includes benchmarking and updating required policies. This past year there were only three Clery-reportable sex offenses at CSU-Pueblo with one perpetrator who has been removed from the campus. Domestic violence, dating violence and stalking are also reported. Definitions of such crimes differ at the federal and state level. There is not currently a state dating violence statute; efforts are being made to obtain clarification.

**Title IX:** General Counsel Nosler reported Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender in all educational programs and activities which receive financial aid, not just athletics. The enforcement powers of the U.S. Dept. of Education have been expanded. Each campus is required to publish a nondiscrimination statement; appoint a Title IX coordinator; and adopt and publish equitable grievance procedures for those making complaints of sexual discrimination. Recently institutions of higher education have come under heightened scrutiny related to allegations of sexual assault on campus.

General Counsel Nosler recounted legal and regulatory actions that have occurred since 1997. On January 22, 2014, President Obama established a White House Task Force to protect students from sexual assault with a report issued in April 2014 that includes an executive summary outlining additional enforcement procedures. There is new legislation pending on the federal level called the Higher Education Campus Accountability and Safety Act that will have additional reporting and disclosure requirements including creating a new position of confidential advisor to protect and counsel assault victims. CSU already has such advisors on campus. Failure to comply with the requirements could result in the U.S. Dept. of Education imposing a civil penalty of 1% of an institution’s operating budget.

Additionally the Campus SAVE Act became effective which amends the Violence Against Women Act to include additional categories such as domestic violence and same sex assault violence. Governor Brown of California has signed a “Yes Means Yes” law on sexual assault prevention that applies to all of higher education institutions in California receiving state aid or funding and defines a new legal standard for sexual assault. Similar legislation could potentially be enacted in other states.

General Counsel Nosler commented that the CSU System campuses have in place vigorous campus policies, procedures and support systems, but more is being done to prevent this type of activity among students. He also noted there must be a balance in prosecuting sexual misconduct violations while protecting the due process rights of all parties involved including the accused.

Mr. Josh Zugish, an attorney from the Office of General Counsel, explained how campus safety works at CSU. He introduced Dwight Burke, Deputy Title IX Coordinator who oversees the CSU Office of Support and Safety Assessment that receives and investigates reports; Kathy Sisneros of the CSU Women
and Gender Advocacy Group (WGAC) which is funded through student fees and provides education and prevention services, training materials, and victim support with victim assistance teams available 24/7 365; and Craig Chesson, Director of the CSU Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services which oversees the discipline after an investigation indicates there may be a violation of the student conduct code.

Mr. Zugish reviewed programs and trainings available for faculty and staff. Training has been occurring in a variety of offices. With the current budget cycle, a new training position has been created that will organize and coordinate trainings. Various publications are also available.

Since 2011 all incoming freshmen and transfer students are required to complete the HAVEN online sexual harassment education module during their first semester or have their accounts put on hold for future registrations. There has been a compliance rate of over 95%. Sexual harassment and violence brochures are also distributed to students. There are various awareness campaigns conducted through WGAC; a Tell Someone program which is a campus-wide safety initiative; and training including Consent Café.

Mr. Zugish commented on the coordination that occurs to ensure support services and resources are available to the victims, other students impacted, and the accused. An incident review and investigation flow chart, and a listing of student support services were provided. At the conclusion of an investigation, a report with supporting documentation is sent to Student Conduct Services. The Office of Equal Opportunity has oversight of the appeals process. When asked about intersecting activities with a formal criminal justice investigation, Mr. Zugish explained there is coordination with the CSUPD or Fort Collins Police Department as well as the campus investigation. The criminal process is a separate and distinct process from the university’s process with different standards or burdens of proof.

Deputy General Counsel Doyle explained the resources and structure at CSU-Pueblo. She introduced Roosevelt Wilson, Title IX Coordinator and EEOC/AA Officer for CSU-Pueblo. There is a campus-wide focus to ensure Title IX compliance and safety. Restructuring has occurred to have consistency across the campus and to utilize resources efficiently. Student support includes a counseling center and various trainings. There is a new health and prevention coordinator that is coordinating an upcoming training on preventing sexual assaults/misconduct. Community resources are available including a rape crisis center and a victim’s advocate group through the Sheriff’s office. Support and training is also provided to staff and faculty.

When asked about questions on safety issues raised by parents of prospective students, President Di Mare explained she utilizes the criteria from The Durango Herald report that covered a ten-year period and named CSU-Pueblo as one of the safest campuses in Colorado. President Frank explained he directly addresses safety in Preview and Orientation, particularly at Ram Welcome. Chancellor Martin observed that the public needs to have a greater understanding of the deep commitment of the campuses to safety and, as the cost of education has increased, services have also increased.

The meeting recessed for a break at 11:05 a.m. and reconvened at 11:19 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

General Counsel Nosler reported there were no material changes in the litigation report since the last meeting. An executive session would not be held unless requested by a Board member to answer any questions to which there was no such request.
CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Horrell noted the two posthumous degrees were approved during the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and the remaining items for approval were the minutes from the August 2014 meeting. **Motion/Action:** Governor Tuor moved to approve, Governor Robbe Rhodes seconded, and the motion was unanimously carried.

FACULTY AND STUDENT REPORTS

**Faculty Reports:** Chair Horrell pointed out the written report prepared by Governor Bernasek, CSU Faculty Representative. She asked Governor Deemer, Faculty Representative, CSU-Global Campus, for his report.

Governor Deemer remarked on the commitment of CSU-Global Campus for faculty training. The 4th annual CSU-Global Campus retreat would be held October 9-10 with a focus on academic quality, student assessment and best practices. President Takeda-Tinker added the retreat would involve program coordinators for every degree program, and marketing and enrollment staff to assess the university’s activities and to understand how everything integrates into the achievement of students. Governor Deemer remarked on the need to continually assess and improve given the competition. He shared a yellow book of online programs and noted there are more than 7,000 online schools now in the U.S. and 17,000 worldwide.

Governor Mincic, Faculty Representative, CSU-Pueblo, reported the faculty is cautiously optimistic for the current year after the financial difficulties of the prior year. He acknowledged the Board’s support and the work of the campus recruitment team. There was good dialogue at the last Faculty Senate meeting and faculty are working diligently with President Di Mare on important campus issues. Governor Mincic reviewed the issues the faculty will be addressing during the coming year. A presentation will be made by Royall & Company to help the faculty be more involved in the recruitment process. Challenges include filling vacancies on the various boards, and continuing to adapt to the Kuali Financial System and the new administrative structure. An Experiential Education Roundtable Committee has been formed and funding for mini-grants has been received through the Provost’s Office.

Governor Mincic reported he is the CSU-Pueblo representative on the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council. CSU also has a representative on the Council. Lt. Governor Garcia will be the speaking at the next meeting and there will be an opportunity to discuss HB14-1319. Additionally Governor Mincic has been working with CSU-Global Campus and the CSU System to develop an online construction management program.

**Student Reports:** Governor Schiffelbein, Student Representative, CSU-Global Campus, explained that, while CSU-Global Campus does not have a physical campus, the “It’s on Us” campaign is important because sexual assault is not just a campus problem, and it provides helpful information to students, staff and faculty with an opportunity to be proactive. Governor Schiffelbein is working with Regina Martel at the National Campus Leadership Council on the best way to approach the campaign given the uniqueness of the students at CSU-Global Campus. Chair Horrell added that Governor Schiffelbein was working with Governor Tuor on updating the CSU System strategic plan.

Governor Zercher, Student Representative, CSU-Pueblo, noted his written report provided an update on the work being undertaken by the Associated Students’ Government. Additionally, he is coordinating with Governor Guinn and the student government president at Fort Lewis College on the first official summit under the new constitution of the Colorado student government coalition. The summit will be
Chair Horrell reported that Governor Mosher was able to participate the previous day via telephone for President Frank’s stadium report and the public comment, but unable to remain on the line for the Board’s stadium discussion and action. She summarized the key principles or values to be considered in approving President Frank’s recommendation to move forward. The intent is to have a report and recommendation for action at the December board meeting with the understanding that, given the amount of work to be completed, the action may need to occur at the February meeting. Governor Mosher noted he had emailed his support for President Frank’s recommendation. Chair Horrell commented on how the process of having the Board discuss the topic after the public comment was positive. The meeting was recessed for lunch at 11:58 a.m. and resumed at 12:31 p.m.

Governor Guinn, Student Representative, CSU, provided an update on the chronic illness mentoring program and other mental health initiatives. Other highlights include the ASCSU is close to having a full senate for the first time in eight years; a new Inclusive Excellence Council is being considered as a place for students to discuss issues for underserved groups; weeklong Homecoming activities are being planned to better engage students; and a website is being developed for the free/reduced priced meal program to be launched in spring 2015 with a variety of donor options. Governor Guinn has been working with former ASCSU President Regina Martel on a sustainability event to be held in the newly renovated Lory Student Center. ASCSU has been encouraging participation at the International Colloquium and has been registering students to vote and providing information to assist with informed decisions.

PRESIDENTS' REPORTS

Colorado State University: President Frank reported CSU is working with the University of Colorado at Boulder and the CU Anschutz Medical Center to submit a joint proposal to the NIH and the National Institute for Drug Abuse for a contract to produce marijuana reagents for research and testing. The research will be conducted for legitimate scientific investigations into the components and biomedical benefits of marijuana, not on recreational or social aspects.

President Frank explained that a Ram Pride Service Award was established two years ago to recognize service beyond the scope and expectations of main job responsibilities. The first award was presented to the individuals who collectively are responsible for the Ram Welcome, Orientation and Preview. The award this year was being presented to Drs. Raj Khosla, Jim Cooney and Lou Swanson who stepped out of their carefully orchestrated schedule during an overseas trip to assist a CSU student who became ill while in India, and to Laura Thornes and Scot Allen of the Office of International Programs who assisted the father with obtaining a passport and visa to bring his son home. Dr. Swanson thanked President Frank and the Board on behalf of the recipients for the award.

CSU-Global Campus: President Takeda-Tinker amended her comments of the previous day to note that CSU-Global Campus has 3,600 graduates to-date of which 2,500 are undergraduate and 1,100 graduate. On November 10, 2014, CSU-Global Campus will launch two new cohorts. One cohort will be a test for first-time freshmen adult learners who have never attended college and the second cohort will be CSU-Global Campus’ first hybrid course with both online coursework and face-to-face interaction.

CSU-Global Campus has become a leader in utilizing competency-based exams to assist students, particularly those who do not have enough financial aid remaining on their lifetime cap, with their degree completion goals. A mentor is available to help students navigate the information and learning materials
supplied through free links provided in course shells. Students do not pay the $250 exam fee until they are ready to take the exam for which they have two attempts to pass. Of the original 388 students who entered the course shells, 31% have taken exams of which 61% have passed; and 71% of the 39% that did not pass initially re-took the exam and passed. The competency-based exam process continues to be monitored for improvements.

President Takeda-Tinker has been presenting data at national conferences on the competency-base exam process and will be speaking at three more conferences in the coming month. She shared an example of a student who was able to complete his degree for less than $17,000 by transferring 55 credits, earning 22 credits through competency-based exams, and completing 43 credits through standard CSU-Global course work.

President Takeda-Tinker commented on a $10,000 community outreach effort that allows CSU-Global Campus to be involved with its employees’ lives in their communities. The outreach will be expanded to faculty and then to students.

**CSU-Pueblo:** President Di Mare reported fall 2014 enrollment experienced a 3% decrease in headcount and a 3.3% decrease in FTE. Due to the mix of FTE students and the 15% increase in the freshmen class, the budget is currently better than projections. Merit scholarships were a big driver for the freshmen class. Of the 600 merit scholarships awarded, 280 students accepted of which 33% were Hispanic students. Preliminary assessments of freshmen enrollment indicate that 113 are attributable to the partnership with Royall & Company and 200 are for athletics.

CSU-Pueblo’s radio station, KTSC-FM, REV 89, under the direction of the Mass Communications Dept., received the Broadcast Education Association’s Signature Station award as the #1 student-operated radio station in the country. The marching band was one of ten bands chosen to help promote the new Fox dramedy, the Red Band Society, with a performance at the Colorado Children’s Hospital in Denver.

President Di Mare reported there was an unanticipated week-long U.S. Department of Education financial aid program review. An interview was held upon arrival of the review team and, based upon the exit interview, she anticipates CSU-Pueblo will have done well in the review with few findings.

Provost Carl Wright worked with the IT department to prepare an executive summary of the GTRI CSU Network Assessment on the technology infrastructure at CSU-Pueblo. The upgrades could be phased in over three years at a total estimated cost of $2.3 million. Application has been made to receive $700,000 of state funding set-aside for IT needs to be used for cooling of the servers. CSU-Pueblo has received $53,000 from the $500,000 allocated for the Denver South initiative to pay for switches to support online programs. Mr. Schweigert explained how the state has identified $400 million of computer replacement needs and will be using a portion of the Capital Development funds.

President Di Mare provided an update of the 2015-2020 CSU-Pueblo strategic plan with three overriding metrics – enrollment, retention and graduation – that coincide with the CCH performance metrics. She reviewed the focus and objectives/strategies of four goals: excellent academics; affordable education; transformative opportunities; and supportive student life. The finalized strategic plan will be presented to the Board in December.

**CHANCELLOR’S REPORT**

Chancellor Martin reported a planned trip to the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture in Washington, DC to discuss agricultural education opportunities for Native Americans is being rescheduled. President Takeda-Tinker
has met with one Native American tribe and Chancellor Martin continues to work in collaboration with other Native American land-grant institutions.

The CSU System will have a large presence at the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) conference to be held in Denver October 4th through 7th. Chancellor Martin is scheduled to moderate a discussion on how Hispanic Serving Institutions might fare under the new Duncan-Obama metric ranking system that will be introduced next fall.

Chancellor Martin reported he and other System staff continue to participate in the various HB14-1319 committees. The statewide listening sessions that are occurring have largely been attended by representatives from the institutions in the various areas with low participation by the general public which will hopefully increase to provide input from students, parents and the general citizenry of Colorado.

Chancellor Martin has been invited to be a panel speaker at a two-day international symposium on innovation in the future of higher education to be held in Saudi Arabia in mid-November. Chancellor Martin and Mr. Schweigert have been meeting one-on-one with the CCHE members to better understand the CCHE’s long-term agenda and how it aligns with the CSU System.

Chancellor Martin reported he and Dr. Dianna Natalicio, the President of UTEP, initiated a venture to create a Rio Grande compact composed of a consortium of universities along the Rio Grande River to develop a model for how the river affects the economy, the environment, the culture and social behavior along that corridor in an arid part of the world. Dr. Lou Swanson is leading the effort that will examine how universities and businesses can come together to maximize services for the greater good.

The prospect of relocating the CSU System office to 475 17th Street for consolidation with the CSU Denver offices continues to be explored. The state process has been completed and the relocation would decrease costs through synergies. Governor Mosher has provided assistance in evaluating the potential move and the Board will be kept apprised.

SYSTEM-WIDE DISCUSSION ITEMS

21st Land Grant System: Chair Horrell indicated Kathay Rennels, Assistant Vice President, and Geniphyr Ponce-Pore, Assistant Director, CSU Office of Community and Economic Development, would be providing an update. Chancellor Martin added that Dr. Ajay Menon and others have continued to be involved in the discussions which have been centered on understanding how the capabilities of each of the institutions are complementary and, if an e-Center is created, how to understand the community’s needs to deliver services.

Ms. Rennels explained the presentation at the previous meeting was budget-oriented. Since that meeting, there have been meetings at CSU-Global Campus and CSU-Pueblo. Oregon State was also contacted and Ms. Ponce-Pore has been working with Colorado manufacturers. The “e” in the e-Center concept is intended to match with extension and experiment stations, but was perceived to mean online or an electronic center. The terminology is being changed to “hub” which reflects that the centers are to be creative, vibrant spaces designed and customized with the community. The CSU System will serve as a bridge to facilitate a statewide network of strategic partners to provide community solutions.

When asked about the National Western Center and urban extension, Ms. Ponce-Pore commented on helping K-12 students find pathways to STEM through CSU research and extension. Ms. Parsons added
that the issue is being discussed, particularly with the Denver urban agriculture extension agents to possibly locate an office in the NWC.

Chancellor Martin reported he met with Governors Robbe Rhodes and Flores to discuss organizing a community round table discussion to examine how the Pueblo community can advance its economic aspirations. The CSU Center for Colorado Futures is interested in conducting a pilot study of the Pueblo economy.

When asked if the Sterling regional engagement center would be changing to a hub, Ms. Rennels confirmed that eventually it will be migrated without disruption of the current activities. She commented on the progress made through discussions held with the Pueblo manufacturers and manufacturing extension partnership, and the potential to work with youth in Denver. Conversations have also been held in Mesa County. Chancellor Martin commented that utilization of the System’s synergies and resources will continue to be explored and the Board will be kept apprised.

**Denver South Initiative:** Chancellor Martin explained how the initiative is complementary to the NWC discussions; fits within the strategic plan with all three campuses involved; and is entirely student-centric with the programs driven by the work force.

Dr. Miranda reported there are currently four programs in various stages. On the graduate level, the systems engineering program led by CSU is the most mature with classes offered last semester and currently being offered. CSU is also taking the lead in a certificate program in computer information systems. On the undergraduate level, there are nursing and business programs being developed from CSU-Pueblo and to be facilitated by CSU-Global Campus beginning potentially in spring 2015. President Di Mare added that the RN to BSN program in partnership with CSU-Global Campus will be online and there have been discussions about a hybrid MSN program.

Chancellor Martin explained the intent is to only add value to current programs which can be built upon and conversations have been held with community colleges for potential 2+2 or other combinations. CSU-Global Campus’ capabilities can be utilized to create hybridized programs that give students maximum flexibility and to respond to the unique economy and student population.

When asked about co-locating with businesses and developing a virtual campus in lieu of bricks and mortar, Chancellor Martin confirmed that, while there is a prospect for a future site for CSU-Global Campus, the intent is to embed programs with business partners; utilize hybridized programs; and minimize commitments by being fluid and flexible with nimble operations while assessing the long-term viability. He remarked that, in the future, even on traditional campuses, degrees will be hybridized, customized and more adaptable through articulation agreements and other arrangements to meet students’ aspirations. The Denver South initiative provides an opportunity to experiment in a new direction with low costs.

There was discussion on bandwidth and setting priorities to ensure excellence in academic quality is preserved as new initiatives are launched; utilizing hybridization and partnerships with businesses, and community and junior colleges; and potential opportunities particularly in agricultural education to meet the demand and needs of the citizens of Colorado.

**BOARD MEETING EVALUATION**

Comments were provided on how the consolidation of the committee meetings with the full Board meeting was productive and worked better than the previous meeting; the process used for the stadium
discussion was positive and should be considered for future large issues; and, when on campuses, tours and interaction with other groups and constituencies is beneficial.

Chair Horrell reminded the Board that the next meeting is December 4th and 5th in the Denver area. With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
Taskforce Chair Joe Zimlich convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Present: Board members Joseph Zimlich and Nancy Tuor; Michael Martin, Chancellor, CSU System; Becky Takeda-Tinker, President, CSU-Global Campus; Michael Nosler, General Counsel, CSU System; Melanie Geary, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor, CSU System.

The taskforce convened to discuss the structure of the conversation for the December Board of Governors meeting related to “Newco”.

They outlined the December discussion as follows:

1. Why
2. What Newco will do
3. Structure
4. Relationship

The group determined they would meet again in early January to flesh out further planning in advance of the February Board meeting and retreat.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

2014-15 Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual Revisions: Section C.2.3.1.e College of Liberal Arts

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the proposed revisions to the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section C.2.3.1.e College of Liberal Arts.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President.

The proposed revision for the 2014-2015 edition of the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual had been adopted by the Colorado State University Faculty Council. A brief explanation for the revision follows:

The field of journalism and communication has changed drastically since the department was originally created. A study conducted by the department indicated that potential students did not understand what “technical communication” meant. The name change from Journalism and Technical Communication to Journalism and Media Communication reflects more accurately what the department has to offer students.

Relative to the Music, Theatre, and Dance change, the term “School” connotes the full range of performing arts activities in the discipline, from the skills and theory to a full complement of the practical application of those skills in a full season of public performances. The term “School” is also consistent with competing programs at other Universities.
NOTE: Revisions are noted in the following manner:
Additions - underlined  Deletions - overscored

ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL
REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS – 2014-15

e. College of Liberal Arts (last revised February 14, 2014)

Comprising the Departments of Anthropology; Art and Art History; Communication Studies; Economics; English; Ethnic Studies; Foreign Languages and Literatures; History; Journalism and Technical Media Communication; Music, Theater, and Dance; Philosophy; Political Science; and Sociology and School of Music, Theatre, and Dance.

Note: Music, Theater, and Dance shall be changed to School of Music, Theatre, and Dance wherever it appears in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual. Journalism and Technical Communication shall be changed to Journalism and Media Communication wherever it appears in the Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

2014-15 Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual Revisions: Section D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the proposed revisions to the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual, Section D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President.

The proposed revision for the 2014-2015 edition of the Colorado State University Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual had been adopted by the Colorado State University Faculty Council. A brief explanation for the revision follows:

Administrative Professional employees at CSU have played a significant and positive role throughout the history of CSU and currently help to shape the institution in several arenas outside of faculty appointments. These activities continually and directly support the mission of CSU as a land-grant institution in the areas of instruction, research, service and outreach. Furthermore, upon retirement, many of these distinguished AP employees support the university through transitioning important development and donor relationships; sharing institutional knowledge about process and partnerships; continuing to participate in classroom instruction and research; and give back to the University with their time, talents, and financial support. Yet, these dedicated and influential employees are excluded from applying for special recognition upon retirement. CSU Faculty and Administrative Professional employees share the same retiree benefits with this one exception.

Compared to other academic institutions, CSU may be behind the times, because Emeritus status is available to non-faculty at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, University of California-Davis, Minnesota State College and Universities, University of Wisconsin, University of Arkansas, University of Montana, Iowa State University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, North Carolina State University, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, Texas A&M University, Tennessee State University, Virginia Tech University, University of Tennessee, and University of
Connecticut – to name a few. In fact, 10 of the 15 universities that we consider peers allow either high-level non-faculty or anyone to be awarded emeritus status.

As with Faculty, Administrative Professional employees seeking Emeritus status would involve a rigorous and formal nomination and review process before being submitted to the Provost and Board of Governors for approval. Only cases with merit and having full support at all levels would make it through the process. This process will follow the same nomination, review, and approval steps as indicated in Section E.3.1, so as to not create a new system.

Those AP employees seeking Emeritus status would need to show extraordinary and meritorious work to the fulfillment of the mission and programs of CSU. The goal is to recognize the full impact of a career, not the title given. These contributions should have resulted in a transformational difference in their field through significant discoveries or greatly enhanced student successes, public recognition of remarkable accomplishments and leadership, or a substantial increase in resource development, with a lasting positive impact for the University.
NOTE: Revisions are noted in the following manner:
Additions - underlined  Deletions - overscored

ACADEMIC FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONAL MANUAL
REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS – 2014-15

D.7.20 Emeritus/Emerita Status

Administrative Professionals who have completed ten (10) years or more of outstanding and distinguished full-time or part-time service to Colorado State University shall be eligible, at the time of their retirement from Colorado State University, for an emeritus/emerita title equivalent to their highest rank.

Candidates must hold a senior or other advanced rank within Administrative Professional positions at Colorado State University, which may include, but not be limited to Academic Advisor/Support Coordinator, Research Scientist/Associate, Extension Agent/Specialist, Forester, Manager, Director, Executive Director, or Vice President, and must have honorably and consistently demonstrated extraordinary and meritorious contributions to the fulfillment of the mission and programs of the University. These contributions should have resulted in a transformational difference in their field through significant discoveries or enhanced student support and successes, public recognition of remarkable accomplishments and leadership, or a substantial increase in resource development, with a lasting positive impact for the University. In rare occurrences, a deserving candidate may qualify outside of the criteria above. Exceptions may be made with the approval of the Provost.

An eligible administrative professional may request emeritus/emerita status from their college or unit at the same time of retirement from the University, or candidates may be directly nominated by their director, department head, dean, or vice president. The nomination shall be routed for approval by the employee’s department head/director through the dean/vice president and then to the Provost. The final decision on granting emeritus/emerita status will be made by the Board.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

CSU: Posthumous Degree Candidate

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the presented candidate to receive a B.S. degree for his major in Natural Resource Management with a minor in Conservation Biology posthumously. The posthumous degree is to be conferred in conjunction with the May 2015 commencement ceremonies.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Tony Frank, President

In May 2005, the Board of Governors approved the policy stating that “In exceptional circumstances, the Board may award degrees posthumously. Recommendations for such an award will only be considered when the student had completed nearly all of the requirements for his or her degree before dying, and when the student’s academic record clearly indicates that the degree would have been successfully completed had death not intervened. Nominations for posthumous awards of degree will be initiated by the student’s department and approved internally by the relevant college dean and the Provost. The posthumous nature of the recommended degree award shall be made explicit when the recommendation is forwarded to the Board. The Provost’s office shall be responsible for presenting the degree to appropriate survivors”.

Colorado State University Fort Collins – Posthumous Degree
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
Meeting Date: December 4, 2014
Consent Item

MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Colorado State University-Pueblo – Academic Calendar AY 2015-2016.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors approve the Colorado State University-Pueblo

Academic Calendar for AY2015-16.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Lesley Di Mare, President.

The Colorado State University-Pueblo Academic Calendar for AY2015-2016, recommended by Faculty Senate on November 17, 2014, is as follows.
# ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2015-2016

## FALL 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Planning Sheets Due</td>
<td>Jan. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Begins</td>
<td>Mar. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Aug. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Add Period (full-term courses)</td>
<td>Aug. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Drop Period (full-term courses)</td>
<td>Sept. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Full-term Course Withdrawal Period</td>
<td>Oct. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving Break</td>
<td>Nov. 23-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>Dec. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>Dec. 7-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SPRING 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Planning Sheets Due</td>
<td>Sept. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Begins</td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>Jan. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Add Period (full-term courses)</td>
<td>Jan. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Drop Period (full-term courses)</td>
<td>Feb. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Full-term Course Withdrawal Period</td>
<td>Mar. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>Mar. 21-25 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>Apr. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>May 2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>May 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SUMMER 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Planning Sheets Due</td>
<td>Feb. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Begins</td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### First 4, 6 and 12-week Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>May 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day (University Closed)</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 4-week</td>
<td>June 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 6-week</td>
<td>June 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-week</td>
<td>Aug. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second 4-week Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>June 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day Observed (University Closed)</td>
<td>July 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>July 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second 6-week Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>June 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day Observed (University Closed)</td>
<td>July 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>Aug. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Third 4-week Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
<td>July 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes End</td>
<td>Aug. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issue for the Board to consider:

Approve the submitted academic calendar start and end dates of semester course offerings, under the assumption that course meeting times will be adjusted for lecture classes that meet on M, W and F, in accordance with Colorado Commission of Higher Education (CCHE) requirements.

Why some change in course meeting times and/or # of weeks in the academic calendar is necessary:

CSU-Pueblo 3-credit hour lecture classes that meet MWF are not in compliance with CCHE minimum expectations by 10 minutes total each semester offered. Because approximately 25% to 30% of our credit hours each fall and spring are derived from MWF 3-credit hour lecture classes, it is imperative that we address the shortage of minutes. (E.g. in fall 2013, 26.2% of credit hours came from MWF 3-credit hour lecture classes, and 26.9% from TuTh 3-credit hour lecture classes.)

DETAIL: Some background on total number of minutes required:

CCHE expects that a credit hour of lecture-based instruction corresponds to a minimum of 750 minutes/semester of lecture. This is consistent with what is known nationally as the Carnegie unit. [While some of the wording in federal and regional accreditor documents is vague with an intent to allow for some flexibility due to newly evolving/developing instructional delivery models, many state higher education commissions/boards have explicitly adopted this same 750 minute/credit hour standard (e.g. Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas,…).] Thus the CCHE (and typical national) expectation is for a minimum of three times this amount, i.e. 2250 minutes during the semester, for a 3-credit-hour lecture-based course.

What the CSU-Pueblo Faculty Senate is recommending regarding course meeting times for MWF lecture classes:

The recommendation from the CSU-Pueblo Faculty Senate proposes adding 5 minutes to each 50-minute lecture class meeting for courses that meet on M, W, and F (14 weeks), resulting in a 15-week semester which includes final exam week. Course meeting times would be adjusted from 8am-8:50am, 9am-9:50am, etc, to 7:45am-8:40am, 8:50am-9:45am, 9:55am-10:50am, 11am-11:55am, etc, on M, W and F, maintaining the current 10-minute break between classes. (There is no change to classes that meet on Tu, Th, Sat or Sun.) These changes will meet and surpass CCHE credit hour requirements.
Comparison with CSU:

CSU’s MWF 3-credit hour classes meet for 15 weeks with one holiday in fall and spring (i.e. Labor Day and Martin Luther King’s birthday) totaling **2200 minutes** prior to final exams. CSU’s final exams are **120 minutes**, yielding **2320 minutes** in total, so CSU’s MWF 3-credit hour classes are 70 minutes in excess of the CCHE standard. CSU’s TuTh 3-credit hour classes meet for 75 minutes each class for 15 weeks (2250 minutes prior to final exams), yielding 2370 minutes in total. That is, CSU’s classes are 120 minutes in excess of the CCHE minimum standard for 3-credit hour TuTh classes.

By comparison, CSU- Pueblo’s proposed Academic Calendar will have MWF 3-credit hour classes meet for 14 weeks with no holidays in fall or spring semesters totaling **2310 minutes** prior to final exams. CSU-Pueblo final exams will continue to be **140 minutes** yielding **2450 minutes** in total, i.e. CSU-Pueblo MWF 3-credit hour classes will be 200 minutes in excess of the CCHE standard. CSU-Pueblo’s TuTh 3-credit hour classes will continue to meet for 80 minutes each class for 14 weeks (2240 minutes prior to final exams), yielding 2380 minutes in total. That is, CSU-Pueblo classes are 130 minutes in excess of the CCHE minimum standard for 3-credit hour TuTh classes.

The following table summarizes the proposed changes and provides a comparison of the two campuses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 credit hour course meeting times</th>
<th>Current Class Schedule for Both Campuses</th>
<th>Proposed Class Schedule for CSU-Pueblo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current class minutes before final exam week</td>
<td>Final exam minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF CSU-Pueblo</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF CSU</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuTh CSU-Pueblo</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TuTh CSU</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References

Many university websites indicate the 750 minute/cr hr standard (i.e. a keyword search yields many hits). Below are two links to CCHE and one link to a summary of many issues that relate to the credit hour definition, including some state higher education requirements.


http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Groups/AcademicCouncil/minutes/20121009_MINUTES.pdf
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Faculty and Student Representative Reports
October 7, 2014 Faculty Council Meeting

1. President Frank gave a report to Faculty Council. In his report he talked about enrollment being flat for undergraduates, improvements in retention and graduation rates, another record year for research funding, philanthropic giving is also up. He talked about the budget for FY 2016 and why he decided to take a more conservative approach in estimating the state’s expected contribution ($5m). He talked about HB 13-19 and his concerns about a one-size-fits-all approach to funding for higher education. He also mentioned the campus leadership committee that is charged with evaluating the four options he set for the stadium. He was asked questions about HB 13-19, the budget, and student retention.

2. Action items:
   a. Proposed revision to the Manual – Section C.2.1.e – College of Liberal Arts. The proposal was for a name change from the Department of Journalism and Technical Communication to the Department of Journalism and Media Communication. The motion passed.
   b. Proposed revision to the Manual – Section C.2.3.1.e – College of Liberal Arts. The proposal was for a name change from the Department of Music, Theater and Dance to the School of Music, Theater and Dance. The motion passed.

November 4, 2014 Faculty Council Meeting

1. Chair of Faculty Council reported on the CCHE “outreach” session on HB 13-19. Apparently it was not useful and contrary to how it was advertised there was no collection of any substantive ideas from participants. She also talked about a meeting the Chief of CSU PD on the topic of surplus military equipment and he assured her that CSU has not participated in that program and was not likely to. He did not think a “militarized” campus police force was appropriate.

2. There was a written report from the Benefits Committee. The Committee’s main achievement was in having their recommendation that the university increase its contribution to employees DCPs from 9% to 12% over three years.

3. Action Items:
   a. Proposed revision to the Graduate and Professional Bulletin – E.1.3 – Scholastic Standards. The proposal includes new language that deals
with situations where students are not progressing satisfactorily for reasons other than low GPA. The motion passed.

b. There were two new centers approved. One was The Africa Center – which will focus on issues of environmental and social sustainability in Africa. The second was Prevention Research Center – which will focus on promoting health across the lifespan. There were questions about the title of the center. The Center Director was present and explained that Prevention Research is a well established discipline and is known to people who work in the field.

4. Discussion Item: Proposed changes to Health Care Benefits. Diana Prieto and Teri Suhr gave a presentation on proposed changes to employees health care plans (1) making a greater distinction between the Green and Gold Plans (making changes to the Gold Plan in particular) and (2) making the Green Plan into a “high deductible plan” to comply with the Affordable Care Act provisions that allow for utilizing health spending plans that can be rolled over even into retirement (providing another option for saving in case of a serious medical emergency). There was considerable discussion of the second proposal and it was determined that employees need lots of information about the pros and cons of that change in order to know whether they want it or not. The power point presentation is on the Faculty Council website.

Items for upcoming Faculty Council meetings:

1. Reports: (1) A Report from the Grievance Officer on the number, type, and outcomes of grievances over the last few years. (2) A Report from the Standing Committee on Women Faculty on the work they are currently doing around improving gender equity and fairness for faculty.

2. Discussion items: (1) Public-private partnerships – what is the rationale for these, how are decisions made, what input is sought into these? This is motivated by Option 4 on the list of stadium options and on the experience of the Todos Santos project. (2) Adjunct faculty issues – what are some of the recommendations from the committee on non-tenure track faculty?

Invitation to the Chancellor and Members of the Board:

Graduating seniors in my ECON 492 capstone class have compiled a “White Paper on Student Loan Debt” and will be giving two presentations on campus summarizing their findings. The presentations will be 9:30-10:45 am in LSC 322 on Tuesday 9 December and Thursday 11 December. The talks are open to the public but the students particularly wanted me to invite you. If you are interested in reading the report I can send that to you also. Thanks!

Respectfully submitted by Dr. Alexandra Bernasek, CSU Faculty Rep to the BOG.
MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Report Item. No action necessary.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Robert Deemer, Faculty Representative from CSU-Global

Report to the Board of Governors that provides an overview of the CSUGlobal Curriculum Development Process.
Curriculum Development Process

New Programs/Courses
- Re-Visioning

Program Evaluation
- Industry Analyst
- Assessment Data
- Faculty feedback
- Student Feedback

Program Analysis Report (PAR)

Program Team
- Provost
- Deans
- Program Coordinators
- Faculty
- Program ID
- Industry Analyst

Program Design Package (PDD) Due from Program Coordinator (PC)

Kick-Off Program/Course Development

Course Team
- Program Coordinators
- Course ID
- Content Expert
- Faculty Reviewer (2)
- Production

(1) Course Design Document (CDD)
(2) Course Design Document (CDD)
(3) Course Design Document (CDD)
(N) Course Design Document (CDD)

16 Weeks

Reviewed Annually

Course Level Planning

Time Line
This report covers highlights since the October 2014 Board of Governors Retreat.

Since the October Board of Governors meeting the 2014-2015 Colorado State University-Pueblo faculty senate have met twice. The first meeting with the full senate occurred on October 20, 2014 and then again on November 17, 2014. This report highlights the major items currently under consideration with the full senate and the accompanying sub-committees.

October 20-2014 Colorado State University-Pueblo Faculty Senate Meeting

The senate and senate sub-committee have been working on major issues which were recommended at the August retreat as well as issues suggested by president in preparation and planning of the 2015-2016 academic calendar and university operations.

The Senate received an update from President Di Mare of the following issues:

- An e-mail was sent to the deans on October 12th regarding moving forward with the prioritization for tenure track lines.
- Applications for sabbaticals are due on October 25th. The priority will be on funding individuals that were approved last year but could not take sabbaticals due to budgetary issues. However, new faculty sabbatical submissions will be given consideration as well.
- Funding for higher education is now being looked at on the legislative level—performance, retention, and graduation rates are being monitored.
- Royal is coming to campus on November 17th and they will be presenting at 3:00 p.m.
- Two administrative cabinet members that were on leave have returned (Paul Orscheln and Karl Speicker).
- A meeting will take place on October 23rd to review data on the equity study to ensure that everything is correct. The meeting will be attended by the Faculty Compensation Committee members, Administrative Council, and two Lecturers.

Provost Wright reported the following issues:

- The Provost strongly urges faculty to focus on the challenges surrounding the 15 week academic calendar—if faculty do not address this challenge, the Board of Governors could impose a plan that they believe will work better.
- Discussed viewpoints on the difference between remediation and supplemental services. The Provost would like to see a focus on supplemental services.
- The 12/12 teaching load is for this academic year only. Regarding the plans for release time, the decisions will be made within the Colleges and a recommendation will then be forwarded to the Provost for consideration.
- The Extended Studies Office has moved to the Administrative Building room #310.
- A Reaffirmation visit should be taking place on campus in Spring 2017.
An IT application was submitted to the state. The granting (or not) of funds should be revealed in a month.

Global Blackboard will be available Spring 2015 if faculty members would like to switch.

The Senate received an update on the Proposed University Strategic Plan by Dr. Rhonda Gonzales.

- An update was given on the Strategic Plan Taskforce.
- Dean Gonzales and Dr. Kreminski are chairing the committee.
- Open forums are scheduled to gather information from interested parties.
- The timeline is to have a draft finalized by early November so the Strategic Plan can be presented to the Board of Governors at the December meeting.
- The draft can be found on the I drive.

Several Action Items were presented by the senate sub committees as unfinished business, new action items, first readings, second readings or votes:

I. 2nd reading – Motion to use IDEA center for student evaluations – Ad-hoc committee Student Evaluations Bill Brown
   - Senator Brown discussed the low response rate (approximately 30%) for student evaluations for the current system.
   - Brown also mentioned the advantage that objectives for courses can be set by individual faculty members.
   - The IDEA Center supports approximately 400 institutions.
   - A motion was made by Bill Brown to accept the use of the IDEA Center. A second was made by Rick Huff.
   - The motion passed with two Senators abstaining.

II. 1st reading—Motion to reinstate Dr. Tim McGettigan’s e-mail to include all rights.
    - Discussion took place regarding academic freedom and allowing faculty to share opinions online.
    - The motion will be voted on at the October meeting.

III. 1st reading—Motion to amend the BoG e-mail policy.
    - Discussion took place regarding academic freedom and allowing faculty to share opinions online.
    - The ITB Committee is recommending that in order to minimize spam, one e-mail is sent out daily with sports, food, campus events information.
    - The motion will be voted on at the October meeting.

IV. 1st reading—Motion for the academic calendar proposal. The following are some of the debate issues for this item.
    - Senator Brown, faculty rep to the sub-committee suggested a 17 week academic calendar (including finals) to include: Fall Semester: Labor Day off and a week off during Thanksgiving week. Spring Semester: The day off for Dr. Martin Luther King’s birthday and a week off for spring break.
    - The current schedule does not allow any lee-way if the university has to close for snow days or other emergencies.
• APSB adopts the standpoint that the first hour of the exam period is set aside to make up any lost time.
• Amy Robertshaw, registrar, offered the following numbers regarding our current schedule:
  For Tuesday & Thursday classes (including exam time)—2, 380 hours are met. For Monday, Wednesday, & Friday classes (including exam time)—2, 240 hours. We are short some time on the MWF schedule.
• Senator Brown made a motion to find out the exact number of hours that are needed in order to satisfy accreditation requirements. There was a second by Senator Souder. Senators unanimously support the motion.

V. At-large senate vacancies--Results of electronic vote

1. Scholarly Activities Board (SAB)—Mel Drueingler
2. Library Board—Still Vacant
3. Grievance Panel—Colette Carter

VI. Strategic Planning Committee Openings
Currently there are no nominations from CHASS or CSM.

The following is are a brief overview of the committee or boards responsible to report to the senate:

VII. Committees/Boards Reports
• Academic Programs and Standards Board (APSB) — currently engaged in conversations about the academic calendar changes with a full report and recommendations to be brought to the November senate meeting.
• Faculty Handbook Committee (FHC) — There are several versions of the Faculty Handbook—the Committee is working to have one correct version made available.
• Faculty Procedures and Policies Committee (FPP) — Committee is currently reviewing APR guidelines.
• General Education Board (GEB) — Freshmen assessments have been completed. The Committee is requesting faculty assistance in allowing their classes to participate in the assessment process.
• Information Technology Board (ITB) — Committee worked on the motions indicated above (faculty members and e-mail rights)
• University Budget Board (UBB) — They are continuing a discussion that they had in a prior meeting regarding the academic calendar.

VIII. Faculty Representatives
• Colorado Faculty Advisory Council (CFAC)-Senator Mincic spoke briefly about the current legislation regarding education in Colorado. Handouts were distributed from the Colorado Department of Higher Education on performance funding.

November 17- 2014 Colorado State University-Pueblo Faculty Senate Meeting

The senate and senate sub-committee have been working on major issues which were recommended at the August retreat as well as issues carried over from the October 2014 meeting.
Since the official minutes of the November meeting have not been approved as of the date of this report by the entire faculty senate, the report will only cover the major topics. Specific details on motions and actions will be represented in the next report to the Board of Governors.

- The senate was presented the list of potential graduates for the fall of 2014 for approval as per handbook language by the Any Robertshaw, Registrar.
- The senate was given a presentation by Royall, recruiting and marketing consultant hired to help with CSU-Pueblo recruitment efforts. Information was provided on:
  - The marketing strategies
  - The focus location of the efforts
  - The marketing tools
  - The current results of the efforts
  - The predicted outcome for the future
- A report was given to the senate from the University Grievance Officer Moussa Diawara on the status of the university grievance process. Dr. Diawara also asked the senate for advice in regulating the selection of grievance panel members. He expressed concern with the need for confidentiality to ensure the fairness of the process and the need to remind the faculty of their role in the process.
- President Timothy Zeurcher of the Associated Student Government (ASG) informed the senate of a resolution passed by the ASG requesting that “The American Association of University Professors at CSU-Pueblo henceforth refrain from speaking on behalf of the students of CSU-Pueblo”. The senate membership was presented with a copy of the resolution. President Zeurcher informed the senate that the resolution was an information item to the senate and no action was requested.
- Several Action Items were presented by the senate sub committees as unfinished business, new action items, first readings, second readings or votes:
  - 2nd reading – Motion to revise catalog language pertaining to thesis instructions from 2014 catalog – GSB – was voted on and passed
  - 2nd reading – Motion to reinstate Tim McGettigan’s email to include all rights (ITB) – voted on and passed
  - 2nd reading – Motion to amend the email policy (ITB) – voted on and passed
  - 2nd reading – Motion for academic calendar proposal – (APSB) – five options were presented and one option was chosen voted on and passed.
  - 1st reading – Motion to change language in the Faculty Handbook – FCC – The item was presented as a first reading there was no need to act on this issue.
- After a lengthy meeting of the issues presented at this meeting and reports from the ASG, UGO and Royall the committee reports were admitted or shortened and will be included in the next report.

Respectfully submitted by:

Michael A. Mincic, PLS, MEd
Board of Governors Representative for the CSU-Pueblo Faculty Senate
Chair of Engineering Technology, Construction and Automotive Industry Management
Professor and Program Coordinator, Construction Management and Civil Engineering Technology
Colorado State University-Pueblo
719-549-2638
Communications with University of Colorado
ASCSU has been working with CU on a multitude of issues this year. We have met them a few times to discuss a “sick day” policy idea for students. The idea comes from students not having enough accessibility to missing classes. The idea will not allow for students to miss very important laboratories or exams but give the students who need to miss class because of migraines or other sicknesses the availability to do so.

We are also talking with CU about writing and endorsing a “Yes Means Yes” law in the state of Colorado. We are in the researching process and are using California’s legislation to model Colorado’s after. This law seems to eliminate more grey area than no means no and would be something that we would be very interested in implementing in Colorado. We will connect with students about their ideas as well as reaching out to California to see how the law is working for them and what they would like to do differently.

Colorado Student Government Coalition
ASCSU is a participant in this new endeavor that the students across the state are a part of. Every public, four year institution is invited to be a part of this organization. We recently passed a resolution that stated that we, as CSGC, supported administrative costs to be a parameter in HB 14-1319 considerations for funding. We have had two meetings during the fall semester and will have our next meeting in late February.

Traditions Week
The department of Student Services is looking into doing a traditions week in the spring semester. We have been looking into this because there isn’t anything exciting like Homecoming during the spring semester. Some of the ideas we are looking into are;

- faculty luncheon where students can mix and mingle with their professors outside of the classroom.
- Campus wide game of traditions with prizes located at each location on campus that means very much to the university.
- Spring concert partnering with Ram Events.
- Color Run on CSU’s campus.

This idea is to encourage students to get in touch with their university and really promote a strong pride within CSU. We are hopeful to do this a few weeks after spring break to make the push between spring break and finals more meaningful and rememberable.

Advocacy Day/ D.C. Trip
Our department of governmental affairs is working avidly with University of Colorado to plan an advocacy day at the state capitol with both of our universities in order to have a large student turn out on issues that effect all of us. We think that with joint collaboration with the two largest institutions we will be able to make a difference in a positive way for the state by having a turnout from both institutions. We are planning on doing this for both Colorado State and also at the federal level in
Washington D.C. We hope to work together to have a joint trip planned together to Washington D.C. and have a joint itinerary rather than making two separate trips. We are hoping to use the slogan “putting the rivalry aside for the students of Colorado.”

**Health**
Our department of health is primarily focused on the sick day policy, the Chronic Health Mentoring Program, Cam’s Crew, and mental health initiatives. The new initiatives we have been working on include:

- Suicide awareness panel for Veteran’s week
- Posters with anonymous quotes from students to break down stigma
- Body acceptance week in the spring semester
- Planning for an anti-stigma campaign during the first few weeks of the semester in the springtime

We hope to be able to help more of the student body with mental health related issues. We want to give them the resources they need to be successful in college and be able to succeed at Colorado State.

**Environment**
The department of environmental affairs has been in a state of transition for the past few weeks. We just hired a new director, who was previously the director last year. She has many ideas including an event called “Light Up the Night” which gives people information about how to bike at night as well as the dangers associated with biking at night. We gave out free bike lights and education at this event which was very successful. We are also planning a “Winter Bike to Work Day” in the spring which ASCSU will be competing in. There will be prizes for the winning office, free promotional items for those individuals who bike, and also breakfast and coffee for people on campus who bike to work. We are also going to be trying to do a community wide “Leave It Behind” program like the residence halls. We are hoping to work with large apartment complexes to have a program like this for students there who wish to donate their unwanted things rather than to throw them away. Lastly, we will also be looking into campus climate, and environment on campus. We hope to create a welcoming, warm, and fun environment at CSU and will be outreaching to students to make sure we are accomplishing this properly on campus. This way we are linking campus and the actual environment together in a positive light.

**Inside ASCSU**

- We ordered promotional items to give to students who utilize the office and take part in events on campus.
  - Items include:
    - Gloves, ice scrapers, umbrellas, and sunglasses.
- We are hoping to do some educational workshops with Fraternity and Sorority Life to encourage students to be good bystanders and promote safety.
- Department of Diversity has been holding round table events to discuss campus climate, inclusive excellence, and interpersonal workshops with the WGAC, LGBTQAA, and RHA offices on campus.
- Department of University Affairs has been holding college council roundtables to open the line of communication between ASCSU and different college councils in order to better serve them.
• We will be putting on a “Custodial Appreciation Day” by students to show them how much they mean to us and how we appreciate the work that they do for all of us.
CSU-Global Campus Alternative Credit Programs

• Purpose of the Programs
  • Affordability
    – Transfer of prior learning/education credit at no cost
    – $250 (3 credit) CSU-Global Competency-based exam credit
    – $150 (1 credit) CSU-Global Competency-based exam credit
    – $150 (3 credit) CSU-Global Prior Learning Assessment via portfolio project
  • Retention Towards Student Success/Graduation
    – CAEL study found that adult students who had alternative credit had faster time to completion (56% in 7 years vs. 21%), experienced a higher graduation rate (43% vs. 15%), had a higher level of persistence (vs. a 1st yr drop out rate of 60%).
  • Student/Stakeholder Engagement
    – 50% of Americans do not believe the investment in higher education is “worth it” (USAToday, 2013)
    – 74% of Americans do no think that higher education is affordable for everyone who needs it (Gallup, 2013)
    – 75% of Americans state that if they could be evaluated and receive credits for what they already know that they would be more likely to enroll in a higher education program (Gallup, 2013)

• Competency-based Exam Credit Program & Demo Video
  • What is it and who is it for? CBE Program launched in 2013 to provide self-motivated, independent Bachelor’s degree seeking students the opportunity to earn alternative credit. The concept is similar to the traditional university “course challenge”.
  • Goal: To provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate competencies that align with standard course outcomes to help them cost-efficiently earn credit towards their Bachelor’s degree.
  • How does it work?
    – No application requirements, open to all students
- Test Prep Study Center provided at no-cost
- Students do not pay a fee until they are ready to take a CBE
- $250 – 3 credit exam; $150 – 1 credit exam
- Faculty scoring of assessment - 70% or higher for passing grade
- Credit on transcript reflected as Course #EX e.g., ORG305EX
- Exams are proctored through an external vendor: at home via webcam or at a local testing center
- Exam format
  - 3 credit exams: 100 questions; 95 multiple choice or multiple answer, 5 short answer questions
    - 120 minutes to complete
  - 1 credit exams: 35 questions; 30 multiple choice or multiple answer, 5 short answer questions
    - 75 minutes to complete
- **CSU-Global faculty grade exams within one week of submission**
- **Students may re-take a failed exam one time within 12 months at no additional charge**

**Competency-Based Exam Program Results Since May 2013 Launch**

- 72 students have passed 80 CBEs (31% who entered into the Test Prep Study Centers)
  - 212 credits have been awarded
    - 388 registrations into Test Prep Study Centers
      » 122 exams attempted (first attempt)
      » 61% passed on the first attempt
      » 71% passed on the second attempt

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Schiffelbein

Student Representative
Colorado State University Global Campus
Colorado State University – Pueblo
Timothy Zercher – Student Representative

CSU-Pueblo and ASG’s focus remains to be building community at CSU-Pueblo. ASG will remain dedicated to the goal of becoming Approachable, Friendly, Professional, and Effective. We believe that this year we will truly be able to make an impact on campus. Please do not hesitate to contact us directly for any questions or ideas related to any of these projects or initiatives:

Student Discount Program

The Student Discount Program here at CSU-Pueblo has existed for about three years and has about fifteen local companies participating in it. These companies offer a variety of special perks and discounts for CSU-Pueblo students. However, due to a lack of promotion most students do not know which companies actually participate in this program or that the program actually exists. This year, ASG has set a goal of doubling the number of companies participating in these discounts as well as drastically increasing the students’ knowledge of this program. We have begun contacting multiple companies and are already being approached by interested parties. As we begin to grow this program we will also be promoting both our current and new discounts to the students.

a. Promotion across campus has begun with the goal of informing students about this excellent program.

b. Three businesses have been added to the Student Discount Program; including Kwan’s Kitchen (a local Chinese restaurant heavily used by students).

Building Student Relationships

ASG believes that there are significant gains to be made in our connection with the student body, both in overall awareness of what ASG does on campus and in terms of WHO actually represents them and their interests on campus. Because of this we have initiated a number of projects that
will begin to build stronger and more visible relationships between every student of CSU-Pueblo and their Associated Students’ Government. Some of these initiatives are as follows:

1. **Remodel of the Occhiato University Center (OUC):** ASG is assisting in the remodel of the OUC by lending student input throughout every step of the process to date. The OUC, being the center for student life and many student resources must both attract and welcome students into the campus community. Because of this need, we feel that it will remain essential for students to remain involved in every step of the rebuilding of the student center. ASG remains excited to be involved as this project continues to evolve!

2. **Wolfie Clock Tower:** Last year, as part of a discussion on how to spend certain funds from the Facility Fee all CSU-Pueblo students pay, ASG proposed to build a clock tower/gazebo, named after our beloved mascot, Wolfie. This clock tower idea has evolved some since last year and we will be keeping the Board updated on its progress, however we expect to begin construction on this project this coming summer.

3. **ASG Website:** the new ASG Website will both help to improve the branding of ASG and make it easier for students to connect with their representatives. It will do this by offering a number of features not available on our previous website, these new features include:
   a. Constantly updated information maintained by our Director of Information Technology regarding everything from contact information to upcoming events in ASG.
   b. Photos and short bios of each Senator, Executive Branch Member and Judicial Branch Member so that students are able to recognize their representatives easily.
   c. The ability to fully post Senate agendas and minutes as soon as they are approved each week. This will also bring us into better agreement with the roles and regulations regarding public documents as well as making it much more convenient for students and members of the community to search through our public documents.
   d. Provide for a much more interactive experience allowing students to easily find information and/or submit ideas, questions, or concerns.
e. **Update:** The ASG website is up and fully functional. It can be located at www.csupueblo.edu/asg.

4. **Social Media:** We have identified social media as one the best ways to communicate with our students and stay up to speed on campus issues/initiatives. With this in mind, we have developed and enacted a full social media plan to increase interactions between students and ASG as well as an increase in the potential reach of ASG through our social media channels.
   a. This is an excellent way for students to keep track of what is going on within ASG, and what events are coming up.
   b. **Update:** Facebook likes, Twitter followers, and Instagram followers have had a significant increase the past 2 months alone. Specific numbers can be given upon request, and we welcome new likes; all social media accounts can be found by searching “CSU-Pueblo ASG” on Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram.

5. **Building Student Services Awareness:** We have begun reaching out to student services across campus to notify them of our plans to promote their services to the students this coming semester. We expect to start promoting these services with short stories and/or pictures within the next few weeks. The whole goal of this project is to educate our students on the services offered to them so that they know what is available and where, when they find themselves in need.

6. **Sexual Misconduct Prevention:** ASG has become active in sexual misconduct and violence prevention. As representatives of the student body, it is our duty to make the students feel as safe as possible. ASG members have:
   a. Started the process of training senators and ASG staff on bystander intervention. Once trained the senators can go out and train other students on campus;
   b. Invited speakers to attend ASG Senate Meetings to inform ASG members of the importance of Affirmative Action and Title IX;
c. Formed a new committee to be a joint task force focusing on sexual misconduct prevention. This committee will focus on ways different departments can work together on campus to help prevent sexual misconduct;
d. Co-sponsored an event with Health Education and Prevention Services to bring the speaker, Don McPherson. Don spoke to student athletes, faculty, staff and several organizations about equality, sexual misconduct and bystander intervention.

**The Colorado Student Government Coalition**
The Colorado Student Government Coalition was recently formed to discuss higher education funding in the state of Colorado. It is made up of all Student Government Presidents of every four-year public institution in Colorado.

a. The purpose, as stated in the newly ratified constitution of the Colorado Student Government Coalition is as follows: We the undersigned representatives of public four-year institutions of higher education within Colorado have established and ordained this Constitution of the Colorado Student Government Coalition to represent the students of Colorado institutions through voicing the concerns and sentiments of its Constituency, especially through political advocacy. The CSGC shall strive to make meaningful change on behalf of its constituents and higher education as a whole.

b. The Colorado Student Government Coalition approved two resolutions at their second meeting on November 15th. The first was a resolution in support of the Campus Accountability and Safety Act, the second a resolution to support limiting administrative costs as a funding metric implemented in HB14-1319.
To The Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System

We are writing on behalf of the Colorado State University-Pueblo student body in regards to our request for assistance in funding our information technology infrastructure. As elected officials of the university, it is our duty and responsibility to voice our concerns in a respectful manner.

Our IT department is overworked and underfunded for the number of students which it serves. This puts our university at a disadvantage in many aspects, both in regards to competing with out-of-state universities in terms of retention of students and in recruiting new students. The faults in our IT systems also affect the learning environment which we, the students, have begun to rely on more significantly due to the changes in our academic environments.

As a university, we have a bright future. We do not only have great room for growth, we also have a great opportunity to prosper as an institution of higher learning with up-to-date and functional institutional technologies. However, in order to capitalize on our opportunities we need assistance from our Board of Governors. We hope that you recognize the same potential we see in CSU-Pueblo and we also hope you will take our request for funding, not as a request for handouts, but rather as an investment in our university.

Our Associated Students’ Government Director of IT, Jim Wiley, has compiled a detailed report surrounding the current situation for you to review. The report is attached. The numbers which are presented are hard facts and the source for this data is noted in the letter as well.

We thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

The Associated Students’ Government of Colorado State University-Pueblo
Dear Colorado State University Board of Governors,

My name is Jim Wiley and I serve as the Director of IT for the Associated Students’ Government at Colorado State University - Pueblo. Per the request of Student Body President Timothy Zercher and President Di Mare, I am writing you in order to share the students’ perspective on the current environment surrounding Information Technology at CSU - Pueblo. It appears that a lack of emphasis and clear communication of funding priorities has resulted in an underfunded CSU - Pueblo IT department and campus infrastructure during the recent years.

CSU - Pueblo’s current annual budget allocates approximately 4.5% of total funds towards our IT department. This compares to other Colorado universities which average a 5.6% allocation towards IT. This continual deficit averaging 1% over a number of years has resulted in a structurally underfunded and therefore understaffed and under equipped IT department. In short, funding for IT did not match the growth of the campus and the operating budget. While the state of the IT infrastructure sets CSU - Pueblo behind its world class peers, I believe that our school’s smaller size gives it the advantage of agility in correcting the set back.

The Associated Students’ Government at CSU-Pueblo therefore resolved to communicate the importance of increasing IT funding and incorporating modern technology into the student experience. We students are proud of the large increase in enrollment that our university has achieved through combined efforts and hard work across the state and within the campus community during the 2014-2015 academic year. We believe focusing efforts on IT funding will yield the continued growth of the student body year to year. Providing results in the areas of standardized campus software distribution and in wireless internet connectivity will further encourage the ability to retain new and incoming students who have a global background and expect a world class standard for their technological environment.

The software interfaces that students experience within the campus lab environment is one of the major front lines for interaction between students and campus technology. The recent operating system upgrade from Windows XP to Windows 7 has made a significant difference by removing an unsupported and insecure operating system from campus. With a newly consistent legacy operating system, Windows 7, dated at just over 5 years and software suit versions without interoperability across departments including Microsoft, Adobe, CAD, engineering, and scientific software, we became aware that the upgrade from XP was the first step of many. Looking forward we recognize the need for the continued hard work of the staff and the dedication and support of the faculty and student body.

Internet connectivity, especially through wireless access points, is another form of interaction between students and campus technology that is in a critical state. During a technology audit conducted by Global Technology Resources, Inc. it was identified that our campus currently has 230 wireless access points. This placed the student wireless experience 570 access points short of the minimum recommended amount of 800. Wireless internet access is a backbone utility that provides a significant value for students in our on campus experience. Fast and stable internet access benefits the campus beyond just empowering students in the academic
environment by providing resources and educational media, but also encourages external interactions with family and friends in a global environment by eliminating geological barriers. Recognizing these immediate needs on campus and solving them proactively will help to ensure the healthy future of CSU-Pueblo. Ensuring an increase in retention is needed to safeguard the university’s future. The most immediate sustainable action we could take to better our retention rates, in my opinion, would be to invest in the critical IT infrastructure of our campus and help to improve the on campus environment and the day to day student experience. We will be able to attract and hold onto students who prioritize modern technology in their lives and who have the expectation of a functional internet and software services better. It may take a number of years of continued funding to make up for the significant deficit we have found ourselves in but the students would be able to recognize an immediate effect. Myself, ASG, and the student body would be content with the knowledge that funding has been approved and changes are being regularly implemented to improve the state of the campus IT environment. We hope that the CSU Board of Governors will consider our request and the critical need for additional funding for our IT services on campus while determining the future budgets and funding.

Thank you for your consideration.
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KEY FEATURES

1. Focused on student success
2. Mission-driven
3. Measurable
STUDENT SUCCESS
Overall Plan Outcomes - 2020

- Enrollment: 5,100
- Retention: 68%
- Graduation: 910 (# of degrees awarded), 36% (graduation rate)

- Outcomes focused on enrollment, retention, and graduation
- Objectives tied to student success outcomes
MISSION-DRIVEN

Colorado State University – Pueblo is committed to excellence, setting the standard for regional comprehensive universities in teaching, research and service by providing leadership and access for its region while maintaining its commitment to diversity.

• Committed to Excellence
  – Developing and supporting excellent academic programs with excellent faculty

• Access and Diversity
  – Creating transformational experiences for a diverse student body

• Leadership
  – Community partnerships, sustainability and stewardship
TIES TO CSU SYSTEM MISSION

• **Ensure Student Satisfaction and Success**
  – Access and affordability
  – Transformational and supportive services and experiences for a diverse body of students
  – Measurable objectives for retention and graduation rates, student-related debt, and improving critical thinking skills and disciplinary knowledge

• **Expand Statewide Presence**
  – Academic programs that serve our region, attracting students from across Southern Colorado and the state

• **Create Financial Sustainability**
  – Committed to expanding our revenue sources while continuing to seek operational efficiencies

• **Transform Colorado’s Future**
  – Support for students from underrepresented groups
MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Enrollment* 5,100
- F2015: 4,559
- F2016: 4,679
- F2017: 4,828
- F2018: 4,959
- F2019: 5,047
- F2020: 5,102

Retention* 68%
- F2014: 63%**
- F2015: 64%
- F2016: 65%
- F2017: 66%
- F2018: 67%
- F2019: 68%

Graduation 36%***
- F2009 cohort: 33% **
- F2010 cohort: 33%
- F2011 cohort: 34%
- F2012 cohort: 34%
- F2013 cohort: 35%
- F2014 cohort: 36%
- 6 year graduation rate of fall freshman cohort by summer of 6th year
- ** (estimated) (i.e. by fall 2015)

- Measures for each objective
- Baseline and target data points for each objective.
- Dashboard

BOARD OF GOVERNORS of the COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
Goal One: Excellent Academics

Attract motivated students capable of academic success (E)
- Increase the percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen (FTFTF) with an index score above 100 from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Attract and retain high quality, motivated faculty and staff who provide outstanding instruction, scholarship, and service (R)
- By 2020, increase opportunities for faculty and staff members for professional development supporting teaching, peer-reviewed scholarship, and creative activities

Provide high quality and relevant academic programs that prepare students for professional and academic success (G)
- Increase the number of students who are employed in a position related to their field or accepted to graduate or professional programs within one year of graduation from x in 2015 to y in 2020

Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
Goal Two: Affordable Education

Provide informed financial aid and debt assistance counseling (G)
- Increase number of students who receive one-on-one financial and debt assistance counseling from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Optimize financial aid resources by using data to leverage award packages (E)
- Increase percentage of students offered financial aid packages who enroll from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Provide financial stewardship and sustainability of University resources (E)
- By 2020, the university’s reserves will have grown from x to y

Provide effective financial literacy education and financial planning tools (R)
- Increase the number of students who participate in financial literacy programs from x in 2014 to y in 2020
Goal Three: Transformative Opportunities

Provide academic advising, counseling, and tutoring services that support student success and graduation (R)

- Increase the percent of FTFTF who successfully complete 60 incremental hours in the first two years from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Enhance ethnic, racial, and cultural diversity across the campus (E)

- By 2020, maintain or increase percentage of students enrolled from groups underrepresented in higher education

Integrate experiential education throughout the student’s curricular and co-curricular activities (G)

- Increase the numbers of students who complete an experiential course from x in 2015 to y in 2020 as determined in conjunction with EE steering committee

Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
Goal Four: Supportive Student Life

Enhance/increase co- and extra-curricular opportunities for involvement and engagement for students (R)
- Increase the number of students who participate in clubs and activities, including student government, student clubs, and intramural, club, and collegiate athletics from x in 2015 to y in 2020

Provide opportunities for networking, leadership, and mentoring opportunities for students both on and off-campus (G)
- Increase the number of internships, networking, and shadowing opportunities for students from x in 2014 to y in 2020.

Improve campus residential life (R)
- Increase the number of students living on campus from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Provide modern and relevant campus facilities and technology (E)
- Provide a totally wired/wireless campus by 2020

Create Sophomore Experience Program (R)
- Increase sophomore to junior retention rate from x in 2014 to y in 2020

BOARD OF GOVERNORS of the COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
STRATEGIES

**Objective One - Attract motivated students capable of academic success. (E)**

- **Strategy:** Investigate and adopt university marketing approaches targeted to prospective students with high academic profiles
- **Strategy:** Investigate measures of academic motivation that might complement our other admissions criteria to predict student success
- **Strategy:** Implement other Academic Affairs initiatives, as developed and measured at the program level.
- **Strategy:** Investigate best practices to sustain a vibrant Honors Program
- **Strategy:** Increase the number of students who receive merit-based scholarships

**Measure:** Increase the percentage of first-time, full-time freshmen (FTFTF) with an index score above 100 from x in 2014 to y in 2020

Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System
PROCESS AND TIMELINE

• 2013 – Strategic Planning Task Force with 15 members and 2 co-chairs consulted with campus constituents via numerous campus open fora to develop draft.

• 2014 – Strategic Plan Implementation Team formed. With further campus input, draft was revised and final version forwarded to President November 7, 2014.

• 2014 and 2015 – Implementation Team will identify benchmark data, clarify targets, develop dashboard for stakeholders, monitor progress, and report to campus.
IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

Team Leads:
Rhonda Gonzales, Dean of Library Services and
Dr. Rick Kreminski, Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics/Acting IR Director

Dr. Derek Lopez, Director of the Center for Academic Excellence

Dr. Paul Orscheln, Vice President, Student Services and Enrollment Management

Amy Robertshaw, Registrar

Vicky Hansen, Professor

Dr. Brad Gilbreath, Professor

Stephen Hodge, Classified Staff

The Implementation Team is responsible for identifying implementation strategies, key stakeholders and resources, and gathering and analyzing data that identifies the university’s success in successfully attaining the performance objectives of the Strategic Plan.

Members of the team will serve a minimum of 3 years and work in collaboration with the HLC team.
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CSU System
Chancellor’s Report and
Presidents' Reports
Over the past year plus the System office staff and the leadership team have worked effectively to advance our Mission, implement the System Strategic Plan and better serve the citizens of Colorado and beyond. Allow me to highlight a number of accomplishments, many on going. It’s important to note up front that these are not individual accomplishments but reflect collaborative efforts on the part of many.

- **Improved System operations, efficiency and effectiveness** – The System staff has been reduced in size and expense yet it provides, in my view, higher quality, responsive service to the Board, the campuses and the interested public.

- **Expanded service and impacts of CSU-Global Campus** – The 2014 legislature adjusted CSU-Global Campus’ mission in recognition of its significant impacts on access, affordability and workforce development. We continue to seek innovative ways for CSU-GC to serve including the exploration of new associated ventures such as “NewCo”.

- **Progress in achieving stability at CSU-Pueblo** – Painful as it turned out to be, the recent budget cut at CSU-Pueblo moves that campus toward a more sustainable fiscal future. CSU-Fort Collins provided invaluable support in getting CSU-Pueblo up and running on Kauli. Much remains to be done in terms of costs, efficiency, revenue diversification and performance. Still steps have been made and are being made in the right direction.

- **Leadership Team Development at CSU-Pueblo** – The last few years the CSU-Pueblo leadership team has experienced near chaotic change. It appears that some stability is now being achieved. President DiMare has become more assertive in her role. Others are exhibiting a willingness to participate in meeting CSU-Pueblo’s challenges. A solid team and team approach will have to be fully demonstrated as CSU-Pueblo is evaluated for HLC accreditation.

- **System Leadership Team Development** – The presidents and I have worked to continue to work to be team oriented and mutually self-supporting. The objective, of course, is to take full advantage of each member’s unique expertise and strengths on behalf of the larger good. We are seeing the pay offs in many ways. One example is our three campus commitment to improve educational opportunities for Native Americans lead by Becky. Another is the emerging collaboration with other Colorado universities in which each campus leader has a role.
Participation in statewide higher education policy – Several CSU representatives have played and are playing significant roles in emerging higher education policy most recently through the implementing of HB1319. I would argue that no other system or institution is more constructively engaged than CSU. We have built strong working relationships with key legislators, the DHE staff and members of CCHE. Beyond HB 1319 issues, this will serve us well in the long run.

Statewide visibility – through a number of initiatives and events CSU’s statewide visibility and impact are on the rise. One strong example is the relationship we’ve developed with Club 20 which represents economic development interests on the West Slope. Tony and I continue to speak out on important topics through public presentations and Op-Eds. Becky has emerged as a respected expert on both the state and national levels. She is also a major player in the South Denver business community. Lesley has made strong connection in Pueblo and beyond.

Emerging collaborations – As suggested above, the CSU System has stepped up to initiate new collaborations aimed at better serving students and citizens. The development and expansion of joint programs in areas such as agriculture and natural resources are a prime example of how we can reach out through joint ventures.

As noted in prior reports we continue to discuss a wide range of partnerships and collaborations with other Colorado Colleges and Universities. We have been encouraged by CCHE members and DHE staff to redouble these efforts.

Likewise a potential partnership between CSU-Pueblo and Rocky Vista University in nursing holds real promise. Others are developing as well.

Thanks primarily to Governor Flores we are working to develop, with the assistance of the Colorado Futures Center and the Latino Chamber of Commerce of Pueblo, an institute involving CSU-Pueblo (our Federally designated HSI) aimed at serving that community with a special focus on Hispanic business and leadership development.

CSU and UTEP Rio Grande Water Initiative is now underway. Our team is now receiving new research funding through Business Higher Education Forum (BHEF) for a large, multi institution collaborative organized around the economic, social, cultural and environmental dimensions of the Rio Grande River. Lou Swanson is providing leadership from CSU. Several other universities and businesses will likely join.

Federal and congressional relations – Based on recommendations from a special taskforce we are reorganizing and refocusing federal and congressional relations to reflect the changing nature of research funding and the many higher education policy issues playing out at the national level. With the days of “earmarks” behind us it is now imperative that we fully connect with key agencies. And, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act has implications for all three of our campuses. Changes in rating
and accreditation criteria could change the higher education landscape in many ways. We intend to be on top of this change.

- **National higher education engagement** – The CSU System and its campuses continue to be represented and active participants in a number of national organizations and initiatives including but not limited to AGB, NASH, ACE, APLU, ASCU, AIHEC, Complete College America, and the White House T-9 effort. I’m especially proud of CSU’s very active and successful participation in HACU’s annual meeting held in Denver in October. We received kudos from HACU President Antonio Flores. Senator Michael Bennett was recognized for his special support of Hispanic students and Hispanic education.

- **Denver South** – While confessing to some frustration regarding the pace at which we are developing programs to serve Denver South, some noteworthy outcomes deserve highlighting. Under the leadership of Dr. Ron Sega, Systems Engineering has established a strong presence in the Denver South business community. This serves as a platform to other programs which can uniquely serve this region.

  It appears CSU-Pueblo will provide leadership in nursing program delivery and could play a key role in offering business related coursework at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

  Becky is serving as a well-connected liaison in Denver South and seeking new ways for CSU-GC to enhance education and workforce development programs in the rapidly growing region.

  System CAO Rick Miranda is assessing academic program development.

- **Venture Capital Fund** - Amy Parson’s will be providing an update on “Student Enterprise System” which was funded by the first round of Venture Capital Fund grants. Others are making real progress. This will hopefully set the stage for further discussion in February regarding a possible second round of grants.

- **Saudi Arabia** - Unfortunately I was not able to travel to Saudi Arabia for the Rector’s conference but they indicated they would like me to attend next year. I will reschedule the additional meetings we had planned for CSU-Global and the College of Business.

  I’ll close by emphasizing that many other good things are underway on behalf of CSU and the 21st Century mission we serve. All are driven by the letter and spirit of the System Strategic Plan and our performance contract with CCHE.
ASCEND TEAM

Jeremy Poteany, M.Ed.
Director

Jeremy Poteany serves as the Director of Ascend, providing leadership to the program and organizational strategy for Ascend partners. Over the last 15 years, Jeremy has visited with leaders and talent managers from over 550 organizations, helping them define and partner with universities to grow their talent. He is passionate about innovation, leadership coaching, and organizational growth. Jeremy also serves as the Director of The Career Center at Colorado State, leading a team of 50 full-time and part-time staff in all aspects of student career advising, employer engagement, and career events.

Prior to coming to Colorado State, Jeremy began developing students and organizations at Indiana University and Western Michigan University. Outside of work, he enjoys time in the mountains with his wife and four children, is an avid college basketball fan and loves trying new restaurants.

Email: Jeremy.Poteany@colostate.edu
Phone: 970-491-5707

Arthur Sinta, MBA
Associate Director for Business and Program Development

Arthur Sinta serves as the business and program developer for Ascend. He received a Bachelor’s in Speech Communication and a Masters in Business Administration from Colorado State University. He was hired at CSU full-time and has worked for over ten years in a variety of departments, including Admissions and Student Affairs. He currently includes serving at a Retail Store Manager for many years with Starbucks Coffee Company which was fundamental in developing his people-focused approach to management.

Because of his unique blend of corporate management and higher education, Arthur was recruited to bring clients success and expectations with the educational programs and services of a world-class research university. He brings a passion for delivering high-quality experiences to organizations ready to partner with CSU to reach their highest potential.

Email: Arthur.Sinta@colostate.edu
Phone: 970-491-118
Ascend develops capable, connected, and healthy organizations through a powerful affiliation to Colorado State University, leveraging excellence in training, wellness, professional development, entertainment, consulting, retreats, recruiting, networking, and more.

**AFFILIATE MEMBERSHIP**

**Affiliate Membership Includes**
- Concierge Service: Personal service from our staff to connect your organization to the entire CSU community and available resources.
- Access to Purchase: All Ascend Services: Build a customized bundle for your organization based on your unique training, wellness, and connection goals.
- Access to Organizational Assessment and Report: An online survey to collect baseline data and to create a snapshot of the overall health of your organization.
- Top Level Leadership Networking: C-suite and VP level leadership have the opportunity to connect with other leaders to enhance their professional network.
- Preferred Partner Discounts: Use of CSU discounts on office supplies, computers, moving services, insurance, and more.
- Access to Strategic Research and Development Meetings: Schedule a discovery and strategy session to connect to the research important to your organization.
- Information Stream: Subscription to an electronic calendar and newsletter featuring educational speakers, workshops, and activities.
- Invitations to Exclusive Events: Nationally recognized speakers and programs.
- Admission to On-Campus Conferences.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ASSESSMENT**

**Base Assessment and Report**
- 40+ question delivered online to assess 6 dimensions of organizational culture including:
  - Capabilities, Connectedness, and Health
  - Individuals, Team Environment, and Leadership
  - Extensive report provided, along with in-person overview presentation for key decision makers.

**In-Person Interviews with Leadership Team**
- A deep dive with a team of your leaders to help illuminate the needs of your organization.
- Findings report provided, along with in-person overview presentation for key decision makers.

**Custom Add-ons**
- Customized questions from you, with cross-tabulated results.
- Connect assessment to employee demographics via confidential code.
- Tailored reports for multiple departments.
- Presentations for multiple departments.
- Language translations for non-English literate workers.
- Paper-based survey process for staff without computer access.

**HOLISTIC SERVICES**

Our services are divided into a variety of themes including Training & Development, Certificate Programs, Retreats, Wellness & Nutrition, Arts & Athletics, Academic Credit, and more.

- **Connected to Employee Engagement:**
  Each theme provides a variety of offerings that tie back to the Employee Engagement Model and are provided through a network of partnerships with faculty, staff, departments, and the CSU community.

- **Something for Everyone:**
  Ascend offers products and services designed to create a productive organization on all levels. All offerings are represented on a spectrum from Entry Level employees to Top Leadership and from the individual to the entire team.

- **CSU Partners:**
  These offerings are made possible through partnerships which include the Center for Professional Development and Business Research, Kendall Anderson Nutrition Center, Conference Services, Athletics, University Center for the Arts, Career Center, Online Plus, and many more.

**AFFILIATE ORGANIZATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Company</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birko</td>
<td>Agriculture/Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Business Bank - Fort Collins Branch</td>
<td>Banking and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine Health Systems</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Bank for Larimer County</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Hills Gateway</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins Country Club</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miramont Lifestyle Fitness</td>
<td>Health and Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>Affiliation Management/Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benchmark Solutions</td>
<td>Healthcare Benchmarking/Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


"Ascend has been an outstanding partner in enhancing the team culture of the Food Bank for Larimer County. Through trainings by renowned faculty, retreats at Pingree Park, and a personalized concierge service, our team will have the tools to grow our organizational culture for years to come."

Amy Pizzuti, Executive Director, Food Bank for Larimer County
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I. TEACHING AND LEARNING: ASSURE EXCELLENCE IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

A. Colorado State University Reports Seventh Consecutive Year of Record Enrollment

Colorado State University posted a record total enrollment for the seventh consecutive year, bolstered by a surge in graduate, non-resident, and international students. Along with record enrollment, the university is celebrating 10 consecutive years of increasing racially and ethnically diverse enrollment, demonstrating the university’s commitment to access and diversity. CSU’s enrollment now stands at 31,725 – a nearly 1 percent increase above last year’s record enrollment of 31,514. Racially and ethnically diverse enrollment is at an all-time high at 5,700 students, or 18 percent of the total student population. Colorado State also continues to be Colorado’s school of choice; more Colorado freshmen students attend CSU than any other university in the state. At 3,154, Colorado students make up 72 percent of this year’s freshman class. The university saw increases in:

- international students at 1,859, up 23 percent and now representing nearly 7 percent of the resident student population – a nearly 110 percent increase over five years.
- Non-resident students at 6,924, up more than 2 percent.
- Graduate students at 4,580, up nearly 2.5 percent.

The quality of the freshman class is demonstrated by an average ACT score of 24.9 and includes a wide array of accomplished students, including 54 class valedictorians, six Boettcher Award winners and 17 Daniels Fund Scholars. Nearly one in four CSU freshmen will be the first in their family to earn a college degree. CSU’s incoming class includes 702 Pell-eligible, low-income Colorado residents (22 percent of incoming resident students). In light of the Commitment to Colorado program, now in place for four years, an additional 112 freshmen above Pell but at or below the state median income will have at least half their tuition costs covered. Overall, 4,017 CSU undergraduates will benefit from the Commitment to Colorado program.

B. New Master's Degree in Greenhouse Gas Management and Accounting

To help train professionals for a new job market emerging for professionals who can accurately quantify and reduce the greenhouse gas emissions of businesses, Colorado State University has launched a new Master of Greenhouse Gas Management and Accounting degree that combines environmental knowledge with quantitative and technical skills. The MGMA program is offered by CSU’s Department of Ecosystem Science and Sustainability and showcases CSU’s diverse greenhouse gas expertise by combining curriculum from the University’s Warner College of Natural Resources and College of Business. The MGMA program will start its first cohort of students in fall 2015 and is accepting applications through February 2015.
C. Vaske Receives National Award of Excellence for Recreation and Park Research

For his significant contributions and dedication to the field of parks and recreation, CSU Professor Jerry J. Vaske in October received the national Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt Award for Excellence in Recreation and Park Research. Vaske is a professor in the Department of Human Dimensions of Natural Resources in CSU’s Warner College of Natural Resources. He teaches classes on research methodology and advises graduate students studying social science issues related to natural resources. For the last 30 years, Vaske’s research has focused on the application of social science theory and methodology to the concerns of tourism and natural resource managers. Vaske has published more than 150 refereed journal articles, nine books, and 20 book chapters.

D. Biochemistry Graduate Program Ranked No. 6 Nationally

GraduatePrograms.com, a premier online information resource for prospective graduate students and faculty, ranked CSU’s program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology No. 6 in the country among programs of its type, above comparable programs at Harvard, Princeton, Cornell, Ohio State, and University of Wisconsin. Program rankings were based on reviews by more than 70,000 students participating in more than 1,600 graduate programs nationwide.

II. TEACHING AND LEARNING: INTEGRATE ACADEMIC AND CO-CURRICULAR EXPERIENCES

A. CSU Exhibit Draws Inspiration from Diverse Cultures

Graduate students in Colorado State University’s Department of Design and Merchandising showed off their original textile designs in a new multicultural exhibit that debuted Sept. 26 in CSU’s Gustafson Gallery. The textile items featured in the exhibit, *Diversity in Textile Design: Works in Progress*, were inspired by a diverse combination of cultures. Inspiration for the designs comes from West Africa, Western Saudi Arabia, and Victorian England, as well as from the world of microorganisms and the biodiversity of nature.

III. RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY: FOSTER EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ARTISTRY/FOCUS IN AREAS OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH AND SOCIETAL NEED

A. CSU Researchers Collect Water-Quality Data at Oil and Natural Gas Sites

For the first time, Colorado residents, regulators, and other stakeholders have access to water-quality information gathered in real-time at oil and natural gas well sites in the Denver-Julesburg Basin. Colorado State University researchers Sept. 24 unveiled the Colorado Water Watch (http://waterwatch.colostate.edu/), a monitoring system that collects groundwater quality data from oil and natural gas sites and uploads the information every hour to a CSU-run website. Ken Carlson, a professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, leads the project. Carlson and former Colorado Gov. Bill Ritter, director of CSU’s Center for the New Energy Economy,
proposed the idea to the Colorado Department of Natural Resources and Noble Energy as a way to provide the public with more information about an increasingly controversial topic.

B. Camels Emit Dangerous MERS Virus, CSU Researchers Confirm

In a finding with global health implications, a research team led by a doctoral student at Colorado State University has confirmed for the first time that camels vent volumes of the deadly Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) virus, making them the likeliest suspect for spreading the pathogen to people. The findings were announced Nov. 6. The CSU team is now testing a vaccine that could keep camels from shedding the MERS virus, which has caused acute respiratory illness in about 900 people across the Arabian Peninsula since it was identified in 2012. The CSU researchers, partnering with an arm of the National Institutes of Health, demonstrated that infected camels shed large amounts of MERS virus, primarily through their nostrils. They also established for the first time that the virus develops in the animals’ upper respiratory system, and that camels shed the infectious virus for up to a week. The findings were not surprising to many scientists who study viral infectious disease – camels have been a primary suspect as a source of MERS – yet confirming the source is essential to advancing science, knowledge and solutions. Danielle Adney, a Ph.D. student in CSU’s Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology, was lead author on a study to be published in the December issue of Emerging Infectious Diseases. Adney’s paper shows that three infected dromedary camels, housed at a CSU research facility, expelled high levels of MERS virus, mainly from the nose. The principal investigator is Richard Bowen, a professor in CSU’s Department of Biomedical Sciences and Vienna Brown, also a CSU doctoral student in Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology, is co-author.

C. CSU Veterinarians Pursue Stem-Cell Therapy for Cats with Severe Kidney Disease

Colorado State University is the sole veterinary institution in the nation using stem-cell therapy to treat feline kidney disease, common among pet cats, and researchers are now launching a new clinical trial to further explore the power of stem cells to improve organ function. Chronic kidney disease is common in older cats. Yet other than a kidney transplant, there is no cure, and risk factors for the disease are poorly understood. For the new clinical trial, researchers will work with cat patients with stable, stage 4 chronic kidney disease.

D. CSU Provides New Findings on Controversial Racehorse Drug

A Colorado State University researcher released in October a new study about the impact that bleeding in the lungs has on racehorse performance and the effectiveness of the most common treatment for the condition. Lasix, the original brand name for a diuretic called furosemide, is used by horse owners to reduce exercise-induced pulmonary hemorrhaging (EIPH), the bleeding in the lungs that commonly occurs while horses are racing. The use of the medication was banned by the Breeders’ Cup last year in races that were limited to 2-year-old horses, but race officials reversed that policy and are allowing Lasix to be used in all races this year. Research by Paul Morley, a CSU professor in the Department of Clinical Sciences and one of the foremost experts on Lasix and EIPH, is providing important new information to stakeholders in the debate. Morley is part of a long-standing collaborative group that has published three new papers in
Equine Veterinary Journal that address the effects of EIPH on performance as well as the efficacy of Lasix in controlling the condition. In this latest project, Morley and his research team examined existing studies on Lasix and concluded that there is high-quality, albeit limited, evidence that Lasix is effective in reducing the incidence and severity of EIPH in racehorses. The finding supports the results of his team’s landmark 2009 clinical trial on Lasix.

E. CSU Center to Assist in Ebola Vaccine Development and Manufacturing

Colorado State University’s Biopharmaceutical Manufacturing and Academic Resource Center (BioMARC) has been awarded $2 million by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) to aid in the development and manufacturing of a vaccine to protect against infection by filoviruses, including the Ebola and Marburg viruses. The $2 million subcontract was awarded by Battelle Memorial Institute, a research organization that serves the DoD Medical Countermeasure Systems Joint Vaccine Acquisition Program (MCS-JVAP). Among MCS-JVAP’s requirements is to develop a vaccine to protect soldiers from aerosolized exposure to filoviruses, which cause several types of hemorrhagic fever. BioMARC will make contributions toward furthering the development of a replicon vaccine platform containing a non-infectious Ebola antigen, which has been shown to protect nonhuman primates from an intramuscular and aerosol challenge with the Ebola virus.

F. CSU Prepares Research Effort for Bats Threatened by White Nose Syndrome

White Nose Syndrome has decimated more than 5 million “little brown bats” in the eastern United States since it was identified in New York in 2006, and it has now progressed as far west as Missouri. In preparation for the anticipated arrival of the fungus that causes the syndrome, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program at Colorado State University, in partnership with Colorado Parks and Wildlife, is conducting surveys of the state’s little brown bats so that scientists can detect any declines in that population caused by White Nose Syndrome. Jeremy Siemers, a zoologist with the Colorado Natural Heritage Program in CSU’s Warner College of Natural Resources, was part of a team that trapped and tagged more than 600 bats this summer at two locations near Steamboat Springs where females were raising their young. By inserting tags into the bats, the researchers can track their presence at the roosts and hopefully be notified of the fungus’s arrival if a notable decline in the population occurs.

IV. RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY: IMPROVE DISCOVERY CAPABILITIES

A. New Research Partnership to Speed Medical Advances in Northern Colorado

Colorado State University, Poudre Valley Hospital, and the Medical Center of the Rockies have agreed to combine resources and personnel to bring CSU research to patients faster and more efficiently. The entities will collaborate in several areas, including clinical trials, funding opportunities, technology transfer, employee education/training and marketing. Patients will see direct benefits from a new agreement connecting physicians with university researchers in Northern Colorado. The agreement promotes new partnerships between CSU and the two hospitals’ parent organization, University of Colorado Health.
B. Cancer Experts Launch Plan with Japan to Carbon-ion Radiotherapy Center

Colorado cancer researchers and medical doctors announced in September they are launching a $200,000 feasibility study as a key step to building the nation’s first carbon-ion radiotherapy research and treatment facility in Aurora, where they and colleagues hope to investigate and provide to patients leading-edge radiation therapy that is effective against the deadliest cancers and now is available only in Europe and Japan. The site of the proposed research and treatment facility on the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus would cost an estimated $300 million. The project’s collaborators include world-renowned cancer experts at CU and Colorado State University. They have signed a memorandum of understanding to pursue the project with University of Colorado Health’s Poudre Valley Hospital in Fort Collins and with carbon-ion radiotherapy pioneers at the National Institute of Radiological Sciences in Japan, the first nation in the world to build a facility of this kind.

C. CSU Receives Grand Challenges Explorations Grant for Malaria Control

Colorado State University has been selected as a winner of a Grand Challenges Explorations grant, an initiative funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. CSU Associate Professor Brian Foy will pursue an innovative global health and development research project to pioneer a new method for controlling malaria. Grand Challenges Explorations supports individuals worldwide to explore ideas that can break the mold in solving persistent global health and development challenges. Foy will explore the possibility of giving humans a drug that makes their blood poisonous to the mosquitoes that carry the disease. Foy, an associate professor in the Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Pathology at CSU, will conduct a clinical trial next spring in Burkina Faso.

D. CSU Ventures and Partners to Help with Agriculture Tech Transfer

CSU Ventures, Rocky Mountain Innosphere, the Colorado Bioscience Association, and members of Ag Innovators of Northern Colorado have joined the Agricultural Research Partner Network to strengthen and enhance technology transfer and commercialization efforts within the state’s agricultural sectors. The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Agricultural Research Service established the network to match business needs with ARS innovations and research capabilities, to help companies and startups solve agricultural problems, develop products, and create new jobs. The project supports ARS’s mission to conduct research that develops and transfers solutions to agricultural problems of high national priority and to provide access to information.

V. SERVICE AND OUTREACH: PREPARE AND EMPOWER LEARNERS OUTSIDE THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

A. First-ever Veterans Symposium explores value of veterans

CSU’s hosted its first-ever Veterans Symposium, an event that created an educational forum and dialogue for faculty, staff, students, Northern Colorado businesses, and veteran service providers Oct. 30-31. The sold-out symposium explored the value and challenges veterans experience and
identified potential ways the public, private, and non-profit sectors can better support veterans in maximizing their academic and career potential.

**B. CSU Veterinarians Provide Free, Online Presentation, 'Coping with Colic in Horses'**

Colorado State’s Veterinary Teaching Hospital hosted two interactive online discussions in October to provide horse owners with information about identifying, treating and preventing equine colic – the leading cause of premature death in horses.

**C. Children's Musical Garden at CSU dedicated**

The Colorado State University Early Childhood Center celebrated its new Children’s Musical Garden at a dedication ceremony Oct. 17. The garden, which features various musical instruments designed for children, was funded with a $53,000 donation from former Colorado First Lady Bea Romer and her close friend Peggy Noland, who met as freshmen at what was then Colorado A&M in 1947. The idea of creating the “Bea Romer and Peggy Noland Children’s Musical Garden” arose during their tour of the Early Childhood Center last year. The outdoor instruments, which include a xylophone, pagoda bells, contrabass chimes, and a metalophone, were made by Durango-based Freenotes Harmony Park.

**VI. SERVICE AND OUTREACH: ENGAGE CITIZENS THROUGH COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

**A. CSU Student Volunteers Assist Elderly Fort Collins Residents**

Off-Campus Life at Colorado State University and the City of Fort Collins Neighborhood Services Office teamed up for the 10th annual Fall Clean Up event Nov. 1. More than 1,200 volunteers helped more than 170 residents throughout the Fort Collins community with outdoor yard work like raking leaves, trimming bushes, and other essential tasks. Last year, 100 percent of the students surveyed felt that assisting with Fall Clean Up helped them feel more a part of the Fort Collins community. Ninety percent felt that as a result of participating, they would be less likely to choose behaviors and actions that could negatively impact neighborhoods in the community; the other 10 percent shared that they are choosing behaviors and actions that have a positive impact in the neighborhoods. Ninety-seven percent felt that volunteering further motivated them to help maintain the neighborhood quality of life in Fort Collins.

**B. CSU Professors Help Disabled Farmers and Ranchers**

Professor of Agricultural and Resource Economics Norm Dalsted and Professor of Human Development and Family Studies Robert Fetsch have received a four-year grant of $720,000 from the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture to provide assistance, networking, and educational workshops across Colorado for farmers and producers affected by disabilities. For the past 16 years, CSU has led the AgrAbility Project and has served 436 clients. Now, with another four-year renewal, the university will have led this program for a full 20 years.
C. **CSU’s Cans Around the Oval Celebrates 28 Years**

Cans Around the Oval, held on campus Oct. 22, raised 47,470 pounds of food and $46,743 this year. As the largest one-day food drive in Northern Colorado, CSU partners with the Food Bank for Larimer County to raise food and monetary donations to help those in need in the community. The donations from this one collection day can help more than 40,000 people served by the Food Bank.

VII. **RESOURCES AND SUPPORT: EXPAND FUNDRAISING**

A. **Phase II of Animal Sciences Building Receives Major Support from Faculty Donors**

Drs. Temple Grandin and Gary Smith are both professors of animal sciences at Colorado State University and respected national leaders in animal welfare and meat sciences. The renowned professors are each donating $250,000 to support Animal Sciences Phase II Building construction and programs within the Department of Animal Sciences at CSU. The first phase of building construction, a renovated Animal Sciences Building, was unveiled Sept. 17. Animal Sciences Phase II will be named the Gary and Kay Smith Global Food Innovation Center and will feature a complete livestock, poultry and meat processing center spanning harvesting and all processing; a culinary research and sensory analysis facility; an auditorium lecture hall and meat demonstration classroom; and a retail meat and dairy store and café. The new building will also include the Temple Grandin Animal Handling and Education Center, with Grandin-designed livestock handling and teaching areas as well as a fully equipped livestock arena. Once completed, the center will provide additional classroom and study space, state-of-the-art laboratory and research space focused on meat and food science, and will serve as a resource for students and faculty to collaborate with industry professionals through education, training and equipment development/testing.

B. **Report on Private Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October 2014</th>
<th>FY15 (July - October)</th>
<th>FY14 (July - October)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>$3,810,530</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>$23,648,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrevocable Planned Gifts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$54,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocable Gifts and Conditional Pledges</td>
<td>$1,160,700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$54,368,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to Commitments Prior to Period</td>
<td>($414,916)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>($2,682,141)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Philanthropic Support</td>
<td>$4,556,314</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>$75,389,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Research</td>
<td>$3,822,657</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$13,354,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Private Support</td>
<td>$8,378,971</td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>$88,743,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Gifts – ($100,000 +) Not Previously Reported

- $42,500,000 conditional pledge designated as $32,500,000 to support the *Institute for Biological and Translational Therapies Operations*, and $10,000,000 to support the
Institute for Biological and Translational Therapies Building, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

- $4,312,000 gift-in-kind to support the *CSU Research Foundation Mexico AC*, Office of the President
- $1,977,345 use of property to support *Geosciences*, Warner College of Natural Resources
- $800,000 revocable commitment to support *CVMBS Greatest Need*, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
- $56,000 to support the *Weitzel Family Scholarship*, College of Agricultural Sciences
- $384,642 gift-in-kind to support *Chemistry Research*, College of Natural Sciences
- $300,000 gift to support the *Veterinary Teaching Hospital*, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences
- $255,000 realized bequest to support *Design and Merchandising*, College of Health and Human Sciences
- $250,000 pledge designated as $225,000 to support the *Gary and Kay Smith Global Food Innovation Center*, and $25,000 to support the *Animal Sciences Building Maintenance and Operations Endowment*, Department of Athletics
- $207,000 revocable commitment split evenly to support *Animal Sciences* and *College of Agricultural Sciences Enrichment*, College of Agricultural Sciences, and *Morgan and University Libraries*, Morgan Library.
- $200,000 revocable commitment to support the *Gil Gutierrez Memorial Scholarship*, Division of Student Affairs
- $200,000 revocable commitment to support the *Paul Gleason Wildland Fire Scholarship*, Warner College of Natural Resources
- $200,000 in pledges split evenly to support *Cotrufo-Hoppess Fund and Soil Ecology Research* and *Borch-Hoppess Fund for Environmental Contaminant Research*, College of Agricultural Sciences
- $164,132 revocable commitment to support the *Occupational Therapy Scholarship*, College of Health and Human Sciences
- $150,000 gift to support the *CSU Marching Band Pre-Performance Space*, College of Liberal Arts
- $150,000 gift to support *Hydrocarbon Research – Department of Civil Engineering*, College of Engineering

- $137,250 gift designated as $116,750 to support the *National Western Sock Show Scholarship*, $16,500 to support the *Beef Industry Leadership Fellowship*, and $4,000 to support the *National Western Stock Show/Jim Henry Scholarship*, College of Agricultural Sciences

- $125,000 gift to support the *GSSE International Student Scholarship*, College of Business

- $125,000 gift to support the *Center for Energy and Water Sustainability*, College of Engineering

- $120,000 gift to support *Solvents-in-Groundwater*, College of Engineering

- $119,982 gift to support the *Engineering Faculty Achievement Award*, College of Engineering

- $100,222 gift to support the *Golden Retriever Endowment*, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

- $155,000 gift designated as $90,000 to support the *Gary and Kay Smith Global Food Innovation Center*, $55,000 to support the *Temple Grandin Project*, and $10,000 to support *Animal Sciences Building Maintenance and Operations*, College of Agricultural Sciences

- $100,000 pledge to support *CM Cares*, College of Health and Human Sciences

- $100,000 revocable commitment to support *Engineering College Scholars*, College of Engineering

VIII. RESOURCES AND SUPPORT: NURTURING HUMAN CAPITAL

A. **Pritchett to Lead New Outreach Initiatives on Agriculture and Food Issues**

Colorado’s robust agricultural scene, combined with increasing consumer interest in health, wellness, local foods, food safety and environmental issues, is the driving force behind expanded research and outreach at Colorado State University. As the newly appointed assistant vice president in the Office of Engagement, James Pritchett will serve as a catalyst for new engagement efforts in food systems and contribute to ongoing excellence in research and Extension initiatives. Pritchett, a professor of agricultural and resource economics, will assume full-time duties Jan. 1, 2015.
B. CSU’s Barker Named to National Veterans Office

CSU Assistant Registrar/Military Veterans’ Education Benefits Manager Marc Barker was elected NAVPA president at the National Association of Veterans’ Program Administrators meeting in October. NAVPA is the only national higher-education organization specifically dedicated to veteran program administration. Barker also was instrumental in coordinating CSU’s first major symposium on veterans’ issues this fall.

IX. RESOURCES AND SUPPORT: INCREASING AWARENESS

A. Rooftop Solar Arrays Installed on Braiden Hall

An array of solar panels capable of powering 14 homes was installed in October on the roof of Colorado State’s Braiden Hall. The 100-kilowatt array is the first of six that will adorn the rooftops of several CSU buildings as part of a project led by the city of Fort Collins. Five other arrays will be added on to CSU buildings next year. Once complete, the CSU-portion of the Solar Power Purchase Program is expected to generate 1,200 kilowatts of power annually – or 1.65 million kilowatt hours — enough to power 180 homes a year. Energy from the solar arrays will feed the Fort Collins Utilities electric grid and help power local homes and businesses, including buildings on the CSU campus.

B. Reinventing Undergraduate Education Topic of National Conference

Different dimensions of the enduring promise by research universities to provide a distinctive undergraduate experience was the topic of “Engaged Learning and the Ethos of Discovery: Achieving the Promise in a Turbulent Era,” held Nov. 14-15. It was the seventh biennial conference of the CSU-based Reinvention Center, a consortium of 70 major public and private universities dedicated to advancing undergraduate education on research campuses – the only national organization of its kind. The meeting coincided with the 20th anniversary of the convening of the Boyer Commission, a group of concerned university presidents and chancellors, scientists and artists, communications professionals and nonprofit executives, who issued the groundbreaking report, Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research Universities, in 1998. President Tony Frank led a panel discussion exploring the impact of the Boyer Report and its relevance for today’s research universities.

C. Colorado State University Street Renamed Amy Van Dyken Way

Colorado State University honored alumnus and Olympic swimming legend Amy Van Dyken-Rouen on Oct. 17, by renaming West Drive on campus Amy Van Dyken Way. This marks the first time a campus street has been named for a former student. Van Dyken-Rouen is a six-time Olympic gold medalist. In 1996 she became the first American female to win four gold medals in a single Olympics.
D.  Bomb-Sniffing War Dog Shows Heart, Gets Veterinary Care at CSU

A bomb-sniffing war dog that saved thousands of American lives in Iraq and Afghanistan has a new lease on life after heart surgery Sept. 16 at CSU’s Veterinary Teaching Hospital. Kay, a 9-year-old pit bull and Labrador mix, served two tours in Iraq hunting down improvised explosive devices. Then U.S. Army Spec. Brandon Donahue became the war dog’s handler and grew devoted to Kay during three years of grueling bomb-detection work in Kandahar, Afghanistan. Donahue adopted Kay in May 2013, after the soldier and dog finished their final tour of duty. Donahue and his wife, Brandi, wanted to give back to Kay after he had given them and others so much. Kay has an inoperable heart tumor, a condition that some veterinarians told them would require euthanasia. The Donahues found the help they sought with canine heart specialists and surgeons at CSU. The surgery involved draining fluid from the sac around his heart, allowing the heart to function more effectively even with inoperable cancer. Overseeing the procedure was Dr. Catriona MacPhail, a CSU surgical oncologist and small animal chief medical officer.

E.  2013 Anschutz Grant Supports Strong Progress of Flint Animal Cancer Center

The Anschutz Foundation awarded CSU’s Flint Animal Cancer Center a three-year, $1.5M grant in April 2013 to strengthen the collaboration between Colorado’s leading centers for human and animal cancer research and to expand the capacity for interdisciplinary clinical research benefiting humans and animals. In an October 2014 progress report, the Flint Animal Cancer Center reported that the Foundation’s support has enabled them to assemble a strong team and infrastructure with to advance comparative oncology. The majority of grant funds have been used to attract the personnel needed to support a robust operation to support clinical trials and research. This has included creation of an online referral and consultation service that has significantly enhanced clinical trial enrollment and currently includes about 2,000 veterinarians and pet owners. This service has helped accelerate a clinical trial in dogs with non-Hodgkins lymphoma. As of October 2014, the Animal Cancer Center has a total of 16 clinical trials in progress, with eight new trials pending. The Anschutz funding has also been deployed to leverage support from other sources with matching funds. The cumulative impact of the Anschutz support goes beyond the walls of CSU and the University of Colorado – it is also helping to elevate the role of comparative medicine and cancer to a national agenda and to bring federally designated funding to this area.
Increase Degree Attainment and Stakeholder Engagement
- CSU-Global hosted the director of adult education from the Southern Ute Indian tribe to provide information and insight into its work and processes for adult education leading to online certificates of completion and degree programs. CSU-Global has also provided its online pilot for customer service training as requested by the tribal council leadership.
- The university has successfully cleared November reviews by the Department of Education and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators in its handling of student financial aid and other financially-related university services.

Improve Student Success
- CSU-Global has converted and launched its courses onto its new learning management platform which is intended to enhance student ease of course navigation and social networking, while streamlining faculty and administration processes for securing data on learning outcomes, increased student interaction, and increased classroom management flexibility.
- As of November, General Education math and English courses have been re-launched with the inclusion of adaptive technology to facilitate student academic success while in CSU-Global’s standard courses.

Enhance Access and Reduce Attainment Gaps through Academic Excellence
- CSU-Global held its Fall Faculty Retreat in October for its lead and program coordinator faculty members from each academic discipline. The Fall Retreat provides a unique opportunity to bridge the onsite and offsite cultures of CSU-Global Campus to enhance student learning and satisfaction as the faculty leadership work with staff on enhancing the alignment between CSU-Global curriculum and learning outcomes, curriculum development, and training.
- In its ongoing preparatory work towards its future ability to accept degree-seeking first-time-first-year Freshmen (FTFYF), CSU-Global has awarded scholarships to 15 students between the ages of 22 and 48 years old with no prior college credit, who will experience CSU-Global’s uniquely designed FTFYF learning environment which includes heighten student interaction with staff and faculty, and General Education courses with adaptive
learning technology. As part of their scholarship, the students are participating in weekly feedback sessions and activities with the CSU-Global staff and faculty so that the university can ensure that it is properly prepared to facilitate FTFYF student success.

**Promote Affordability and Efficiency**

- Over the last two months, in effort to facilitate nationwide university success in working with nontraditional students, CSU-Global has presented information on its activities, policies, and processes at several American Association of State Colleges and Universities meetings; the Leaders in Professional, Continuing and Online Education workshop on admissions and enrollment; the Academic Management Institute Annual Conference; and at the Lumina Foundation Convening for Adult Degree Completion.
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I. ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

A. Students Continue Summer Research

Students in the Ecology Field Course (Biol 453L) collected stream insect data at the Baca National Wildlife Refuge in the San Luis Valley in southern Colorado. The Baca Refuge is a recently established refuge, and Crestone Creek, which runs through the refuge, hosts one of only two remaining historical populations of Rio Grande sucker (Colorado State Endangered Species) in the state. Three other native fish occur in this creek, including Rio Grande chub (Colorado State Species of Special Concern). Protection and management of these populations is a top priority for the Refuge and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in the San Luis Valley. The data collected by the students will help establish baseline information about the diversity of stream macroinvertebrates in the Refuge. Students in the Ecology Field Course also participated in duck banding in the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge. This activity contributes to an ongoing study on Cinnamon Teal and Blue Teal migration. The Monte Vista Refuge has banded more teal than any other location in the study. The research seeks to determine the health of the teal populations – species who over-winter in Mexico, Central and South America. These collaborations between CSU-Pueblo students and the San Luis Valley National Wildlife Complex is a follow-on activity to the FWS Faculty Fellowship that Dr. Lee Anne Martínez held in summer 2014. This national fellowship program is designed to increase the interaction between the FWS and institutions of higher learning, in order to improve conservation education and promote workforce development.

B. American Chemical Society Student Chapter Recognized

The American Chemical Society recognized the CSU-Pueblo student chapter with an Honorable Mention Award for its activities conducted during the 2013-14 academic year. Professors David Lehmpuhl and David Dillon, faculty advisors of the chapter, or one of the officers will be presented with an award at the 249th ACS National Meeting in Denver, CO on Sunday March 22, 2015. The award-winning chapters will also be published in Chemical & Engineering News.
II. STUDENT ACCESS AND SUPPORT

A. CSU-Pueblo Foundation receives $384,000 for scholarship

A former Colorado Fuel and Iron (CF&I) employee has chosen to assist education majors of German or Italian descent in his estate with the endowment of a scholarship to the CSU-Pueblo Foundation. Long-time Puebloan Ralph Heilman made a bequest of $384,500 through his estate to create the Ralph A. and Jennie Mae Heilman Scholarship Fund. The Ralph A. and Jennie Mae Heilman Fund will award annual scholarships to CSU-Pueblo students in their second year of school who are of German or Italian descent and majoring in education. Recipients must have a 3.0 GPA and be a full-time student.

B. CSU-Pueblo Establish Pack Pantry

A collective effort by students at CSU-Pueblo will result in the establishment of a food pantry for needy students and faculty/staff this fall. The Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity along with President’s Leadership Program student Autumn Black are teaming up to bring a food bank to campus to make a difference in the lives of students and employees who may be struggling to make ends meet. Black, a senior PLP scholar and bioscience major, is establishing the Pack Pantry as part of an internship that fulfills requirements in the PLP program. She undertook the pantry project in January 2014 and will continue coordinating the Pack Pantry until her graduation in May 2015. She researched similar food banks at other universities in an effort to find best practices of the most successful programs. The pantry is a partner agency to the Care and Share Food Bank of Southern Colorado and receives and purchases food items from the Care and Share Warehouse in Pueblo, as well as in-kind donations and monetary donations from donors.

The pantry is located next to the Veteran’s Resource Center in the Underground of the Occhiato University Center. The Pack Pantry will be open twice a week for 4-5 hours at a time. Each client is asked to present their CSU-Pueblo ID to verify they are an entity of CSU-Pueblo and will sign in with their PID at the pantry entrance. Clients are asked to visit the pantry only one time per week and are allowed to choose six (6) unique food items and one (1) hygiene item per visit. If more than one visit per week is necessary, Black will attempt to arrange further assistance. When leaving the pantry, clients may take a brochure of various resources available in Pueblo if further aid is needed.

The Lambda Chi Alpha fraternity is coordinating a community-wide food drive for the initial stocking of the pantry with a goal of 200,000 pounds of food. Lambda Chi Alpha fraternities nationwide are partnered with Feeding America to collect food and donations for the domestic hunger relief cause.
III. DIVERSITY

A. Fall Distinguished Speaker Series Concludes
The CSU-Pueblo Distinguished Speaker Series will close out the fall semester with a performance by a nationally renowned theatre group and an Iraqi War Veteran who fought for the repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” gay rights legislation. The Denver-based Su Teatro theatre group brought their national reputation for productions highlighting the history and experiences of Chicanos to the Hoag Recital Hall stage on Nov. 19. West Point Graduate and gay rights advocate Lt. Dan Choi shared his experiences as soldier and protester on Dec. 1 in the Occhiato University Center Ballroom. The series will resume in 2015 with inspirational Coach Ken Carter on January 20 and the Cleo Parker Robinson Dance Troupe on February 19.

IV. IMAGE BUILDING

A. Veteran Student Share Educational Experiences
The Southern Colorado Press Club had its monthly meeting on the CSU-Pueblo campus on Nov. 10, hearing from two military veteran students in “From Soldier to Student: Perspectives on the Transition.” Student Veterans of America officers Paul Hendrickson and Craig Staley discussed their military service experiences as well as the challenges they have faced since returning to civilian life and enrolling at CSU-Pueblo.

V. COMMUNITY OUTREACH

A. Area Students Celebrate National Chemistry Week Activities
Students from four area middle and high schools explored the “sweet side of chemistry” on campus in celebration of National Chemistry Week. “Candy, the Sweet Side of Chemistry” was the theme for the Chemistry Department’s Mole Day on October 23 (a reference to one mole being $6.022 \times 10^{23}$). Students from East, South, and Centennial high schools and Skyview Middle School learned about sugar and candy making, and participated in lab activities and a scavenger hunt as part of the day-long event. Students alternated among three rotations hosted by chemistry faculty. Dr. Sandra Bonetti helped students determine the optical rotation of various sugars, which is an important aspect of how the sugars are used by the body. Drs. Chad Kinney and David Lehmpuhl hosted an instrumental rotation in which students measured the residual triclosan on hands following use of an antibacterial liquid hand soap using gas chromatography and mass spectrometry, as well as the amount of mercury contained in sugars or hair. Dr. Rick Farrer created candy made from
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different types of sugars and had students taste the differences. After the rotations, the 60 students witnessed additional demonstrations put on by Dr. Farrer during a pizza lunch, before heading off on a Chemistry Club scavenger hunt throughout the Chemistry building.

**VI. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

**A. Beverly A. Moore Gallery Dedication**

The career and philanthropic contributions to CSU-Pueblo and the Pueblo arts community were the focus of the dedication of the Beverly A. Moore Gallery in the Library and Academic Resources Center on Dec. 4. Moore, a 2007 President’s Medallion for Distinguished Service to the University, has contributed more than $25,000 to the Thunderwolf athletic program, Colorado Music Fest, and the Pueblo Symphony. In more than three decades with the University Library, she exhibited significant leadership and dedication to the success of University students and faculty alike.

**VII. GRANTS and CONTRACTS – RECEIVED ONLY:**

**Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Colorado Department of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Ms. Rhonda Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>State Grants for Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Dates</td>
<td>10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Total Received: **$3,000**
Section 12

Real Estate/Facilities Committee
EXECUTIVE SESSION

OPEN SESSION

1. Mineral Lease: Weld County  (Tony Frank)  Action (5 min)
2. Colorado State University Master Plan Foreshadow  (Amy Parsons)  Update (15 min)
3. National Western Stock Show Update  (Amy Parsons)  Update (45 min)
Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System  
Meeting Date: December 5, 2014  
Action Item

Stretch Goal or Strategic Initiative: Additional Revenue, #38 Comprehensive Financial Management. Board approval of this administrative action is required by statute, CCHE, Board, or university policy.

MATTERS FOR ACTION:

Land: Oil & Gas Lease on a proportional interest in a 1/2 Interest in Approximately 40 Mineral Acres in Weld County, Colorado.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOVED, that the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System (Board) hereby approves the lease of its proportional interest in a 1/2 interest in approximately 40 mineral acres in Weld County, Colorado in accordance with the parameters outlined with the Board in its executive session. FURTHER MOVED, that the President of Colorado State University, in consultation with the Office of General Counsel, is hereby authorized to sign implementing contracts and other documents as may be necessary and appropriate to consummate the transaction.

EXPLANATION:

Presented by Dr. Tony Frank, President.

The University wishes to enter into an oil & gas lease, at market rate, on a proportional interest in a 1/2 interest in approximately 40 mineral acres in Weld County, Colorado. The mineral interests were gifted to the University in 1976 and are in an area of high activity for the oil & gas industry.

Approved       Denied

Board Secretary

Date

Colorado State University –Land: Oil & Gas Lease on Weld County Mineral Acres
State Process for the Master Plan

- The legislative mandate for a Master Plan comes from CRS 23-1-106 (3), that directs the Department of Higher Education (through the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE)) to “review and approve master planning and program planning for all capital construction projects of institutions of higher education.”

- Department of Higher Education (DHE) policy requires reassessment of facilities master plans every 10 years. The current Master Plan was approved by the BOG in May 2004 and approved by CCHE in April 2005.
## Master Plan Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2012 - October 2014</td>
<td>Master Plan Presentations to Key Stakeholders, Campus-wide and Community-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Completion of CSU Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Master Plan Presentation to BOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Submission of CSU Master Plan to CCHE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Inspired by its land-grant heritage, CSU is committed to excellence, setting the standard for public research universities in teaching, research, service and extension for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, the United States and the world.”

*Adopted by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System, May 2010*
# 2014 Master Plan Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Parsons</td>
<td>VP - University Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Johnson</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hultin</td>
<td>Director - Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Rush</td>
<td>University Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Haberecht</td>
<td>University Landscape Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bradford</td>
<td>Director - Parking and Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Henry</td>
<td>CEO - CSURF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Hurt</td>
<td>Director - Real Estate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Smith</td>
<td>Director - Training and Organizational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Max</td>
<td>Senior Associate A.D. for Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Miranda</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dolak</td>
<td>Executive Director - Housing &amp; Dining Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Brown</td>
<td>VP - Enrollment and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Milligan</td>
<td>VP - External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell Rae Ciaravola</td>
<td>Senior Communications Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Nerger</td>
<td>Dean - College of Natural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Hendee</td>
<td>Assistant City Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Guinn</td>
<td>ASCSU President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Li Puma</td>
<td>ASCSU Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Carroll</td>
<td>Capital Construction and Controlled Maintenance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hansen</td>
<td>University Landscape Architect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CSU Staff Master Plan Input**

- In addition to the Master Plan Committee members, several staff from various campus departments have provided content for the Master Plan document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Carroll</td>
<td>Steward and Author of the 2014 Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Ellis and Susanne Cordery-Cotter</td>
<td>Utility Infrastructure, Stormwater Management and Floodplain Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Friedrich</td>
<td>Telecommunication Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bradford and Aaron Fodge</td>
<td>Parking and Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Haberecht, David Hansen, Per Hogestad, and Mike Rush</td>
<td>Campus Master Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campus and Community Master Plan Input

Over 150 Campus and Community Outreach Events since January 2012:

- Campus Advisory Committees and Open Forums
- Community: Public Agencies, Neighborhood Groups, City/County Staff
Master Plan is a “Living Document”

- Guides the University in Sensible Growth for the Next 10 Years:
  - LEED Buildings and Landscape
  - Sustainability
  - Transportation
- Strategically Plans for 35,000 Students (Resident Instruction Students)
- Provide space and facilities that support the University’s programmatic role and mission.
- Provide physical character that symbolizes the University’s role in society.
- Provide a physical environment that encourages, through the University Facilities, a sense of community between faculty, staff and students.
- Maintain the health, safety and well being of all users of University facilities.
MAIN CAMPUS

ASSUMPTIONS

• 75% of the Projected 35,000 Student Campus Development will Occur on Main Campus
• Limited Land Acquisition
• Campus will Maintain Historic Character and Setting

KEY ISSUES

• Parking and Transportation
• Utility Infrastructure
• “Town & Gown”
SOUTH CAMPUS

ASSUMPTIONS

• Limited Access Points
• Expansion Potential Limited

KEY ISSUES

• Parking
• Access & Security
• Portray a Modern Research and Teaching Facility Identity
• Integration of Main and South Campuses as a Cohesive Environment
FOOTHILLS CAMPUS

ASSUMPTIONS

• Retain Agricultural/Rural Character
• Christman Field is an Asset to Remain
• Federal, State and City Inholdings to Remain

KEY ISSUES

• Access and Security
• Limited Utilities North of LaPorte Avenue
• Connectivity on Campus between LaPorte Avenue and Rampart Road
• Connectivity between Foothills Campus and Main Campus
• Increased Neighborhood Pressure
• What is the Highest and Best Use of Foothills Campus?
Master Plan documents can be found on the Facilities Management website:

www.fm.colostate.edu/construction

Under “Documents of Interest”
Commercial Development is also a **Business Strategy** designed to make DENVER more globally competitive.

Strategy seeks to leverage our regional economic clusters, strong millennial immigration and corporate relocations.
NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER

Site Vision, Goals and Partners

National Western Center Partners

Vision

The National Western Center celebrates the pioneering spirit and promise of the West through year-round experiential lifelong learning, the arts, entertainment, competition and commerce.

Goals

- Community and Neighborhood Integration
- Engage the River and Nature
- Celebrate Western Heritage
- Inspire Health and Wellness
- Build Cultural Crossroads
- Be Pioneering: Break Trail and Foster Innovation
- Create Fun and Entertaining Experiences
- Grow Local, Regional, and Global Intelligence
- Embrace an Ethic of Regeneration
Recommended Site Plan and Key Site Elements

1. Water Resources Center
2. Stockyards/Event Pavilion
3. CSU Equine Clinic
4. Equestrian Center
5. Livestock Center
6. NWC Transit Station
7. Shared Use/TOD Parking Structure
8. Livestock Exchange Building
9. Trade Show/Exhibition Hall
10. New Arena
11. CSU Center
12. Pioneer Plaza
13. Stadium Arena Market
14. Coliseum Redevelopment
15. Forney Transportation Museum

Illustrative Master Plan
NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER

Master Plan Big Ideas

Provide Visibility and Access to the South Platte River
- Move rail from river’s edge and consolidate to center of site
- Bury or move the Delgany Interceptors
- Relocate National Western Drive to create a public front and enable visible access to the river
- Improve river habitat
- Activate public space along the river with educational and recreational programming

Flexible, multi-use, 365 Day a Year Program
- Group complementary uses to create synergy and multiple-use flexible space
- Activate the site 365 days a year with a multitude of uses and activities for visitors and residents
- Provide a variety of character and sizes of open spaces to allow for both NWC and community events
NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER

Master Plan Big Ideas

Provide New Connections

- Create two new connections across the river between Washington Street and National Western Drive at 49th Avenue and 51st Avenue
- Connect Washington Street and Brighton Boulevard with a new through street
- Provide an elevated walkway connection between National Western Drive and the RTD Station
- Increase active transportation options with improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities on all new and existing streets
- Lower 46th Avenue under I-70 to connect the NWC to the Denver Coliseum
- Improve Brighton Boulevard for better access and streetscape elements

Provide Partnership Opportunities

- Build off the history and heritage of the National Western Stock Show
- Increase year-round program opportunities for education, food and food production, art, agriculture and livestock, water resources, and recreational activities
- Provide flexibility for long term opportunities to add additional partners with complementary vision and goals
- Redevelop Coliseum site south of I-70 for complimentary uses and new partners
NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER
New West Architecture

Livestock and Equestrian Center

- Buildings specifically related to agricultural purposes
- Simple Forms with pitched roofs
- Metal, wood with muted earth tones
- Arcades and galleries
- Highlighted entryways
- Broken up long facades
- Architectural ornament
  - Rafter tails
  - Ridge beams
  - Overhangs
  - Struts
  - Lanterns
  - Clerestories
  - Exposed columns
Industrial Architecture

Trade Show/Exposition Hall
- Reflects the historic industrial and meat packing history of the site
- Simple rectangular forms with horizontal reference
- Tower forms to highlight main entry
- Building elements that scale down the building at the plaza level
- Flat roof with architectural sawtooth clerestory
- Glass facades at street level to show activity inside
Signature Architecture

New Arena/CSU Center
- Reflects public use of the facilities
- Modern material of glass and steel
- Respectful to the history of the place
- Provides a unique identify to the NWC
- Provides a sense of pride for the community
- Inviting entry from I-70
Historic Architectural Reference

Historic Building and Site Artifacts Reference
- Rehabilitate and reuse historic structures
- Use elements that reflect historic past-stone, brick, wood
- Site signage and wayfinding elements tied to the history of the place
- Reference in pedestrian scaled elements throughout site
CONNECTIONS

- Provide multiple connections under I-70 to 46th Avenue and the National Western Center.
GLOBEVILLE ELYRIA SWANSEA/ NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER
COMBINED PLAN

Conceptual Representations -Not Final -
Preliminary draft for discussion purposes only
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

Inspiration

river
cottonwoods
history
prairie
agriculture
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

River Principles

1. Maximize public access along the river
2. Create recurring opportunities for educational and recreational activity
3. Create an inviting river corridor experience
4. Create a connected habitat mosaic along both sides of the river
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

The Stockyards: History & Prairie
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

Livestock Plaza: History & Cottonwoods
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

Transit Plaza: Prairie & Cottonwoods
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

Event Plazas: Prairie & Cottonwoods
OPEN SPACE CHARACTER

Pioneer Plaza: Prairie & Agriculture
Proposed CSU Building and Conservatory
Proposed CSU Building and 1909 Market
Proposed CSU Conservatory
Proposed CSU Conservatory
Questions
Site Orientation and Character

Vision
The National Western Center celebrates the pioneering spirit and promise of the West through year-round experiential life-long learning, the arts, entertainment, competition and commerce.

Goals
- Community and Neighborhood Integration
- Engage the River and Nature
- Celebrate Western Heritage
- Inspire Health and Wellness
- Build Cultural Crossroads
- Be Pioneering: Break Trail and Foster Innovation
- Create Fun and Entertaining Experiences
- Grow Local, Regional, and Global Intelligence
- Embrace an Ethic of Regeneration

Key Site Elements
- Water Resources Center
- Stockyards/Event Pavilion
- CSU Equine Clinic
- Equestrian Center
- Livestock Center
- NWC Transit Station
- Shared Use/TOD Parking Structure
- Livestock Exchange Building
- Trade Show/Exhibition Hall
- New Arena
- CSU Center
- Pioneer Plaza
- Stadium Arena Market
- Coliseum Redevelopment
- Forney Transportation Museum

National Western Center Partners

For more information on the National Western Center please visit: Denvergov.org/NDCC
NATIONAL WESTERN CENTER

Master Plan Big Ideas

Provide Visibility and Access to the South Platte River

- Move rail from River’s edge and consolidate to center of site
- Bury or move the Delgany Interceptor sewer lines
- Relocate National Western Drive to allow for better River and Event Pavilion access
- Improve river habitat and health
- Create recreational trails and educational areas along the River

Flexible, multi-use, 365 Day a Year Program

- Create flexible, efficient, vibrant indoor and outdoor spaces that allow various uses throughout the year, including markets, offices, restaurants, retail, festivals, etc.
- Provide a variety of programs—educational, recreational, commercial, competitions, entertainment, visual and performing arts—for neighbors and local to global visitors
- Provide hands-on, informal and formal educational programs for families, students, and life-long learners
- Build off the history and heritage of the site, while highlighting innovation, particularly in food, energy, and water use
- Pursue long-term opportunities to create new programs, spaces, and partnerships

Provide New Connections

- Create two new connections across the River between Washington Street and National Western Drive at 49th Avenue and 51st Avenue
- Connect Washington Street and Brighton Boulevard with a new street
- Provide an elevated walkway connection to provide access to the RTD Rail Station
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout the NWC
- Increase active transportation options with improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities on all new and existing streets
- Lower 46th Avenue under I-70 viaduct to allow easier movement between the NWC and the Denver Coliseum
- Improve Brighton Boulevard for safer access and improved streetscape
- Redevelop area south of I-70, including Coliseum, for complementary uses

Provide Partnership Opportunities

- Build off the history and heritage of the National Western Stock Show
- Increase year-round program opportunities for education, food and food production, art, agriculture and livestock, water resources, and recreational activities
- Provide flexibility for long term opportunities to add additional partners with complementary vision and goals
- Redevelop Coliseum site south of I-70 for complimentary uses and new partners
THE CITY & COUNTY OF DENVER CONTINUES TO STRENGTHEN ITS PROGRESSIVE, VISIONARY REPUTATION WITH SEVERAL EXCITING REDEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS UNDERWAY.

Named the Corridor of Opportunity, the nearly 23-mile stretch provides a connection from Denver Union Station to Denver International Airport and is one of the most compelling commercial investment opportunities in the world with thousands of developable acres.

Within this corridor are the dynamic, historically rich neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. Currently, there are six significant redevelopment projects in this cornerstone that provide unprecedented opportunities to rebuild a connected community and energize a gateway to downtown Denver. In early 2013, Mayor Michael B. Hancock aligned these efforts under one coordinated vision in pursuit of creating a world-class city. The North Denver Cornerstone Collaborative (NDCC) is a coordinated effort to ensure integrated planning and deliberate connections among the converging projects are taking place.

"We have a remarkable opportunity to create access to necessary social, cultural, environmental and economic opportunities through the collaboration of six projects in Globeville, Elyria and Swansea. The culture of these neighborhoods tells an important part of the history of our great city, and it is time for the culture to be magnified through these catalytic projects."
COUNCILWOMAN JUDY MONTERO, DISTRICT 9

LA CIUDAD Y CONDADO DE DENVER CONTINÚA FORTALECIENDO SU REPUTACIÓN COMO UNA CIUDAD PROGRESISTA Y VISIONARIA GRACIAS A VARIOS ATRACTIVOS PROYECTOS DE REDESARROLLO URBANO Y DE INFRAESTRUCTURA QUE AHORA SE ESTÁN REALIZANDO.

Entre esos proyectos figura el llamado Corredor de Oportunidad, un sector de casi 23 millas (unos 36 kilómetros) que provee una conexión entre la Estación "Union" en Denver y el Aeropuerto Internacional de Denver (DIA, en inglés). Este corredor ofrece algunas de las más importantes oportunidades para inversiones comerciales en todo el mundo, con miles de acres (hectáreas) disponibles para proyectos de construcción.

Dentro del corredor se incluyen los dinámicos vecindarios de Globeville, Elyria y Swansea, ambos con larga historia. En la actualidad existen seis proyectos distintos de desarrollo urbano en el marco de esta iniciativa fundamental, logrando oportunidades sin precedentes para reconstruir una comunidad conectada y para energizar el punto de conexión con el centro de Denver. A principios de 2013, el alcalde Michael B. Hancock alineó estos esfuerzos bajo una sola visión coordinada con la meta de crear una ciudad de nivel mundial. El Fundamento Colaborativo Comunitario del Norte de Denver (NDCC en inglés) es una gestión coordinada para asegurarse una planificación integrada y conexiones deliberadas entre todos los proyectos convergentes que ahora se están llevando a cabo.

"A través de la colaboración de los seis proyectos tenemos una oportunidad extraordinaria para crear accesos a oportunidades sociales, culturales, ambientales y económicas en los vecindarios de Globeville, Elyria y Swansea. Por medio de la cultura de estos vecindarios podemos contar una parte muy importante de la historia de nuestra gran ciudad, por medio de estos proyectos catalíticos tenemos la oportunidad que la cultura de estos vecindarios se extienda."
CONCEJAL JUDY MONTERO, DISTRITO 9
**NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS**

Long-term economic and cultural benefits follow when a neighborhood is revitalized. So when the distinct neighborhoods of Globeville, Elyria and Swansea take flight through thoughtful, innovative planning, the ripple effect will be exponential. Each will follow a plan that outlines a strong vision to support the uniqueness of each neighborhood and its residents, while still sharing a common synergy. The neighborhood-driven plans will guide future decision-making on land use, urban design and infrastructure in addition to identifying key partnerships.

**NATIONAL WESTERN COMPLEX & DENVER COLISEUM**

Imagine the next generation of an iconic Denver landmark. Through a visionary transformation, the envisioned “National Western Center” will become a must-see destination with sustainable, year-round programming. Educational opportunities and entertainment will be bolstered by innovative partnerships with Colorado State University, Denver Museum of Nature & Science and History Colorado. That’s the exciting vision for this center where residents and visitors discover the heart of the West.

**BRIGHTON BOULEVARD CORRIDOR REDEVELOPMENT**

Paving a warm welcome to our city means energizing Brighton Boulevard, a major gateway to and from downtown Denver, with significant improvements. The second phase of planning for this corridor focuses on potential streetscape design elements, as well as additional amenities and mobility improvements. Public and private investment partnerships will build a new energy and encourage innovative collaborations to further development that mixes the old with the new.

**RIVER NORTH**

This vibrant community, also known as “RiNo,” is home to a remarkable mix of creative businesses. Radiating this progressive energy out to the rest of the city is key to the next phase of development. Plans call for innovative uses of the South Platte River as the focal point for future development and recreation. And RiNo’s evolution is expected to continue over the next 20 years thanks to transit-oriented development near 38th and Blake, and other mixed-use development in the area.

**INTERSTATE 70 RECONSTRUCTION**

Lowering a highway below grade is a bold move. That’s the innovative proposal from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) via the I-70 East Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the reconstruction area located between Brighton and Colorado Boulevards. Swansea Elementary School will gain four acres of community space from the cover that will provide new connections within the neighborhood. Just imagine how people, places and neighborhoods in the area will be reenergized and rediscovered with this significant and exciting restructuring of I-70.

**DEVELOPMENT AROUND RTD STATIONS**

Transit opens up paths for residents and boosts the economic viability of neighborhoods. As the cornerstone of the Corridor of Opportunity, Globeville, Elyria and Swansea are in a unique location that will be home to four RTD stations and the commuter rail maintenance facility. Due to the East, Gold and North rail lines, the community will enjoy enhanced connections to other parts of the city and provide vital access to and from Denver Union Station, DIA, National Western Center and Arvada.

"Denver is taking bold steps to re-create a connected and sustainable community that will drive job creation and growth on a globally competitive scale."

**MAYOR MICHAEL B. HANCOCK**

**NORTH DENVER CORNERSTONE COLLABORATIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA**

**PROJECTED TIMELINE** (Subject to change)

- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
- 2018
"Denver está dando pasos audaces para recrear una comunidad conectada y sostenible que impulsará la creación de empleo y el crecimiento en una escala competitiva a nivel mundial."

ALCALDE MICHAEL B. HANCOCK

**PLANES DE VECINDARIO**

La revitalización de los vecindarios generará beneficios económicos y culturales a largo plazo. Por eso, cuando los vecindarios distantes de Glendale, Plyry y Swansea comiencen a levantar vuelo gracias a una planificación atenta e innovadora, el efecto dominó será exponencial. Cada vecindario seguirá un plan que incluya una fuente visión para respaldar la singularidad de cada vecindario y de sus residentes, a la vez que se comparte una visión común. Estos planes determinados por los vecindarios gularán el futuro proceso de decisiones en cuando al uso de terrenos, diseño urbano e infraestructura, a la vez que identificarán los grupos interesados claves.

**CENTRO DE EXPOSICIONES NACIONAL OCCIDENTAL Y EL COLISEO DE DENVER**

Imagínese la siguiente generación de este histórico sitio de Denver. Por medio de una transformación visionaria, el National Western Center (un centro nacional de exposiciones agrícolas-ganaderas) se convertirá en un lugar de visita obligada gracias a programas sostenibles durante todo el año. Las oportunidades educativas y de entretenimiento se potenciarán por medio de innovadores proyectos de colaboración con la Universidad Estatal de Colorado, el Museo de Naturaleza y Ciencia de Denver y el Museo de Historia de Colorado. Eso es la etapa visión para este centro en el que los residentes y los visitantes descubren el corazón del Oeste.

**CORREDOR DE REDESARROLLO DE BRIGHTON BOULEVARD**

Ofrecer una calidad bienvenida a nuestra ciudad significa energizar Brighton Boulevard, uno de los principales puntos de acceso y de salida del centro de Denver. Y eso significa importantes mejoras. La segunda fase de la planificación para este corredor se enfoca en los elementos del potencial diseño de su paisaje urbano, así como en mejoras a la movilidad y en amenidades adicionales. La asociación de inversiones públicas y privadas generará una nueva energía y fomentará innovadores colaboraciones para impulsar un desarrollo que mezcla la vieja con lo nuevo.

**RIVER NORTH (RÍO NORTE)**

Esta vibrante comunidad, apodada "RN" es el hogar de una remarcable mezcla de creativos negocios. Irrigar esa energía progresista en el resto de la ciudad es la clave para la siguiente fase de este desarrollo. Los planes incluyen usos Innovadores del río South Platte como el punto focal de futuros proyectos de desarrollo y recreación. Se espera que la evolución de RN continúe durante los próximos 20 años, gracias al desarrollo urbano conectado con transporte público cercano de 38 y Blaine y a otros proyectos de desarrollo urbano con uso mixto en la zona.

**RECONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA INTERSTATE 70**

Reconstruir la carretera por debajo del nivel del suelo es un movimiento audaz. Sin embargo, esa es la innovadora propuesta que el Departamento de Transporte de Colorado (CDOT, en inglés) desarrolló por medio del Estudio de Impacto Ambiental de la I-70 para la reconstrucción de la Interstate 70 entre Brighton Boulevard y Colorado Boulevard. La Escuela Primaria de Swansea ganará cuatro acres de espacio para la comunidad de la subida que proporcionará nuevas conexiones dentro de la vecindad. Imagenes cuantas gente, lugares y vecindarios en esta área serán reenergizados y redescubiertos debido a los importantes y significativos cambios en la estructura de la I-70.

**DESARROLLO ALREDEDORE DE LAS ESTACIONES DE RTD**

El transporte público abre nuevas opciones para los residentes e impulsa la viabilidad económica en los vecindarios. Como lo pide el Corredor de Oportunidad, los vecindarios de Glendale, Plyry y Swansea están en una ubicación única que será el hogar de cuatro estaciones de RTD y un edificio de mantenimiento para trenes eléctricos. Debido a las líneas de ferrocarril del Este, Oeste y Norte, la comunidad disfrutará de mejores conexiones con otras partes de la ciudad, contando con el viaje acceso desde y hacia la Estación "Union" en Denver, el Aeropuerto Internacional de Denver, el National Western Center y la ciudad de Arvada.
Section 13

Stadium Report
Stadium Recommendation to the Board of Governors of the CSU System

December 5, 2014
Process

- February - August 2012: Stadium Advisory Committee
  - Amy Parsons, VP for University Operations
  - Tim Romani, CEO, ICON
  - Martin Carcasson, Director, Center for Public Deliberation

- October 2012: Initial Recommendation and BOG Action

- March - September, 2014: Community Design Development Advisory Committee
  - Bob McCluskey, Chair

- October 2014: Second Recommendation and BOG Action

- November 2014
  - Kevin Unger, Community Leadership Committee
  - Drs. Katherine Leigh and Susan LaRue, Campus Leadership Committee
  - Department of Athletics and CSU Facilities

- Overview of Public Process
  - Tom Milligan, VP for External Relations
Assumptions

- Football will continue to be played as a collegiate sport and will remain popular with a wide segment of the population.
- In Colorado and at Colorado State, as elsewhere, there is abundant interest in attending live sporting events, obviously with a competitive product deriving more interest and attendance.
- Colorado State University is an exceptional comprehensive, student-centered research university, yet the brand of the university is not as broadly understood as we might wish it to be.
- Intercollegiate athletics, despite the obvious flaws and challenges we face in our day, add value to the life of the campus, the life of the community and – whether we might think appropriate, excessive or not – draw a great deal of attention to a university.
- Intercollegiate athletics, despite the large sums of money and costs associated with them, are worthy of some rational investment. At Colorado State, our net investment is extraordinarily low, and I believe the return on reasonable additional investments will be very high.
- Improvements in intercollegiate athletics do not have to come at the expense of academics, either fiscally or in focus. Our budgets, investments and priorities have been and will remain unambiguously focused on our academic mission.
- There is no substitute for expecting excellence in everything we do as a university.
Risk Analysis

- General Fund
  - No Impact

- Option #1
  - 10 years - $30M - $60M bond cost - General Fund

- Options #2 and #4

- Option #3
  - 50% philanthropy and 50% revenue bonds
  - Most Recent Analysis
  - CSL Study is a key element
CSL

• Survey methodology
  – 95% confidence interval and 1.2% margin of error
  – National comparisons
  – Historical CSU data
  – Weighting of various inputs based on their professional methodology (grounded in experience)
  – Track record
  – Low, base, high, and hybrid cases

• Attendance
  – Projected at 27,000 per game
    • 9% increase over 10-year mean (survey = 22%)
    • Average attendance in winning seasons since 1994: 29,900

• Product
  – New mix
    • Doubling of club and loge boxes; 15% increase in suite seats; 27% increase in capacity
    • Projected at 75% sold

• Pricing
  – Within existing range with premium and priority seating donations

• ECA methodology review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total CSU Budget</td>
<td>$952M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total Debt Service Payments</td>
<td>$34.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual New Faculty Hires</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty Start-ups</td>
<td>$16M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total General Fund Budget</td>
<td>$491M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total Debt General Fund Debt Service Payments</td>
<td>$8.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Incremental E&amp;G Budget Change</td>
<td>$31.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Incremental Academic Quality Investments</td>
<td>$6.7M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All figures are for FY2013-14*
Recurring Revenues

**Namings & Sponsorships**
- $3.5M (total)
- $3.0M (hybrid)
- $4.1M (total)

**Premium & Priority Seating**
- $3.7M (total)
- $4.3M (hybrid)
- $5.0M (total)

**Tickets**
- $4.2M (total)
- $5.2M (hybrid)
- $6.4M (total)

**Miscellaneous**
- $1.4M (total)
- $2.1M (hybrid)
- $2.7M (total)

(These revenue streams are inflation-adjusted by 2% annually; revenues differ by size of stadium; the smaller version is illustrated here.)

---

**Philanthropic Payments** $40M
(These payments vary by year according to pledge agreements, and include elements of the revenue buffer below.)

**Annual Expenses** $2.8M
(These sources inflate by 2% annually.)

**Existing Allocated Hughes Income** $3.6M

---

**plus**

**minus**

**equals**

Net Annual Revenue

(Revenues differ by size of stadium; Base, hybrid, and bar new revenue scenarios derived from 2012 CSL analysis.)

---

**Comparative Financing Illustration**

**Project Cost $195M (bonded)**
- Annual Payment $12.1M

**Base Revenue**
- $13.7M – year 1
- $21.2M – year 15
- $34.5M – year 30

**Hybrid Revenue**
- $11.2M – year 1
- $17.2M – year 15
- $26.5M – year 30

**Low Revenue**
- $9.7M – year 1
- $13.1M – year 15
- $22.4M – year 30

---

The low case revenue scenarios both generate 30-year net excess revenues ($76M and $34.2M), but they both run interim deficits beginning in year 3. The $195M project has a maximum cumulative revenue flow deficit of $19.4M by year 12, while the $220M project’s maximum revenue flow deficit is $37.2M by year 15.

Interim cumulative revenue flow deficits (shown in the first two bars in the chart to the right) are buffered by the value of the Hughes property, estate gifts to the project, and final phase philanthropy (third bar) as well as internal bridge loans to project revenue (fourth bar). The buffered risk is compared to F&U payments of option #1 Hughes maintenance (fifth bar).
Conclusion

- I believe we can attain a CSU-owned and -operated facility with minimal changes to the full scope of the original design that meets the fiscal standard we’ve established: the lowest risk of any negative impact on the general fund.

- In fact, I believe it is likely that there will be no impact on the general fund, and I believe that the minimal level of risk that remains is more than adequately buffered by non-general fund sources.

- Such a facility is, in my opinion, in the best long-term interests of Colorado State University.
Recommendation

- Approve the construction of a new multi-use stadium located on Colorado State University’s main campus.

- Authorize me to return to the Board with both a final program plan and a plan of finance in accord with State and Board policies.

- Authorize me to select a scope of plan and financing option that meet the standard of minimizing the risk of any negative impact to the general fund.
Section 14

Public Comment
Stadium-Related
1. **Misdirection**

(Rewrite: These sources inflate by 3% annually. Revenues differ by size of stadium; the smaller version is illustrated here.)

2. **Inaccuracy**

3. **Not scaled**

4. **$2M Cash + $30M pledged + $5M “intended”**

5. **Minus Sinking Fund $4M**

6. **$2.4M + Philanthropic**

7. **All borrowed**

8. **$3.6M per year from Hughes bonds $60M of maintenance and renovations, with $0 of flow deficits.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurring Revenues</th>
<th>Philanthropic Payments $40M</th>
<th>Annual Expenses $2.8M</th>
<th>Existing Allocated Hughes Income $3.6M</th>
<th>Net Annual Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Namings &amp; Sponsorships</td>
<td>Premium &amp; Priority Seating</td>
<td>Tickets</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>equals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.5M (low)</td>
<td>$3.7M (low)</td>
<td>$4.2M (low)</td>
<td>$1.4M (low)</td>
<td>$12.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.8M (hybrid)</td>
<td>$4.3M (hybrid)</td>
<td>$5.3M (hybrid)</td>
<td>$2.1M (hybrid)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.1M (base)</td>
<td>$5.0M (base)</td>
<td>$6.4M (base)</td>
<td>$2.7M (base)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Financing Illustration**

Including the philanthropic pledge payments made prior to initiation of bond payments, these scenarios never run an annual deficit. 30-Year net excess revenues range from $160M-$328M in the Low and Base scenarios.

The low case revenue scenarios both generate 30-year net excess revenues ($76M and $34.2M). But they both run interim deficits beginning in year 3. The $195M project has a maximum cumulative revenue flow deficit of $19.4M by year 12, while the $220M project's maximum revenue flow deficit is $37.2M by year 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Revenue</th>
<th>Low Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9.7M - year 1</td>
<td>$9.9M - year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.1M - year 15</td>
<td>$13.1M - year 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22.4M - year 30</td>
<td>$23.4M - year 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost $195M (bonded)</th>
<th>Project Cost $220M (bonded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Payment $12.1M</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual Payment $13.7M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Revenue**

- Base Revenue: $13.7M - year 1, $21.2M - year 15, $34.5M - year 30
- Hybrid Revenue: $11.2M - year 1, $17.2M - year 15, $28.5M - year 30

**Low Revenue**

- Base Revenue: $9.7M - year 1, $13.1M - year 15, $22.4M - year 30
- Hybrid Revenue: $12.3M - year 1, $17.2M - year 15, $29.5M - year 30

**Graphs and visualizations**

- $12.8M - $2.8M - $4.0M - $3.6M + Philanthropic = $12.1M

- $2.4M

- $9.7M
This is the people's university.

This is the people's money.

Who decides this institution wants that

misdirection and misdirections of the Comparative Financing
inaccuracies and misdirections of the Comparative Financing

Conclusion: There is a serious and valid concern that a BOG vote of

Resolution: Costing the General Fund $60m.

Not intended purpose: $60m of deferred maintenance and renovation, with no flow

of cumulative revenue. How direct it does no good to argue that this

Resolution of Higher (not maintenance, not maintenance and renovation)

Most important, it ignores the fact that the $47m of deferred:

4. This is an inaccurate. It was $50.96m in May 2022.

3. May 2022 numbers are not accurate as they have not been scaled for revisions.

2. This is misleading. "Renovate, new, renovate, renovate," the terms were low, medium, and high.

1. In the SAC final report of May 2022, the terms were low, medium, and high.

7. Remember when this was to be a $70m stadium, with no bored decks.

9. Initial cost: $72.1m, to service the $72.1m bonded

10. Total net annual revenues to the $72.1m to service the $72.1m bonded

5. Review of the May 30, 2022 video of the SAC meeting, shows the VP for

6. Resolution: Revenue are $72.1m per year, reflecting expenses of $2B.

Council of University operation starting that 72% per year is what CSU wins.

University operation that $2B per year is what CSU wins.

swing fund of $34m, and the loss of existing

Operating expenses of $72.8m.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Revenue are $72.1m per year, reflecting expenses of $2B.

Resolution of Higher (not maintenance, not maintenance and renovation)

Most important, it ignores the fact that the $47m of deferred:

4. This is an inaccurate. It was $50.96m in May 2022.

3. May 2022 numbers are not accurate as they have not been scaled for revisions.

2. This is misleading. "Renovate, new, renovate, renovate," the terms were low, medium, and high.

1. In the SAC final report of May 2022, the terms were low, medium, and high.

7. Remember when this was to be a $70m stadium, with no bored decks.

9. Initial cost: $72.1m, to service the $72.1m bonded

10. Total net annual revenues to the $72.1m to service the $72.1m bonded

5. Review of the May 30, 2022 video of the SAC meeting, shows the VP for

6. Resolution: Revenue are $72.1m per year, reflecting expenses of $2B.

Council of University operation starting that 72% per year is what CSU wins.

University operation that $2B per year is what CSU wins.

swing fund of $34m, and the loss of existing

Operating expenses of $72.8m.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.

Higher income of $34m. (are $34m of fees, per year.
Remarks by John Yule Before the CSU Board of Governors, 12/05/14

President Frank, Chairwoman Horrel, Chancellor Martin and members of CSU's Board of Governors, I am John Yule. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the main-campus stadium deliberations.

It was a pleasure reading in CSU's Fall Alumni Magazine about its outstanding ranking in the Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Reporting System (STARS). CSU achieved the top score in the country for the second time, among 300 universities that participate. I applaud the engagement of all eight of CSU's colleges. WELL DONE!

CSU claims that a main-campus stadium would be LEED Gold Certified. There was no comparative analysis of a Hughes remodel to achieve the same status. Such an omission in comparative analysis makes wise long term planning difficult and of far less value.

I understand that you received a letter from the Sierra Club's, Will Walters (11/23/14) who stated: "The Club...urges the University to conduct and publish an environmental impact analysis of all its stadium alternatives and take that analysis into account prior to deciding whether to pursue constructing a new main-campus stadium".

This is the responsible approach to use and is in line with CSU's Green University reputation. In fact, it is reasonable to think that this is the best place to start on a project of this magnitude. Thank you.
Remarks by Jean Yule Before the CSU Board of Governors, 12/05/14

President Frank, Chancellor Martin, Chairwoman Horrel, and members of CSU's Board of Governors, I am Jean Yule, a third of four generations of CSU alums and a fourth generation Fort Collins native. Thank you for this opportunity to address the stadium issue. President Frank mentions in passing that the "location" has been a "polarizing issue". This "issue" deserves much more fleshing out.

I am not adverse to change. I have watched with pride and pleasure many changes and additions in our community as well as on campus. Comparatively, this proposal is an outrage and an embarrassment. It is a "want" for some but there is no "need" or justification.

Equally insulting is the process and propaganda implemented, starting with the vilification and neglect of Hughes Stadium, which, by the way is not beyond repair. For example look at the fine results achieved at the Morgan Library, the Lory Student Center or the University Center for Arts, all as old older than Hughes.

President Frank refers to the past three years as a "saga". I agree—a sorry saga indeed! In my seventy-five years, I have never witnessed a split as wide or as deep as this issue, both on campus and in our community. It is not an even split—there is a demonstrable and irrefutable majority who oppose it and for reasons that are beyond mitigation. Paradoxically, these are the very people you are relying on to fill the stadium. They are not the six, seven, and eight figure donors or the suite dwellers.

To this group of citizens, making this facility an entertainment venue and events center, beyond football, makes it even more disturbing and distasteful. The shift of focus and realignment of priorities away from CSU's Land Grant Mission is a breach of faith and trust that will be costly and difficult to restore. As you well know, CSU has vast academic and athletic bragging rights and needs make no apology.

Friends, relatives and alums from across the state have expressed disgust and disbelief that CSU would abandon Hughes. Hughes embodies their experience, their fond memories and proud traditions. Is this a rupture CSU can afford?
Remarks by Jean Yule Before the CSU Board of Governors, 12/05/14

In closing, your own BOG Set of Policies states..."it is imperative that borrowings are for projects that directly support the vision, mission and values of the CSUS and its strategic goals and objectives". This stadium project strays far from that policy. I implore you to revisit Abraham Lincoln’s vision and the Land Grant Mission you swore to uphold and protect. It is literally set in concrete on the approach to the Administration Building and there is no mention of anything remotely related to this sorry, sorry stadium saga.

Again, I thank you.
TO: CSUS Board of Governors
FROM: Linda Vrooman, Fort Collins
DATE: December 5, 2014

Dear Board Members,

Copied below is a statement I read at the December 2 Fort Collins City Council meeting during public comment on the approval of the initial work on an agreement between CSU and the City of Fort Collins mitigating the costs to the City of an on-campus stadium. I have attached the November 30 Coloradoan article that I quote in my statement. I am also including copies of Coloradoan Letters to the Editor, from Wednesday and Thursday of this week, and the first two pages of the December 3, 2014, New York Times article titled: It's a Game of Spiraling Costs, So a College Tosses Out Football.

Please do not approve an on-campus stadium proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Vrooman
P. O. Box 1328
Fort Collins, CO 80522

December 2, 2014

The more Dr. Frank continues his stadium saga, the less confidence we the people have in his thought process and his decision-making abilities. We started with the $100 Million all private money idea (Coloradoan article January 1, 2012), which had morphed to $246 Million by May 31, 2012 (Coloradoan headline that date). In October, 2012, he said he would not go forward unless half of the cost was from private donations. The donation goal was not reached by the deadline of October, 2014, so he changed his mind again and asked for more time and more options to choose from.

His new plan to pay for his obsession for an on-campus stadium depends on revenue estimates made, for the most part, by consultants paid for by CSU, companies who make a living being involved in building stadiums. Dr. Frank has chosen to ignore experts in the field who disagree with those projections.

Here is an attention getter from the November 30 Coloradoan article:
"If revenues do not exceed the low-case projections, Frank said, the cumulative deficit over the first 12 years of $19.4 million could still be covered by the university without any impact on the general fund. THAT WOULD BE DONE THROUGH THE $10 MILLION IN ESTATE GIFTS THAT HAVE BEEN PLEDGED TOWARD THE PROJECT, and an estimated $10 million in net revenue after demolition costs from the sale of the 162 acres on which Hughes stadium sits."

Frank will recommend on-campus stadium to board Fri'day

By K. Bylly Lylle

CSU President Tony Frank will recommend that school build a new $108 million stadium on campus.

Frank released his recommendation Saturday, saying that the school has enough money to cover the cost of the stadium.

The stadium would be the largest in the country and would have a seating capacity of 50,000.

Frank said that the stadium would be located on the east side of campus, near the current football field.

The cost of the stadium would be $108 million, which would be covered by a bond issue and private contributions.

If approved by the board, the stadium would be completed by 2017.

Frank said that the stadium would be a significant boost to the university's athletic program and would help the school compete for top recruits.

The stadium would also provide a place for students to come together and enjoy the games.

Frank said that he was confident that the board would approve the stadium project.

The decision is expected to be made at the board meeting on Tuesday.

Frank said that he was confident that the stadium would be a success and that it would benefit the university for years to come.
CSU should consider Hughes site for stadium

Sandy LeBerg

A new stadium should be built on the CSU football property.

The following was sent to the Colorado State University Board of Governors and the Fort Collins City Council:

I was part of a tour of Hughes Stadium on Monday. The CSU officials who conducted the tour were very helpful and presented a tour that was, in my opinion, the best of any stadium I have attended.

The condition of the stadium is excellent, not just in terms of the field but also the seating and facilities. The new stadium should be built on the CSU football property. The new stadium should be built on the CSU football property.

LETTERS

On-campus stadium not part of Colorado State's mission

Let's face it: pro football players are our idols. They are immensely strong and fast. They entertain us in huge stadiums with violent competition, so violent that on average one-third of them will suffer permanent brain damage or be crippled for life.

Major college football programs are developmental league for the pros, while offering similar violence generally less violent entertainment to fans.

With its on-campus stadium proposal, the administration of Colorado State University is driven to conduct such a large entertainment enterprise, in this case one that resembles gladiators in the coliseum.

Here is how the website states Colorado State's mission:

"Our Mission
Inspired by its land-grant heritage, CSU is committed to excellence in teaching, research, service and extension for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, the United States and the world, as adopted by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System in May 2010."

As the university fulfills its mission, it enables prosperity lives for students from Colorado, the United States, and the world. And it does something even larger, which is to cultivate their minds and character.

"By providing large public entertainment events just isn't in the mission of teaching, research, service and extension. Don't build the on-campus stadium, Colorado State. Concentrate on fulfilling your mission if donors wish to sponsor a project that is so far outside the university's mission, remind them of what that mission is."

John Mahan

emoritus professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, CSU

Many reasons why CSU should not build an on-campus stadium

I am against any on-campus stadium project in Fort Collins.

- Esthetically this stadium does not belong on the campus. Few architectural drawings actually show this stadium, which will be the largest building in Fort Collins, with any of the surrounding campus buildings.

- Could it be because it is so big, an eye sore that is totally out of proportion with anything else on campus and in the surrounding area? It will create the same unpleasant atmosphere as that monstrosity being built as a new hotel complex for IKEA

- How can the university sell 120,000 acres of land upon which the Hughes stadium sits just to finance a new stadium?

- CSU already faces limited acreage on which to build new classrooms and dormitories, so building an on-campus stadium is ridiculous.

- With most alum living outside the local area, are these people going to park?

- Many students already live off campus so an on-campus stadium does not help them.

- It is unrealistic to think the discussion needs to shift focus and consider that question as primary. If Hughes is replaced, should it be replaced by a new stadium in the original site or should a new stadium be built on the main campus?

Robert A. Schmidt

Fort Collins
LETTERS

CSU's decision to build stadium based on false assumptions

Dr. Tony Frank, CSU president

Bad decision. Your assumptions underlying the decision to build a new stadium are neither indisputable facts (as you acknowledge) nor informed opinions (as you claim). They are biased assumptions based on an ill-founded predisposition to build an on-campus stadium.

Your track record on this issue has not been stellar. You claim that you have, and will, mitigate the risk of using cash from the general fund. You failed to raise the philanthropic funds that you earlier claimed to be a 'fiscal standard' for moving forward.

You claim to objectively analyze the facts in order to make a rationale decision. In your Nov. 29 memo to the Board of Governors, you cite a single unscientific poll that supports your recommendation to build a new stadium.

Most analysts would call this cherry-picking. Although you mentioned other polls, you chose to cite only one poll. You also chose to accept only the economic estimates that support your decision.

You claim — in order to foster a fact-based dialogue — to have made every reasonable effort to accept input and listen to other voices and viewpoints. Your efforts have caused great harm to the relationship between Fort Collins, CSU and alumni. In the end, you found only your "facts" to be "cogent and compelling," and the voices that made a difference were those of $100,000-plus donors; donors who had already demonstrated their support for a new stadium.

In arriving at this decision, you claim to be mindful only of CSU's long-term interests. We should all believe your sincerity, yet directing extra-dinary funds — in the form of coaches' salaries and facilities — on a single sports program you are changing CSU's character and reputation not for the better, but for the worse. You are also risking CSU's financial position.

It is your job to lead CSU into the future. The rest of us — including the Board of Governors — will decide whether to continue to support CSU under your leadership. Pretty easy decision for me.

Kevin Cassidy,
Fort Collins

APRIL'S CITY ELECTION COULD ALTER MAKEUP OF COUNCIL

The next round of city elections is just four months away, scheduled for April 7. We will elect a mayor to a two-year term, three council members from their respective districts each to serve a four-year term, and potentially vote on a number of referendums originating from the City Council or from residents.

Council will likely propose its agenda of housekeeping changes to the Charter or Code. The unknown is what citizen-initiated changes will be put forward. It's hard to imagine what might be so earthshaking as to influence voter turnout.

The mayor's race will be highlighted by the campaign dollars to be spent. Mayor Karen Weitkamp has served two terms and, with current term limitations, can still seek another term. However, there is no assurance that the mayor will seek a third term. The biggest indicator in her cap is the formation and initial stages of build-out within the Midtown Urban Renewal District, and she presided over the opening of MAX.

In the poll of potential candidates, the mayor's office likely is comprised of current council members. Logic suggests that Gery Horak, Wade Troxell and K. S. Cunniff are the most likely to enter the field.

Horak has an opportunity to seek election as mayor or to seek another four-year term on council. In looking back over Horak's past four years of service, many would conclude by his leadership actions that he has the advantage of being a real force in spite of only being mayor pro tem. The question before "Mayor" Horak is whether to seek a two-year term as mayor or re-election for a four-year term as council member, District 6?

Troxell from District 1 is term-limited in his service as council member. He has been very effective during his two terms in representing the needs of the people in this district. A logical step would be to seek election as mayor.

The freebie position in this election belongs to Cunniff. He still has two years remaining on his council term. Unfortunately, his record of accomplishments is a little thin on which to run.

One has to wonder what citizen initiative will be placed on the April ballot concerning the proposal to build an on-campus football stadium. Will the question be based on simplicity, which will frame the idea as better or less expensive to the community? Or maybe the CSU Board of Governors will make the right decision at week's end; CSU does not need a new stadium to be a major university and can instead use the money for a new housing development.

From the community perspective, given the millions in costs that will need to be borne by the city, it's a win. Based upon prior agreements between the city and the state, the city has little control over on-campus activities.

Randy Fischer has now concluded his terms of representing House District 55 due to term limitations. When he was first elected to the House of Representatives, I had a high degree of respectation because of his major differences on issues facing Fort Collins. However, over the past six years he has done an admirable job of representing his constituents and the people of Colorado. Congratulations on a job very well done!

John Knezevich is a Fort Collins certified public accountant. He has been both a council member and mayor. Send your comments to john.kwcpello.com.
It’s a Game of Spiraling Costs, So a College Tosses Out Football

By BEN STRAUSS and ZACH SCHONBRUN  DEC. 2, 2014

The University of Alabama-Birmingham said Tuesday that it was terminating its football program, becoming the first university in college sports’ top tier to do so in nearly 20 years and providing the most visible sign yet that athletic officials throughout the country are considering radical options in the face of mounting financial burdens.

The most prominent athletic programs have charged ahead with reforms that allow them to make their own rules on matters like whether to financially reward athletes. Everyone else — including dozens of colleges with proud athletic histories — has been left at a daunting crossroads. Those programs can try to compete with the likes of Alabama and Ohio State, no matter the cost, or retreat and possibly face athletic irrelevance.

It was this decision that prompted an internal study at Alabama-Birmingham, whose football team recently finished its regular season with a 6-6 record and is eligible to play in a bowl game for the first time since 2004. The judgment, according to a news release Tuesday from the university’s president, Dr. Ray L. Watts, was that “football is simply not sustainable.”

U.A.B. already needed to subsidize two-thirds of its $30 million athletic operating budget, and major capital improvements were seen as necessary to maintain a viable program. As a result, U.A.B. — a team from Conference USA situated in football’s hotbed, 50 miles from the campus of the No. 1 team in the nation, Alabama — has been forced to capitulate. The last college in the top subdivision of Division I to get rid of its football program was the University of the Pacific.
"The escalation of the arms race in Division I football made it hard to see that the investment in U.A.B. football over time could have enough money put into it to have a program that would be successful," said John D. Johns, a member of the University of Alabama system's board of trustees.

The issue of autonomy for the five major conferences appears to have spooked U.A.B., which moved to the top subdivision in 1996, as well as the University of Hawaii, which plays football in the Mountain West Conference.

But the prevailing mentality among the smaller leagues is that they must follow whatever changes the so-called Big 5 institute during the N.C.A.A. convention in January. Even with bleak financial outlooks for many of these athletic departments, a certain consensus seems to have been reached.

"We're going to fight speed with speed," Sean Frazier, the athletic director at Northern Illinois, said.

The cost will be steep, particularly for teams in the American Athletic, Mid-American, Mountain West and Sun Belt Conferences and Conference USA — the five football leagues not among the Big 5 in the Football Bowl Subdivision, Division I's top tier. Many of their athletic departments require student fees to support their teams, and some people worry students will be squeezed even harder.

**A Sea Change**

For years, universities with fewer financial resources have tried to compete with the traditional college sports powers. The little guys, too, have built new facilities and paid their coaches higher salaries even as the financial gap has widened, thanks to bigger conferences' signing television contracts worth billions of dollars.

Historically, though, the smaller universities were able to rein in their larger competitors to some degree, especially when it came to benefits for players. In 2011, after the N.C.A.A.'s executive committee voted to allow an annual $2,000 stipend for players, universities vetoed the rule with an override vote. They were led by programs in the smaller conferences, with many citing costs.

Three years later, it appears that they have given up fighting the sea change in collegiate athletics spurred by a union movement and lawsuits. Now, the centerpiece of the first changes from the Big 5 conferences is increasing the value of a yearly scholarship by several thousand dollars.

"Providing greater resources for our student-athletes is something we've neglected in the past, and it's time to readdress the definition of the athletic
Section 15

Board Stadium Discussion

This section intentionally left blank
Section 16

*Board Meeting Evaluation*

This section intentionally left blank
APPENDICIES

- Appendix I: Correspondence
- Appendix II: Construction Status Reports
- Appendix III: Higher Education Readings
Appendix I

Board Correspondence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Email/Letter</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Al Hornung</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jim Kreutz</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Cody Landry</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Diane Burton</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Ross Cunniff</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Charles Brett</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Richard Bailey</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>R. Cook Cloninger</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Linda Seals</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Email/Letter</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jack Armstrong</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Robert Keller</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Melinda Meyers</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jerry Dauth</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Steven Shulman</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Judy Berndt</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>E. Michael Rosser</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>T. Loadman</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2014</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>Harold ?</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Linnell (5)</td>
<td>stadium-5 different links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Email/Letter</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Ray Hogler</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Eric Ersley</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Phyllis Jachowski</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Scott Burnworth</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Linnell</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Louis Scharf</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Judith Smith</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Mary Stonaker</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Wardle</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Margaret Cummings</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jaime Jacob</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Karen Murphy</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Clyde Stonaker</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Brian Grauberger</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Ryan Brown</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carl Wangsvick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Don Donahue</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Bob Vangermeersch</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jack Armstrong</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Kevin Cassidy</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Anne Macdonald</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Philip Hoefer</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Max Beavers</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Paul Avery</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carol Podmore</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Deborah Shulman</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Julie Savidge</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>M. Dyer</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Mark De Gregorio</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Alexander Lemberg</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Ken Reed</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Leigh Twwill</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Email/Letter</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/2014</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>David R. Anderson</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carl Wangsvick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Robert McDonald</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Will Walters, Sierra Club</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Linnell</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Michael Pruznick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jean Yule</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Beth Benscheidt</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Sue Windels</td>
<td>Congressman Polis/ High Speed Broadband Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2014</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td>Chris Marshall</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Robert L. Kibler</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Greg Groene</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Linnell</td>
<td>WSJ article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Linnell</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Anita Wright</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Erick Larson</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Edythe Slovick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Chuck Minks</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tamara Schmidt</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Norm Rasulis</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Michael Pruznick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Edythe Slovick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Dennis Acott</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Travis Neidert</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Wayne Charlie</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Logan Turner</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/6/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Joan Robert</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>John Grant</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tracy Vanger</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Byrd C. Curtis</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Cheryl Rennels</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>John and Karen Nystrom</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jennifer Bell</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Ellen Bandsma</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Bernie Koppenhofer</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>J.J. Rodgers</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>John Sprackling</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>John Potyondy</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Paul Avery</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Phil Skraba</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Nancy Foxley</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Beth Nelson</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>JoAnn Kison</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Lynne Barnes</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Robin Nielseng</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Bill Kamm</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Mary Ann Henke</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Greg Adkins</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Kurt Barth</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tom Gillette</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Bill Beltz</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jean Yule</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>President Frank</td>
<td>Coloradoan Soapbox re: stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>President Frank</td>
<td>Coloradoan Soapbox re: stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Steve Johnson</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/23/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Charles Mabarek</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Henry Dougan</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Tyler Shannon</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Jeff and Jill Kukuk</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Molly Baldrige</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Carl Wangsvick</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Linda Vrooman</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Eric White</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2014</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Beverly Hill</td>
<td>stadium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attn Sharon Teufel Executive Assistant

Dear Sharon

Would you kindly submit my letter to the Board of Governors for the meeting today at the CSU offices on 17th Street.

I will be there to read it, if allowed

Thank you

Al Hornung '61
Former President of the Denver Ram Club
Former Member of the Alumni Board
Current member of the 50 Year Committee
Campaign Chairman of the Sig Ep Renovation Project
December 5, 2014

Board of Governors
Colorado State University

Today you vote on the destiny and vision of CSU.

It is now the time for the City of Fort Collins, Larimer County, All of CSU Alumni, and all the friends and Alumni of CSU in The Denver Metro and Front Range be given the opportunity to elevate the last weak point in all the programs of a great university. That weak point is the football program.

The on-campus football stadium is the catalyst that will provide the economic opportunity for the area and the cohesiveness of the fan base to achieve that goal.

Please give us that opportunity to show the nation that CSU and its family is up to the task of achieving greatness in all endeavors.

If you want to soar with the eagles, you can't be grouzing around on the ground with the prairie chickens.

Vote for the On-Campus Stadium today. We will reward your faith and confidence in us.

Sincerely

Al Hornung ‘61
Sharon, my wife Martha and I also support the sentiments of Al Horning and Richard Bailey in their support of the new stadium...Please add us to the “in favor” column. Thanks. Jim Kreutz ’63 also former letterman
Hello. I am a resident of Fort Collins and have lived here for 20 years. I am opposed to the building of an on campus stadium for the following reasons:

1. The costs of the stadium will be carried by the future students of the University.

2. The stadium will take up precious real estate that will be needed for CSU to grow over the next 50 years.

3. The Hughes site is one of the most unique places in college football and it is out of the way.

4. The waste of resources on a stadium that will be used less than 10 times per year.

5. The people of Fort Collins do not want a stadium in the middle of our fair city. 60% of the people surveyed said that they do not want this stadium at the proposed location.

6. As of now, there is no winning coach, there is no winning athletic director and there is only Dr. Frank advocating for this stadium. When CSU is 3 and 9 and there are less than 10000 people sitting in the stands CSU and Fort Collins will be the laughing stock of college football. This is not a good bet.

I hope that you will read this, and take my words into consideration. I have to work so will not be able to attend this afternoon’s meeting.

Thank you

Cody C. Landry
Fort Collins
Cogent21@msn.com
970 305 1167.

mailto:csus_board@mail.colostate.edu
From: Burton, Diane
Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 11:38 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Well, there's this:

http://www.collegian.com/2014/12/ascsu-releases-results-of-student-poll-on-stadium/104989/

Diane Burton
Assistant Director, University Honors Program
(970) 491-2225
Teufel, Sharon

From: Ross Cunniff <rcunniff@fcgov.com>
Sent: Friday, December 05, 2014 11:21 AM
To: CSUS Board
Cc: Teufel, Sharon
Subject: CSU stadium options

To the Colorado State University Board of Governors,

I understand that today you will be considering the options that Dr. Frank is presenting to you regarding potential stadium options for Colorado State University. Unfortunately, I am not able to be there in person. I hope that you will take the time to read my comments before you make a decision.

My name is Ross Cunniff. I am the Fort Collins City Council representative from District 5. My district encompasses Colorado State University's main campus, as well as several surrounding neighborhoods. I am writing on my own behalf, and on behalf of my constituents, not on behalf of the Fort Collins City Council.

You should know that my constituents are overwhelmingly opposed to a stadium located on CSU's main campus. I hear from them nearly every day. The financial cost is not the only, nor even the primary, reason. The neighbors of CSU are very concerned about the likely negative impacts to their quality of life - impacts that no amount of money or services could fix. The character of their neighborhoods will change. Game noise will interrupt their normally quiet afternoons and evenings. Even if road improvements are made, they will not be able to easily enter or leave their neighborhoods on game day. Many of them own houses constructed 50 or more years ago - well before a large multi-use stadium was considered at this location. They had assumed that their quality of life could continue. This is now at risk. And their primary defenders of their neighborhood - the Fort Collins City Council - has nearly zero power to protect them.

The public process regarding the stadium has been unsatisfactory to my constituents. You should know that the "community leaders" group that made the most recent recommendation to Dr. Frank in no way represents the make-up of the community. The whole process has strained relationships between CSU and the community.

Although the Fort Collins City Council has not taken a position on stadium location, my preference, and the preference of my constituents, would be in favor of the current Hughes location. Please take this sentiment seriously, and do not approve a stadium on the main campus.

Ross Cunniff
Councilmember, District 5

With limited exceptions, emails and any files transmitted with them are subject to public disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA). To promote transparency, emails will be visible in an online archive, unless the sender puts #PRIVATE in the subject line of the email. However, the City of Fort Collins can’t guarantee that any email to or from Council will remain private under CORA.
Unfortunately, I will be unable to attend today's meeting, however, I do want to voice my concerns about a new stadium located on the CSU campus.

As a home owner in the immediate area, I am concerned about the following:
Traffic congestion, which is already intolerable at times.
Noise and vandalism, which was proven by last year's Macklemore concert held in the area of proposed stadium.
Construction traffic and noise, which will impact everyone for a long period of time, and has already been shown to be a problem by the non-stop construction on campus over the last few years.
Additional traffic generated as student parking is moved off the main campus to a proposed location in the Spring Creek flood plain, south of the main campus, as well as other locations.

I have read the studies, and have concerns about how some figures are shown, and others are not. There is an emphasis on the on-going costs of maintaining Hughes stadium, but it’s not compared to the on-going costs associated with a new stadium, in addition to its initial costs. Mr. Frank’s letter mentions a $30M cost over 10 years, but fails to mention the $28M cost of maintaining a new stadium [comparative-financing.pdf / Annual expenses $2.8M ]. This makes me skeptical about other figures mentioned in his letter.
The traffic studies show improvements to sidewalks, turn lanes, and crossings. It does not mention the fact that Prospect Ave, which will become the main route to and from I-25, is only 2 lanes wide until it enters the City limits, and is 4 narrow lanes, with no center/turn lane between Riverside and College. I think you should attempt to drive into town on this road on a Friday afternoon to see what it’s like today.
The rail line that runs through campus is not even mentioned as a problem, which it is every time a train passes through town. Also, the frequency and length of trains have been increasing recently.

On a personal note:
CSU is between our home and our daughters’ school. We have to negotiate existing CSU traffic every morning and afternoon transporting them between home and school. I use Prospect Ave every day for my commute to and from work. We are very familiar with the traffic patterns and issues in Fort Collins and have been for over 25 years. The roadways in the area cannot accommodate the existing traffic, much less the additional traffic that would be generated. The existing traffic plan is jokingly referred to as, “if it gets bad enough, people will stop using it”. We currently have a senior in high school and are not even considering the CSU system, even though it is blocks from our home. The reason – the lack of emphasis on education, the focus on revenue, and the poor value for our money. Yes, CSU has some successes – in veterinary sciences and agronomy, but as a whole, not something that I, as a resident of Colorado and Fort Collins, am proud of.

I will be looking forward to your decision and reasoning.

Charles Brett
414 Buckeye St
Fort Collins, CO 80524
Sharon

Please add my name to the list of supporters for the new stadium. I am in agreement with Mr. Hornung’s letter. I don’t want to go to Hughes Stadium any more. My class was asked to vote for it and we were given no on campus alternative. Time for the bad dream to end and watch this university soar in all endeavors including Football.

I am still traveling this week or I would have attended the meeting.

GO RAMS
Richard Bailey
BSME 1970

Sent from mobile phone
CONetic Resources, Inc.
Richard Bailey
303-888-4853 cell

On Dec 5, 2014, at 9:13 AM, al hornung <achornung@hotmail.com> wrote:

    Attn Sharon Teufel Executive Assistant

    Dear Sharon

    Would you kindly submit my letter to the Board of Governors for the meeting today at the CSU offices on 17th Street.

    I will be there to read it, if allowed

    Thank you

    Al Hornung ’61
    Former President of the Denver Ram Club
    Former Member of the Alumni Board
    Current member of the 50 Year Committee
    Campaign Chairman of the Sig Ep Renovation Project

    <CSU Stadium Vote Board of Governors December 5, 2014.docx>
To Whom It May Concern

I am one more voice that is totally opposed to having a football stadium on campus. We have the land with parking and tailgating space available. Colorado State University should be 95% education and at most 5% athletics. Please, if a new stadium must be built, build it next to Hughes and take advantage of what we already have.

I would plead to renovate Hughes and perhaps in the future build a new stadium. Don’t fall prey to the “throw away” generation.

Thank you for listening.
R Cook Cloninger
Former Ticket Seller at Moby and Hughes

"I would rather live my life as if there is a God, and die to find out there isn’t, than to live my life as if there isn’t, and die to find out there is." Clark Little (Hawaiian Photographer)
Dear CSU Board of Governors,
I am a CSU alumna and supporter living in Fort Collins. The proposed on-campus stadium does not make sense financially, nor does it support the mission of the university.

There is little support for it among donors, alumni, faculty, students, business people, residents, or City Council. CSU’s committees and polls to the contrary are widely seen as pre-arranged outcomes by CSU, and questioned why CSU would need to rig the situations if it truly wanted information, and it truly wanted to present reality instead of only the CSU version to the public.

Impacts on Fort Collins have been glossed over by CSU, and it does not bother to send representatives to attend public information meetings such as City Council. Where are we to get unbiased information?

Not from CSU. The administration has been disingenuous with the public about plans for the stadium, stating one intention and then arranging another behind doors; using ever changing figures of what’s included or not; or using creative accounting to shochorn financial scenarios into paper realities. The list of missteps is a long one.

All of this has created a huge distrust of CSU as a whole, changing it from welcome neighbor to town bully. Pursuing the financial boondoggle of an on-campus stadium will also negatively affect alumni relations and donations because of lack of trust in CSU’s vision and direction.

You have the power to change these negative effects on CSU, and Fort Collins, by not approving any plan for an on-campus stadium at CSU.

Thank you.

Linda Seals
Good morning, Mr. Armstrong:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Greetings Members of the Board of Governors,

For what it is worth, here is my newly inspired rant..., as an alumni...

Looking at the front page of the Wednesday Collegian (CSU newspaper) the graphic of salaries for various levels of professors, CSU President, and coaches shows clearly the discrepancy that has taken place over the years!!!

Tony Frank, as the CSU President, has way more responsibility than any of the sports coaches – bringing students to the university to further their futures, recruiting excellent professors, managing the entire university, etc. etc....

BUT, who gets paid more than Tony Frank? The basketball coach (almost 2x) and the football coach (3x). The President should be the top salaried person at the university

And, let’s compare the salaries of professors, all under $160K/year, while the coaches all make $200K plus, and the head football coach makes 10x that much – who is really worth more to the purpose of this wonderful land-grant university?

THIS IMBALANCE IS RIDICULOUS

CSU is a university – Education and furthering the life-long possibilities of its students is its primary responsibility and purpose for being!

Football, in our society, is entertainment.

Think what the over $250 million would do for salaries of valuable professors, the quality of labs and classrooms, the ability to maintain the infrastructure of the university... The reputation built over so many years by all those who have worked so hard at research and education
I urge you to not approve the building of an on-campus football stadium for the Fort Collins campus.

Thank you for “listening”

Jack Armstrong
Fort Collins
Good morning, Mr. Keller:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attachment which will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Ms. Teufel,

Would you please distribute copies of my attachment to members of the Board of Governors.

Thank you,
Bob

Dr. Robert (Bob) Keller
Professor of Economics
C 325 Clark Building
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1771
(970) 491-6778
December 4, 2014

To:          Board of Governors, CSU System
From:      Robert R. Keller, Professor of Economics
Subject:  Reject the Proposed On-Campus Football Stadium

I am writing as a long-time professor of economics (42 years), a former interim dean of the College of Liberal Arts (1997-9), a former Faculty Athletics Representative (1999-2005), and as a former Director of the University Honor Program (1999-2012). I request the Board of Governors to reject the proposal for an on-campus football stadium and fully investigate the viability of refurbishing and renovating Hughes Stadium, and the viability of building a new stadium at the Hughes site. Now is the time to reject the proposed OCFS and to reflect on the University’s mission, purpose, and core values and to place football and the OCFS in their proper level of priority.

The process and decision to build an on-campus football stadium (OCFS) was fatally flawed from the very beginning because:

- President Frank met with Jack Graham who apparently convinced Frank to terminate Paul Kowalczyk and to name Graham as athletic director. There was no official search for the new AD.
- Jack Graham, at the press conference that formally introduced him as the new AD, announced a “Bold New Era” and he championed the idea of an on-campus football stadium (OCFS).
- The viability of an OCFS was never researched before the announcement was made nor did the proposed new building go through appropriate planning channels for approval.
- So a decision was made to march forward with the OCFS by providing rationales without researching costs and benefits and more importantly researching other alternatives.
- The result over the next several years was to dismiss shared governance and to dismiss using informed campus faculty (sports economists and urban regional economists in the Department of Economics and faculty in other departments) as resources to increase the likelihood of informed decision-making.
- Reaching a conclusion and moving forward with a plan before researching the benefits and costs of an OCFS is an affront to the core values of a nationally prominent research university especially when the costs are in the range of $220 to $300 million.
- So it’s not surprising that a majority of the faculty are dismayed and/or angry.

There are at least two issues that have not been fully taken into account:

1. There is a large opportunity cost to building the OCFS at the proposed site. It is a choice location in the central campus core that should be used for research laboratories, classrooms, office space, and/or residence halls which better align with the University’s mission.
   - The size of the stadium coupled with limited space means that it will have to be “shoe-horned” next to Academic Village South and other residence halls.
   - The size of the stadium is huge and the site is small. As architecture, no OCFS in America will receive an award for aesthetic beauty. The proposed OCS would be a big, ugly building in the central campus core.
   - Further the proposed OCFS would create all types of negative externalities such as traffic congestion, various forms of pollution, disruption of near-by neighborhoods, etc., that can be only partially mitigated by spending an estimated $30 million in tax payer funds.
   - No wonder the OCFS proposal has disrupted, angered, and divided the Fort Collins community.
2. The most recent argument for the proposed OCFS and against the $30 million dollar refurbishment of Hughes Stadium is that General Fund monies will have to be used (of course the best estimate is that a larger amount of the General Fund monies will have to be used for the OCFS).

- I don’t understand the statement because Hughes Stadium must be producing net income which could be used as the revenue stream to issue bonds to finance the improvements. What are the net revenues associated with Hughes Stadium? If revenue stream is large enough, General Funds will not have to be used.

There are two recent developments that decrease the viability of college football:

1. There is a super abundance of evidence and publicity on brain damage and other debilitating injuries caused by football. The image of football is being transformed into a gladiator/blood sport played in a coliseum in front of an emperor. This image is repulsive and antithetical to the mission and core values of the University.

- The sport could be banned as NCAA boxing was banned in 1970.
- More realistically in the short run, the popularity of football may wane which would have huge revenue implications for any football stadium in America.

2. If football endures there is another development that decreases the viability of football:

- There are various proposals to increase the compensation of student athletes which of course would increase costs and decrease net revenues significantly.
- Increasingly the question that will be asked is: Can an academic institution afford the high costs of Division I football that drains resources away from the academic core mission?

Division I football is a microcosm of the mal-distribution of income and wealth in America. In football, as in society, there are the “Have Mores,” the “Haves,” and the “Have Nots.” Athletic budgets, coaches’ salaries, facilities, etc., all reflect the distribution of income and wealth among these three classes. The Big Five Conferences have the largest share of wealth, the highest paid coaches, and the most expensive facilities. CSU and the Mountain West are among the “Have Nots” that beg for the crumbs off the tables from their richer brethren. It’s what is known as trickle-down economics and what John Kenneth Galbraith called “horse and sparrow economics (you feed the horses oats and the sparrows...).” Although CSU gets the crumbs from the super-rich, a parallel structure holds—the football coach is paid more than the President, way more than the average tenured faculty member, and an obscene multiple more than non-tenure track faculty (adjuncts) who are responsible for the majority of undergraduate teaching on campus. Football is a drain on academic resources and non-tenure track faculty produce a significant surplus for the academic sector.

- How on earth can we put a higher priority on an expensive proposed OCFS than ameliorating the plight of non-tenure track faculty, the inadequacy of research facilities, and shoddy classrooms and offices? Shame on us. It is time to stop the tail (football) from wagging the dog (the core values of our academic institution).
- Now is the time to reject the proposed OCFS and to reflect on the University’s mission, purpose, and core values and to place football and the OCFS in their proper level of priority.
- And if CSU wants to begin a really “Bold New Era” we should consider dropping Division I football in the not too distant future and become a national leader instead of a “me-too” follower.
Good afternoon, Mr. Philips:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

Dear Board of Governors:

This is an absolutely inane idea. Absolutely nothing supports an on-campus stadium (based on majority/over-whelming majority):
Not the donors;
not the students;
not the alumni;
not the facts;
not the statistics;
not the trends;
not the financials.
To quote Morris, deputy AD - FC Coloradoan:
"This is a world-class, research university“. Having what exactly to do with sports??

This MUST be stopped. CSU is, has been and will remain a stepping stop for biggest pastures. The timing of Coach mac could not have been more timely. We simply are NOT going to ever be in the leagues of the infinitesimal group of money makers in college football.

Please take your role seriously and do NOT rubber stamp this project. President Frank has NOT kept his word and the donor money has not been raised and now the coach that brought sold-out Hughes stadium crowds (I went to a couple games) has said bye-bye.

CSU Alumni
Football fanatic
FC Business Owner
Larimer County Land Owner

Sincerely,

Rob Phillips, Esq.
Partner
RMBA Group
215 West Oak Street, Suite 600
Fort Collins, CO 80521
www.RMBAGroup.com
rob@rmbagroup.com
Office: 970-224-1258
Direct: 720-258-5755

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this e-mail from the RMBA Group contains information which is privileged and confidential and/or protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 2510 et seq., and the state and federal attorney-client privilege or attorney work product privileges. If you are not the addressee and/or intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you must not read this transmission and that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please destroy it and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Please notify us immediately at 720-258-5755. Thank you.
Good afternoon, Mr. Wangsvick:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attachment which will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

----Original Message-----
From: Carl Wangsvick [mailto:cwangsvi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 9:34 AM
To: Teufel, Sharon
Subject: New York Times story

Dear Governors:

For Your Information. A new stadium is not nearly the end of the big costs when you choose to join the arms race in college football. And the losers easily outnumber the winners. Now you have no AD and no coach and a 300 million dollar stadium to build? Start printing the money now.

Carl Wangsvick
The University of Alabama-Birmingham said Tuesday that it was terminating its football program, becoming the first university in college sports’ top tier to do so in nearly 20 years and providing the most visible sign yet that athletic officials throughout the country are considering radical options in the face of mounting financial burdens.

The most prominent athletic programs have charged ahead with reforms that allow them to make their own rules on matters like whether to financially reward athletes. Everyone else — including dozens of colleges with proud athletic histories — has been left at a daunting crossroads. Those programs can try to compete with the likes of Alabama and Ohio State, no matter the cost, or retreat and possibly face athletic irrelevance.

It was this decision that prompted an internal study at Alabama-Birmingham, whose football team recently finished its regular season with a 6-6 record and is eligible to play in a bowl game for the first time since 2004. The judgment, according to a news release Tuesday from the university’s president, Dr. Ray L. Watts, was that “football is simply not sustainable.”

U.A.B. already needed to subsidize two-thirds of its $30 million athletic operating budget, and major capital improvements were seen as necessary to maintain a viable program. As a result, U.A.B. — a team from Conference USA situated in football’s hotbed, 50 miles from the campus of the No. 1 team in the nation, Alabama — has been forced to capitulate. The last college in the top subdivision of Division I to get rid of its football program was the University of the Pacific.

“The escalation of the arms race in Division I football made it hard to see that the investment in U.A.B. football over time could have enough money put into it to
have a program that would be successful,” said John D. Johns, a member of the University of Alabama system’s board of trustees.

The issue of autonomy for the five major conferences appears to have spooked U.A.B., which moved to the top subdivision in 1996, as well as the University of Hawaii, which plays football in the Mountain West Conference.

But the prevailing mentality among the smaller leagues is that they must follow whatever changes the so-called Big 5 institute during the N.C.A.A. convention in January. Even with bleak financial outlooks for many of these athletic departments, a certain consensus seems to have been reached.

“We’re going to fight speed with speed,” Sean Frazier, the athletic director at Northern Illinois, said.

The cost will be steep, particularly for teams in the American Athletic, Mid-American, Mountain West and Sun Belt Conferences and Conference USA — the five football leagues not among the Big 5 in the Football Bowl Subdivision, Division I’s top tier. Many of their athletic departments require student fees to support their teams, and some people worry students will be squeezed even harder.

A Sea Change

For years, universities with fewer financial resources have tried to compete with the traditional college sports powers. The little guys, too, have built new facilities and paid their coaches higher salaries even as the financial gap has widened, thanks to bigger conferences’ signing television contracts worth billions of dollars.

Historically, though, the smaller universities were able to rein in their larger competitors to some degree, especially when it came to benefits for players. In 2011, after the N.C.A.A.’s executive committee voted to allow an annual $2,000 stipend for players, universities vetoed the rule with an override vote. They were led by programs in the smaller conferences, with many citing costs.

Three years later, it appears that they have given up fighting the sea change in collegiate athletics spurred by a union movement and lawsuits. Now, the centerpiece of the first changes from the Big 5 conferences is increasing the value of a yearly scholarship by several thousand dollars.

“Providing greater resources for our student-athletes is something we’ve neglected in the past, and it’s time to readdress the definition of the athletic
scholarships,” the Sun Belt commissioner, Karl Benson, said, adding that Sun Belt colleges would maintain independence in how they implemented potential changes.

Critics contend that more athletic spending is further proof of misplaced priorities at universities that simply cannot afford it. Yet in interviews with about a dozen commissioners and administrators, nearly all said they were determined to remain competitive on the field, despite the costs.

Jon Steinbrecher, commissioner of the Mid-American Conference, said his conference would not “back down from this new challenge.” Tom Yeager, the longtime commissioner of the Colonial Athletic Association — one of two conferences to vote against the new governance plan (the Ivy League was the other) — said more expensive scholarships would simply be the new cost of doing business.

And Val Ackerman, commissioner of the Big East (a nonfootball conference), said there was almost no struggle reaching unanimity among her league’s 10 members about whether to follow the Big 5’s lead. A major reason, cited by all the commissioners, was recruiting.

“If this is what it’s going to take to make sure we have access to the kinds of players that our coaches want to coach and our schools want as part of their communities,” Ms. Ackerman said, “they’re going to do it.”

David Ridpath, a professor at Ohio University, a member of the MAC, has raised a familiar question: financing. He said colleges in his conference relied heavily on student fees to finance their athletic programs; the Big 5 conferences have expensive broadcast rights fees and their own networks.

“At the big schools, television money pays the bills,” Dr. Ridpath said. “Here, we’re talking about kids going further into debt for the football team. I’m all for benefits for athletes, but at some point these schools have to accept who they are. Ohio isn’t Ohio State, and we have to be O.K. with that.”

In a study to be published in the Journal of Sport this winter, Dr. Ridpath calculated that in 2012-13, MAC students spent on average more than $300 per semester subsidizing athletics. During a time of mounting student debt, that is nearly $2,500 over four years.
Cost of Attendance

The Big 5’s legislation centerpiece — cost of attendance, as it is called — is designed to bridge the gap between what is currently covered (tuition, books, housing) and common expenses, like travel home. The price tag varies among universities, ranging from a few thousand dollars to closer to $10,000 per athlete.

Administrators around the country said rising costs were always a concern. At Hawaii, Athletic Director Ben Jay told the board of regents this summer that the athletic department would have to find a new way to do business, which some interpreted as the end of the football team. But Mr. Jay said the program was too important to Hawaii, calling it a part of the university’s and the state’s identity.

Mr. Jay is aware of the grim financial outlook, though. He said Hawaii moved $14 million in accumulated debt from the athletic department to the university last year. He is spending an extra $350,000 this year to provide more meals to athletes after N.C.A.A. rules were relaxed.

“I recognize that students are strapped, so I don’t want to do this on their backs,” he said. “It’s my responsibility to find the money elsewhere. A lot depends on the football team winning.”

At San Jose State, also of the Mountain West Conference, Athletic Director Gene Bleymaier presided over a more than $24 million athletic budget in 2013 that required about $17 million in subsidies, according to a USA Today database. He cited marketing, sponsorships, advertising and royalties as ways to raise revenue so students and the university would not face a greater burden.

“It comes down to fund-raising,” he said.

Mr. Bleymaier would like more help from the larger universities, although he does not expect it, he said. More revenue sharing would be beneficial, he said, but he also said that if more marquee teams were willing to play teams from other conferences on the road, those programs could generate more interest and more money.

Mr. Steinbrecher estimated MAC members would pay $500,000 to $1 million each year for cost of attendance. He said new revenue streams, including a contract extension with ESPN and payouts from the new football playoff television deal, would help pay for it, although the Big 5 conferences retain the vast majority of the playoff proceeds, worth $470 million annually.
Other Issues Looming

Cost of attendance may be just the beginning. The N.C.A.A. is appealing a ruling by a federal judge that declared that rules prohibiting athletes from profiting from their images were illegal. The judge suggested colleges provide athletes with trust funds worth $5,000 per year, which the Big 5 could do. At some point, they could also seek to increase the number of scholarships they are allowed to offer or loosen restrictions on athletes’ relationships with agents and advisers.

“What I am concerned about are the unknowns,” said Mr. Frazier, the athletic director at Northern Illinois, who played football at Alabama and previously worked in Wisconsin’s athletic department. “That’s what keeps me up in the middle of the night. How far are these institutions willing to go to separate themselves? I do know the capabilities they have.”

Those in other leagues will have tough decisions about where to draw the line.

“You have institutional ego involved,” Mr. Yeager, the commissioner of the Colonial Athletic Association, said. “You get to the point where you can’t let go, and then places will be getting rid of the president and A.D. for not being visionary enough. But at some point you have to figure out where to cut your losses.”

Still, Justin Craft, the leader of the B Club, a group of vocal U.A.B. football supporters, wondered about his alma mater without the sport.

“The team builds a national brand,” he said. “People around the country don’t know who U.A.B. is except that they saw them play Mississippi State on the SEC Network.”

Any subsidies the athletic department needs should be viewed as a marketing expense, he said.

While Mr. Craft simply hoped for the chance to see his alma mater’s team take the field next fall, at Northern Illinois, plans were announced in November to expand and retrofit the 49-year-old football facility, Huskie Stadium, to raise money and attract recruits.

“You’re either moving forward or moving back,” Mr. Frazier said. “As my wife would say, there’s no such thing as half-pregnant.”

Correction: December 2, 2014

An earlier version of this article misstated the year in which the N.C.A.A.’s executive
committee voted to allow an annual $2,000 stipend for players. It was 2011, not 2012.

A version of this article appears in print on December 3, 2014, on page A1 of the New York edition with the headline: It’s a Game of Spiraling Costs, So a College Tosses Out Football.

© 2014 The New York Times Company
Good afternoon, Ms. Adamy:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Dear CSU Board of Governors,

Please send a clear message that academics are far more important than athletics and vote against the proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Briefly:

> CSU prides itself on being a green university, and tearing down a stadium to build a new one is not in keeping with that laudable and hard-won reputation.

> In a time of ever-increasing college tuition, threat of declining state assistance, and consequent student debt, the CSU development team should focus the majority of its time and effort on courting donors who are interested in creating or bolstering significant academic scholarships, not on funding an enormous, limited-use structure that primarily benefits one, male-dominated sport.

> Football may be a dying game, literally – high schools and parents are questioning the value and logic of a sport that has the potential to seriously injure and kill young people.

> Has anyone questioned why so much money is purportedly needed to restore Hughes? If maintenance was neglected at Hughes, where is the evidence that a new stadium will be maintained any better?

A small group is pushing a project that will benefit too few people at too high a cost. The return on the taxpayers’ investment is just not sound.

Thank you,

Cindy Adamy
Fort Collins
Good morning, Ms. Burton:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the stadium issue at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Please please please be the adults in the room and stop this senseless vanity project in its tracks. The citizens of Fort Collins are overwhelmingly opposed to an on-campus stadium and the faculty, staff and students at CSU don't want it either. It's an expense the university can't afford and doesn't need and it will wreck our reputation and relations with our neighbors. For what?

The administration couldn't take care of the stadium they already have so why should you approve letting them build a new one? By their own admission, Hughes Stadium needs $30M in repairs/renovations. If that's really the case, then the administration should be reprimanded for letting that happen.

Oh, and apparently Tony Frank has just reduced the buyout for our football coach so now he's gone too. Yeah, so let's approve a new stadium?

Seriously?
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Loadman, Kori - RIF
Subject: RE: no new stadium

Good morning, Ms. Loadman:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

From: Loadman, Kori - RIF [mailto:kloadman@psdschools.org]
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 7:52 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: no new stadium

In addition to the funds that could be better spent on helping all CSU Students, instead of a few departments and athletes, a stadium on CSU campus will pose great hardships on the rest of the community. Getting around town on game day will be extremely difficult due to traffic tie up. I imagine instead of helping local old town businesses it will harm them because non-game viewing people will avoid that area on game day.

The stadium is great exactly where it is located!

Kori Loadman
Riffenburgh Literacy Teacher
(970)488-7954
Good morning, Mr. Gabriel:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

First off, why is it so hard to renovate the old Hughes Stadium? Second, Hughes is amazing! It has parking (huge necessity for tailgating-and also parking), doesn't create major in town traffic, doesn't cost millions, is in a beautiful location already, doesn't involve killing off the beautiful nature on campus, and the list goes on. What the heck does a brand new stadium do for us? It only makes it harder for the community to support the team (people will not flock to the games, and in fact I will refuse to go to those games). This new stadium is such a ridiculous waste of student dollars. I am graduating soon, thank god!

--Gabriel Thom
Good morning, Mr. Carpenter:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

There are two graduates of Colorado State University in our immediate family, and approximately 6 more in our extended family. None of us believe that an new main campus stadium is in the best interests of the university, the community of Fort Collins, or anyone but a narrow base of football players, coaches, and others who will profit from this misuse of public money. We believe that the financial plan is full of loop holes and that the taxpayers or students will ultimate pay for this. Please do not do this!

Wayne Carpenter
Fort Collins
Good morning, Ms. Towill:

Your additional comments regarding the football program will also be shared with the Board of Governors. Again, thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

From: Leigh [mailto:leigh.towill@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 2:07 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Re: Proposed campus stadium

Thanks for your acknowledgement of my email. I certainly hope each member reads it. Please also forward to the board the excellent article in the Wed. New York Times on the spiraling cost of football programs. I also read today in The Coloradoan a comment from former AD Graham that Tony Frank added in Coach McElwain’s contract a mechanism to avoid paying the buyout ($7.5 million) clause in the contract. What is going on!!! So much for transparency. Again I reiterate my concerns about the costs of the whole football program.

I think the board should take a couple of months to gather independent assessments (not just CSU's) before making any decision. I hope you will respond to my comments.

Yours
Leigh towill

Sent from my iPad

On Nov 26, 2014, at 9:27 AM, CSUS Board <csus_board@Mail.Colostate.edu> wrote:

Good morning, Dr. Towill:

This acknowledge receipt of your email regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the CSU System Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
Board members,

I am writing this to express my extreme displeasure about the process and consequences in developing a new stadium on campus. I am very unhappy with the manner in which Dr. Frank has handled the whole issue.

Specifically:

1. Building of the campus stadium will require considerable use of city funds for intersections etc. As a tax payer I strongly object to this use without having a vote on the matter. Dr. Frank has said CSU will only fund items adjacent to the stadium. The traffic issues have no real solution with a campus stadium

2. The proposed demolition of the horticulture greenhouses and plots will require new facilities. These costs have not been listed on the stadium costs. I also understand that until the stadium is built, temporary facilities are to be rented (where?, certainly not on campus). This is extremely inconvenient and unfair to horticulture students. As a former affiliate in horticulture for 23 years, I think this underlines the extreme emphasis being placed on athletics at the expense of academics.

3. Dr. Frank has said no student fees will be used for the stadium, but then has backtracked with the proposed placing of classrooms in the stadium. This is extremely two-faced--I hope you strongly object to the use of student fees even if classroom are included in the new stadium.

4. Dr. Frank has not met with some economists that express concern about the total economic benefits to the university and city. Some issues seem to be nuanced to favor a campus stadium. As an example, use of committee with favored members. I also do not understand why bonds cannot be issued to repair/or completely update Hughes stadium; it seems they will be a major funding of the proposed campus stadium. I also strongly object to the favoring of big donors so that fancy boxes can be constructed.

As I expected at the outset of the process, and the extreme amount of money spent developing the proposal, it seems it is (was) a done deal from the start. I am extremely unhappy with the process that Dr. Frank has used, and as a scholarship donator (along with my wife), am unhappy with Colorado State University. Dr. Frank has completely misread the feelings of the community at large, which has led to extreme divisiveness.

I have many more comments, but have tried to be brief. I certainly hope you address these issues at your upcoming meeting. The current location for Hughes stadium, repaired or demolished and rebuilt, is just wonderful and I hope all of you do realize this. I welcome comments on these issues.

Sincerely,

Dr. Leigh E. Towill
Good morning, Ms. Dunn:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the CSU football program. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors. Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Hello Sharon,

The following article about college football was just sent to me:
http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/03/sports/ncaafootball/uab-cancels-football-program-citing-fiscal-realities.html?emc=edit_th_20141203&nl=todaysheadlines&nlid=40937370&r=0

My friend is aware of my opinion on the new stadium and he agrees it is a boondoggle. I’m hoping you can send this to the CSU Board of Governors members for me. It’s a nice compilation of my and many of my friend’s thoughts about the unnecessary endeavor.

Over and above this, I’ve often wondered why Tony Frank has not made the same effort towards our basketball presence. We already have an on campus arena and we’ve produced truly fine male AND FEMALE athletes out of the program.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I really appreciate your help with moving it to the Board.

Lorraine Dunn
Good morning, Ms. Meyers:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Board of Governors,

I am unable to attend the public comment section in which Tony Frank will present his proposal to recommend an on campus stadium at CSU and I would like to comment on the subject. I don't need to hash out what others have hashed out, but simply put.

The money was not raised, we can't keep the Football Coaches we have, we do not need to be a football school. We are an academic school, we need to support the students, faculty, and staff. We should not have to burden students, faculty, staff and now the City and State to pay for what comes down to football if they don't want it. Why is it that the administration claims transparency and honesty, but statements of if the money is not raised for the stadium in two years Hughes will be renovated just get overlooked. The articles below address the same issues.

http://www.coloradoan.com/story/sports/csu/football/2014/12/01/csusay-schools-talking-mcelwain/19741981/

I hope in this decision process, a process actually occurs that is open and transparent. This issue is dividing CSU students, faculty, staff and citizens of Fort Collins. Open forums and discussions to hear both sides is irrelevant when Tony Frank and the administration are going to build an on campus stadium matter what the consequences. Save your opinions and forget your facts, no one is listening.

Sincerely,
CSU Alumni and current CSU staff
Good morning, Mr. Dauth:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Jerry Dauth [mailto:jerrydauth@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 7:27 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: PROPOSED FOOTBALL STADIUM AT CSU

I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AT CSU TO NOT APPROVE THE PROPOSED ON CAMPUS FOOTBALL STADIUM AND INSTEAD LOOK FOR WAYS TO UPGRADE THE EXISTING STADIUM AS REQUIRED. I BELIEVE THE FINANCING FOR THE PROPOSED STADIUM WILL ULTIMATELY HAVE TO BE PARTLY REPAID OUT OF FUNDS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE SUPPORT THE ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS OF CSU AND POSSIBLY RESULTING IN FURTHER FUTURE INCREASES IN TUITION AND FEES FOR OUR STUDENTS. SINCERELY, JERRY DAUTH, AGE 76, 1925 SERRAMONTE DRIVE, FORT COLLINS, 80524.

1
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2014 8:49 AM  
To: Shulman, Steven  
Subject: RE: Stadium commentary

Good morning,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

From: Shulman, Steven  
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 7:25 PM  
To: Teufel, Sharon  
Subject: Stadium commentary

Ms. Teufel -- Today the Collegian published my commentary on President Frank's proposal for a new football stadium. It is copied below. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a few moments to read it and circulate it to the other members of the Board of Governors.

It is understandable that President Frank wants CSU to excel in football. However, there is no reason to believe that a new stadium will achieve that objective. There is ample reason to fear that spending so much on football will shift scarce university resources away from our educational mission. That is why almost all of the many faculty members who I know vehemently oppose this proposal.

Thank you,

Steven Shulman  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Economics  
Colorado State University

WE CANNOT AFFORD A NEW FOOTBALL STADIUM

by Steven Shulman  
Professor of Economics
Everyone in the CSU community should be concerned about President Frank’s decision to build a new on-campus football stadium.

A new stadium is estimated to cost between $180 million and $225 million, but the actual total cost is likely to be much higher. The estimates do not include the additional spending that will be required for infrastructure upgrades, the relocation of adjacent streets and structures, the demolition of Hughes and the inevitable cost overruns.

President Frank has repeatedly promised that this spending will not come out of the general fund, meaning that it will not take resources away from academic programs. Nonetheless, the two options for building a new stadium include up to $55 million from the general fund.

CSU already spends millions of dollars subsidizing football from the general fund and athletic fees. Increasing that subsidy moves us in exactly the wrong direction.

Then there is the risk that the revenues generated by a new stadium could easily be insufficient to pay down its debt. In that case, CSU students would find themselves on the hook for increased tuition and fees.

There is little or no evidence that a new football stadium will improve the performance of the team, attract out of state students, increase donations to academic programs or become financially self-sufficient. The claims to the contrary simply ignore the research by sports economists and other experts on these questions.

Nonetheless, CSU has already spent $6.5 million on the planning for the new stadium, an extraordinary amount before the ground has even been broken.

It is hard to believe that President Frank ever fairly considered the alternatives to building a new stadium if he was willing to condone preliminary spending of this magnitude.

Now we face the prospect of the football coach earning up to $2.75 million for a single season.

Spending this much money on football is an outrage. Imagine what that amount of money could have done for CSU’s adjunct faculty.

In stark contrast to the wildly overpaid coach, adjunct faculty members create huge profits for the university. They teach most of the undergraduate student credit hours, generating most of CSU’s tuition revenue while getting paid abysmally little in return.

Football may be fun, but it is very, very expensive. Only a handful of top college football programs earn a profit. The large majority of college football programs have to be subsidized out of funds that would otherwise flow into teaching and research programs.

Spending so much money on football sucks resources out of education and increases its cost. It diminishes every other sport and makes it impossible to achieve gender equity in college athletics.
The benefits that college football supposedly brings beyond mere entertainment – mainly stronger school spirit and more engagement with alumni – are laudable but hardly worth the cost, risk and harm to the university’s fundamental educational mission.

Like every public university, CSU faces a variety of daunting challenges rooted in its precarious financial situation.

State support has been sharply reduced. Tuition and student debt keep rising. Research funding is drying up. More and more courses are taught by poorly paid adjuncts. Faculty and staff salaries frequently fail to keep up with inflation. Students are stuffed into large lectures and often cannot get into the courses they need.

A new football stadium will only make it harder to solve these core problems. It is a vanity project justified by little more than wishful thinking.

No business would ever make a significant investment decision like this. Neither should we.
Good morning, Ms. Berndt:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Judy Berndt [mailto:jberndt@lamar.colostate.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 6:14 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU stadium

Dear Members of the CSU Governing Board:

In spite of not having raised money from donations as promised, President Frank wants to go ahead with the plans to build an on-campus stadium. If you read The Coloradoan you will know that there have been many, many informed and thoughtful letters challenging all of the assumptions being made by President Frank. This proposed stadium makes no fiscal, environmental, or educational sense. Please, please do not approve the plans for an on-campus stadium. Please protect the residents of Fort Collins who will suffer the most from this stadium but please also protect all of the taxpayers in Colorado who will end up paying for it.

Respectfully,

Judy Berndt
1108 West Magnolia St
Fort Collins, Co 80521
Anthony A. Frank
President, Colorado State University

Begin forwarded message:

From: "emrcmb." <mikerossercmb@gmail.com>
Date: December 4, 2014 at 8:01:01 AM MST
To: <ahornung@hotmail.com>
Cc: <tony.frank@colostate.edu>, <joe.blake@colostate.edu>, <kyle.henley@colostate.edu>,
<MV.Martin@colostate.edu>, "Geary,Melanie" <Melanie.Geary@colostate.edu>,
<sharacastle@aol.com>, <CMeyer@AR.colostate.edu>
Subject: Rosser Letter in Support of an On-Campus Stadium.

Dear, Madam Chair and members of the CSU Board of Governors,

I've asked my friend, Al Hornung to speak and submit written testimony on my behalf. Please enter my comments in the permanent record. I regret that must be on campus Friday for a meeting and that I'm not able to speak to you in person.

Since I testified at your October meeting in Fort Collins I have been following both sides of the argument, both pro and con and have been giving the issue considerable thought. I have found none of the arguments against the stadium at all compelling. On the contrary our intercollegiate athletic programs are experiencing unprecedented success. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on building new academic, research and recreational facilities on campus. Hughes Stadium is the last of all the facilities thrown up in the 1960's and needs to be addressed.

Regretfully Hughes Stadium has outlived its usefulness. It is economically and functionally obsolete and from my 50 years of experience in real estate finance a rehabilitation would be a waste of critical resources. All of us who have experienced a remodeling project can relate to the unexpected "surprises" that can arrive in the middle of a project. Those surprises inevitably increase costs and result in delays. Ultimately, after a renovation all that remains is dissatisfaction and disappointment.

The time has come to replace an outmoded, unattractive stadium that is not at all accessible nor friendly. All of us need to join together to replace Hughes with a new facility that will engage and welcome students, alumni, fans and the community to one of the most beautiful campuses in America. Let's build first-class multipurpose venue for not only football, but soccer and lacrosse.

Furthermore, an on-campus multipurpose facility would be used more than six time a year and is a better solution for the numerous other possible uses both tangible and intangible that have been identified by the administration.
However I do need to be totally open and transparent. I do have a financial stake in your decision today. I have made my contribution to the new stadium! For me it is a sizable contribution given my financial circumstances but my gift is contingent only on the building of a new facility and not renovating Hughes Stadium.

Our family has a deep and abiding love for the University. Financially, we have endowed scholarships, helped found the Everett Real Estate Center and given time on various academic committees and advisory boards. If is important to state that that only about 25% of our financial commitment over the years to CSU has gone to athletics Our family does have skin in the game.

As a season ticket holder since the early 1970's, a former president of the CSU Alumni Association and a former member of the CSU Foundation Board I urge you to vote unanimously in favor of the new multipurpose facility and to encourage the administration to move ahead as quickly as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Michael Rosser, MA, CMB "64"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Home <a href="mailto:t.loadman@comcast.net">t.loadman@comcast.net</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 03, 2014 6:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>CSUS Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>No new stadium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why not spend all those millions on better education for all CSU students instead of a structure for a handful of athletes?

Sent from my iPad
Mr. Tony Frank and The C.S.U. Board of Governors:
Dorothy Horrell, William Mosher, Scott Johnson, Joseph Zimlich, Mark Gustafson, Demetri Munn, Jane Robbe Rhodes, Nancy Tuor, Dennis Florres, Alexandra Bernasek, Michael Mincie, Robert Deemer

Every Deity, even fake ones need a new grand cathedral of gluttony and decadence from which to be worshiped. Every cathedral needs within it rooms of related gluttony and decadence from which the self proclaimed powers that be can sit upon their thrones and cast their condescending eyes down upon the masses over those they feel to be inferior to themselves. All of course done at no charge to them, simply by passing the costs down to those of less means.

Each of you should feel fully ashamed for your self-serving decision to move forward with a new football stadium. Furthermore, each of you and your like-minded, close-minded self-serving counterparts in colleges and universities all across the nation should feel fully ashamed of yourselves for the hardships, heartbreaks and even financial ruin you choose to continually inflict on people with the price of higher education. Nothing, absolutely nothing in the economy has seen the inflationary rise in price as compared to that of a college education. It is simply sickening and borders on the line of corruption, which simply means there in no responsibility, no justification an no accountability for the endless cycle of your self-serving actions. So, in turn how is it you try to fool the public that higher education is still affordable? Just by lengthening student loans and reducing loan rates, all while still grossly inflating the price of the product sold. It is not just a simple lack of truth, but nothing more than a straightforward lie.

As you move forward with your account less decision, no doubt each of you has already made tremendous financial contributions to the project right out of your own pockets, or at least you will pretend you did with money that you claim to have been your own.

Perhaps, an on campus stadium will generate more money for downtown, but in your educated short-sightedness will it be new money or will is just redirect money that was previously being spent in all kinds of businesses all over town?

In closing, it was quite interesting when Mr. Frank re negotiated a nice raise in his contract, Quickly thereafter a hike in tuition rates was announced. With this same train of deceitful thought, one way or another as plans move forward with the stadium, in some form or another, stadium costs and all the excessive cost over runs that will most assuredly happen will be passed on to students in some form or another, be it announced to the public or kept hidden it will happen, and is no doubt already planned, and like with all else in higher education no one will be held accountable in your void of responsibility profession.

Let us all not forget, that despite it being overwhelmingly opposed by the majority once your cathedral of self-servitude is built, all profound problems of vastly greater importance within your very own community will of course be solved.
Teufel, Sharon

From: Arthur Thomas Linnell <at.linnell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 8:56 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Soapbox: CSU should consider Hughes site for stadium

http://www.coloradoan.com/story/opinion/contributors/2014/12/03/soapbox-csu-consider-hughes-site-stadium/19789377/
From: Arthur Thomas Linnell <at.linnell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 8:57 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Letter: CSU should not build on-campus stadium
Letter: CSU should not build on-campus stadium

I am against a new on-campus stadium at CSU:

- Esthetically this stadium does not belong on the main campus. Few architectural drawings actually show this stadium, which will be the largest building in Fort Collins, with any of the surrounding campus buildings. Could
it be because it is too big, an eyesore that is totally out of proportion with anything else on campus and in the
surrounding area. It will create the same unpleasant atmosphere as that monstrosity being built as a new hotel
complex for DIA, overpowering the original terminal design.

• How dare the university sell 160-plus acres of land upon which the Hughes stadium sits just to finance a new
stadium.

• CSU already faces limited acreage on which to build new classrooms and dormitories, so building an on-
campus stadium is ridiculous.

• With most alumni living outside the local area, where are these people going to park?

• Many students already live off campus so an on-campus stadium does not help them; just look at the full buses
and the off campus parking situation during school days.

• After a new stadium, the football team will cry it needs an overpriced training facility like the boondoggle
being built on the CU campus in Boulder.

Make the student fee designated for athletics voluntary and see how many are willing to support these
expensive athletic programs!

Without voter approval, the City Council should allocate zero dollars for any infrastructure changes that
building this stadium creates.

Robert A. Schmidt,
Fort Collins
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It’s a Game of Spiraling Costs, So a College Tosses Out Football

By BEN STRAUSS and ZACH SCHONBRUN 

Dec. 2, 2014
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University of Alabama-Birmingham students held rallies on campus this week in an effort to save the football program. Credit Jay Reeves/Associated Press

The University of Alabama-Birmingham said Tuesday that it was terminating its football program, becoming the first university in college sports’ top tier to do so in nearly 20 years and providing the most visible sign yet that athletic officials throughout the country are considering radical options in the face of mounting financial burdens.

The most prominent athletic programs have charged ahead with reforms that allow them to make their own rules on matters like whether to financially reward athletes. Everyone else — including dozens of colleges with proud athletic histories — has been left at a daunting crossroads. Those programs can try to compete with the likes of Alabama and Ohio State, no matter the cost, or retreat and possibly face athletic irrelevance.
It was this decision that prompted an internal study at Alabama-Birmingham, whose football team recently finished its regular season with a 6-6 record and is eligible to play in a bowl game for the first time since 2004. The judgment, according to a news release Tuesday from the university’s president, Dr. Ray L. Watts, was that “football is simply not sustainable.”

U.A.B. already needed to subsidize two-thirds of its $30 million athletic operating budget, and major capital improvements were seen as necessary to maintain a viable program. As a result, U.A.B. — a team from Conference USA situated in football’s hotbed, 50 miles from the campus of the No. 1 team in the nation, Alabama — has been forced to capitulate. The last college in the top subdivision of Division I to get rid of its football program was the University of the Pacific.

“The escalation of the arms race in Division I football made it hard to see that the investment in U.A.B. football over time could have enough money put into it to have a program that would be successful,” said John D. Johns, a member of the University of Alabama system’s board of trustees.

The issue of autonomy for the five major conferences appears to have spooked U.A.B., which moved to the top subdivision in 1996, as well as the University of Hawaii, which plays football in the Mountain West Conference.

But the prevailing mentality among the smaller leagues is that they must follow whatever changes the so-called Big 5 institute during the N.C.A.A. convention in January. Even with bleak financial outlooks for many of these athletic departments, a certain consensus seems to have been reached.

“We’re going to fight speed with speed,” Sean Frazier, the athletic director at Northern Illinois, said.
The cost will be steep, particularly for teams in the American Athletic, Mid-American, Mountain West and Sun Belt Conferences and Conference USA — the five football leagues not among the Big 5 in the Football Bowl Subdivision, Division I’s top tier. Many of their athletic departments require student fees to support their teams, and some people worry students will be squeezed even harder.

A Sea Change

For years, universities with fewer financial resources have tried to compete with the traditional college sports powers. The little guys, too, have built new facilities and paid their coaches higher salaries even as the financial gap has widened, thanks to bigger conferences’ signing television contracts worth billions of dollars.

Historically, though, the smaller universities were able to rein in their larger competitors to some degree, especially when it came to benefits for players. In 2011, after the N.C.A.A.’s executive committee voted to allow an annual $2,000 stipend for players, universities vetoed the rule with an override vote. They were led by programs in the smaller conferences, with many citing costs.

Three years later, it appears that they have given up fighting the sea change in collegiate athletics spurred by a union movement and lawsuits. Now, the centerpiece of the first changes from the Big 5 conferences is increasing the value of a yearly scholarship by several thousand dollars.

“Providing greater resources for our student-athletes is something we’ve neglected in the past, and it’s time to readdress the definition of the athletic scholarships,” the Sun Belt commissioner, Karl Benson, said, adding that Sun Belt colleges would maintain independence in how they implemented potential changes.

Critics contend that more athletic spending is further proof of misplaced priorities at universities that simply cannot afford it. Yet in interviews with about a dozen commissioners and administrators, nearly all said they were determined to remain competitive on the field, despite the costs.

Jon Steinbrecher, commissioner of the Mid-American Conference, said his conference would not “back down from this new challenge.” Tom Yeager, the longtime commissioner of the Colonial Athletic Association — one of two conferences to vote against the new governance plan (the Ivy League was the other) — said more expensive scholarships would simply be the new cost of doing business.

And Val Ackerman, commissioner of the Big East (a nonfootball conference), said there was almost no struggle reaching unanimity among her league’s 10 members about whether to follow the Big 5’s lead. A major reason, cited by all the commissioners, was recruiting.

“If this is what it’s going to take to make sure we have access to the kinds of players that our coaches want to coach and our schools want as part of their communities,” Ms. Ackerman said, “they’re going to do it.”

David Ridpath, a professor at Ohio University, a member of the MAC, has raised a familiar question: financing. He said colleges in his conference relied heavily on student fees to finance their athletic programs; the Big 5 conferences have expensive broadcast rights fees and their own networks.

“At the big schools, television money pays the bills,” Dr. Ridpath said. “Here, we’re talking about kids going further into debt for the football team. I’m all for benefits for athletes, but at some point these schools have to accept who they are. Ohio isn’t Ohio State, and we have to be O.K. with that.”
In a study to be published in the Journal of Sport this winter, Dr. Ridpath calculated that in 2012-13, MAC students spent on average more than $300 per semester subsidizing athletics. During a time of mounting student debt, that is nearly $2,500 over four years.

Cost of Attendance

The Big 5’s legislation centerpiece — cost of attendance, as it is called — is designed to bridge the gap between what is currently covered (tuition, books, housing) and common expenses, like travel home. The price tag varies among universities, ranging from a few thousand dollars to closer to $10,000 per athlete.

Administrators around the country said rising costs were always a concern. At Hawaii, Athletic Director Ben Jay told the board of regents this summer that the athletic department would have to find a new way to do business, which some interpreted as the end of the football team. But Mr. Jay said the program was too important to Hawaii, calling it a part of the university’s and the state’s identity.

Mr. Jay is aware of the grim financial outlook, though. He said Hawaii moved $14 million in accumulated debt from the athletic department to the university last year. He is spending an extra $350,000 this year to provide more meals to athletes after N.C.A.A. rules were relaxed.

“I recognize that students are strapped, so I don’t want to do this on their backs,” he said. “It’s my responsibility to find the money elsewhere. A lot depends on the football team winning.”
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At San Jose State, also of the Mountain West Conference, Athletic Director Gene Bleymaier presided over a more than $24 million athletic budget in 2013 that required about $17 million in subsidies, according to a USA Today database. He cited marketing, sponsorships, advertising and royalties as ways to raise revenue so students and the university would not face a greater burden.

“It comes down to fund-raising,” he said.

Mr. Bleymaier would like more help from the larger universities, although he does not expect it, he said. More revenue sharing would be beneficial, he said, but he also said that if more marquee teams were willing to play teams from other conferences on the road, those programs could generate more interest and more money.

Mr. Steinbrecher estimated MAC members would pay $500,000 to $1 million each year for cost of attendance. He said new revenue streams, including a contract extension with ESPN and payouts from the new football playoff television deal, would help pay for it, although the Big 5 conferences retain the vast majority of the playoff proceeds, worth $470 million annually.

**Other Issues Looming**

Cost of attendance may be just the beginning. The N.C.A.A. is appealing a ruling by a federal judge that declared that rules prohibiting athletes from profiting from their images were illegal. The judge suggested colleges provide athletes with trust funds worth $5,000 per year, which the Big 5 could do. At some point, they could also seek to increase the number of scholarships they are allowed to offer or loosen restrictions on athletes’ relationships with agents and advisers.

“What I am concerned about are the unknowns,” said Mr. Frazier, the athletic director at Northern Illinois, who played football at Alabama and previously worked in Wisconsin’s athletic department. “That’s what keeps me up in the middle of the night. How far are these institutions willing to go to separate themselves? I do know the capabilities they have.”

Those in other leagues will have tough decisions about where to draw the line.

“You have institutional ego involved,” Mr. Yeager, the commissioner of the Colonial Athletic Association, said. “You get to the point where you can’t let go, and then places will be getting rid of the president and A.D. for not being visionary enough. But at some point you have to figure out where to cut your losses.”

Still, Justin Craft, the leader of the B Club, a group of vocal U.A.B. football supporters, wondered about his alma mater without the sport.

“The team builds a national brand,” he said. “People around the country don’t know who U.A.B. is except that they saw them play Mississippi State on the SEC Network.”
Any subsidies the athletic department needs should be viewed as a marketing expense, he said.

While Mr. Craft simply hoped for the chance to see his alma mater’s team take the field next fall, at Northern Illinois, plans were announced in November to expand and retrofit the 49-year-old football facility, Huskie Stadium, to raise money and attract recruits.

“You’re either moving forward or moving back,” Mr. Frazier said. “As my wife would say, there’s no such thing as half-pregnant.”

**Correction: December 2, 2014**

An earlier version of this article misstated the year in which the N.C.A.A.’s executive committee voted to allow an annual $2,000 stipend for players. It was 2011, not 2012.

A version of this article appears in print on December 3, 2014, on page A1 of the New York edition with the headline: It’s a Game of Spiraling Costs, So a College Tosses Out Football. [Order Reprints](/reprints) [Today's Paper](/paper) [Subscribe](/subscribe)
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From: Arthur Thomas Linnell <at.linnell@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 8:55 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Knezovich: City election could bring major changes
Knezovich: City election could bring major changes

John Knezovich 2:54 p.m. MST December 2, 2014
The next round of city elections is just four months away, scheduled for April 7. We will elect a mayor to a two-year term, three council members from their respective districts each to serve a four-year term, and potentially vote on a number of referred items originating from the City Council or from residents.

Council will likely propose its agenda of housekeeping changes to the Charter or Code. The unknown is what citizen-initiated changes will be put forward. It’s hard to imagine what might be so earthshaking as to influence voter turnout.
The mayor’s race will be highlighted by the campaign dollars to be spent. Mayor Karen Weitkunant has served two terms and, with current term limitations, can still seek another term. However, there is no assurance that the mayor will seek a third term. The biggest feather in her cap is the formation and initial stages of build-out within the Midtown Urban Renewal District, and she presided over the opening of MAX.

The pool of potential candidates to seek the mayor’s office likely is comprised of current council members. Logic suggests that Gerry Horak, Wade Troxell and Ross Cunniff are the most likely to be interested.

Horak has an opportunity to seek election as mayor or to seek another four-year term on Council. In looking back over Horak’s past four years of service, many would conclude by his leadership actions that he has the advantage of being a real force in spite of only being mayor pro tem. The question before “Mayor” Horak is whether to seek a two-year term as mayor or re-election for a four-year term as council member, District 6?

Wade Troxell from District 4 is term-limited in his service as council member. He has been very effective during his two terms in representing the needs of the people in his district. A logical step would be to seek election as mayor.

The freebie position in this election belongs to Cunniff. He still has two years remaining on his council term. Unfortunately, his record of accomplishments is a little slim on which to run.

One has to wonder what citizen initiative will be placed on the April ballot concerning the proposal to build an on-campus football mausoleum. Will the question be based on simplicity, which will frame the idea as utter stupidity or at a minimum insensitivity to the community? Or maybe the CSU Board of Governors will make the right decision at week’s end! CSU does not need a new stadium to play its relegation to minor league football. Maybe the university is banking on philanthropist/billionaire Pat Stryker to buy Hughes Stadium as a site for a new housing development. From the community perspective, given the millions in costs that will need to be borne by the city, it’s not a win. Based upon prior agreements between the city and the state, the city has little control over on-campus activities.

Randy Fischer has now concluded his terms of representing House District 53 due to term limitations. When he was first elected to the House of Representatives, I had a high degree of trepidation because of our major differences on issues facing Fort Collins. However, over these past six years he has done an admirable job of representing his constituents and the people of Colorado. Congratulations on a job very well done!

John Knezovich is a Fort Collins certified public accountant. He has been both a council member and mayor.

Send your comments to john@kwcpallc.com.
Good afternoon, Mr. Hogler:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Hogler,Ray
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 3:20 PM
To: Teufel,Sharon
Cc: Bernasek,Alexandra
Subject: Decision to move forward with an on-campus stadium

December 2, 2014

Dear Board of Governors:

President Tony Frank announced by email on November 29 that he intends to proceed with the construction of a stadium on the campus of Colorado State University in Fort Collins. This decision does not reflect a sound strategic plan because it fails to consider the changing environment of college football and educational institutions. Consequently, you should refer the matter back to President Frank for additional analysis based on the transformations taking place in both athletics and education.

The New Game of Football

For many years, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has ruled college athletics using the concept of “student athletes.” The result of this approach was that athletes could not be paid for their participation in sports beyond a scholarship to attend the university. A number of pending lawsuits threaten the NCAA’s monopolistic stranglehold on college athletics. Antitrust suits, administrative claims for workers’ compensation and fair labor standards compliance, and collective bargaining rights are altering the terrain formerly under the exclusive control of the NCAA. The eventual result will be more money for players, and more expensive programs due to regulatory costs. Those costs must be offset by ticket sales.
A recent article in The Economist (Aug. 16, 2014), measures players’ compensation compared to revenue for the NCAA, the National Football League, and the National Basketball League. College sports programs generate over $10 billion in revenue, while the NFL’s revenue is about $9 billion and the NBA’s just over $4 billion. NBA players receive more than half of total revenue, NFL players about 40 percent, and NCAA athletes get no paid salaries. Football players at Northwestern are now defined by the National Labor Relations Board as “employees” with a protected right to form and join unions. That decision, and pending antitrust litigation, have effectively undermined the NCAA’s fictive power to unilaterally control monetary inducements in college football. Football programs are already dominated by a few key teams and conferences. If players and coaches can command ever-increasing salaries and benefits, the market for college football will eventually resemble that of the NFL where successful teams generate vast wealth for a few owners. Certainly CSU will not compete against Alabama, Florida State, Auburn, Louisiana State, and other teams where the university is merely an appendage to the football program. Spending $200 million toward a stadium is a poor investment under such conditions.

President Frank’s justification for a new stadium seems to be that the university will attract greater financial support from alumni, more nonresident students who will pay higher tuition, and increased ticket revenue. The overwhelming consensus of sports economists is that only a handful of football programs yield income over and above the costs of the program. The idea of generating more nonresident tuition is even weaker than the hope for higher ticket sales and contributions. As President Frank and his committees produce evolving explanations for the plan, he has not provided any data to support his position. If greater donor activity and higher tuition is anticipated, how much revenue will it produce relative to the growing expense of the stadium and the football program? The cost of a college education already is beyond the means of many families. In any case, CSU’s fundamental purpose is to educate Colorado citizens, and a football stadium designed to attract nonresidents seems incompatible with that objective.

**What’s Changing in Higher Education**

The strategy also suffers from a failure to anticipate broader developments in college education. The arrival of massive open online courses, or MOOCs, is already having an impact on the way college credit is delivered. As major online programs roll out, such as Coursera and others, traditional resident instruction will become less attractive than a low-cost alternative. That is, if students can enroll in distance courses at elite universities, it is unlikely they would choose to pay nonresident tuition at CSU because the institution has a football stadium on the campus. President Frank may have an answer to the threat of MOOCs, but I am not aware that MOOCs were ever discussed in the context of the stadium.

CSU already has a response to online education in the form of CSU Global. In the new competitive environment, this branch of the system will be forced to deal with the expansion of MOOCs and fashion a strategy to attract new students. As CSU-G draws off more potential students, the resident program in Fort Collins will be adversely affected by technological developments. A stadium designed for a handful of football games each season creates a sense of separation rather than a community of learning. Graduates with a predominantly online learning experience are not likely to form an attachment to the institution because it has a venue in which to play football.

**Next Steps**

Faculty and concerned citizens in Fort Collins have vigorously opposed the construction of a new stadium. Looking back on events since the announcement that a new stadium was under consideration, it appears that the decision was made early in the process and any “debate” was a sham intended to convey the appearance of reasoned discussion. At no point was there a realistic possibility to abandon the stadium plan, regardless of the arguments against it. Those arguments have been made vigorously from the beginning and President Frank has not provided a fact-based and persuasive rebuttal against them. His reasons for a new stadium are ambiguous,
ill-defined, and unrealistic. The constant stream of anti-stadium commentary published in the *Coloradoan* confirms there is a high level of hostility to this idea.

The best decision the Board could make is to refer the plan back to President Frank with instructions to provide a detailed cost-benefit assessment over the next decade beginning with this season. The assumptions should be that costs of a football program will increase between 10-15 percent annually, that enrollment at CSU will remain relatively flat, and that tuition will increase by five percent annually. Using those parameters, President Frank should be asked to demonstrate that investment in a new stadium is fiscally sound. If he can do so, then the construction of the stadium should be approved. If not, it should be rejected. There is no reason the Board needs to rush to a decision.

Thank you for your attention.

Regards,
Raymond L. Hogler
Department of Management
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1275
970.491.5221

Fulbright Distinguished Chair in Labor Law, 2007
University of Tuscia (Viterbo, Italy)
Good afternoon, Mr. Ersley:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

With the on-campus football stadium consistently failing financial benchmarks (even though these keep on being revised downward) and public opinion benchmarks, it makes no sense to remove all outside oversight and trust Tony Frank to be the sole determiner of the financial plan and financing option.

We need a completely unbiased evaluation of this proposal, not the opinion of committees hand-selected by Tony Frank to advocate for an on-campus stadium.

Eric Erslev, Emeritus Professor, Colorado State University
Good afternoon, Ms. Jachowski:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

To the Board of Governors:

In your deliberations about a CSU stadium this week, please continue to discern and use your continued wisdom to sort out the needs of CSU and how the decision greatly affects the city of Ft Collins. The concern is that no one is truly listening or open-minded, and that the on-campus stadium decision has been both pre-decided and overwhelmingly maneuvered.

In your deliberations as you listen to "new reports and recommendations" this week, please consider thoughtfully these concerns:

* The "new" reports of support for the on-campus stadium seem to be a trumped up poll to make you to think views have changed. It seems to show more support but is suspect because of the non-disclosure of poll procedures. It appears to be a hand-selected group of recipients largely in favor of the poll. No other poll has shown support above 33% for an on-campus stadium. The issue has split the community and is a divisive issue, rather than a community building one.
* Positive financial reports that repeatedly appear are widely considered to be optimistically overblown. Several more realistic reports seem to be discarded in favor of exaggerated ones.

* Think of the football program to be a balanced part of CSU educational experience. It seems to be the dream of some that CSU become known as the Crimson Tide of Colorado. Please consider balance and not stretch unrealistically into this type of dream. Money-wise, consider the imbalance of monies spent on this project and the athletic leaders salaries vs the salaries of adjunct faculty that rely on food stamps and other welfare or two jobs to make ends meet, for example.

* Use of an on-campus stadium is said to be viable for multi-use sports. With different field requirements and overlapping or concurrent sports seasons, this isn’t realistic. The argument seems to shore up the idea of use more than 6 times per year.

* An on-campus stadium site will adversely alter the campus and surrounding housing area. The proposed site will be a congested, more commercial site that doesn’t blend well with existing area and lifestyle. The proposed site will eliminate part of the agricultural arboretum and perennial gardens. Although greenhouses can be relocated, it will also disturb the flow of the gardens to add in a stadium. It is a non-compatible use of space. Please consider the negative impact of the on-campus site.

* There once was an on-campus stadium. It was wisely moved to the foothills campus because of the spacious land available and a strikingly handsome setting. Only two miles west of the existing campus, it lies along the Overland Trail corridor that can be accessed with a good transportation plan.

* The current football stadium needs work. Apparently, CSU has not budgeted for maintenance on the current stadium. It appears to have some remodel problems. Of concern is that the estimates to remodel now seem to have been exaggerated so that the costs appear almost as great as a new one. Please consider that there is distortion.

* What the majority of community and donors would support is a new facility on the foothills campus with a good transportation plan. If a new stadium building plan is chosen, consider that the site better suited is the foothills campus. In the four proposals to be presented this week, this option is not one that has been considered. Please look at it as a realistic solution that is a viable compromise. Most probably both private and public funds could be generated for this option.
As it stands, no proposal is really a great solution. If you agree, please consider a negative vote for the Tony Frank recommendation, and develop one that is more viable.

Respectfully,
Phyllis Jachowski,
Ft Collins
Good afternoon, Mr. Burnworth:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the CSU System Board of Governors regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your communication will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

---

Dear Board Members,

As a long time resident of Fort Collins, I am writing to express my opposition to Dr. Frank’s new on-campus stadium proposal.

Our system of governance over public entities is based upon: 1) representation, and 2) checks and balances. In the current situation, both are severely lacking.

This very divisive issue has been well aired here in Fort Collins, and it is clear that:

- The new stadium is not economically viable and will also put an undue strain on we the local taxpayers as well as the future students of CSU.
- The new stadium is not needed—even this very successful football season could not come close to selling-out the smaller Hughes Stadium except for two games.
- The community, by a factor of nearly 2 to 1, disapproves of the proposal as reflected in an independent and scientific survey.
Unfortunately, Dr. Frank is ignoring sound reasoning and judgment in what appears to be a single
minded desire to construct a monument to himself. The hand-picked select committees are obviously
not an accurate reflection of the community. As a result, there is an absence of true representation of
the citizens' thinking and desires in this dictatorial decision to build a new stadium.

This Board stands as a safeguard to protect the citizenry from unwise and capricious decisions.
There are no other checks and balances to protect us against university presidents who are running
amuck. However, the Board of Governors is widely perceived as being a "rubber stamp" for Dr.
Franks' personal agenda. If that is the case, then you will you grant his request and the perception
will be become the reality. But, if you are truly independent and exercise rational judgment, then you
will deny his request and provide the wisdom and representation that the citizens of Colorado deserve
and expect.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Scott Burnworth
4429 Monte Carlo Pl
Fort Collins, CO 80525
(970) 282-7945
Good afternoon, Tom:

This acknowledges receipt of the Soapbox which will be shared with the CSU System Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202
Soapbox: Proposed uses of stadium make situation worse

5:16 p.m. MST December 1, 2014

John Yule (Photo: Courtesy Photo)

You don’t have to be a rocket scientist to see the flaws in Tony Frank’s idea of a “multi-use, on-campus” stadium. He may already realize the flaws, yet still promotes the idea — perhaps because at first glance it seems to enhance the case for a new main-campus football stadium. However, some of the uses he suggests for the venue are impractical or inappropriate for the main-campus location, and are a much better fit for the present Hughes site.

In his “Charge Letter” to the recently appointed Community and Campus Leadership committees, Tony says:

“Were the only use of this facility for football games six times per year, I would see this issue differently [...] If I look at this facility as a multi-use project, ...then the risk/benefit ratio changes substantially.”

Some of his suggested ideas either compromise the proposed use — “to allow a high-quality venue for football” — or are in conflict with other established venues.

For example: The idea of using the football field for soccer would compromise both sports. Why? Because of major differences in field requirements and fan viewing, both of which should be considered. Football fields are crowned, whereas soccer fields are flat. Soccer fields are also much wider than football fields, pushing the viewing stands further from the field. Artificial turf would be the choice for football, but not for soccer. Almost no Division I fields, even new ones, are designed for multiple sports. Ten of the 11 Mountain West soccer teams (except Nevada) play on natural grass, and tout that fact. A multi-use field would be a compromise many would abhor.

Using an “on-campus” football stadium as a venue for graduations and convocations is another idea expressed by Tony. Why use an outdoor stadium instead of Moby, where staged graduations by college are currently held? Moby is enclosed; therefore, it is not subject to fickle weather changes in May and icy winter conditions in December when the ceremonies are held. Or, why hold a graduation ceremony for the entire university in the new outdoor stadium that may take all day, if CSU continues to grow as projected?

As for using the facility as a venue for “high quality meeting and entertainment space,” Tony does not acknowledge the conflicts with private and public facilities throughout the community
(eg., Fort Collins Senior Center, The Ranch Events Complex). Will CSU’s long-standing non-compete policy be honored? Will special event sound levels meet acceptable guidelines?

Last but not least, Tony references “the opportunity to add academic space at a subsidized cost.” Piggybacking academics onto the stadium? I can only imagine the cost and the compromise that would result to both the facility and the academic programs it would supposedly house! CSU’s enrollment growth comes primarily from the Global Campus; physical classroom space should only be added when needed.

I believe a “multi-use,” main-campus stadium is purely a promotional argument by Tony Frank. His multiple-use case makes even less sense when considering how the Hughes site and other existing CSU facilities (eg., the newly remodeled, $65 million Lory Student Center and the recently acquired Drake Center) could be more fully utilized to realize the same or enhanced objectives.

The disruptions to campus and community life that would result from a “multi-use” main-campus stadium are unacceptable.

John Yule lives in Fort Collins
Morning, Louis. I am in receipt of your materials and have skimmed all of the slides. I'll review them in more detail prior to the meeting. Thanks for your continued input - tony

Anthony A. Frank  
President, Colorado State University

> On Nov 28, 2014, at 10:25 AM, "Louis Scharf" <Louis.Scharf@ColoState.edu> wrote:
> > Members of the BOG and President Frank:
> > You will remember that I have previously sent you two comprehensive Power Point analyses of the Main Campus Stadium. I believe they were included as Correspondence or Appendix materials in your previous meeting books.
> > I am asking you to indulge me once again, as I adapt my analysis to the adjustments you made in October 2014 to your deliberations over the proposed main campus stadium.
> > May I respectfully ask you to review the enclosed Power Point materials in advance of your Dec 5, 2014 meeting of the BOG in Denver? As before, I would be pleased to meet with you individually or collectively to clarify my analysis.
> > Kindly acknowledge that this email and its attachment will be sent in their entirety to each member of the BOG. Thank you in advance for your consideration.
> > Sincerely,
> > Louis Scharf  
> Research Professor of Mathematics, and Emeritus Professor of 
> Electrical and Computer Engineering <Stadium_Nov_2014.pdf>
Good evening, Mr. Scharf:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence and the attachment will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Louis Scharf [mailto:Louis.Scharf@ColoState.edu]
Sent: Friday, November 28, 2014 10:25 AM
To: CSUS Board; Frank,Tony; Louis Scharf
Subject: Stadium Issues

Members of the BOG and President Frank:

You will remember that I have previously sent you two comprehensive Power Point analyses of the Main Campus Stadium. I believe they were included as Correspondence or Appendix materials in your previous meeting books.

I am asking you to indulge me once again, as I adapt my analysis to the adjustments you made in October 2014 to your deliberations over the proposed main campus stadium.

May I respectfully ask you to review the enclosed Power Point materials in advance of your Dec 5, 2014 meeting of the BOG in Denver? As before, I would be pleased to meet with you individually or collectively to clarify my analysis.

Kindly acknowledge that this email and its attachment will be sent in their entirety to each member of the BOG. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Louis Scharf
Research Professor of Mathematics, and
Emeritus Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Main Campus Stadium Concerns: A November 2014 Update

Louis Scharf

Research Prof of Mathematics
Prof Emeritus of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Colorado State University
42 Year Resident of Fort Collins
scharf@engr.colostate.edu

November 28, 2014

It is I Again

These materials are adapted and updated from materials I have sent to the BOG and President Frank during the past 18 months. You can find those materials in the Appendices of your previously-received meeting books.

Similar materials have been used in presentations to a great number of individuals and groups in Fort Collins.

Our previous work on budget calculations has been validated by a financial analyst, engaged by the President to check my work, and his own Budget Office. It checked out. I take this validation to suggest that my Money and Banking work in this document will stand scrutiny.
It is I Again, contd

I am hoping that as you cast your votes on December 5, 2014, you will ask yourselves what you find compelling about the proposed main campus stadium, and what you have rejected in the arguments against it.

Would you kindly persuade us that President Frank’s assurances to leave tuition, fees, taxes, and state appropriations untouched have been honored?

Would you share your thinking about the centrality of football to campus-centric higher education for the next 50 years, the period of time the President has identified as a period of tradition-building around a main campus stadium?

I think I speak for a majority of parents and taxpayers when I say we will be uncomfortable with a decision based on a belief in models of reality that are not supported by intellectual or empirical reasoning.

Claim of Benefit # 1: An on-campus stadium will bring CSU academics (teaching, research, performance, and extension) the national stature it deserves, elevating CSU to top-of-mind status.

- Where is the evidence for this claim? A large fraction of the faculty who have made CSU’s reputation reject this claim.

- The top of mind status brought by the September 28-29, 2013, front-page article in the Wall Street Journal, A College Bets on a Stadium to Fill Its Coffers, is certainly not the status we seek.

- The 134 comments to this WSJ article were overwhelmingly critical and dismissive, suggesting in the main that it was quality academics at an affordable cost that matters. Not new stadiums and a doubling down on Big-Time College Sports.
Claim of Benefit # 2: Help to attract 5,000 new out-of-state students, and protect CSU against declining state appropriations

- The Provost told Faculty Council in Spring 2014 that the distribution for 8000 new students was to be this: 3000 new in-state, 2500 new foreign, and 2500 new domestic. (It is generally agreed that foreign students, who are in the main graduate students, do not qualify as out of state students attracted by football.) So the target is actually 2500 out-of-state students, not 5000, a target that should be addressed with imaginative thinking based on our academic assets.

- President Frank says in the Sept 28-29, 2013, Wall Street Journal that part of him remains skeptical that a new stadium can translate directly into an enrollment boom.

Claim of Benefit # 2, contd

Sports economist Andrew Zimbalist has noted in his writing that students attracted to a campus by its football stadium are typically not the students who elevate the academic standing of a university. This complicates the strategy of recruiting out-of-state students with a new stadium, when it is agreed that not a single out-of-state student can be admitted with an academic record inferior to the record of any Colorado student who is denied admission.

Moreover, it seems quite clear that a large fraction of future university students will turn to the Internet and Junior Colleges to meet their early undergraduate course requirements. This will impact the draw of football for 18- and 19-year old Freshmen and Sophomores.

Does any of us believe that in the 50 year horizon of tradition mentioned by the President, big-time college football will be central to the university experience? Is it central now?
There has been a lot written about declining State support for Higher Education, due to pressure from Medicaid, K-12 education, and Prisons. Some have used a report from DU to predict a future where Colorado reduces its support for Higher Ed to zero. It has been reported elsewhere that State support for resident instruction at CSU has declined from $129 M in 2008 to $90 M in 2012, and that this $90 M amounts to just 10% of CSU’s operating budget.

But I read things differently:

- Resident instruction amounts to just 1/3 of CSU’s budget, so State support is really 30% of resident instruction, and last year support increased slightly.

- What State is going to announce to Corporate America, and the men and women who build it and maintain it, that they will no longer support Higher Ed? This does not seem to be a competitive strategy.

- The DU report actually outlines sensible budgeting restraints and taxing policies that will in fact bring expenses for Medicaid, K-12, Prisons, and Higher Ed into balance with tax revenues.

- In fact, in FY 2014, CSU saw a $12 M increase in State Appropriations.
Claim of Benefit #3: This stadium will bring the community together.

Surveys by the Associated Students at CSU (ASCSU) and by the Center for Public Deliberation (CPD)\(^1\), letters to the editor, public meetings, 10,000 petitions in opposition to the main campus stadium, and the two recently concluded polls by the Coloradoan and by SOSH showing two-to-one opposition to the main campus stadium do not support this claim.

\(^1\)Center for Public Deliberation, www.cpd.colostate.edu

Claim of Benefit #4: A main campus stadium will be good for business

There is anecdotal evidence for and against a positive economic impact, but little analytical evidence to support the contention that a main campus stadium would have a positive effect on Ft. Collins commerce. Claims of benefit are almost always over-stated. There are legitimate concerns:

- Increased ticket prices, parking fees, tailgating fees, and food and beverage tabs may cut into disposable entertainment budgets outside the stadium.
- Traditional weekend shoppers may avoid downtown and mid-town on game days to avoid the crush of fans and their cars.
- The use of stadium facilities for meetings and conventions may undercut the renting of off-campus facilities.
Claim of Benefit #4, contd

Let's put a finer point on the question of economic benefit: independent work on the economic impact of stadiums and arenas finds no statistically significant positive correlation between sports facilities and economic development.

There is more to be found in the extant literature on the economic impact of sports teams and facilities.

Pres. Frank's Assurances

These are President Frank's four hard constraints on the main campus stadium project [The Coloradoan, Feb 24, 2012]:

- CSU won't consider putting the stadium on existing open green spaces, including the intramural fields.

- CSU won't consider putting the stadium in front of significant existing view sheds, so as to protect views of the mountains.

- All recommendations from the advisory committee must take into serious account any impact on neighbors in areas adjacent to or near a new stadium.

- State appropriations, tuition, fees, or taxes will not be considered as funding sources for a stadium project.
Pres. Frank’s Assurances # 1 and #2

"CSU won’t ... [put] the stadium on existing open green spaces, ... [and it won’t put] the stadium in front of significant existing view sheds, so as to protect views of the mountains.”

- The footprint of this on-campus stadium is approximately 12 acres, which compares with the 9 acre footprint of the Oval. The originally-conceived stadium rises to 125 feet on its mountain side, much higher than any of the elm trees on the oval, and it occludes a mountain view. Perhaps the staged stadium will have a lower profile, but we do not know what the final staging will produce.

- This project cedes to the Athletics Department 12 – 15 acres of prime academic real estate on campus, when they already have 160 acres of prime entertainment real estate in the Foothills.

- This trade of academic space for entertainment space on the Main Campus introduces economic and social risks that do not exist for Hughes.

In the 1970’s, Vet Med moved off campus, leaving behind a main campus building that now houses Chemical Engineering and Engineering Network Services. Atmospheric Sciences and the Engineering Research Center reside in the Foothills. In the 1960’s, Morgan Library re-located, leaving its home on the Oval to the Music School, which in the 2000’s moved off campus to the Old Fort Collins High School, leaving its building to organizations for learning enhancement. In the late 1960’s, a facility that had served a variety of academic purposes became the home for Statistics and the Dean of Natural Sciences. And so it goes. Academic buildings house a variety of functions during their lifetimes, as they are re-purposed to new realities in higher education.

A main campus stadium is an athletics facility that may be used from time to time to hold events like graduations and convocations, but it is a single purpose facility that cannot be re-purposed. It will never migrate to a different department, to meet a new or more pressing need. Is it suitable for siting on a university campus where space is scarce, and nimble planning for future eventualities is required?
Pres. Frank’s Assurance # 3

“All recommendations from the advisory committee must take into serious account any impact on neighbors in areas adjacent to or near a new stadium.”

Certainly neighbors do not think CSU is addressing their concerns, and CSU’s quiet phase has brought no confidence that it will. Parking, noise, safety, and property values remain unresolved concerns.

Negative externalities of the main campus stadium remain unquantized.

Pres. Frank’s Assurance # 4: Tuition, fees, state appropriations, and taxes

“State appropriations, tuition, fees, or taxes will not be considered as funding sources for a stadium project.”

- These are precisely the sources that seed the General Fund at CSU and taxes are what seed the City, County, and State Treasuries. The issuance of a bond to finance a main campus stadium brings these sources into consideration.

- Pres. Frank’s admission to the public, and to the BOG on Oct 4, 2012, that the General Fund would be used to make interest and principal payments on issued bonds if the monetized stadium does not produce its projected income, violates this assurance. Quoting from the President at that meeting, “If one dime of public money ... we will have failed.”

- There is troubling evidence that this assurance has been re-worked to “minimize risk to the General Fund.”
Pres. Frank's Assurance # 4: Tuition, fees, state appropriations, and taxes, contd

When the President was presented with the AD's proposal to build a $100M main campus stadium, using private donations, this assurance must have seemed innocuous. But as the price tag escalated to $246M, the assurance became a binding constraint. Even in the new staging of the stadium, the constraint is binding, as I will demonstrate in sections on Money and Banking.

None of the many committees that have reported out their findings has operated within the binding constraints of this assurance. They have not prefaced their findings with a statement that they have adhered to the constraint.

The Various Committees

There was no symmetry to the recently proposed four alternatives.

- If a staged main campus stadium was an option, why was not a staged Hughes an option? If a private-public partnership for a main campus stadium was an option, why was not a private-public partnership for Hughes an option? One could imagine a long-term lease to a private consortium, which would build a stadium and build out a net-zero activity and all-sports complex on the Hughes site, for all in Fort Collins to enjoy. Compare this idea with the narrow thinking of a main campus football stadium.
- It is hard to escape the conclusion that committees were hand-picked to return the finding they were expected to find, and in the bargain taking license to ignore the President's constraints.
- How much credence does the President give to each of the reports he has received?
Here is what a bait and switch strategy looks like.

What began as a $100M stadium, built entirely with private donations, has become who knows what? We were baited with a $100M stadium, hooked at $246M, released into the wild when private donations failed to materialize, and then re-hooked with a staged stadium at something on the order of $200M. This is unsportsmanlike.²

None of these revised numbers will likely stand up, after costs of mitigation, infrastructure improvements, and so on are accounted.

²At the May 30, 2012 meeting of the Stadium Advisory Committee (SAC), the AD explained the difference between $100M and $246M by saying, “That one’s on me.”

Using the conservative number of $200M for a staged stadium, in 30 years CSU will be looking for another $120 M to pay for deferred maintenance on the stadium, at the rate of 2% per year. If the staged stadium continues to grow in size and cost, this number will go higher. In 50 years it will exceed $200M.

It has been suggested that CSU has no requirement to build a sinking fund on its facilities. However, the President’s own Vice President for University Operations said in an exchange with Diane Jones at the May 30, 2012 SAC meeting that 2% per year is CSU’s target. (Watch the videotape.) Moreover, in the Coloradoan of November 26, 2014, President Frank is said to say that, “... he is confident a new stadium will bring in enough revenue to cover the cost of its maintenance and use as well as debt payments on the project.” Evidently he now acknowledges that a sinking fund for deferred maintenance is required to protect students, parents, and taxpayers from future pay-outs for the main campus stadium.
Let's use the SAC's methodology of assigning one set of income sources to bond payments and another set of sources to expenses. Assume donations come in at $75M, less than half of what even a staged and down-sized $200M stadium will cost. Let's not quibble over, nor discount for NPV, the value of pledges as opposed to checks written.

- Principal and interest payments of $7.5M at 4.24% APR, on a bonded indebtedness of $125M will be made from two sources:
  - $2.0M in corporate naming and sponsorship (down-graded from the original estimate of $3.5M to account for down-sizing, staging, and the damaged reputation of the publicly-opposed stadium), and
  - $2.86M (down graded by a factor 30/42 to account for re-sizing from 42,500 seats to 30,000 seats) from premium seating, event income, and a facilities development fee. This leaves a deficit of $2.64M per year.
- If you don't like the down-graded naming rights, add $1.5M back into the income stream, to reduce the deficit to $1.14M per year. But do you really believe the stadium will deliver $3.5M per year in naming rights?
Operating expenses, continuing maintenance, and deferred maintenance will be covered by ticket sales and miscellaneous income.

- Using the factor of 30/42 on the original SAC estimates, expenses of $2M per year will be met from ticket sales and miscellaneous revenue of $3.75M, but this apparent net of $1.75M per year is offset by the $4M per year payment into a sinking fund. The net is a loss of $2.25M per year.
- The net net loss from debt payments and expenses is $4.89M per year.
- And finally, if the current net of $3.65M (now likely much higher with increased attendance) from Hughes is compared to the main campus stadium, then the net net loss is $8.54M per year. Now, admittedly, a renovated Hughes would incur its own expenses for a sinking fund, but who among you believes Hughes has been given a fair hearing?

Maybe only $100M will be borrowed, in which case debt payments would be reduced to $6M per year. The net net loss would then be $3.49M per year. The fact would remain:

To commit to a main campus stadium is to commit to a future of massive outlays for its debt, maintenance, and management.

And there are many modes of failure, with only one fail-safe mode: tuition, fees, taxes, and State appropriations.
Money and Banking, contd

We have used the SAC’s own attendance numbers, re-scaled to account for down-sizing. However we do make two points.

Attendance numbers will have to be achieved with much higher donor levels and ticket prices, in a stadium smaller than Hughes.

In the SAC’s survey, only one class of ticket holder indicated they would attend fewer games at a main-campus stadium than they currently attend at Hughes: non-donor season ticket holders, indicating what we already knew. This will be a stadium for donors.

The Risk Environment for a Major Reinvestment in College Football

In his December, 2011 essay from the Office of the President, "Athletics-Why and at What Cost?", President Frank offered his arguments to “… invest modestly in our athletics programs without such investments being at the expense of growth in academic funding.”

Modest, indeed. This modest investment in athletics has produced a head football coach whose salary exceeds the combined salaries of the 10 most outstanding STEM professors on campus. He makes more money than the University President, for heaven’s sake. It has produced athletic administrators and football coaches who, individually, make more money than any Dean on campus, and more than the highest paid professor on campus. The investment has increased the athletics budget from about $24M to about $36M, on its way to the $50M projected by the recently-terminated AD. It does no good to claim that a fraction of the General Fund subsidy of $14M to athletics, on its way to $20M, is re-claimed by collecting tuition from athletics. That tuition money was given to them in their subsidy.
The Risk Environment for a Major Reinvestment in College Football, contd

Big-time College Football bears all the earmarks of a bubble: irrational exuberance, inflated value of asset, miscalculated or ignored risk (pay for play to college football players, and escalating insurance costs for brain and spine injuries, during and after college years), a failure to anticipate liability (concussions and CTE), lack of transparency and accountability ("We are in our quiet phase.").

And, as in the case of all such bubbles, taxpayers will be the lender of last resort.

An increased commitment to Big-Time College Football turns the attention of the University President to oversight of football, and detracts from his oversight of academics. To commit to a major re-investment in football is to constrain the pool of future presidential candidates to those who are committed to big-time football.

The Risk Environment for a Major Reinvestment in College Football, contd

- The NCAA and College football is facing a range of legal challenges to its arbitrary definition of amateurs, who now demand pay for play, the right to benefit from their status, and compensation for use of their images (cf. the O'Bannon class action suit).

- The transition of Olympic Games from amateur to professional, over the lifelong advocacy of Avery Brundage for an amateur Olympics, is a probable precedent for amateur college football. Major publications are foretelling an annual stipend of $2200 to supplement the current scholarship for all D-1 athletes. Some estimates are far higher. The Big-5 conferences are already all-in.

- Participation in youth and high school football has declined. At some point, Mothers will take their cue from Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and revolutionize our thinking about football and its consequences for the health and safety of their sons.
The Risk Environment for a Major Reinvestment in College Football, contd

- Football staffs are exploding, well past the NCAA limit of 9 coaches to staffs of as many as 24 coaches and non-coaches (wink, wink) in the case of Alabama; coaching salaries and buy-outs exceed all reasonable bounds; in 34 states the highest paid public official is a football coach and in 11 others it is a basketball coach.

- General university funds and student fees continue to bail out athletic budgets, to the tune of over $10 M per year (an average); at CSU the bail out is $14 M per year, and likely to increase as the athletics budget grows from its current $24 M to the AD’s projected $50 M.

- CSU commands a small television demographic, suggesting the scheduling of Thursday night games for B-grade coverage, dramatically impacting the flow of academic events during the week, a problem not posed by Hughes.

Perhaps CSU will be invited into the Big-12 to join Texas, Texas Tech, TCU, Baylor, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State, Kansas State, West Virginia, Kansas, and Iowa State.

Then the fun really begins. In 2013 the athletics budget at Texas was $153M.
The Risk Environment for a Major Reinvestment in College Football, contd

It is unlikely the NCAA will carry insurance to indemnify universities against lawsuits for brain, spine, and other injuries; universities will be required to carry increasingly expensive insurance policies to cover acute and chronic injuries.

The recently (and provisionally) settled suit for $786 M against the NFL has put the NCAA in a vulnerable position related to how they have handled head injuries and risk education for their student-athletes. A suit against the NCAA and/or specific universities will put all universities with football teams on notice for making significant and costly changes. Apart from such lawsuits, parents may force universities to take their in loco parentis responsibilities more seriously when it comes to safety in football and other sports. Repetitive head trauma is unavoidable without major alterations to the game, alterations with potential impact on the attractiveness of the game.

And finally, where is the risk assessment for Big-Time College Football in the Internet Age of Massive Open Online Courses. It does not take too much imagination to foretell an Age of Mix and Match Higher Education in which a far fewer number of 18- and 19-year old undergraduates take residency at a university campus and attend football games six or seven times per year. It would not be a bad bet to bet that a 50 year horizon for a new football stadium is a bad bet.

Let's address our problems head-on, not obliquely, using social media and alumnae networks to attract committed students to CSU for the quality of its academic offerings.

3In 2011, 32% of college students were taking at least one online course, and 14% of all higher education enrollments were for fully online degrees. We see no technology or educational psychology impediments to the further increase in these numbers, leading to a mix-and-match environment wherein college students divide their studies and loyalties among a number of campus-centric and online universities.
Surveys, petitions (10,000 signatures), public comments, letters to the editor, and the two polls recently concluded by the Coloradoan and by SOSH indicate that the on-campus stadium is undesirable. By consensus, faculty, staff, and students don’t want it. Citizens don’t want it. Neighbors don’t want it.

- Email polling by CPD, and posted on the SAC website shows that by a 2 to 1 margin, faculty and staff oppose the on campus stadium.

- An ASCSU student survey reported in the Collegian indicates 2 to 1 student opposition.
  - would increase visits to campus, as alums (No, 67%).
  - would increase their pride in CSU (No, 67%).
  - would approve of the project, if privately funded (No, 67%).

- Students. This is not a stadium for students. Student priorities are academics and career opportunities, increased financial aid, and intramural sports. Sixty-seven percent find world-class athletics to be unimportant. [Jan 2012 ASCSU Task Force Survey].

- Parents. This is not a stadium for parents. Seventy-two percent say Division I sports, “… (has) too much influence over college life.” And 40% say they would actually discourage their child from choosing a Division I institution that “… places a strong emphasis on sports.” [2011 Widmeyer Communications Survey].

- Alumni Giving. “… if the net overall effect of athletic success on alumni giving is positive, it must be small… ” [Robert Frank, Knight Commission on Athletics: Challenging the Myth, 2004].
Public and Campus Concerns, contd

- **General Fund.** In any given year, not more than 1/5 of 125 Division I athletics programs in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) balance their budget. And of the ones who do, the average stadium size is approximately 80,000 and the average athletics budget is approximately $80,000,000.

- **Academics.** There is no measurable impact of successful football programs on quality of admitted or entering students. [Toma and Cross, University of Michigan].

- **Neighbors.** Attempts to measure and mitigate the impact of a main campus stadium on the health, safety, quality of life, and property values of neighbors are unconvincing. What is the real cost and risk to the City and University of managing traffic and security on game days, on campus and in the congested Shields/Prospect neighborhood?
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 3:11 PM
To: Judith Smith
Subject: RE: Against on-campus stadium plan

Good afternoon, Ms. Smith:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Judith Smith [mailto:grandmajudy4102@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 02, 2014 9:50 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Against on-campus stadium plan

I fervently hope that you will veto the plan for an on-campus stadium.

1. Hughes is in an ideal and beautiful setting with plenty of parking space for tailgaters.
2. The campus is already too crowded with buildings and not enough space for parking.
3. Access to an on-campus stadium would create traffic havoc on surrounding streets.
4. Students should not have a problem with hiking to Hughes - or using shuttle buses.
5. Students are here for 4 to 6 years; most citizens of Fort Collins, who would be most impacted, are here for the long term.
6. The proposed plans for an on-campus stadium far exceed what has been "pledged" thus far.
7. Residents of the surrounding areas should not be harassed by the kind of traffic which would occur.
8. As a 51-year resident of Fort Collins, holder of 2 advanced degrees from CSU, I strongly object to an on-campus stadium.

Please listen to people who will have to endure the inconveniences for the longest time and veto an on-campus stadium.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith A. Smith
1818 Enfield Street
Fort Collins, CO 80526
Good afternoon, Ms. Stonaker:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

To the board of CSU:

I have listened to much of the evidence given for both sides of this debate. It does not make sense on so many levels.

1) People who have done this actually done this have testified that it doesn't accomplish the goals claimed by the Franks camp.

2) People who study and evaluate the economics of stadiums such as the one proposed have put forth evidence against such stadiums. Interesting (and embarrassing) that a university that prides itself on research is not giving it any weight.

3) Why not draw new students by improving and advertising our academic excellence? Isn't that what great universities are about. I would definitely want to send my child to Harvard or Yale but I can't even remember if they have a football team.

4) I understand that only 60% of the student body and faculty support the stadium. Students who support football be quite blind in their loyalty. Support given for Jerry Sandusky in the Penn State scandal is a case in point. Do you think they understood all the ramifications of their actions?

5) From a purely personal and esthetic point of view I love the stadium set up against the hills. I love all the new trees and I know other more structural improvements that have been made. Add to the base you have.

6) Traffic snarls? I will not go anywhere near the downtown area on game days!

7) Needless to say we will no longer be donating. We have been a CSU family since the 1940's. My father-in-law was even Dean of Ag.

Gosh, I could go on and on. I already have but I do hope you will take my comments to heart. I think on
Frank’s side money is doing the talking and when that happens reason goes out the window. Look at our sad political situation today.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully, Mary Stonaker
From: Wardle, Tom  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 6:51 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: RE: Please reject Dr. Frank's request to build an on-campus stadium in Fort Collins

Good evening and thanks for the reply. Tom

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:17 PM  
To: Wardle, Tom  
Subject: RE: Please reject Dr. Frank's request to build an on-campus stadium in Fort Collins

Good evening, Mr. Wardle:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

From: Wardle, Tom  
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 6:48 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: Please reject Dr. Frank's request to build an on-campus stadium in Fort Collins

Dear Board Members: I write asking you to reject Dr. Frank's request to build a football venue on the main campus of CSU Fort Collins.

I am a proud CSU graduate (Forest Management, 1967) and I have worked for CSU on 2 occasions (the Colorado State Forest Service Chatfield Dam Vegetation Management Project from 1971 to 1976, and the State Forest Service as Assistant State Forester from 2001 through 2011) and I know Dr. Frank personally and have the greatest respect for him as a man and as an administrator.

Nevertheless, I am convinced that the costs, and damage (not impact but actual damage) to the campus, will far exceed the numbers and impacts currently being discussed.

Please end this multi-year but clearly and obviously inevitable process. It will harm CSU and football is not worth it.

Thank you for listening.

Tom Wardle

PS - Please take the time to look up today's story about Ohio State football player Kosta Karangeorge. It is worth thinking about prior to the decision.
Teufel, Sharon

From: Cummings, Margaret
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:25 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: RE: NO NEW STADIUM!!

Dear Sharon Teufel,

Thank you for your reply.

I hope you have a good evening, too.

Best,

Maggie

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:23 PM
To: Cummings, Margaret
Subject: RE: NO NEW STADIUM!!

Good evening, Ms. Cummings:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Cummings, Margaret
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 1:41 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: NO NEW STADIUM!!

Dear Board of Regents,

I am a resident of Fort Collins, alum of Colorado State University, and employee of Colorado State University, as well. I strongly oppose the construction of an on-campus stadium.

Please seriously consider the severe and adverse implications of an on-campus stadium at Colorado State University.

I urge you to take notice of the particulars outlined in the following documents:
• The cost to the Plant Environmental Research Center (PERC):

• Also, the costs to the community:

• The consequences of declining monetary support, attendance, and interest:
  http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304795804579097223907738780.html?mod=WSJ_hpp_LEFTTopStories
  University of Massachusetts bets big on football program despite poor attendance

• And the relevance and health and legal implications to the players themselves:
  http://kxan.com/2014/10/28/former-longhorn-sues-ncaa-over-head-injuries/

Again, I strongly oppose the construction of an on-campus stadium, and recommend repairing and maintaining the existing Hughes Stadium facility, instead.
Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Margaret E. Cummings
970-988-3591
Fort Collins, CO 80521

Campus Delivery 1019
Fort Collins CO 80523-1019
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:24 PM
To: Jaime Jacob
Subject: RE: New stadium

Good evening,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Jaime Jacob [mailto:jagr2627@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 3:13 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: New stadium

Dear CSU Board of Governors,

As a CSU alumna and a financial supporter of our fine institution, I ask you to please NOT vote for a new stadium. One of the best things about the CSU campus is open space and I would hate to see any more of it disappear. Also, I really enjoy going out to Hughes Stadium for the games.

Thank you,
Jaime Jacob
Good evening, Ms. Murphy:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80220

-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Murphy [mailto:klavian@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 1:14 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Stadium

Dear Board of Governors,

I am writing to please urge you to not move ahead with a new on-campus stadium. A giant monstrous stadium in the middle of town is going to be an eyesore, create major traffic issues (traffic is already heavy on college), and cause light and noise pollution for the surrounding neighborhoods. Besides all that the sheer costs are outrageous. It would be a much greater benefit to the students if such funds could be raised to lower tuition.

Thank you,

Karen Murphy
Fort Collins resident
From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:22 PM
To: Stonak9
Subject: RE: No on New Stadium

Good evening, Mr. Stonaker:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Stonak9 [mailto:stonak9@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 11:15 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No on New Stadium

I respectfully ask that the Board of Governors consider the option of maintaining Colorado State University’s Hughes Stadium and reject the proposal of building a new stadium on campus.

As a resident of Fort Collins, and as a former student of Colorado State University, I am strongly opposed to President Frank’s plan for the following reasons:

1) It is not supported by the majority of residents of Fort Collins, nor by the majority of faculty and staff.

2) Although Mr. Frank is using this as a potential revenue source for the University, there is little evidence that building a new stadium would be a revenue producer.

3) The University will in fact be supporting the maintenance of two stadiums at huge costs.

4) Construction of such a large structure on top of the current University footprint is unfeasible when you consider the usage (every other week for one game during the football season).

5) Overemphasis of athletics vice academics. Why can’t we attract money and students via CSU’s academic and research excellence?

6) We may be building for the past instead of the future, as football and other athletic competitions are viewed through media rather than in person. Is football going to remain America’s favorite sport? It seems very speculative.

7) As a “Green University” I would think that discarding the huge Hughes stadium and building a new one from scratch would be a poor decision. Considering the huge amount of carbon expended in building with concrete and asphalt, what are we doing to reduce global warming? Perhaps Mr. Frank has an answer, but he and his developer friends aren’t telling us.
Respectfully,

Clyde H. Stonaker
970-472-0509
Good evening, Mr. Grauberger:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding support for the proposed on-campus stadium. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Brian Grauberger [mailto:bgrauberger@thegroupinc.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 9:48 AM
To: Frank, Tony; CSUS Board
Subject: Support for On-Campus Stadium

Dear Dr. Frank and CSU Board of Governors,

I would personally like to thank Dr. Frank and the CSU Board of Governors for your vision and commitment to Colorado State University. Nearly 50 years ago the decision was made to build the University’s football stadium roughly 3 miles west of Campus. While Hughes stadium has provided CSU and its fans a venue for watching CSU Football, this stadium has fallen far short of providing a venue that encourages fans and alumni to visit and promote CSU’s main campus. The decision to move forward with the building of an on-campus stadium tells the alumni, fans, and the Nation that CSU is serious about striving to excellence in everything that we do. I can’t tell you how excited I am to have the opportunity to bring my family and friends to Campus, roughly 6 times a year, to cheer on my beloved Rams. I also look forward to many other events at the new on-campus stadium, such as soccer, lacrosse, graduations, concerts, etc...

I honestly believe this is one of the more important decisions regarding the University and its alumni and support base in quite some time. Regardless of whether it is right or wrong, college athletics serve as a life-line to the alumni and the community. The on-campus stadium would serve as a gathering place to support CSU, as well as our wonderful Northern Colorado lifestyle. The current stadium is out of site, and therefore, out of mind for most non-football fanatics. Driving down College Avenue, even on a game day, one may never know that a CSU game is taking place. I have four children, and in the past, with the exception of CSU Basketball games (which are usually at night – on the corner of the Campus), there is very little reason for my kids to experience the beautiful campus which now exists. I recently took my two daughter’s to a CSU Women’s Soccer game against Iowa (on-campus), and the environment was amazing. Young kids everywhere, enjoying watching Division 1 Athletics on a beautiful campus, and at the same time, falling in love with CSU. THIS SHOULD HAPPEN WITH FOOTBALL EVERY FALL! I can imagine a beautiful fall day, with alumni showing their kids and friends where they studied, met their spouse, and experienced those amazing years as a college student. I can also imagine the areas around the on-campus stadium being developed by the different Colleges within the University. Perhaps one section could be dedicated to Forestry, and another to Horticulture, etc... (bring part of the flower gardens from the Performing Arts area over to campus – this would be amazing!)
If CSU truly is a university that strives for excellence in everything we do, we have no choice – we must build this on-campus stadium, and do it in a first class manner. I have been a Ram Club Member and season ticket holder for over 20 years. Colorado State University is one of the best public universities in America. The projections of both Northern Colorado and CSU are for unprecedented growth. CSU deserves to be thought of as a major Division 1 Athletic institution. Whether this is right or wrong, athletics are my connection to CSU. I took one of my kids to the CSU vs. Alabama game. While the tradition at Alabama would be difficult for any school to duplicate, an on-campus stadium at CSU, with its proximity to Old Town and MAX (the new mass transit system in Fort Collins), could be world class, and I would argue an overall better venue than at Alabama. I was a freshman at CSU exactly 30 years ago. During my first week on campus my buddies and I questioned why the stadium wasn’t build on campus. My oldest son has started studying at CSU this Fall, and I have three more kids that will be heading off to college in the coming years. I really hope they can enjoy all the benefits that an on-campus stadium provides.

As you can see from my name and business affiliation below, I am a real estate broker in Fort Collins. Over the past 20 years I have helped hundreds, if not thousands of people move into the Fort Collins area. Many of these people have come from schools with major athletic programs. I would say most of these people have tried to adopt CSU as their “local team,” but once they have seen the lack of commitment, they decide to spend their money and time elsewhere. Please remember, our front porch is only as prominent as we make it!

Thank you for your time and commitment to Colorado State University!

Brian Grauberger
Broker Associate/Partner
The Group, Inc. Real Estate
Cell: 970-690-9746
Office: 970-229-9700
Web: www.brianinfortcollins.com
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:19 PM
To: Ryan Brown
Subject: RE: New Stadium = stupidity

Good evening, Mr. Brown:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Ryan Brown [mailto:ribrown@alumni.colostate.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 2:10 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: New Stadium = stupidity

Howdy,
I grew up in Fort Collins since I was about 8 years old, and have seen my home town go through many changes. Some for the better, many, in my opinion, for the worse. That is to be expected when it comes to growth and development of a town. Especially in such a beautiful place as Colorado.
I went to University at Colorado State and received my bachelors in Natural Resource Management and Forestry in 2009. Where I cherish my degree, I have to say. I would certainly consider disowning my alma matter if this in town stadium is to be finalized. Especially if it is to include the destruction of the PERC arboretum off Lake Street. Not only will you be destroying one of the most spectacularly beautiful places on campus. But the destruction of so many decades of research, blood, sweat and tears that were put into it. I had the pleasure of working there for the majority of my college career.
I am saddened to think the dollar sign means more to a research oriented university's football team (which I support athletics, but not over education quality) over education. Where is your catch Colorado State? Are you actually putting the proper amount of thought into how this will impact Old Town? Have you considered the pre and post game traffic? Or the mess from Tailgating? Or how about the massive influx of intoxicated students after a match?
I do recognize the desire for a new stadium as Hugh's is old, and I can remember going to games as long ago as 1992, and can assure you. A new stadium is far less than a bandaide to fix a 'problem' when it comes to a athletic program.
I believe you are being swayed far too heavily by the dollar sign to truly see the magnitude of the negative impact on putting a new stadium on campus or in the middle of town would have.
For the first time ever, I will be ashamed of my alma matter if this stadium proposition goes through.

Please reconsider the new stadium. And if you must, put it in a similar spot as Hugh's

Thanks
Good evening, Mr. Wangsvick:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System and the attached letter of response regarding the CSU stadium issue which will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Carl Wangsvick [mailto:cwangsvi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 4:02 PM
To: Teufel, Sharon; Joe Garcia
Cc: chancellor@colostate.edu
Subject: Dr. Frank’s Nov. 29 Memo

Folks,

A letter of response is attached. Governor Hickenlooper will receive his copy by direct contact.

Thanks!

Carl Wangsvick
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2014

To: The Board of Governors, CSUS

From: Carl Wangsvick, former member of the Community Design Development Advisory Committee

Subject: Stadium Recommendations

Copy: Governor John Hickenlooper, Lt. Governor Joe Garcia, Chancellor Mike Martin

Dear Folks,

In response to Dr. Frank's Memo of November 29, 2014, I would like to reply to a few points.

1. The Stadium Advisory Board process was an orchestrated "show trial." All members were CSU appointees, and all but two (wealthy supporters and not neighbors) were CSU employees/contractors. Neighbors were banned, illegally, from attending subcommittee meetings, even the "public engagement" one, as I was personally informed via email from VP of Ops Parsons, though Mrs. Ginger Graham (neither employee nor resident) attended many, if not all, of those meetings. The citizen on the Public Engagement Committee, from the County Club area, I believe, later dropped out. This phony SAC, led in actuality by the Athletic Director Mr. Graham, not Ms. Parsons, was under orders to approve a stadium. Mr. Graham had, after all, told the community the previous December that a stadium would be built on campus by Fall, 2014. He was overheard (by my friend Mike, a grad student who happened to be in the Lory University Club), exhorting the SAC before one of its public performances, saying, "We are
going to have this stadium, remember!” At the SAC’s “show trial” reports to the public, the committee marketed the stadium, ignored problems, downplayed the data of massive disapproval its polls had uncovered, and took no questions. In contrast, a similar committee at the University of Minnesota took three years, conducted an Environmental Impact Study, included large representation from the communities around the selected site, and created impact plans. All before recommending the building of a stadium the school absolutely needed (having none at all), and with money provided in large part by the State itself. Certainly, CSU’s SAC was not public engagement in any way.

2. Dr. Frank asserts he made every effort possible to engage the community. Outrage the community is more like it. As above, at every opportunity, and I was at all, the pattern was purely marketing by the stadium contractors, and a process determined to ignore any other option. The SAC above never reported on the viability of Hughes, completely ignoring the Facility Chief’s testimony that it was in “Good” condition, with proper maintenance. Even in his list of “four options,” Frank consistently “poisoned the well,” making clear that the choice of Hughes would be “criminal” mismanagement on his part. What was always missing from every session (except the lone Q and A that Dr. Frank held) was any participation by the CSU leadership, so conspicuously present in Minnesota’s engagement process. Sessions at the Fum Center: marketing by Populus and ICON. No CSU folks but Mr. Milligan, then the PR guy for the project. Phony engagement. Sessions at the local churches: marketing by the same folks, giving answers like “We have done stadium parking before and will figure it out...maybe at Hughes.” Seriously! Those marketers deserved combat pay, given they had no real answers to present. No CSU folks at all. Phony engagement. The same for the CDDAC, whose time was spent listening, sometimes with a complete
repeat the next month, to sales pitches on how things were just dandy. Some questions from the group, like “Exactly how big is it?” repeatedly went unanswered for four months. Diagrams showed the 12 story side appearing no bigger than a 2 story home! No CSU admin folks at all. Phony engagement. The SAC was all CSU folks circling the wagons for the project, and the CDDAC, with some neighbors, was told Hughes was off the table, so talk all you want. Frank was even directed by members of the Board (and he agreed) that this group should have no say at all in anything. Another phony committee. Finally, there was a Community Leaders committee lacking any community leaders. Hand picked supporters by CSU, as were all committees, to rubber stamp Frank’s choice. This group was provided with an incredibly dishonest assessment of choices, not that that would have mattered anyway. They were there to agree, to be boosters, and they knew it and did so.

3. Engagement of the CSU campus was a darker tale, one of coercion, forced support, covered up dissent, bullying, you name it. Frank totally ignored the Faculty Council’s voice, and has continued to ignore widespread student disapproval. CSU’s own scientific polling showed marked disapproval on campus from every group. When marketers had a “meet and greet the stadium day” on campus, their suggestion board was so filled with obscenities of student rejection, they never used one again. (Meanwhile, the anti stadium group signed up over a thousand students at the same time.) It seems “loyalty to stadium oaths” were obtained for propaganda purposes. It’s how one kept one’s job as a Department Chair, I guess. And oh, yes, the campus committee Frank selected, and the AD and Facilities Directors he hired, all gave his choice a thumbs up. What did you expect? Some of these poor folks may be trotted out before you during the “show trial” Dr. Frank presents at your meeting. Expect loyalty, not honesty.
4. Other propaganda. Unfortunately, the report you get from Mr. Milligan on the public engagement aspects of the project by the Center for Public Deliberation will be missing something. Ask Mr. Milligan how he and Ms Graham instructed Dr. Carcasson to handle those CPD meetings. I was there when that meeting occurred. The instructions were to have facilitators versed in “pro stadium” arguments they themselves could present at sessions involving the few advocates and the many opponents. It was the Center’s job, Mr. C. was told, to see these facilitators were briefed and had evidence to back these positions up. I was surprised, too, that Ms. Graham seemed to have the authority to discuss with Dr. Carcasson the money his program would receive for handling those public sessions. Again, however, as no CSU leaders were involved in these public discussions at all, they were just another “tin ear” exercise, like every one of the dozens I attended.

5. Your directions to Dr. Frank to “engage the community.” How could he follow them when also directed by you to ignore the community committee? You were three years too late anyway. The damage was done, and is deep. More phony committees and reports from CSU departments will not undo that. They are just insulting. The CDDAC was stacked by Frank with so many stadium supporters who were chosen for loyalty to a campus stadium, that the CDDAC could not even agree to prohibit activities such as “monster truck shows” from the stadium. And the chair, Mr. McClusky, has been out of city affairs for a decade. Why pick him? Loyalty. Did any of you question the draconian principles here? No. In fact, you congratulated Ms. Parsons for her unsuccessful attempt to justify the fact that CSU created, and awarded a contract based on, an illegal RFP. That contract is still illegal today, as bidding was limited only to firms that agreed to create a donations plan for the stadium, ones chosen under the “pay to play” rules. You have given no Title IX counsel to Dr. Frank at all, whose school
is now on OCR probation for a problem that’s getting worse, not better, that he has some federal laws to uphold. No words of wisdom about limiting the 2.2 billion CSU will have to pay over 30 years, once you’ve approved the 200 million down payment for this project. Yes, “down payment.” Get on the internet! No one buys even a cheap steel stadium for that price anymore. (Baylor’s cheap steel one came in at $350 million, according to its President last week. So add a hundred million to that for concrete, and you are close here.)

6. Excellence? Every standard set for this project is lowered once it cannot be met. Frank: community support essential. Now: not my position. No problem with giving town the brush off. Frank: we’ll raise 110 million. Frank to Graham: you get the 30 million Hughes money if needed, so make it 80. Anderson to the Coloradoan: we have 17 million. Frank to Board: we will have 50 million. Frank in his memo to you: we now have 10 million. Frank: Hughes money we should have spent out of the GF for maintenance now overwhelms the GF. Frank later: borrow 200 million and there’s no effect on the GF, and every single sports economist is wrong because this program will be different from every other stadium project ever. (If you believe the marketers he hired.) Frank: no support money will exist for Hughes. Frank later: no support for Hughes among donors above fifty thousand. Frank later: no support for it among donors above 100,000. Wow! As a former debate coach, we call every standard erected for this program a “moving target.” That is what losers do.

7. Assumptions. Any choice to spend 383 million that is based on the accuracy of a pillar of seven assumptions like Dr. Frank’s stands no chance in a debate round or in real life. He is in the realm of the metaphysical here.
8. Option One. Frank: no need to bond the 30 million. Frank now: see my chart, that is now 60 million. CW: that would be only five of the 30 bond payments, right?

9. Option Two. The most reasonable one is dismissed with a single sentence of generality. You have seen my analysis of option two, comparing the job to Boise State’s stadium upgrade, which would cost CSU only 3.8 million/year/30 years. Boise knows how to make money at football. CSU has no chance to when it will be hundreds of millions in debt.

10. Options 3 and 4. These are very speculative. I would say, as Dr. Frank once did, actually in his November 29 memo: “Without donor support (10 million is not enough), with uncertain costs, with uncertain bond revenue support, the risk to the general fund is unacceptable.” Certainly, the price of 30 million (Frank at first), 39 million (Frank’s biased “Blue Book,”), or 60 million (moving target # 3) for Hughes is almost no risk compared to a 383-483 million debt for a stadium justified by the hypothetical assumptions presented. These analyses are textbook fraud.

11. The academic facility. Frank then: vital, justifies the project. Frank now: scrapped unless we get tons more revenue. (Oh, that’s going down, by the way. And didn’t you hear Dick’s report on debt capacity, folks?)

12. Recommendations. Frank to the Board in October: give me two months to get you a financing plan. Frank to the Board in December: ditto. Just say no.

Finally, who gets blame for the impending debt here? True, soon Dr. Frank will become the only Coloradoan ever to create 2.2 billion in public debt. That’s over the next 30 years. Impressive. A real legacy. But remember, the Zimlich and Horrell Boards never denied him a dime, and rarely even
questioned, publically at least, his borrowing. So give them some blame too. Another who was, and apparently still is, a "debt denier" is CFO Schweigert. "No red flags" until all the money is gone. His "can spend" attitude is equally blameworthy. And the man the Board hired for Chancellor, Mr. Martin, rubberstamped a lot of checks too. (It appears he is looking to leave the Titanic soon, and wisely so. While Florida State and Nebraska can make big money from football, he knows CSU will not.) Next, Lt. Governor Garcia's job is to oversee the DHE, but I got no responses from him. Either he knows and approves, or just has no interest. Either way, he is somewhat at fault, I believe. And last, there's Governor Hickenlooper, who appointed all these fiscally irresponsible Board members, though some of them presumably had done better someplace else before this fiasco here. Did the Governor know they were so fearless in the face of certain debt? I doubt it. However, I believe political patronage may have been at work as well, and that always muddies the waters, doesn't it? So perhaps an elected Board of Governors seems the best choice for CSU's future financial stability, or what's left of it. Certainly, it is time for the State Legislature to make inquiry into this dishonest process and its terrible results.
Good evening, Mr. Donahue:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80220

From: Don Donahue [mailto:ddonincolo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 2:32 PM
To: Teufel, Sharon
Subject: Stadium

This is a bad idea and a flawed decision-making process. Despite the rosy scenarios, I doubt that this stadium will pay for itself. There is a limited pool of donation money, and this will surely divert some from education. As a state institution, sports must be secondary to education.

I am a recent MA grad and contract employee, and I have ceased making contributions to CSU while this matter has been on the table. I will not contribute to a CSU that is run by the athletic department.

Don Donahue
1607 Oak Creek Drive
Loveland, CO 80538
970-669-1785
From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:12 PM  
To: 'bobvangermeersch@aol.com'  
Subject: RE: mail for the Governors

Good evening, Bob:

This acknowledges receipt of your email which will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

From: bobvangermeersch@aol.com  
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 12:47 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: mail for the Governors

Hi Sharon
Please send the below email to the Governors. Thanks
Bob Vangermeersch

---

by Steven Shulman  
Professor of Economics

Everyone in the CSU community should be concerned about President Frank’s decision to build a new on-campus football stadium.

The cheaper option for the new stadium is estimated to cost under $200 million, but its actual total cost is likely to be much higher. The estimate does not include the substantial additional spending that will be required for infrastructure upgrades, the relocation of adjacent streets and structures, the demolition of Hughes and the inevitable cost overruns.

President Frank repeatedly promised that this spending will not come out of the general fund, meaning that it will not take resources away from core academic programs. Nonetheless, the two options for building a new stadium include up to $55 million from the general fund.

CSU already spends millions of dollars subsidizing football from the general fund and with athletic fees. Increasing that subsidy moves us in exactly the wrong direction.
Then there is the dirty little secret that the revenues generated by a new stadium could easily be insufficient to pay down its debt. That financial risk will be borne by students, who could find themselves on the hook for increased tuition and fees.

There is little or no evidence that a new football stadium will improve the performance of the team, attract out of state students, increase donations to academic programs or become financially self-sufficient. The claims to the contrary simply ignore the research by sports economists and other experts on these questions.

Nonetheless, CSU has already spent $6.5 million on the planning for the new stadium, an extraordinary amount before the ground has even been broken.

It is hard to believe that President Frank ever fairly considered the alternatives to building a new stadium if he was willing to condone preliminary spending of this magnitude.

Now we face the prospect of the football coach earning up to $2.75 million for this winning season (which could easily prove to be a one-time event). Imagine what that amount of money could have done for CSU's adjunct faculty.

In stark contrast to the wildly overpaid coaches, the adjunct faculty creates huge profits for the university. They teach most of the undergraduate student credit hours, generating most of CSU's tuition revenue while getting paid abysmally little in return.

Football may be fun, but it is very, very expensive. Only a handful of top college football programs earn a profit. The large majority of college football programs have to be subsidized out of funds that would otherwise flow into teaching and research programs.

Spending so much money on football sucks resources out of education and increases its cost. It diminishes every other sport and makes it impossible to achieve gender equity in college athletics.

The benefits that college football supposedly brings beyond mere entertainment – mainly stronger school spirit and more engagement with alumni – are laudable but hardly worth the cost, risk and harm to the university's fundamental educational mission.

Like every public university, CSU faces a variety of daunting challenges rooted in its precarious financial situation.

State support has been sharply reduced. Tuition and student debt keep rising. Research funding is drying up. More and more courses are taught by poorly paid adjuncts. Faculty and staff salaries frequently fall to keep up with inflation. Students are stuffed into large lectures and often cannot get into the courses they need.

A new football stadium will only make it harder to solve these core problems. It is a vanity project justified by little more than wishful thinking.

No business would ever make a significant investment decision like this. Neither should we.
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:11 PM
To: Jack Armstrong
Subject: RE: CSU stadium plans

Good evening, Mr. Armstrong:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Jack Armstrong [mailto:jacko@frii.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 11:25 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU stadium plans

Hello,

Myself, a Fort Collins resident and graduate of CSU, and almost everyone that I know personally, strongly oppose the building of a new football stadium on the CSU campus in Fort Collins!

The foothills physical setting at Hughes Stadium is unique and shows off what Colorado is all about!

The cost, no matter how it is funded, will never be covered without being paid for out of students and citizens pocketbooks! The administration of CSU (Tony Frank and others) have played loose and easy with the large numbers being talked about, but the reality of spending over $300 million and eating up a large part of campus is just ridiculous.

The disruption to the neighbors of the campus would be long and arduous during construction.

Game day disruption to the neighbors of the campus would be horrific. Remember please that football games are another excuse for most young college students to get drunk and party, and with more excessive and drunken parties already happening around campus, game day would cause a lot of distress and bad feelings from neighbors.

Over 60% of citizens of Fort Collins are against the on-campus stadium being built. CSU Administration has said they are listening and concerned and are taking the feelings of citizens of Fort Collins into account, but the truth is they have not done so. Bad feelings and distrust from the Fort Collins Citizenry.

The cost to the City would be great for infrastructure needs of a new stadium, and it is doubtful that CSU would be willing to reimburse or pay for up-front for these costs. More bad feelings and distrust from the Fort Collins Citizenry.

There is no REAL NEED for this stadium!
Hughes Stadium can be updated. It is on a beautiful setting. Parking/traffic is not an issue. There is plenty of room for tailgating and partying without intense disruption to neighbors.

Please do not approve the building of an on-campus football stadium on the CSU campus in Fort Collins.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Jack Armstrong
Fort Collins
Good evening, Mr. Cassidy:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Kevin Cassidy [mailto:justkcassidy@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 10:31 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Dr Frank's recommendation to build an on-campus stadium

Dr. Frank,

Bad decision.

Your assumptions underlying the decision to build a new stadium are neither indisputable facts (as you acknowledge) nor informed opinions (as you claim). They are biased assumptions based on an ill-founded predisposition to build an on-campus stadium.

Your track record on this issue has not been stellar.

You claim that you have, and will, mitigate the risk of using cash from the general fund. You failed to raise the philanthropic funds that you earlier claimed to be a ‘fiscal standard’ for moving forward.

You claim to objectively analyze the facts in order to make a rationale decision. In your November 29th memo to the Board of Governors you cite a single unscientific poll which supports your recommendation to build a new stadium. Most analysts would call this cherry-picking. Although you mentioned other polls, you chose to cite only one poll. You also chose to accept only the economic estimates that support your decision.

You claim - in order to foster a fact-based dialogue - to have made every reasonable effort to accept input and listen to other voices and viewpoints. Your efforts have caused great harm to the relationship between Fort Collins, CSU, and alumni. In the end you found only your ‘facts’ to be ‘cogent and compelling’, and the voices that made a difference were those of $100,000-plus donors; donors that had already demonstrated their support for a new stadium.

In arriving at this decision, you claim to be mindful only of CSU's long-term interest. We should all believe your sincerity, yet by directing extraordinary funds - in the form of coaches salaries and facilities - on a single sports program, you are changing CSU’s character and reputation not for the better, but for the worse. You are also risking CSU's financial position.

It is your job to lead CSU into the future. The rest of us - including the Board of Governors - will decide whether to continue to support CSU under your leadership. Pretty easy decision for me.

Kevin Cassidy
From: Sharon Teufel
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:09 PM
To: Anne Macdonald
Subject: RE: CSU Stadium vote

Good evening, Ms. MacDonald:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Anne Macdonald [mailto:abmac@frii.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 7:17 PM
To: CSUS Board
Cc: Governor.hickenlooper@state.co.us
Subject: CSU Stadium vote

Here are some questions that, in the spirit of transparency, I would appreciate the Board of Governors consider before voting on Dec. 5:

1. How can the Governors justify ignoring the sports economic studies that show the stadium costs cannot be justified as a means to build the financial viability for CSU?
2. How can you ignore the 60% (three surveys) of the Fort Collins community who oppose the stadium? Does our community values just not matter?
3. How can you justify spending over $300 million on a college sport that in twenty years will be the bane of universities? A college sport that is known to be corrupt and corruptible?
4. How can the Governors justify $300 million (private or public) on an all-male sport and all-male section of the athletic department? Why are we not equalizing the amount for women’s soccer and women’s volleyball? I’m sure Tony Frank can justify to the letter of Title IX but not to the intent.
5. Why are the Governors even considering the building of a second stadium in a century when environmental and fiscal stewardship has to be foremost in our decision-making?
6. How transparent has this process been when Tony Frank already knows he has the votes to pass it? This is one of the most disappointing issues in this process. (this is actually a lawsuit waiting to happen)
7. Will the Board of Governors demand that all costs are tracked and ten/twenty years from now, a report will be made that evaluates the promises against the reality? This is the biggest problem with college athletic facilities (as well as all government promises) – in the end, no one tracks the fiscal promises made with the end-results.
8. The 21st Century is the century of science, technology, engineering. Why are you still living in the male-oriented 20th century?

I realize that the citizens of Colorado and, especially the community in Fort Collins, have little say in this absolute nonsense but the members of the Board of Governors should be asking pertinent questions in a transparent manner. The Board’s role is to make sure the CSU system reflects the needs of the 21st century. The equivalent is to have NASA, because Congress will not allocate enough funding, build a football team and stadium so they can get TV contracts so they can run NASA. This stadium is an environmental, fiscal, athletic, financial and social travesty. I have
to tell you guys – this is the most nonsensical fiscal idea I’ve seen in years. Think about it: Tony Frank is trying to increase the CSU budget by building a $300million second stadium for a sport that is dying in a town that doesn’t want it so he can get out-of-state students in a university that has a compact to educate the citizens of Colorado.

I am a CSU alumni. I received one of my Master’s degrees from CSU; my husband received his PhD in Atmospheric Science at CSU; our son is attending CSU. My husband and I both have worked as faculty at CSU during our careers. Our daughter did not attend CSU because she wanted a degree in Astrophysics. She attended CU-Boulder where the emphasis is on math, science and physics not football.

Anne Macdonald
Fort Collins
abmac@frii.com
970 225-1772
Good evening, Mr. Hoefer:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Pjhoefer@aol.com [mailto:Pjhoefer@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2014 7:25 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: On Campus Stadium

Dear Board of Governors,
I can't believe that an on-campus stadium will be more economical, according to President Frank, than repairing Hughes Stadium. Please vote NO for the proceeding with a new on-campus stadium.

Philip Hoefer
CSU Graduate, 1968

603 Atwood Court
Fort Collins, CO 80525
pjhoefer@aol.com
970/377-1950 (H)
970/988-3466 (Cell) Marcia
970/988-3467 (cell) Philip
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:08 PM
To: Max Beavers
Subject: RE: CSU football stadium

Good evening, Mr. Beavers:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Max Beavers [mailto:mbeavers2000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 6:05 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU football stadium

Myself and most of the people I know are apposed to an on campus stadium. We feel the current location is the best location. As the campus grows, where will new classrooms be built? Where are many of us going to park and tailgate? I doubt if you will take additional space for a 20,000 - 25,000 vehicle parking lot on campus to achieve comodate fans. Please vote against an on campus stadium.
Max Beavers

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Good evening, Mr. Avery:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and attachment to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Paul Avery [mailto:pavery99@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 2:48 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU Stadium Revenue Projections Statement
On-Campus Stadium Revenue Concerns

CSU have proposed abandoning the recently improved Hughes Stadium and constructing a new, multiple-use facility on the Fort Collins campus, in a location surrounded by congested, well established residential areas and churches. The claimed benefits of this facility have been largely based on financial predictions and the University is obligated to be honest, diligent and transparent in evaluating these claims.

The main source referenced by CSU has been a revenue estimate by Convention, Sports & Leisure International (CSL), provided to the project architects, the ICON/Populous Group.

Concerns

Limited Survey Size and Low Response:

Only existing fan groups were surveyed by CSL.
An unusually low response rate to the survey (8%) was obtained.
Other paid-for forecasts of benefits, published by regional pro-business groups, were not reviewed by CSU, but have been used as further justification for proceeding with the project.

Extrapolation of Limited Data:

The CSL report claimed that their surveys showed a 22% probable increase in ticket sales due to the “new stadium” effect, yet the stadium now planned would be smaller than either Hughes or the originally proposed on-campus facility. Revenue growth may be limited by events restrictions resulting from the choice of location.

Failure to Identify, Quantify and Mitigate Potential Risks within the Analysis:

Ticket sales and prices achievable may be overestimated since residents have a large choice of sporting events and other outdoor activities in the area.
A peak in the popularity of college football may have been reached, as indicated by recent declines in nationwide attendance and parent’s growing concerns over brain trauma. College football may become as unacceptable as boxing within a decade.
There may be limited repeat attendance due to traffic congestion, public transit capacity and parking problems at the proposed mid-town site.
Project construction cost overruns and delays were not considered in the analysis, but could greatly increase the required debt and repayment costs.
There is an increasing potential of liability for player injuries, legal costs and new compensation requirements for players and staff. A possible reduction of alumni athletic program donations could be caused by a changing economy and new alumni priorities. Impending modifications of the tax code might exclude or discourage sports related donations in the coming years. Legal action by community groups may block or delay the project. These could be based on CSU’s questionable bidding process, the lack of fiscal transparency, Title IX issues, reduced emergency services access to neighborhoods and conflicts of interests within the CSU Board. Legal restrictions may be imposed by the City on acoustic noise levels, traffic access and parking due to the proximity of residential areas and concerns over public safety and quality of life. CSU may never be part of a major collegiate football division due to it’s geographical location. Consequently, the optimistically estimated naming rights and television revenues may never be realized. No review of alternative revenue generating projects possible with a similar incremental investment, was performed. The financial assumptions made have not been subjected to any kind of stress testing or worst case analysis by an independent agency.

Failure to Include Major Costs in the Revenue Analysis Presented by CSL:

Coaching staff salaries in the millions of dollars. Any provisions for repayment of debt. Lack of a construction project ROI or IRR analysis. The effects of a reduced debt rating on future CSU programs.

Lack of Impartiality in the CSL Revenue Analysis:

The revenue analysis was performed on behalf of the major construction contractors, not CSU. CSU appear to be counting on the use of state taxpayer backed debt and show limited concerns over a failure to meet the revenue goals. CSU have not demonstrated that it would be possible to sell revenue bonds as planned based on the unproven performance of a new facility in a minor division.
Pressure from Dr. Tony Frank to present an overly optimistic assessment of both financial and intangible benefits of the project:

Dr. Frank and his subordinates have presented wildly varying design and financial information in support of this project and goals have been revised, as necessary, to keep it afloat following a failure to meet the donations target. It is apparent that he is personally invested in the success of this effort. While he is highly valued in his current role, he appears to be using this political strength to force his personal wishes on the University and the Community, against the will of a well documented opposing majority. This personal ambition could well be blinding him to the significant financial risks which could be incurred.

Paul A. Avery
Fort Collins 11/28/2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Paul Avery <a href="mailto:paulavery@comcast.net">paulavery@comcast.net</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Monday, December 01, 2014 9:24 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>CSUS Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Stadium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Revenue shortfall highly probable - CSL estimates were highly optimistic |
| No guarantee of gift income in the future - no certainty of sustained income |
| No solutions for concussions - reduced recruitment of students to the game |
| Valid local objections to congestion, pollution, noise, parking - no EIS |
| Conduct unbecoming a state institution |
| Narcissistic, sociopathic, hot-headed, bizarre leadership - too much ego and vanity involved |
| Environmentally unsustainable approach - millions of yards of new concrete and steel required, continuous ground water pumping |
| No plan for Hughes disposal |
| Resentment of salaries, costs, extravagance, elitism, arrogance and grandiosity on display - |
| Dire impact on future costs if revenues not achieved |
Good evening, Ms. Podmore:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

From: Carol Podmore [mailto:carolpodmore733@comcast.net]  
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 1:48 PM  
To: Teufel, Sharon  
Subject: CSU On-Campus Stadium

To Whom It May Concern:

I have hesitated to write the Board because public sentiment, correctly or incorrectly, sees you as a rubber-stamp Board.  
Tony Frank will make his recommendation and you will approve it (when haven’t you). It’s been a done deal since the beginning.  
The very goal post moving re: funding reinforces this. Announce the financing terms that must be met; when they aren’t, change the terms.  
As Board members, you probably will not suffer any consequences from your vote to support Frank’s decision...one can hear the uplifting PR language already.  
However, it would have been nice to have someone stand up for our community and the “inventive” funding process.  
Ten or twenty years from now it won’t matter and the persons that pushed this through will long be gone from the CSU scene including me most likely.  
However, be assured, that it will be forever known by all (except football enthusiasts) as Frank’s Folly, and you all will have been his enablers.  
As I once mentioned to him, it’s all about power...who has it and who doesn’t.

Sincerely and sadly,  
Carol Podmore  
34 Year Resident of Fort Collins  
CSU Alumna  
Former CSU Auxiliary Faculty
Wife, CSU Professor Emeritus
Good evening, Dr. Shulman:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Deborah Shulman [mailto:drd.bodyscience@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 10:57 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: land grant role of CSU versus a new football stadium

Please distribute to board members by Monday, December 1, 2014:

I ask you to delay the decision on moving the football stadium to the academic campus or to do the responsible thing and remain at the Hughes stadium site.

I am an alumni of the graduate school with a Ph.D. in neurobiology, long time academic donor and local resident of the Fort Collins area. Spending and focus at CSU should be on the land grant goals and the academic and service mission of a public land grant university as Dr Frank described in 2010 in the article below - not to move the football stadium to the academic campus and impose football on academics, pay the escalating price and deficit spending on football or divert public land granted for education to football.

Ask yourselves why 4 of 4 committees set up by Dr Frank recommend an on campus stadium despite 60% or more opposition within CSU faculty/staff/students, among total alumni and in our city and community. Moving the football stadium from a location just a few miles away into the middle of the most densely developed part of town and imposing football on the academic campus is wildly unpopular here for good reason.

The Vital Role of Land-Grant Universities
By Joe Blake and Tony Frank
Posted 2/11/2010

"Eight years after Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, and six years before Colorado became a state, CSU was authorized to carry out this land grant mission for Colorado. While land-grant schools like CSU have shifted over the last 140 years from a predominant emphasis on agriculture and mechanical arts to a more broad-based curriculum, the role of the land-grant university as
an engine of opportunity, economic advancement, and social responsibility has remained unchanged.  
With a growing reputation as one of the nation’s leading research universities and more than 180,000 alumni of the Fort Collins campus, CSU today is the modern realization of Morrill’s vision of American colleges that would address societal needs, conduct up-to-theminute research, and provide high-quality education to people from all walks of life.  
The CSU campuses and their graduates are economic drivers that account for more than $4.1 billion in statewide household income in Colorado. Private-sector start-up businesses that have grown directly out of CSU research now employ more than 2,500 Coloradans, most notably in the fields of clean and renewable energy and infectious disease.  
But CSU’s most enduring legacy is its graduates - more than 200,000 from all three CSU campuses - who have used their education to transform our world — as teachers, doctors, scientists, political leaders, artists, businesspeople, lawyers, parents, and community volunteers.”

I ask the each of you - community college president, business people, law, school superintendent, health care, ranching... - to critically and objectively analyze Dr Frank’s rationale for moving the football stadium to the academic campus and review the reports produced by Conventions, Sports and Leisure (in lieu of regional economists or sports economists) which cherry picked schools and used different schools for different categories in order to generate a desired result - not a consistent representative sample like we are taught to do in undergraduate statistics. According to actual economists (which CSU declined to employ), the economic stimulus is wildly exaggerated and for a few local businesses while substantial costs are imposed on the city and taxpayers.

response to Dr Frank’s rationale:

**engaging alumni on campus**: only college football fan alumni (a small subset of total alumni). There is no evidence that academic donations increase as a result of an on campus stadium. Spending hundreds of millions to generate athletic donations (which are now $3-5 million and don’t cover the deficit spending for football), to bring these alumni to campus and impose so much on so many in the most densely developed section of town is unconscionable. Why should athletic donors dictate development, spending, and debt at CSU and in our city?  
**visibility** (the demographic that watches college football is considerably less than NFL, less than baseball and closer to figure skating in viewership and is white (88%) men (62%) over 24 (~88%)), Football does not sell academic programs and is not a proxy for academics - quite the opposite.  
**strong sports program** $11.2 million is spent annually on CSU football team of 120 athletes not counting coaching, facilities, scholarships or recruiting while spending $7.2 million on all the women’s sports combined and only $660K on men’s track for the same number of athletes. CSU should be trying to attain gender equity and focus on individual sports and Olympic sports and provide opportunity for student athletes that are academically deserving, Because of football there are only 4 male scholarship sports. No swimming scholarships for men.  
**increased student application** due to winning football season (not a stadium) attracts applications from students that score lower than average on SAT scores -- and is a small, transient factor at big football schools only. High academic achievers choose schools based on academics first. CSU is ranked #121 in US News and World Reports which we used when choosing a school for our son a few years ago. Remember that women parents often guide the application process and fund college education - especially for out of state schools with more expense. A big football culture was a negative in our choice if we were going to spend a lot of money and for his debt.  
**Revenue sport**: football sucks up resources that should be spent on education and academics. Most of the revenue to run CSU (85%) comes from labor of faculty, another 7-10% comes from taxpayers like me. The business of CSU is education, research to create new knowledge and service such as extension. Football is an expensive, frivolous diversion and to place emphasis on football and move the football stadium is misguided, at best and completely irresponsible.  
**serving the people of Colorado**: how does a football stadium moved on to the academic campus serve the people of Colorado? This is a TABOR state that emphasizes fiscal responsibility. Participation in HS football in Colorado has dropped 14%, mirroring a nationwide trend.
This new stadium is highly unpopular both within CSU faculty/staff/students and in our community. The costs (financial, infrastructure, social) are excessive for such small, intangible benefits.

Thank you for your time,
Deborah Shulman

--
Deborah Shulman, Ph.D.
DrD.BodyScience@gmail.com
970-481-2523
NO NEW CSU STADIUM
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 5:00 PM  
To: meggster@comcast.net  
Subject: RE: Dr. Frank said "I don't know"

Good evening,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

From: meggster@comcast.net [mailto:meggger@comcast.net]  
Sent: Friday, November 28, 2014 9:37 AM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: Dr. Frank said "I don't know"

Dear BOG,
I asked Dr. Frank in person what will become of the Hughes Stadium property and structure should an on-campus stadium be built and he answer was "I don't know."

In my opinion this is a bad answer. The plans for a new stadium should, must, include the answer to this question. Please ask him and have a plan in place before you decide anything. Those of us that live near Hughes (thousands of us) need and want to know the plan. What sort of business plan would it truly be without this important information?

If there is not a plan in place please vote AGAINST a new stadium. My livelihood depends upon it.

Thank you,
M. Dyer
Good evening, Mr. De Gregorio:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Mark De Gregorio [mailto:markie@webaccess.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 27, 2014 7:32 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: About a new stadium at CSU

To the Board,

As a major donor, I wish to express my concern about Dr. Frank’s recommendation that a new main campus stadium be constructed. From everything I’ve read, the majority of folks who live in the surrounding area are opposed to it because of the traffic, noise, trash, and partying that it will bring into the middle of town. President Bill Morgan had it right when he had Hughes built on the outskirts of town. He knew that the large amount of land needed for a new stadium would one day be needed for academic and research buildings.

I’ve followed this process for the past three years, and have been very disappointed by what I see as a serious miscalculation of the numbers by those hired by the administration, and by Dr. Frank’s mishandling of the whole process. The initial fund raising “quiet period” was a disaster. Revenue projections from ticket sales and sponsorships, in the opinions of two noted sports economists, are unrealistic. Dr. Frank’s selection of Jack Graham, who’s arrogance threw gasoline on a controversial proposition, has polarized the community. It seems that the BOG has just stood back with hands off disengagement until the October meeting, when finally a few members expressed concern. All of you have a fiduciary responsibility to deeply scrutinize such an expensive and consequential capital construction project. Before you rubber stamp Dr. Frank’s recommendation, the Board really ought to dig deeply into it. There is enough opposition in the community, that long-term damage to CSU’s relationship is a real possibility. Especially once the game and event day disruptions begin.

The other aspect that deeply troubles me is how Dr. Frank promised that he would not move forward with a stadium that required public funding, yet he is poised to do just that. He made a conscious decision three years ago to defer $30 million in scheduled general fund maintenance, that apparently is now budgeted for infrastructure improvements by the City of Fort Collins. If revenue from ticket sales and sponsorships falls flat, general fund money will be required to pay
the debt on the stadium bonds. And it's reasonable to assume that a big part of the costs will be passed on to students in tuition increases and fees.

As a taxpayer, I do not want my money going to what I feel is an unnecessary new stadium. As a former student, with a BA (79), MS (81), and post-grad certificate (2013), I do not wish to see tuition increases forced upon students. As a donor, I'm having a very hard time supporting Dr. Frank's leadership from what I've observed these past couple of years. Less than a month ago, I signed a Letter of Intent with the university promising a planned gift of a quarter million dollars. I'm afraid that if this new stadium moves forward, I will have to reconsider.

Most Sincerely,

Mark De Gregorio
PO Box 72
Masonville, CO, 80541
970-227-5236
Good afternoon,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Alexander M Lemberg [mailto:sandylemberg@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2014 2:11 PM
To: CSUS Board
Cc: abernasek@vines.colostate.edu
Subject: Should a new stadium be built on CSU Foothills property?

To the CSU Board of Governors:

I was part of a tour of Hughes Stadium on Tuesday, November 18.

The CSU officials who conducted the tour were very helpful and presented what seemed to me to be a balanced view of the condition of Hughes and the need for repair or renovation.

We were able to take in the natural beauty of the Foothills environment which is a wonderful setting for a sports stadium.

It was also clear that the structure itself and the on site facilities are in need of extensive renovation and repairs. The condition is so serious that there is clearly a case for tearing down the stadium and replacing it with a new one. Another factor in favor of a new stadium is that the size of the field is insufficient for it to serve as a venue for Soccer and possibly some other sports.

In short, there is a reasonable case for replacing Hughes Stadium.

That said, an obvious question is where to build a new stadium if Hughes is to be replaced. If Hughes Stadium is deemed in need of replacement, should a new stadium be built nearby, on CSU owned Foothills property, or should a new On-Campus-Stadium be built.

When I went back to look at the four options put forward by Tony Frank, I was shocked to see that this question was not addressed. I had assumed, incorrectly as it turned out, that one of the options was a new stadium near the original site.
My sense is that Tony Frank and other CSU officials deliberately omitted the option of replacing Hughes with a new stadium nearby so that the debate would focus on the On-Campus-Stadium idea as the only option in the event that replacement of Hughes were to be deemed necessary.

It is a real problem that Tony Frank and other CSU officials gave absolutely no consideration to what is clearly the most important question at this time.

I think the discussion needs to shift focus and consider that question as primary. If Hughes is replaced, should it be replaced by a new stadium near the original site, or should a new stadium be built on the main campus?

It's time for everyone to stop and take a fresh look at the situation.

I call on the CSU Board of Governors, City of Fort Collins officials, and all interested parties (including all activists opposed to and in favor of a new stadium) to stop and give urgent attention to the question of whether a new stadium should be built on CSU Foothills property.

Sandy Lemberg
300 Remington Street, Apt 413
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524
November 26, 2014.

Odd Trick Fights Diabetes
"Unique; Proven Method To Control Blood Sugar In 3 Weeks. Watch Video."
http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL3131/54764261a393426039dbst03vuc
Anthony A. Frank, President  
Colorado State University

From: Ken Reed [mailto:kenreed22@mac.com]  
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 10:35 AM  
To: Frank, Tony  
Subject: New Stadium Request

Dr. Frank,

I'm a CSU alum, former football season ticket holder (would still be but my kids weekend activities make it unworkable) and fan of all things CSU.

I was thrilled to read that you're going to recommend that a new stadium be built on campus. I was even more excited to see that you're hopeful that the full plan (42,000+ seats) can still be implemented.

I have been very impressed with your work at CSU and how CSU has risen in the eyes of key audiences around the country and world, both academically and athletically.

While there were certainly issues with Jack Graham and his approach, I fully embraced his "bold" vision, along with your commitment to excellence in everything CSU does.

I strongly believe that the new stadium must have 40,000 seats at a minimum. Good or bad, the perception is that anything else is considered second-class and will severely limit what CSU can do in football from a recruiting, media and general public perspective. This is especially true in a Front Range marketplace that considers itself "big-time." A 42,000+-seat stadium would say a lot symbolically.

I realize the full plan is a stretch from a fundraising and/or debt perspective but I strongly encourage you to go "all-in." I fear that if we don't go all-in that given the current landscape in major college athletics we'll be stuck in a sort of "no-man's land" between the "Big Five" and the "Big Sky."

I think Ft. Collins and Colorado can support an elite athletics program and with a full-plan stadium, the Big 12 or another power conference may see the potential of CSU and the Denver/Front Range market.

I'm proud to be a CSU Ram and excited about your decision to move forward with the stadium. I applaud the quest for excellence in academics, athletics, and community outreach at CSU!

Sincerely,

Ken
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2014 9:28 AM
To: Leigh Towill
Subject: RE: Proposed campus stadium

Good morning, Dr. Towill:

This acknowledge receipt of your email regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the CSU System Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Leigh Towill [mailto:leigh.towill@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 4:36 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Proposed campus stadium

Board members,

I am writing this to express my extreme displeasure about the process and consequences in developing a new stadium on campus. I am very unhappy with the manner in which Dr. Frank has handled the whole issue.

Specifically:

1. Building of the campus stadium will require considerable use of city funds for intersections etc. As a tax payer I strongly object to this use without having a vote on the matter. Dr. Frank has said CSU will only fund items adjacent to the stadium. The traffic issues have no real solution with a campus stadium.

2. The proposed demolition of the horticulture greenhouses and plots will require new facilities. These costs have not been listed on the stadium costs. I also understand that until the stadium is built, temporary facilities are to be rented (where?, certainly not on campus). This is extremely inconvenient and unfair to horticulture students. As a former affiliate in horticulture for 23 years, I think this underlines the extreme emphasis being placed on athletics at the expense of academics.

3. Dr. Frank has said no student fees will be used for the stadium, but then has backtracked with the proposed placing of classrooms in the stadium. This is extremely two-faced—I hope you strongly object to the use of student fees even if classroom are included in the new stadium.

4. Dr. Frank has not met with some economists that express concern about the total economic benefits to the university and city. Some issues seem to be nuanced to favor a campus stadium. As an example, use of committee with favored members. I also do not understand why bonds cannot be issued to repair/or completely update Hughes stadium; it seems they will be a major funding of the proposed campus stadium. I also strongly object to the favoring of big donors so that fancy boxes can be constructed.
As I expected at the outset of the process, and the extreme amount of money spent developing the proposal, it seems it is (was) a done deal from the start. I am extremely unhappy with the process that Dr. Frank has used, and as a scholarship donator (along with my wife), am unhappy with Colorado State University. Dr. Frank has completely misread the feelings of the community at large, which has led to extreme divisiveness.

I have many more comments, but have tried to be brief. I certainly hope you address these issues at your upcoming meeting. The current location for Hughes stadium, repaired or demolished and rebuilt, is just wonderful and I hope all of you do realize this. I welcome comments on these issues.

Sincerely,

Dr. Leigh E. Towill
Leigh.Towill@gmail.com
Good morning,

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attached letter regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with Chair Horrell and the CSU System Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Morud, Linda [mailto:Linda.Morud@efirstbank.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2014 10:59 AM
To: 'csus'
Cc: Teufel, Sharon
Subject: Colorado State University - Campus Stadium

Please see the attached letter addressed to Dr. Dorothy Horrell and the Board of Governors.

-----Original Message-----
From: Scanner@FCRanch.org [mailto:Scanner@FCRanch.org]
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Morud, Linda
Subject: Message from "RNP0026735F6039"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP0026735F6039" (MP C5502A).

Scan Date: 11.26.2014 10:42:59 (-0700)
Queries to: Scanner@FCRanch.org

The information contained in this electronic communication and any document attached hereto or transmitted herewith is confidential and intended for the exclusive use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any examination, use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy this communication. Thank you.
November 24, 2014

Colorado State University
Office of the Board of Governors
Attention: Dr. Dorothy Horrell, Chair
410 17th Street, Suite 2440
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO – Campus Stadium

Dear Ms. Horrell and Governors:

Thank you for your service to the Colorado State University System and the people of Colorado. In particular, your recent efforts to analyze and discern information that pertains to the construction of an on-campus stadium at CSU (Fort Collins) is much appreciated. There is no doubt your decision regarding this facility will have far reaching implications for Colorado State University. So the time and care you have taken to understand the issues at hand has been important.

FirstBank and I support President Tony Frank’s proposal to build a new on-campus stadium to replace Hughes Stadium. We believe the stadium will drive success in recruitment of not only athletes but top students. We also believe an on-campus facility will spark a new, unique and re-energized attitude for all sports programs and the University in general.

Many of you know me from my tenure as a member of the State Board of Agriculture from 2007 to 2010. I have a basic understanding of the workings of the University and appreciate the concerns and goals of the various stakeholders. More than anything, I have a deep and profound love for CSU as my time in Fort Collins had a significant impact on the person I am today.

FirstBank has been a long-term and committed supporter of Colorado State University in many ways over the past 20 years. My career at FirstBank started in 1981 and I have had the honor of serving as CEO of the company since 1999. FirstBank has a strong culture of giving back to our communities. Many corporate officers in our management group donate to Colorado State monthly through payroll deduction and FirstBank matches their gifts up to $5,000 per year. This group has built an endowment for the College of Business of over $500,000 and currently awards five large scholarships to Colorado business students. Additionally, FirstBank and its employees’ donations have supported teaching excellence, academic facilities and support for “first generation” students. FirstBank’s aggregate financial support to CSU since 1993 exceeds $1,000,000. FirstBank and our employees understand the importance of Colorado State University to the students, families, employers and economy of Colorado.
FirstBank has also been a steady supporter of CSU Athletics as Ram Club members since 1993 and season ticket holders for both football and basketball. We have provided support to athletics in the form of marketing agreements and sponsorships as well. FirstBank understands that the University must strike a balance between excellent academics and sports and extra-curricular. The leadership of CSU has achieved this goal based on the University’s success in award-winning, funded research, in academic rigor, learning success, job placement and national rankings, in improving athletic programs and national recognition.

As I consider the issue as a proud alumnus, former board member and a corporate partner of Colorado State University, I am struck by the saying — “the best of both worlds”. I believe the University can achieve excellence in both scholarly pursuits and research at the same time as having winning, nationally recognized sports teams and facilities. By being committed to a “both and” approach versus an “either or” direction, CSU will take full advantage of all the assets at its disposable to produce proud, smart, well-rounded graduates that will transform our world in amazing ways consistent with our land grant mission.

Fairly or unfairly, a University’s name recognition and image is driven in large measure by the institutions success or failure in athletics. This is especially true of high school graduates and their parents who are considering multiple colleges. All things being equal, I believe a University that can combine winning academics with successful sports teams and facilities has a better chance at recruitment than an institution with only one or the other attribute.

FirstBank is a supporter of most of the stakeholders I previously mentioned. Students — we hire them and they give back to CSU. Faculty — we fund them and they produce excellent graduates for industry. Academics — we fund facilities and scholarships that make a difference in student’s lives and the Universities finances. Sports — we support them to a lesser degree but understand their integral importance to recruitment, branding and fundraising at the University. The Fort Collins and Colorado communities — we live, work, support and provide capital to the businesses and people that make Colorado special. That is why our opinion on and support for the on-campus stadium (Options 3 or 4) should be taken seriously by the Board of Agriculture. We have committed a substantial gift to the new facility and agreed to lease a corporate suite because we believe in the “best of both worlds” approach. Let’s make CSU great for all and do what is important, needed and right for future CSU stakeholders. Build the new on-campus stadium as soon as possible.

Thank you for the opportunity to enter this letter of support on behalf of FirstBank and me personally.

Sincerely and with full support,

John A. Ikard
CEO — FirstBank Holding Company
Good morning, Dr. Towill:

This acknowledge receipt of your email regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the CSU System Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Leigh Towill [mailto:leigh.towill@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 4:36 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Proposed campus stadium

Board members,

I am writing this to express my extreme displeasure about the process and consequences in developing a new stadium on campus. I am very unhappy with the manner in which Dr. Frank has handled the whole issue.

Specifically:

1. Building of the campus stadium will require considerable use of city funds for intersections etc. As a taxpayer I strongly object to this use without having a vote on the matter. Dr. Frank has said CSU will only fund items adjacent to the stadium. The traffic issues have no real solution with a campus stadium

2. The proposed demolition of the horticulture greenhouses and plots will require new facilities. These costs have not been listed on the stadium costs. I also understand that until the stadium is built, temporary facilities are to be rented (where?, certainly not on campus). This is extremely inconvenient and unfair to horticulture students. As a former affiliate in horticulture for 23 years, I think this underlines the extreme emphasis being placed on athletics at the expense of academics.

3. Dr. Frank has said no student fees will be used for the stadium, but then has backtracked with the proposed placing of classrooms in the stadium. This is extremely two-faced—I hope you strongly object to the use of student fees even if classroom are included in the new stadium.

4. Dr. Frank has not met with some economists that express concern about the total economic benefits to the university and city. Some issues seem to be nuanced to favor a campus stadium. As an example, use of committee with favored members. I also do not understand why bonds cannot be issued to repair/or completely update Hughes stadium; it seems they will be a major funding of the proposed campus stadium. I also strongly object to the favoring of big donors so that fancy boxes can be constructed.
As I expected at the outset of the process, and the extreme amount of money spent developing the proposal, it seems it is (was) a done deal from the start. I am extremely unhappy with the process that Dr. Frank has used, and as a scholarship donator (along with my wife), am unhappy with Colorado State University. Dr. Frank has completely misread the feelings of the community at large, which has led to extreme divisiveness.

I have many more comments, but have tried to be brief. I certainly hope you address these issues at your upcoming meeting. The current location for Hughes stadium, repaired or demolished and rebuilt, is just wonderful and I hope all of you do realize this. I welcome comments on these issues.

Sincerely,

Dr. Leigh E. Towill
Leigh.Towill@gmail.com
Good morning, Ms. Anderson:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the stadium issue. As requested, I will share your correspondence with the CSU System Board of Governors. If you wish to directly email the Board in the future, the email address, as stated on the website, is csus_board@mail.colostate.edu.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Hello Sharon,

I tried to find a way to contact all members of the Board of Governors via their website to no avail. I am writing you, since your email was given, to please forward this to all of them.

I am a 2nd generation graduate of CSU (my Mom graduated with Honors and my Dad attended CSU and worked for CSU until his retirement) We have lived in Ft. Collins for over 57 years since 1957. Please don't ruin CSU campus and Ft. Collins. (Our first home was only 2 blocks from campus and I still live quite near it.

I am writing to let you know that I am completely opposed to building a new stadium. Please do not approve building a new stadium. Do not make the costly mistake of doing so (in more ways than one). The majority of us are opposed
(students, alumni, staff, faculty and city residents) for all of the reasons that have been written and spoken over and over again.

Continue football at Hughes Stadium or phase out intercollegiate football for CSU.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

Dara Anderson
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 9:15 AM  
To: bobvangermeersch@aol.com  
Subject: RE: letter to the Board

Good morning, Bob:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

---

From: bobvangermeersch@aol.com [mailto:bobvangermeersch@aol.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 8:27 AM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: letter to the Board

TO: The CSUS Board of Governors 11-25-2014

FROM: Bob Vangermeersch Save Our Stadium Hughes (SOSH)

SUBJECT: Reasons given for building a $300,000,000 main campus stadium

In early 2012 Dr. Frank lamented that CSU had done such an abysmal job of connecting with their alumni. He said less than 5% of alumni contributed to the University, compared to Michigan State's record of almost 25%.

Frank believed that building a new main-campus football stadium would bring alumni back on campus for the football games ... allowing them to reconnect and hopefully, donate.

While SOSH is fully behind reconnecting alumni with their University, we do NOT believe a main-campus stadium is the way to accomplish this.

QUESTION: What is the cost of Dr. Frank's plan?

ANSWER: The proposed stadium would bring 216,000 seats to the campus for 6 events. After discounting student and loyal fan seats (20K attendees), this leaves 96,000 open seats for alumni. The resulting cost is over $300,000,000, PLUS major damage to university-community relationships.

WHAT DOES SOSH RECOMMEND? Other sports teams, such as the men’s and women’s basketball and volleyball teams play at climate-controlled Moby Arena. Moby's capacity is approximately 9,000 seats. There are 47 events in the year and most of them are less than half full. So 4,500 open seats X 47 = 211,000 open seats for alumni. What a great opportunity for alumni to attend games and reconnect!

QUESTION: What does the SOSH plan for alumni reunion cost?

ANSWER: $0, zero, nada, nothing, rien, nichts, zip! In any language, it's just a better idea.

ACTION NEEDED BY THE BOG! Use what the University already has (Moby Arena) and quit gambling with student and taxpayer funds.
4609 Dusty Sage Drive
Unit #1
Fort Collins, CO 80526
November 22, 2014

Dorothy Horrell, Chair
Board of Governors
410 17th St.
Suite 2440
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Ms. Horrell:

I am writing in bitter opposition to a second football stadium at Colorado State University. The academic side of the University continues to be seriously underfunded. Tuition has been raised 10% in several recent years and 20% two years ago while faculty salary increases have often been zero. Nearly all academic departments have several long-term faculty vacancies that cannot be filled due to a severe lack of funds. The list of huge shortfalls in funding for academics is a long one. Simply the academic program at CSU is broke.

In stark contrast, the football program has enjoyed incredible growth and priority in the past 3 years. The coach’s salary is $1,500,000 and goes as high as $2,750,000 under certain stated conditions. Even the $1,500,000 would fund an entire new academic department! Could we attract 1-2 noble laureates with the same amount of money? The football program has approximately 12 assistant football coaches, several of which are new positions. Beyond these position are countless helpers of various kinds. The enormity of the football program is hard to grasp.

Now I must ask you about the role of this land grant university. The purpose of the program is academics – education and research. The goal is not football. The BoG has responsibility to pursue the University’s mission; that mission is education and research. Diverting several hundred million dollars into the football program and a second stadium is unethical and immoral as well as being fiscally stupid. I hope you will take your role seriously when you meet in early December.

Thank you
Dr. David R. Anderson
BS in 1964
MS in 1967
Professor 1984-2003
Emeritus Professor 2003 - present
Good afternoon, Bob:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attachments which you indicated were also sent via express mail. The information will be provided to the CSU System Board of Governors for their review.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

G'Day Sharon

There is an express mail package on the way with 15 hard copies of the attached information.
Please forward them to the BOG members as they have interesting information that the BOG needs to analyze prior to the Dec. meeting.
Please let me know if you have any questions
Regards
Bob Vangermeersch SOSH
970-223-0493
An open letter to the CSU system Board of Governors

To D. Horrell, W. Moshler, S. Johnson, J. Zimlich, M. Gustafson, D. Munn,
J. Rhodes, N. Tuor, D. Flores, A. Bernasek, M. Miniec, R. Deemer, S. Guinn, T. Zercher, B. Schiffelbein.

Dear Governors,

I am submitting this letter to demonstrate my opposition to the proposed CSU on-campus stadium. The information herein is presented in the form of a question, a hypothesis, supporting evidence, and a conclusion – much the way someone would present scientific data.

**QUESTION:** Will a new stadium and a winning football team, bring in more out-of-state students to CSU and increase revenue?

**HYPOTHESIS:** NO! There is no statistical evidence to support that idea.

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE:**

While there are anecdotal sports success stories demonstrating increases in out-of-state applications, these increases are always temporary and do not always lead to increased enrollment.

I have attached two charts that examine the CSU football wins and out-of-state student enrollment in search of any correlation.

- **Chart 1.** Compares, year by year, the percentage of football wins vs. the percent of out-of-state students (OOSS). You will
note the percentage of OOSS actually goes down during some winning seasons and up in many losing seasons. Even during the Sonny Lubick "hay days" (1993 to 2004) there was no increase. The chart clearly shows there is no correlation between winning football seasons and the number of out-of-state students.

- **Chart 2.** Shows the increase or decrease of out-of-state students compared to the percentage of wins for the football team. Like Chart 1, this chart shows no correlation between the number of out-of-state students and football team wins.

On top of this, consider the cost of marketing CSU to out-of-state students via the athletics department. An analysis of the actual 2014 numbers shows that CSU needed to input over $21 million to balance the athletics department budget!

**CONCLUSION:** There is absolutely NO CORRELATION between a winning football team and a gain in out-of-state students. To build an expensive new stadium and market it to potential out-of-state students is nothing short of ridiculous!

**ACTION NEEDED by the BOG:** Please stop this stadium project now.

Bob Vangermeersch 970-223-0493
bobvangermeersch@aol.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OOSS Enrollment Change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-179</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-36</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-30</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-85</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-81</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of a Football Season Wins vs. the O OSS Enrollment Change the Following Fall

- O OSS Enrollment Change

Change in O OSS Enrollment (following Fall)

Percentage of Football Games Won in a Season

20Nov2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of OSS to Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>69 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>27 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992*</td>
<td>42 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>45 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>83 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>58 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>85 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>67 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>77 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>54 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>36 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>33 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Football Team Wins vs. Percentage of O OSS Enrollment to Total Enrollment

Percentage of Games Won
Percentage of O OSS to Total Enrollment

CSU hires "INTO" to recruit foreign students (Feb 2012)

* O OSS data for 1992 and 1993 may be inaccurate.

20 Nov 2014
Good morning, Mr. Wangsvick:

This email confirms receipt of your email and the attachment sent to the CSU System Board of Governors. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

--- On Sat, 11/22/14, Carl Wangsvick <cwangsvi@yahoo.com> wrote:

> From: Carl Wangsvick <cwangsvi@yahoo.com>
> Subject:
> To: chancellor@colostate.edu, sharon.teufel@colostate.edu, "City Council" <cityleaders@fcgov.com>, "Bob Vangermeersch" <bobjvangermeersch@aol.com>, "Joe Garcia" <josephgarcia.executivedirector@dhe.state.co.us>
> Date: Saturday, November 22, 2014, 2:11 PM Folks,
> 
> I have recently submitted the attached letter to the Coloradoan, in anticipation of the Board's pushing CSU into a billion dollars of debt when they meet in December. I bet no single Coloradoan has ever incurred more public debt than Dr. Frank has. It appears this iceberg cannot be avoided, but it must be made clear to posterity, over time, who was responsible: The Department of Higher Education, the Chancellor, the Zimlich and Horrell Boards, the Governor who appointed them, and Dr. Frank, of course. The disinterest of State Legislators is also remarkable. Rarely has a Colorado public entity spent so recklessly, and never, in this democracy, has such a completely draconian process to waste public assets and destroy an institution's credibility been pursued so methodically as it has been here. It has been a magnificent show trial to remember.
Dear Editor:

"More Phony Committees Approve Stadium" is the headline the Coloradoan should have used recently. It's no surprise that all of CSU's hand picked committees have approved Mr. Frank's half billion dollar stadium gamble. Remember, neighbors and outside experts were banned from all but the CDDAC, where discussion was limited to on-campus options. The makeup of the latest "four" committees made another stacked deck. The athletics and facilities director were each a committee. Two other "committees" included none but boosters like Mr. May and Mr Unger; an unknown "community leader," Mr. Woods; and innumerable folks on CSU's payroll. (I am checking to confirm that Mr. McClusky and Ms. Jones were on that payroll. Ask 'em.) I also recall that Ms. Jones, while the city's rep to the Stadium Advisory Committee, wasn't allowed by CSU to report to a City Council meeting, noting that CSU wanted her to keep its deliberations secret, contrary to Colorado law. It's been a three year Cold War "show trial." No committee was allowed to hear testimony from sports economists or any other skeptics. The embarrassing thing was the obligatory parroting of Mr. Frank's known positions by all appointed CSU folks. They say they support the boss. Did another choice exist? Especially troublesome, is the fiscal fairytale these folks believe in. A new stadium costing the General Fund only 12 million? Total? Ever? They bought that! It's off by about 300-400 million, looking at concrete stadium projects elsewhere. (Meanwhile, many women's facilities remain the league's worst.) And CSU's finances are deteriorating. CFO Sweigert's recent report shows a ratings downgrade soon. CSU's Consolidated Financial Index, according to CSU VP Johnson last year, will be the lowest ever. Academic recognition has hit a plateau. No new distinguished profs. A record number of classes (almost half) taught by
adjuncts, mostly women, who, despite CSU’s promises and their PhD’s, are paid less than daycare teachers. Continued rejection by the Association of American Universities. Ultimately, Mr. Frank’s *enduring* CSU legacy will be payments on his billion dollar debt. Still, he sure knows how to conduct a “show trial,” doesn’t he?
Good morning, Mr. McDonald:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: bmcdonald2@aol.com [mailto:bmcdonald2@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 22, 2014 8:45 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: New On-Campus Stadium

Good Morning,

Among my wife, myself and my children we have 7 Degrees from Colorado State University. We owe our financial success to the wonderful education that I received in 1966 (BS) and in 1974 (MS). While we had to work hard and move around the U.S., our goal was to move back to Fort Collins. We were successful in making that happen in 1978 but I continued to commute to other jobs in other cities.

We have been CSU Rams supports for ever and have season Football and Basketball Tickets for many years. We have supported CSU’s football programs during the good years (not so many) and the bad years (many years). When my wife and I were going to CSU in 1963-1966, CSU had an "on-campus" stadium on College and Pitkin. We went to ONE game because I was out of state and I had to work to pay for out-of-state tuition. I came from Nebraska and if I wanted to go to a school that had a great Football Program, I would have stayed in Nebraska and went to the University of Nebraska. No, I wanted to get a great "education" and made many sacrifices to come to CSU which I don't regret.

I guess my point is that CSU has its priorities all wrong at this point. I recently went on CSU’s Website and learned that CSU is ranked as the top university in the nation for sustainability, and is home to leading researchers and programs dedicated to issues of "environmental sustainability". That is certainly a great honor; however, I would like to know how CSU could walk away from a functioning facility like Hughes to build a new on-campus stadium which will cost several million dollars and have significant adverse impacts on transportation, real estate values and safety for the Fort Collins residents. I certainly believe that is counter to the definition of "sustainability" and I challenge CSU to explain the decision why walking away from a functioning facility and building a NEW facility is a "sustainable" decision.

We recently were presented with a new "pricing sheet" for season tickets and "premium seating" prices from a representative from the Athletic Department. We were shocked to see what it will cost us for similar seats in the new stadium. These prices are similar to what the pricing structure is for larger conferences such as the Big 12. However, if I remember, this stadium will be built for a Mountain West Conference Team located in Fort Collins Colorado and not in the Big 12 Conference located in Lincoln, Nebraska or Minneapolis, Minnesota. To my knowledge, CSU Athletic Department has not released to the general public the proposed pricing structure which I am sure that the long standing ticket holders like us
will not be eager to pay and it will be hard to build a new fan base with the higher premium seating charges.

In conclusion, I urge you to carefully consider the decision to move forward with an on-campus stadium. I believe that the decision will have a long-term adverse affect on the CSU Athletic Program and the City of Fort Collins. I would rather stay with Hughes Stadium and have CSU focus on what it is best at...........providing an outstanding education to the students to continue its high ratings and reputation. As much as I enjoy football, the new stadium is overrated.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to share my comments.

Robert McDonald
Good afternoon, Mr. Walters:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and attached letter to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus the CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

Dear Sirs/Madams
Please see attached letter.
Warm regards,
Will Walters
Chair, Sierra Club Poudre Canyon Group

Will Walters
Fort Collins, CO
970-690-3543
November 23, 2014

To: Colorado State University Board of Governors, CSU President Tony Frank, CSU Faculty Council Chair Mary Stromberger and Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics Chair Susan LaRue, ASCSU President Samantha Guinn and Director of Environmental Affairs John Roos

Subject: Environmental impacts of proposed new main-campus stadium

Dear Sirs/Madams:

The Sierra Club, which includes hundreds of proud CSU alumni, students, parents, faculty and staff, is concerned about various environmental impacts of the proposed new main-campus stadium, including but not limited to:

- Most significantly, a set of data the Club reviewed estimates carbon emissions of approximately **90,000 metric tons** from constructing the proposed main-campus stadium.
- Additionally:
  - Increased traffic congestion in the stadium area may negatively impact air quality for nearby residents.
  - A substantial volume of solid waste would result from constructing a new stadium, and potentially demolishing Hughes Stadium.
  - There would be a loss of valuable green space in the location of the proposed new stadium.

The Club therefore urges the University to conduct and publish an environmental impact analysis of all its stadium alternatives and take that analysis into account prior to deciding whether to pursue constructing a new main-campus stadium. The Club also urges that the University consider the impacts in the context of its various green initiatives, including its ongoing Climate Action planning initiatives and its stated goal of achieving a net-zero campus by 2050. CSU’s most recent Climate Action Plan pegged annual carbon emissions in 2012 at 218,800 metric tons. An addition of 90,000 metric tons for a single project would appear to dramatically impact the University’s ability to meet its carbon reduction commitments. The Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis, used by the EPA and other regulatory agencies, which estimates the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon emissions in a given year, suggests that those emissions could have additional costs to society upwards of $20 million (the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says the SCC estimates are under-stated). A recent court decision in Colorado held that a government agency was required to take such costs into account when permitting a project.

The Club lauds CSU’s many and varied green initiatives, including Green is Gold; its participation in the City of Fort Collins Climate Wise program; its STARS Gold rating; its signatory to the Talloires Declaration; its investment in LEED certified facilities; its research into sustainability across the spectrum of agriculture, business, energy, natural resources, transportation, etc. Nonetheless, “reduce, reuse, recycle” is an apt mantra a truly “Green” university should apply to decisions of environmental consequence such as this one. The “Net Zero Hughes” proposal floated by some students a year or so ago merits consideration as an initiative that could further position CSU as a national leader in sustainability and perhaps contribute to CSU being the first to achieve a STARS Platinum rating. It would be inconsistent with CSU’s stated goals and values, with the values of its host city’s residents, and potentially with evolving environmental law, to make decisions regarding this project prior to performing and without consideration of an environmental impact analysis.

We respectfully request a response describing CSU’s intentions and commitment with regard to analyzing and considering environmental impacts in its decision of whether to build a new main campus stadium.

Will Walters
Chair, Sierra Club Poudre Canyon Group Executive Committee

PO Box 20, Fort Collins, CO 80522-0020

www.rmc.sierracclub.org/pcg
Good morning, Tom:

The December meeting agenda is being finalized. Currently the stadium portion of the meeting is slated to begin at noon on Friday, December 5th, in the 2nd floor atrium of the CSU Denver Center. I recommend that you check the Board's website next week for the final agenda and public notice when they are published 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Have a Happy Thanksgiving, too.

Sharon

Sharon Teufel  
Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440  
Denver, CO 80202  
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----
From: Arthur Thomas Linnell [mailto:at.linnell@gmail.com]  
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 9:44 AM  
To: Teufel, Sharon  
Subject: Planning for December meeting

Good morning, Sharon,

Since those of us who plan to attend the December meeting of the Board will be traveling in to Denver for it, we would be happy if we knew as soon as possible in advance when the discussion of the stadium will be scheduled. Thanks for getting us the word if you can. I also know that Dr. Frank may say something to the media before then and alert everyone to the plan, so we’ll also watch for that. Have a great day, and a Happy Thanksgiving.

Tom Linnell
City Leaders,

Time to start backing the SOSH view. Here is just one more survey that shows the April election will bring in 4 new council members dedicated to protecting our community by opposing the main-campus stadium. If you want to keep your job or upgrade to Mayor, time to start thinking about what it means to be an elected representative.

Otherwise, start a PR campaign to show us why a main-campus stadium would be great for our community.

"You cannot stand still (be neutral) on a moving train," Howard Zin.

Michael Pruznick, D3 Citizen


Fort Collins supporting 1 and/or 2: 24+19+16=59 (59/97=60% SOSH-view)
Fort Collins supporting 3 and/or 4: 10+5+19=34 (34/97=40% main-campus)
Colorado State University Football Stadium Should Remain at the Foothills Campus Location

Executive Summary

The Save Our Stadium Hughes (SOSH) committee would like to provide strong data in support of allowing the Colorado State University Stadium to remain in its current location. Although it’s been nearly three years since Tony Frank presented the main-campus stadium proposal, many of the concerns raised at the beginning still remain unanswered and unresolved. The proposal offered to the Board of Governors by Tony Frank has not been honored or fulfilled.

This topic is of utmost importance because the decision made about it will significantly impact the quality of life on campus and in the “Choice City” of Fort Collins.

Supporting Information

A scientific poll by Triton Research & Polling Group (7/13/14 and 7/14/14), commissioned by SOSH, showed with 95% confidence that our Fort Collins community opposes a main-campus stadium by more than two to one. An ASCSU survey (4/5/12 through 5/31/12) with more than 3,500 responses showed over 70% of CSU students were opposed to a main-campus stadium. Other surveys, including one by the Coloradoan (July, 2014) showed similar results.

The cost to our city for improvements in infrastructure for the proposed stadium would be tens of millions of dollars, borne by Fort Collins taxpayers. Game-day attendees would impact a very large area of the most congested portion of Fort Collins (College and Prospect avenues), without an adequate ingress/egress road system to the center of the city.

The Community Design Development Advisory Committee (CDDAC), established by CSU, included a traffic/parking report without considering the many trains that run through the city each day. Their report (Figure 38) relied on over 50 separate main-campus parking lots for game day parking. In their report CDDAC worked only to resolve problems imposed by a main-campus stadium. The report never addressed the same possibilities with Hughes. The focus was deliberately limited to not include the potential of Hughes Stadium.

Nationally recognized economists, Dr. Andrew Zimbalist, Dr. Victor Matheson, and Dr. Joel Maxcy, agree that this stadium will negatively impact most businesses within a 2-3 mile radius. They also concur that a main-campus stadium would have far greater negative impacts than any perceived benefits for CSU and Fort Collins.

Closing Perspective

Citizens do not agree that a new stadium is necessary; the current proposals for a main-campus stadium are not a fit for our community. Hughes Stadium, sitting on 162 acres, in a beautiful and functional location, is the best option for both CSU and Fort Collins. The vision of President Dr. William E. Morgan (1949-1969) has served the university and the community well.

The Hughes Stadium site showcases our beautiful, natural environment and is superior to the main-campus site for televised games. There is ample land for developing a revenue-generating athletic campus focused on sports performance and research. Such a campus would complement the equestrian and atmospheric science programs that are already a part of the Foothills Campus.

Our community is essentially united in its opposition to a main-campus stadium. Instead, it strongly supports repairing and maintaining Hughes, with the possibility of developing Hughes to become a revenue-generating athletic campus.
Good afternoon, Ms. Benscheidt:

This acknowledges receipt of both of your emails to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

The people of Fort Collins DON'T WANT A STADIUM BUILT ON CAMPUS! The existing Hughes Stadium was built in the perfect location. Plenty of parking, lots of room to tailgate without bothering the neighbors, the lights and noise aren't an issue. The stadium is up against the foothills already, so it doesn't necessarily block the view of our beautiful mountains. A football game can be held there with minimal consequence to the rest of the city. I feel a big plus is that all activity can be very well managed by law-enforcement.

If a new stadium were to be built on campus, I feel it would drive a huge wedge between CSU and the citizens of Fort Collins. Several years ago, I attended a public meeting where we voted that any new construction NOT exceed four stories in height. The 11 or 12 story stadium would completely block our views we hold so dear in Fort Collins. **Our views of the foothills are what make FTC unique and special.**

The cost of building an on-campus stadium should include all the extra street changes Fort Collins' taxpayers are going to get stuck with. Most likely CSU would have to raise the old Hughes Stadium and have to build more dorms and educational facilities at their "West Campus". A bus system would be necessary to get students back and forth. These EXTRA costs should be included. Any on-campus acreage should be preserved to accommodate future growth for dorms and educational facilities.

The initial fund raising attempt should be a BIG RED FLAG to all of you on the Board of Gov's. This whole thing is about Tony Frank's ego, and nothing more.

Yes, it's CSU's right, but is it the right thing to do?

Beth Benscheidt-Fort Collins resident for 38 yrs
970-224-5571
Please, before you even think about letting CSU build an on-campus stadium, ASK what the people of Fort Collins think about it. The tax-payers are going to end up paying for a lot of things that are necessary to accommodate it.
Polis Lauds FCC Proposal to Increase High-Speed Broadband Access for Low Income Students

WASHINGTON, DC — Representative Jared Polis (CO-02) today made the following statement lauding the Federal Communication Commission’s (FCC) proposal to improve and expand the federal E-Rate program:

“Access to high-speed broadband is a necessity for our schools and libraries to prepare students to succeed in the 21st century economy. Unfortunately, inequities in access to broadband increase the digital divide -- preventing our most at-risk students from taking full advantage of new technologies and learning tools, and hindering their success in the modern workforce.

“Chairman Wheeler’s proposal addresses the critical need to expand broadband to reach more schools and libraries. I applaud Chairman Wheeler and urge all FCC members to support this move so that more students in Colorado and across the country will be able to take advantage of personalized learning opportunities and succeed in next-generation jobs.”

Last December, Rep. Polis led a bipartisan letter to the FCC arguing for swift action to improve and modernize the E-Rate program. The full text of the letter can be view in the attached document.

Sue Windels
District Education Advocate
Office of Congressman Jared Polis, CD2
4770 Baseline Rd. Suite 220
Boulder, CO 80303
303-484-9596 (office)
303-568-9007 (fax)
December 18, 2013

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Wheeler, Commissioner Clyburn, Commissioner O’Rielly, Commissioner Rosenworcel, and Commissioner Pai:

As Members of Congress concerned with improving our education system and preparing students for the jobs of the future, we are writing to urge swift action to improve and modernize the E-rate program in order to help connect our nation’s schools with high-speed broadband over the next five years. This critical update will ensure every school has the ability to accelerate next-generation education reforms, support teachers, and enhance student learning. We believe this is an important step we can take to provide our children with high-quality digital learning opportunities in order to improve student outcomes and prepare them to succeed in a 21st century economy.

Improving our children’s ability to take advantage of learning technologies has always been a bipartisan endeavor, as has been the E-rate program itself. We are proud to support the bipartisan recommendations to update E-rate and we call for those across the education, government, and business communities to recognize the opportunity we have to improve and modernize our schools. Therefore, we ask the Commission for swift action to bring high-speed broadband to our students on an expedited basis.

Closing the education gap means ensuring that our schools and libraries have access to digital learning opportunities that require high-speed broadband. However, too many of our children are currently trying to learn skills for tomorrow with outdated infrastructure from the past. While the E-rate program was enormously successful in bringing basic telephone and broadband to schools and classrooms, the connectivity provided is no longer sufficient. The average American school has about the same bandwidth as the average American home, but with 200 times as many users. Therefore, 72% of our schools do not have the Internet infrastructure they need to take advantage of digital learning opportunities today, and fewer than 1% have the infrastructure they will need in the future.

In an age when high-speed broadband is transforming almost every aspect of our lives, we must extend digital opportunities to every classroom. This is particularly crucial in rural areas, where students are less likely to have the speeds and infrastructure they need to take advantage of new technologies and high-quality educational content. Forty million of our nation’s students—the next generation of talent in the United States—are being left behind without the speeds they need to succeed. As Commissioner Ajit Pai has noted, “Today, too many kids walk off the school bus, only to walk decades into the past. This is unacceptable. … Parents are right to expect that schools will help prepare their children for the America of tomorrow, and they know that can’t happen in the classroom of yesterday.”
Experts agree that to enable students to take full advantage of digital learning, America’s schools should aim for 100 Mbps of bandwidth or more for every 1,000 students and staff members today, and 1 Gbps by 2017. In today’s global economy, these high speeds aren’t just an educational imperative, but a competitive necessity. Test results released this month show that American students still lag far behind countries like China, South Korea, Japan, Switzerland, and the Netherlands in math, reading, and science. It’s no longer enough just to compete for jobs; we have to compete for higher educational outcomes enabled by higher broadband speeds.

This means we need to: (1) Focus E-rate on broadband connectivity and infrastructure to ensure that we maximize the impact of the program on learning by limiting support for yesterday’s outdated dial-up era technologies; (2) Create an upgrade fund within the E-rate program to connect every school and library, particularly those in rural areas, to high-speed broadband; (3) Increase transparency and accountability for the program in order to reduce costs, research effective practices, and ensure that all students have access to the connectivity they need; and (4) Simplify and streamline onerous paperwork requirements to improve program efficiency. These reforms will make possible strategic investments to deploy high-speed broadband to schools and classrooms across the country.

We simply cannot prepare our kids to compete for 21st century jobs by leaving them stranded with age-old technologies. Therefore, we ask you to support swift action to modernize and expand the E-rate program to bring transformative learning opportunities to every school in America.

Sincerely,

Jared Polis
Member of Congress

Chris Gibson
Member of Congress

Suzan DelBene
Member of Congress

Don Young
Member of Congress

Tony Cárdenas
Member of Congress
Yvette Clarke  
Member of Congress

John Delaney  
Member of Congress

Richard L. Hanna  
Member of Congress

Ruben Hinojosa  
Member of Congress

Henry “Hank” Johnson, Jr.  
Member of Congress

Adam Kinzinger  
Member of Congress

Barbara Lee  
Member of Congress

Susan Davis  
Member of Congress

Marcia L. Fudge  
Member of Congress

Denny Heck  
Member of Congress

Mike Honda  
Member of Congress

Derek Kilmer  
Member of Congress

Rick Larsen  
Member of Congress

Jerry McNerney  
Member of Congress
George Miller  
Member of Congress

Chellie Pingree  
Member of Congress

Eric Swalwell  
Member of Congress

Gary Peters  
Member of Congress

Carol Shea-Porter  
Member of Congress

Frederica S. Wilson  
Member of Congress
November 17, 2014

Jane Rhodes
Colorado University System
410 17th Street, Suite 2440
Denver, CO 80202

I am sending you this letter to ask that you not approve an on-campus stadium at CSU.

From the start, this has been a very bad idea, and has been promoted in a dishonest and misleading way. Their concept of “open and transparent” is that it has been, openly and transparently, a pro new stadium sales pitch, full of lies.

They never mention the average stadium is on the average 140% of announced cost. There revenue projections include a bounce of 5% for the first year, then another 5% the next, for five years, and that 25% goes on for the future. That is a lie, there is a bounce for a year or two, and then it goes back to normal. The estimated the ticket sales revenue at 100% of tickets issued, but every game a good percentage are complementary tickets, with no revenue. Another lie. They base in increase on attendance revenue by a survey email. People who respond to surveys are not a random sample, it preselects individuals who have a bias. This is another way to fudge the numbers, another lie.

Just like a mortgage, when you raise bonds, there is the equal of mortgage insurance, points, under-writer fees, and a host of other costs. They were not mentioned in the Stadium Advisory Committees presentation.

Tony Frank will have us believe no one in any way shape or form, will ever donate any money to Hughes. Yet people and business will trip over each other to donate to an on-campus stadium, and only an on-campus stadium? I can't help thinking that there is something about the current Hughes site, that is important to Tony and the powers behind the curtain. It would cost less to build a new stadium at that site, than at the on-campus site. Just like was done to Mile High stadium. But the pro-stadium gang won't even let that be discussed. Is there another agenda they have for this very valuable land? Perhaps a “public/private” partnership, where the public gets screwed, and the private has a windfall?

When the started this process, Tony repeated “this will be 100% private financing.” When that did not materialize, it came down to “50% must be raised.” When that did not come to pass, it is now the “four options.” Clearly, they were overly optimistic. Should we trust there judgment?

They put out a survey in 2012 to the students. I have enclosed the questions asked, can
you not see how leading most of these questions are. Also it never asks if you are in favor of the stadium or not. Despite this they did receive over 180 pages, in small print, of reply, overwhelmingly against the stadium. So the results were not released until after the semester was over.

I have also enclosed an article which shows how stadiums in general, never live up to the claims of those behind the project. It makes good reading.

There is much to be said about the current Hughes site. It is in a wonderful location. It is much easier to manage traffic. I can't believe fixing the bath and locker rooms can't be done much less expensively than a new stadium. I has great parking, as opposed to horrible traffic on the Prospect road site. I is a better venue for tailgating.

Given the high likely hood that the new on-campus stadium will, despite claims to the contrary, require the taxpayers of Colorado to cough up the money, it will reinforce the increasing awareness that government is broken. Colorado will have to cut funds to schools, roads, and other services, because of TABOR. Then there will be a ballot item to increase taxes, which will be promoted as necessary for schools and roads. But too many folks may see that it was for the new on-campus stadium, and vote it down. This will hurt the most needy.

Please consider this information and vote down the new on-campus stadium.

Thank You

Christopher Marshall
926 West Mountain Ave.
Fort Collins, CO 80521
Questions on the Student Survey

1. Are you a current CSU Student?
2. What year are you at CSU?
3. Where do you currently live?
4. How often do you attend athletic events at CSU, including Hughes Stadium?
5. Up until this point, I have PRIMARILY been reading news and material about the proposed On-Campus Stadium Through?
6. When I become an Alumni, a new on campus stadium would increase or decrease visits to CSU main Campus?
7. Which of the following factors should be most important to CSU in making the decision on whether to build a stadium on campus.
   - Economic sustainability and affordability of CSU
   - Impact on Academic quality
   - Effective resource management
   - Impact on visibility of the university
   - Impact on surrounding community
   - Impact of environment
   - Impact on local economy
   - Impact on connections to alumni
   - Impact on athletic success
   - Impact on connections to donors
   - Other
8. Please indicate agreement with the following statement "Athletic success can be used as an as an important component of the University's image nationally"
   - from strongly agree to strongly disagree
9. Please indicate agreement with the following statement "I would feel a greater sense of pride in my CSU degree if CSU athletics were nationally known."
   - from strongly agree to strongly disagree
10. Please indicate agreement with the following statement "I understand the difference between public funds, and private funds
11. CSU President Dr. Tony Frank has said that no public funds of any sort, would be used in the construction of the potential on-campus stadium. Additionally, the Stadium Advisory Committee has been reviewing financial opportunities to cover recurring operating costs without public funds as well. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements "Knowing that no public funds of any kind will be used in the construction of an on-campus stadium, I think it would be right for the University to pursue the project.

   "Not only is this push polling it is a lie"
President Dr. Tony Frank has said that no public funds of any sort, would be used in the construction of a on-campus stadium. (Repeat of above question) Indicate level of agreement the statement "Not using state funds, tuition, or student fee affects my opinion the on-campus stadium.

Tony Frank has said that any potential location for the stadium would not inhibit views of the Mountains, nor be placed on any greenspace, buildings may be moved - ect.

From agree to disagree " I am comfortable with the potential locations of the on campus stadium"

What would the best way be for ASCSU to engage you in the Stadium discussion.

Based on the information you have seen in this survey, and in other sources, what additional information do you need to make an informed opinion about the on-campus Stadium

Do you have any further comments about the proposed on-campus stadium.

The question not asked ???

Do you favor or oppose an on-campus stadium?
Playing ball with public dollars

Lawmakers should demand economic guarantees before giving taxpayer dollars to billionaire sports owners

July 28, 2014 6:00AM ET

by Amy B. Dean (/profiles/d/amy-b-dean.html) - @amybdealn (http://www.twitter.com/amybdealn)

Again and again the same old story plays out in sports stadiums across the country. Team owners in the NFL, MLB and NBA demand hundreds of millions of dollars in public assistance in order to build new venues. Sometimes they offer a carrot: a vague, far-off promise of jobs and future tax revenue. But often they offer only the stick: the threat that they'll move their team elsewhere if a city or state government does not comply with their demand.

Years later, the promised economic benefits rarely materialize, and taxpayers are left nursing old wounds. Yet sports owners start the process all over again — demanding new rounds of subsidies and tax breaks ... or else.

We’ve seen this happen twice in the past two months alone. In Atlanta, construction began on the new Falcon stadium in May. Although the stadium — which is being subsidized with a $278 million bond issue — will be publicly owned, all revenues will go to benefit Home Depot co-founder Arthur Blank, the owner of the Falcons football franchise. Not to be left out of the action, Liberty Media, the conglomerate that owns the Atlanta Braves, demanded a massive
subsidy of its own. This time, the city refused (http://nextcity.org/daily/entry/mayor-kasim-reed-happy-braves-leave-atlanta). Eight days after construction began on a new suburban Atlanta Braves Stadium, the Cobb County, Georgia, Board of Commissioners approved (http://www.bondbuyer.com/issues/123_102/atlanta-braves-stadium-bonds-okd-1062874-1.html) a $397 million bond issue backed by county property taxes for the team owners’ benefit.

On the other side of the country, the City Council of Sacramento approved (http://www.sacbee.com/2014/04/03/6294304/sacramento-arena-deal-the-final.html) $255 million in bonds for the new Kings arena on May 20, committing the city to covering over half the project’s price tag. Having suffered seven years of budget deficits, the city is now responsible for an additional $21.9 million in debt payments each year.

Now is the time for elected officials to require strong guarantees alongside this sort of investment that will force billionaire sports owners to make good on their promises of community benefit — or repay the public for its trouble.

**Economic Illusions**

Studies show that massive stadium subsidies like these never pay off for taxpayers. As Harvard University professor of urban planning Judith Grant has argued (http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-11-06/stadiums-cost-taxpayers-extra-10-billion-harvard-s-long-finds.html), “Most economic analyses demonstrate that sports facilities produce very few or no net new economic benefits relative to construction costs.” Economists John Siegfried and Andrew Zimbalist write (http://www.uwlax.edu/faculty/anderson/micro-principles/stadiums.pdf), “there is no statistically significant positive correlation between sports facility construction and economic development.”

Few cities have faced tougher times than Detroit, but its public officials continue to play recklessly with city funds. Last July, Michigan approved a state-level bond issue for Little Caesar’s mogul Dan Illitch to construct a hockey arena just one week after pushing the city into municipal bankruptcy. Though it was unable to halt a water privatization plan for Wayne County or prevent Detroit from slashing pensions for teachers, firefighters, police officers and sanitation workers, the state somehow came up with $284.5 million for a new hockey arena. The Detroit Economic Growth Corp., the public-private partnership overseeing the public contribution, claims (http://www.mlive.com/business/detroit/index.ssf/2013/06/plans_for_650_million_detroit.html#/) the subsidies will create 8,300 jobs and a $1.8 billion economic impact across the state. But taxpayers have every reason to be skeptical.
"Nearly every time a franchise builds a new stadium, the public fronts a substantial portion of the cost."

They need look only to Cincinnati. In what The Wall Street Journal called (http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB100014240527487044613044576216330349497852) "one of the worst professional sports deals ever struck by a local government," Cincinnatians in 1996 were promised $300 million in economic benefits plus the opportunity to keep their team in exchange for financing the Bengals' home field. In fact, what happened was a project whose final cost was nearly double the original estimate. The county sales tax was raised, and promises that the economic benefits would enable a rollback of property taxes were broken. Fifteen years after the deal, the county has found itself saddled with debt payments and without evidence of the economic benefits it expected in return.

The list goes on, and the trend is national. Nearly every time a franchise builds a new stadium, the public forks out substantial portions of the cost. Houston raised taxes and public debt to fund over 70 percent of the Texans' $424 million stadium. Six counties in Colorado had to raise their sales tax to pay for two-thirds of the $365 million Broncos stadium. Arizona and the city of Glendale are paying for nearly 68 percent of the $455 million Cardinals stadium with sales tax increases and proposed budget cuts.

**Private sector lessons**

What can be done to stanch this flow of public dollars to profit-making sports franchises?

The easiest and simplest solution is for local and state governments to stop promising tax revenues for private projects. Collective discipline would go a long way toward preventing sports owners from pitting various cities and states against one another in order to extract the choicest concessions.

Governments could also take cues from the private sector. No private sector CEO would be allowed to keep his or her job if he or she invested money in a project without concrete evidence that the agreement would benefit shareholders. In the case of government, it is insane for elected officials to sign on to stadium deals without having some community benefit agreement in place to ensure that promises about jobs and economic development are not pie-in-the-sky fantasies and will produce demonstrable returns for taxpayers.

Public representatives could demand a stake in the enterprises in which they are investing. Were someone to advocate for even partial public ownership, he or she would surely be denounced as the red menace of professional sports. Yet the Green Bay Packers — whose 4 million shares of stock are wholly owned by the public, split among some 300,000 fans — have
shown that a franchise can thrive under nontraditional ownership. (As Dave Zirin observes: http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/sportingscene/2011/01/those-non-profit-packers.html) in The New Yorker, for Packers fans, “Even the beer is cheaper than at the typical NFL stadium.”)

Short of giving the public an ownership stake in subsidized firms, the absolute minimum that our elected officials should demand are community benefit agreements — policy tools (http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/1/stop-the-americanhustle0.html) that require corporations to use some money from tax incentives to help communities — to ensure that developers and teams make good on their promises. Projects such as the live entertainment complex at Los Angeles’ Staples Center and the new Yankee Stadium in New York City were negotiated with such agreements attached. In Los Angeles a coalition of community, labor and religious organizations came together to demand that, in exchange for public support, the developer make concrete commitments such as a $1 million down payment for public parks, $650,000 for affordable housing, a public hiring commitment and the guarantee that 70 percent of the jobs created by the project would pay the city’s living wage. Researchers have found (http://uar.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/03/24/1078087414527064.full.pdf) that the deal resulted in several benefits to the community, including even more than the minimum number of housing units in the agreement, a land trust and a program to hire locally.

**Going further**

Not all agreements have worked out so well. In Atlanta, for example, community groups have begun to doubt whether the agreement the city made with the developer around the new Falcon stadium is legally binding. Because of this, a new generation of community benefit agreements needs to be strong and legally enforceable in order to prevent developers from backpedaling.

To that end, states such as Arkansas and Minnesota have begun implementing clawback legislation to allow the public to demand its money back from projects that receive taxpayer support but do not live up to their economic development promises. In Arkansas, Hewlett-Packard received at least $17 million for the promise of 1,000 jobs in the city of Conway. After the company downsized the facility, firing half its workforce, clawback provisions allowed the director of the Arkansas Department of Economic Development to demand that the company return a portion of the public money for the jobs it did not keep in the state. Given this track record, it wouldn’t be unreasonable for states to ban these kinds of deals altogether. But short of that, strong and enforceable standards to ensure public benefits are the minimum we should demand in exchange for any future support. The public has been suckered on stadiums too many times.
Good afternoon, Mr. Kibler:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

---

From: bckibler1@aol.com [mailto:bckibler1@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 2:55 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: On Campus Stadium

Board of Governors
Colorado State University

I graduated from Colorado A & M, 1953, from the school of Mechanical Engineering. Also commissioned as a Second Lieutenant, USAF, served two years during the Korean Conflict. I am a Registered Professional Engineer and now retired.

I am opposed to a new on campus stadium.

It is my opinion that the campus is much too small to accept such a large facility. I have visited the stadium in Minn. that was referenced by the stadium committee as similar to the one proposed for CSU.

There are many more related items that have been discussed in the local news paper in objection to the new stadium with which I agree.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert L Kibler
Teufel, Sharon  

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 3:31 PM  
To: Cathy Groene  
Subject: RE: CSU stadium

Good afternoon, Mr. Groene:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, #2440  
Denver, CO 80202

----Original Message-----
From: Cathy Groene [mailto:cggroene@msn.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 2:08 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: CSU stadium

Gentlemen,

Please support/fund the on campus stadium in Fort Collins. I'm an alum and a donor to the university. I will donate to the new stadium but will not donate to fixing Hughes. The OCS will bring more people to campus and see the great things that are going on at CSU. My friends and I have not been on campus in many years, we attend the football games then drive back to Denver but don't go to the campus. Please approve a new stadium.

Thank you,
Greg Groene
Michigan’s President Speaks Frankly About the Craziness of College Sports—A Rarity in Today’s World

The Wall Street Journal Jason Gay
Nov. 13, 2014 12:21 a.m. ET

Who believes in the myth of big-time college sports anymore? The polite fantasy of the student-athlete playing gratefully for pride and tuition has been stripped away by an overwhelming financial reality that became too big and rich to ignore. The hypocrisies can be seen from outer space, and public opinion—not to mention the courts—are catching up.

Still, college sports remain mostly disinterested in pulling back the curtain. The show remains the thing, and most of us remain intrigued by the show, even if it requires a certain, artful reality distortion. If you’re going to obsess over, say, major-college football, it’s useful if you ignore the conflicts, exploitation and awkwardness and (at least temporarily) give yourself over to the illusion.

Celebrate the wins. Howl over the losses. Buy an officially licensed T-shirt; do a shot from an officially licensed Jell-O mold. Don’t go hunting too hard for the truth.

But every so often, the truth can’t help but slip out.

It happened in August, when longtime Kansas State football coach Bill Snyder observed the money-soaked atmosphere that surrounds the game and basically declared the college game to be toast. “I think we’ve sold out,” said Snyder, who, it should be added, will make more than $2.7 million this season. “The concept of college football no longer has any bearing on the quality of the person, the quality of students.”

“It’s no longer about education,” Snyder continued. “We’ve sold out to the cameras over there, and TV has made its way, and I don’t fault TV. I don’t fault whoever broadcasts games. They have to make a living and that’s what they do, but athletics—that’s it. It’s sold out.”
This was admirably honest, as the 75-year-old Snyder is known to be. But within a few weeks, the coach’s sellout comments were pushed aside for the sellout itself. The college season began. The inevitable rah-rah arrived, as did the national fever over rankings and the newly created football playoff, reported to be worth around a half billion annually in TV rights.

The show would not stop.

But another dose of truth arrived this week, when Mark Schlissel, the recently installed president of the University of Michigan, found himself in a faculty governance meeting in which he discussed the school’s struggling football program and the pressure to quickly hire an athletic director to replace David Brandon, who resigned amid a fan frenzy in late October.

Schlissel, who assumed Michigan’s presidency in July after arriving from Brown University, is relatively new to the bizarro world of big-time college sports. He sounded ready to hit or at least tap the brakes. To his fresh eyes, priorities were misshapen.

“If we had won Nobel Prizes this year, we wouldn’t have gotten as much attention as did our AD,” Schlissel said, according to the Michigan Daily. “It’s sad but it’s really true.”

According to the Daily, Schlissel was troubled by the might of the athletic department and its independence from the school—“diminishing connectedness,” was the term he used—as well as relaxed admission standards for student-athletes. With so many concerns, the president was taken aback by the rush to make a decision on Brandon’s successor.

“I’ve really learned that this whole athletic sphere and the usual way you approach things just doesn’t work,” Schlissel said. “It’s just a crazed or irrational approach that the world and the media takes to athletics decisions.”

Translation: Just because big-time college sports have lost their collective minds doesn’t mean everybody at my school has to lose their minds, too.

Schlissel would later walk back some of his comments, apologizing to current football coach Brady Hoke, under whom the Michigan team’s academic performance has improved. But the president’s clarification should not discourage future outspokenness. The warped environment of collegiate athletics may be old news, but seldom is it discussed so freely at the top.

Schlissel went there. Fight Club talked about Fight Club. We’re so accustomed to college presidents, fearful of alienating alumni and donors, happily playing along with the sports machine, but Schlissel hilariously described the attention to sports and his AD hunt as a “time sink.”

(Which it surely is!)

This blast of fresh air was another reminder of how jaded we’ve become to modern college sports. Even staggering revelations—like rampant academic fraud at North Carolina—are just kindling atop the fire. Hirings, firings, multimillion-dollar deals rewarded…what do people expect? This is what happens when schools abandon principles for a piece of the action. It’s been happening for years. Another football Saturday will arrive and we’ll again give ourselves over to the games.

Maybe it would be helpful occasionally to press pause. Not fall prey to the “crazed or irrational approach,” as Michigan’s president put it. Maybe those fresh eyes have some better ideas. Maybe there’s something more that big-time college sports can offer than an illusion. At the very least, there’s the truth.
Good morning, Mr. Linnell:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attached letter to the CSU System Board of Governors regarding the Colorado State University stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Tom Linnell [mailto:at.linnell@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2014 11:25 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Attached statement regarding new football stadium at CSU

Please accept and review the attached letter pertinent to your discussion of a new stadium at CSU-Fort Collins. Thank you.
Tom Linnell
November 15, 2014

Board of Governors-Colorado State University

Re: Football program success and non-resident student enrollment

Dear Board,

Only a few days remain before Dr. Frank will make his recommendation to you regarding a football stadium in Fort Collins. We suspect that you are being bombarded with emails and letters from the various sides of the debate, so we will be brief with this input.

Proponents of a new stadium have argued that it will attract better athletes who will produce winning teams which would in turn propel CSU to a “top-of-mind” status nationally. They usually conclude that this would bolster CSU’s finances by enticing more out-of-state students to come to CSU.

A review of enrollment figures from the last 30 years contradicts their assumptions.

The short story is that non-resident enrollment at CSU as well as at CU-Boulder shows no correlation to the football records of either school. (Full disclosure: after CU won the national championship in 1990, their incoming freshman class in 1992 bumped up by around 15% or about 500 students. However, the very next year it went back down by about 600 students. Since then, it has hovered around the historic average in spite of the CU football team playing in numerous high-profile bowls and defeating big-name teams like Notre Dame and Oregon.)

The data from CSU history are perhaps even more revealing. Non-resident enrollment at CSU had hit a peak in the early 1990’s, just before Sonny Lubick was hired. The Rams then enjoyed unprecedented football success for the next eight years, including three top-25 rankings. Surprisingly, however, while Ram football was rising to national prominence, CSU non-resident enrollment was steadily falling. Even more surprisingly, during the lean football years after the Lubick era, non-resident enrollment displayed a renewed upward trend through 2012.

Whatever decision Dr. Frank suggests or you approve, it should be made with the greatest possible transparency regarding the available data. It is safe to say that there is no positive correlation between winning in football and attracting out-of-state students. We hope that this information is helpful to you in your deliberations.

Thank you.

Tom Linnell, for SOSH
at.linnell@gmail.com
Good morning, Ms. Wright:

This acknowledges receipt of your email and the attached letter to the CSU System Board of Governors regarding the Colorado State University stadium issue. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors prior to the December Board meeting.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

From: AD Wright [mailto:adwright2001@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2014 2:01 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Letter to BOG for 12/5/14 Meeting Re CSU Stadium

Dear CSU Board of Governors,

I have prepared a letter that I respectfully request that you take the opportunity to read prior to the upcoming December BOG meeting. Given the sensitive nature of some of the information included, I did not wish to post it publicly on the CSU stadium website. However, I believe this information is extremely critical to the decision you are being asked to consider at this meeting, and trust that each Board member will review it. I will include the letter as an attachment, as well as in the body of this email. Please notify me if there is any problem with this request to have this letter included in the material to be distributed in advance of the BOG meeting.

Thank you very much for taking the time to read this letter in advance of the December Board meeting.

Sincerely,
Anita Wright

11/13/14

Colorado State University Board of Governors,

As a member of the Colorado State University Board of Governors, your appointment is one of great responsibility to the citizens of the State of Colorado. The Colorado Constitution and the Colorado Revised Statutes vest the supervision and control of the CSU System in this Board of Governors. As a part of the Audit Charter, your fiduciary responsibility encompasses reviewing the reliability and integrity of financial and operating information and the means used to identify, measure, classify, and report such information. As each of you contemplates the upcoming decision regarding the appropriate course of action for CSU’s football stadium, your fiduciary responsibility to perform due diligence in determining the best option becomes especially critical. The ramifications of your decision go far beyond the boundaries of CSU, and I ask each of you to take a much broader approach in examination of the details, rather than simply relying solely on one person’s recommendation.
My involvement in this issue over the past three years as a CSU alum (B.S., M.S., ABD), CSU Flag Team member (3 yrs), retired CSU budget administrator/faculty (24 yrs), parent of a CSU student, appraiser, and Fort Collins resident (43 yrs) has given me a depth of understanding that I would like to share as succinctly as possible with you. Most of you are from outside of the Fort Collins community and have not experienced the intense ill will that this proposed stadium debate has created.

President Tony Frank has requested additional time to analyze four stadium options, two of which are utilizing Hughes Stadium and two are building a new main-campus stadium. The latter two options pose a much greater risk to the university, as Dr. Frank mentioned, due to so many unknowns in constructing from scratch and incorporating city infrastructure/mitigation costs, financing complexities, greater potential for cost overruns, site issues (such as the groundwater table only 15 feet below the surface), and higher financing cost. These two options also place a tremendous burden on the community with far-reaching negative impacts.

A feasibility study of the proposed main-campus stadium was performed by CSL Consulting, and has been reviewed by another consulting firm, ECA (Entertainment & Culture Advisors, which has limited experience with sports stadiums). Both of these companies have a conflict of interest in that they could conceivably receive additional funding from CSU if the main-campus stadium is considered ‘feasible.’ These studies have been reviewed in great detail by nationally-recognized, unbiased sports economists, and have unanimously been found to be incredibly unrealistic, even at the lowest revenue projections. The CSL attendance projections were based upon a survey of hypothetical questions that had only a 9.4% response rate, and a built-in “selection bias,” which is an inflation of real spending decisions. ECA noted that CSL made no attempt to adjust for this selection bias, and noted also that the projections were very optimistic. ECA also mentioned the “halo” or “honeymoon” effect that was not considered in their 4%/year increase in attendance projections (the boost in attendance from a new stadium is primarily a first year phenomenon, as per empirical research; Clapp & Hakes, 2005).

- The nation’s leading sports economist, Dr. Andrew Zimbalist of Smith College, said “CSL has a lot of experience writing bullish reports for pro stadium coalitions. They have no standing as an objective source, in my view. To my knowledge, they have no peer reviewed publications.” [Oct. 2014] “The CSL study has a remarkable overestimate of attendance and ‘honeymoon’ effect. I think CSL’s lowest projection is completely unrealistic.”

- Dr. Joel Maxcy, a leading sports economist from Temple University, states in his in-depth analysis of the CSL study, “Using NPV analysis, the project materializes as a worthwhile financial investment only under the most optimistic of revenue projections. In other words, sufficient revenue will not be generated to cover the costs. Moreover, comparisons to actual revenue growth rates from other new stadiums indicate that the lowest CSL revenue projections are likely overstated.” Dr. Maxcy noted that the attendance and revenue projections are based on a 22% multiplier applied to past reports of ‘tickets out’ rather than actual paid attendance. Basing projections on an inflated measure of actual attendance projections made from this base is unreliable...how the group responses were weighted to come up with the 22% figure is unclear and is an unconventional method for projecting attendance.” Dr. Maxcy noted two examples of new stadiums (Akron and Minnesota), where the revenue growth in comparison to even the lowest CSL projections were modest, and for Akron, resulted in a large increase in the university’s subsidy to athletics.

- Dr. Zimbalist noted that CSL’s 4.3% bonds financing interest rate is unrealistically low, and should be between 6.3% and 7.3%. Dr. Maxcy’s observation is that using any NPV discount rate below 10% is inappropriate, given the risk of this investment. Using this discount rate and CSL’s lowest attendance projections, CSU would lose between $210 million and $218 million over 30 years. The highest CSL attendance projections would result in a loss of $90 million to $105 million over 30 years. This should be very sobering. And yet these figures do not take into account the additional costs: 20-40+% cost overruns (which all new stadiums experience), CSU’s “fair share” of city mitigation infrastructure expenses, opportunity costs of donations and land going to a new stadium instead of to the general fund/academics/research, and negative impacts on the community.
Dr. Victor Matheson, a nationally-recognized sports economist from Holy Cross College stated, "The whole idea of this stadium being able to generate a huge amount of revenue for CSU, and that this stadium was going to magically drive huge increases in attendance to the games and the college, and the luxury boxes were going to be filled... this was always a project that relied on the idea of hope over experience." When Dr. Matheson looked at the four options given by President Frank, his concern was that "a public-private partnership threatens to take another slice to an already small revenue pie. If you're doing this to make a profit, it's impossible to see how a private company will make money on this when the university can't find how to make money on this." With the second and third options, CSU risks building "a multi-hundred-million-dollar facility for something you're going to use six times a year. For a school of CSU's standing in the Mountain West Conference, questions of a stadium's value will persist." [Sept., 2014]

I have had contact with eight other professors (economics, sports management, sports sociology and mathematics) that have studied this CSU stadium proposal and unanimously found it to be completely unrealistic and inappropriate. These are unbiased experts who do not have a conflict of interest. [Dr. David Ridpath, Dr. Hal Cochrane, Dr. Louis Scharf, Dr. Jay Coakley, Air Force Academy professor, and others who do not wish to be identified due to the possibility of reprisal] One economist was concerned especially with the public-private partnership option, and found it quite unacceptable, if not illegal, to have a private entity operating for a profit while putting the state general fund at risk. He feels that this public-private partnership option has the greatest potential risk to CSU and the State of Colorado. And with the landscape of football changing as a result of the NCAA split, O'Bannon lawsuit, concussion issue, ESPN program renegotiations, FBS losses, Title IX issues, and changes in spectator behavior, now is not the time to gamble with our state's resources. "College sports are at a crossroads now, and it is very perilous to try to emulate the Alabamas of the world." [Zimbalist] Although I could share a wealth of additional concerns by these experts, I will move on to other concerns.

Dr. Frank stated in his October 6, 2014 letter to the leadership committees: "Were the only use of this facility for football games six times per year, I would see this issue differently—even as important as football is to the funding model of our athletic programs, ... But if I look at this facility as a multiuse project..., then the risk/benefit ratio changes substantially to my view." In the October 3, 2014 Board of Governors' meeting, he stated that if the main-campus stadium were only to be used for football games, this would not be a project that should be pursued.

Dr. Frank mentioned that the new stadium would be used by women's soccer and lacrosse teams, and yet, women's teams do not want to play on artificial turf, which this stadium would need to have. Out of the eleven Mountain West soccer teams, only one women's team (Nevada) plays on artificial turf. When the Nevada coach was asked if they played in their football stadium with artificial turf by choice, she said, "Hell no!" The other teams have separate soccer facilities with natural grass, which is best for their knees/ankles. Certainly, the CSU women's teams would not want to play in the new stadium.

Dr. Frank states that the new stadium could be used for graduations and convocations. These are very impractical uses of a stadium. One of my graduation ceremonies was held at Hughes Stadium and the other in Moby Gym. Although the weather actually cooperated for the Hughes graduation, I found it to be a much less desirable experience—lacking in intimacy and acoustics. A stadium is a poor venue for speakers, or even music, for that matter. Each of the colleges at CSU provides a more meaningful and intimate graduation experience for their graduates by holding separate ceremonies in acoustically appropriate indoor venues that are not subject to weather problems.

Dr. Frank suggests that the new stadium would provide high-quality meeting and entertainment space. CSU just completed a renovation and expansion of the Lory Student Center, which includes additional meeting/ballroom space (with a $5 million cost overrun). Along with this, the Fort Collins Lincoln Center recently underwent a renovation of their meeting rooms and performance venues. CSU would essentially be competing with private local venues by increasing meeting space inventory as a means to try to justify this stadium. Once again, if CSU's goal is to provide entertainment, rather than what the Morrill Act dictates, then let me point out that CSU already has a football stadium.
At the last Board of Governors meeting, I was absolutely shocked when an individual (Mr. Clark) spoke during the public comment session saying that he just knew that the late CSU President William E. Morgan would be so pleased to see his vision of an on-campus stadium brought forth. This is one of the most absurd comments I had ever heard spoken to the BOG, particularly since Dr. Morgan chose the location of Hughes Stadium with great foresight and for many good reasons. I actually DID hear what Dr. Morgan had to say prior to departing his presidency.

Hughes Stadium is located on the “foothills campus” in an ideal location under the historic “A” on the foothills, with easy access, adequate parking, great tailgating traditions, and beautiful views. My brother, a CSU alum who lives near Boise, has been dismayed to hear that Tony Frank wants to replace Hughes with a main-campus stadium. His comment was, “Hughes is in a beautiful location that Boise State would be very envious of. Why bring all of the game day traffic and chaos into the middle of the city?” The City of Fort Collins had the Overland Trail arterial widened beyond the two lanes to accommodate game day traffic (which is still a challenge with a full capacity crowd). The opportunity cost of land on the main campus is very high and will continue to increase as the pressure to grow student enrollment continues. Dr. Morgan understood that using valuable land that would be required for academic, research and student housing needs took priority over a huge, problematic sports facility. One of the reasons students are drawn to CSU is the “openness” of the main campus, with views of the foothills and great intramural playing fields for personal exercise. In a January, 2012 ASCSU student survey, 90 percent of the students considered intramural sports a high priority, and only 10 percent believed “big-time spectator sports” were a priority. Many students, faculty and staff welcome the opportunity to attend football games in a beautiful and unique venue away from where they spend so much time working, studying and taking exams. Most students live to the west of the main campus, and find access to Hughes Stadium much easier than fighting the congestion on the main campus. Even Jack Graham expressed at the last home football game a year ago “how I just love watching a football game at Hughes Stadium on a fall evening!”

There are many ways to engage alumni with the main campus, such as is done during homecoming festivities, speaker series, lagoon concerts, MMK day, pep rallies, etc. Bringing 36,000 rowdy fans into an academic/research environment where women’s dorms and neighborhood residents put up with people drinking alcohol, littering, urinating, noise, inappropriate behavior, vandalism, riots, vehicle emissions, safety issues, lack of emergency access, bright lights, extreme congestion, inadequate parking, and interference with studying/research activities is NOT a way to engage alumni or students. Sitting in traffic gridlock, peering into the buildings’ shabby interiors, poor quality tailgating, total confusion on how to negotiate parking in over 50 lots, exhaust fumes, lack of easy ingress/egress, paying higher ticket prices, and so forth, are NOT energizing! Over the past few years, the incidence of riots near CSU has increased, and with the use of social media, can quickly become out of control. Why invite more trouble on and around campus?

In fact, 70-90% of students, faculty and staff are opposed to the proposed main-campus stadium. They are aware of the tremendous needs already existing in aging academic/research facilities, huge class sizes, disparity between salaries of adjunct faculty versus athletic coaches, Title IX funding disparity for men’s versus women’s sports, disparity between funding for student athletes ($72K) versus regular students ($12K), lack of student housing and parking, need for financial aid, etc. For example, the old Engineering Building is irreparably contaminated and poses a health risk that can only be resolved by being torn down and replaced.

The majority of faculty and staff do not feel that they can express their opposition to this proposed main-campus stadium, for fear of reprisal. While I was speaking to a CSU professor recently, he expressed that he wished he could verbalize to Dr. Frank his intense disapproval of the proposed stadium, but did not dare since he was an “at will” employee. There are many examples of employees who have expressed their lack of freedom to speak out due to fear of reprisal. Although Dr. Frank rejects this accusation, extortion is alive and well at CSU.

Not only are the overwhelming majority of faculty, staff and students opposed to this proposed stadium, but through a recent scientific Triton Research Poll, between 60-70% of Fort Collins residents are opposed to the stadium. At a February 14, 2012 City Council work session, Dr. Frank said that “if the City is not in support of this stadium, I will not go forward with this project.” Obviously, Dr. Frank is not a man of his word. Dr. Frank also stated in a Winter, 2013 Alumni magazine, “The last thing we want to do is divide the community over this
project.” Dr. Frank also publicly made four assurances regarding this proposed stadium: 1) that no tuition/fees would be used, 2) no taxpayer money would be used, 3) it would not be built on viewsheds, and 4) it would not be built on green space. Apparently, Dr. Frank has abandoned all of these assurances. Dr. Frank also has made statements about state funding for CSU going to zero, which is not the case. Dr. Frank stated two years ago that if $113 million was not raised by the October, 2014 BOG meeting, then he would need to make plans for handling the deferred maintenance of Hughes Stadium. Dr. Frank’s behavior does not coincide with his statements as he continues to try to force a main-campus stadium through.

There are some very wealthy individuals who are putting tremendous pressure on Dr. Frank to proceed with this main-campus stadium, despite the warnings of experts in sports economics, the overwhelming opposition, tremendous financial risks, negative impacts on the community and CSU, and extreme ill will that has been created. According to a close friend of Dr. Frank’s, Tony is not free to make a recommendation to the BOG that is necessarily in the best interest of the university, city or state. According to this confidant, Dr. Frank said he must recommend building the main-campus stadium or face losing his job. Perhaps at the last BOG meeting you noticed a large number of realtors who would like to see a main-campus stadium built—thus, freeing up 162 acres near the foothills for making huge profits from a development (at the expense of the city residents and other businesses). Just a thought....

Although there are a few people who believe that building a stadium on the main campus would be good for the local economy, this is not supported by research. “Virtually all empirical research done on the economic impact of stadiums has uniformly found that there is no statistically significant positive correlation between sports facilities and economic development.” [Zimbalist, Noll, Siegfried] “There is no statistically significant evidence that college football games contribute positively to a host’s economy.” [Baade, Baumann & Matheson] “Numerous economic studies have shown the economic impact of a new stadium on the surrounding community to be negligible, even negative...this is more pronounced when the stadium is simply a replacement for an already existing team.” [Maxcy] In other words, except for a few restaurants/bars within walking distance and a small portion (15%) of the construction involved, most businesses would experience a loss in revenue on game days. An example is the University of Minnesota, where there is a 20-30% reduction in revenues on game days for nearby businesses. The UMN pays $1 million/ year to the surrounding neighborhoods to help offset the negative impacts of their newest on-campus stadium.

By building a football stadium on CSU’s main campus, the City of Fort Collins would be faced with tremendous negative impacts, including millions in expenses for mitigation. Given the huge problems with traffic congestion, parking, emergency access, crime, safety, vehicle emissions, noise, bright lights, riots, and so forth, CSU would be creating a “nuisance” in legal terms. If this stadium is built, the City Council may wish to take action under their Nuisance Ordinance, at the very least. Certainly, CSU is opening up an opportunity for litigation if expenses for mitigation are not covered by CSU and its “nuisance” is not properly abated.

Hopefully, each of you has read this entire letter and will take your responsibility in determining the appropriate course of action very seriously. I do not believe that President Frank is in a position where he can objectively recommend the appropriate action. There is much at stake here. Your decision to accept Dr. Frank’s recommendation will affect thousands of people and cost millions unnecessarily. Please do your due diligence. President Frank has been an intelligent, articulate and witty leader, but please look beyond his charming demeanor and seek the advice of unbiased experts before accepting any recommendation as the appropriate course of action for CSU and the State of Colorado. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Anita Wright
Good afternoon, Mr. Larson:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the proposed on-campus stadium at Colorado State University. Your communication will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: ERICK LARSON [mailto:emlarson05@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 10:37 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No New Stadium

I urge you to vote NO when the issue of building a new stadium on campus comes to a vote.

All indications are that football is a sport that is decreasing in attendance, decreasing in young people playing the game in high schools and will continue to cost schools (and the NFL) increasing amounts of money due to past and present injuries.

Make Hughes stadium and surrounding area into a sports fitness complex for all students. Use some imagination to involve hiking, bicycling, overall fitness areas connected to the campus by a pedestrian/bicycle/skateboard trail that would encourage all students to participate in both mental and physical fitness while at CSU.

Erick Larson
Good afternoon, Mrs. Slovick:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding the proposed on-campus stadium at Colorado State University. Your communication will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim & Edye [mailto:jimedye@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 10:08 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Re: Hughes Stadium

To the Board of Governors:

Why is an On Campus Stadium needed? I have never seen reasons listed except it is to energize and engage the students and HOPEFULLY will gain national attention and therefore will attract more out of State students. Did your children select their colleges because of a stadium and football? I have read that the reasons we need an on campus stadium are many. Period.

Why has Hughes Stadium been allowed to be so run down? What has happened to Hughes Stadium maintenance funds?

Please vote to build a stadium on the Hughes Campus site or renovate Hughes Stadium.

Thank you,

Edythe Slovick
Good afternoon, Mr. Minks:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the President Frank and the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University. Your correspondence regarding the proposed new on-campus stadium will be shared with the Board. Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Dear Dr. Frank and the Board of Governors,

This well written piece was published in the Fort Collins Coloradoan and carries a good message we all could have benefited from.

There was never any serious attempt to have a quality discussion on the proposal to build a new on campus stadium. Jack Graham was hired and more or less simply said we are going to do this. There was no apparent interest from the university administration as to how the citizens or public might consider discarding Hughes stadium or if there could be a choice, yet afterall this is a public funded university. It’s not hard to imagine that if the pros and cons for doing one of the two options had been considered, we would not find ourselves in the current loggerhead situation. Community relations would not be so tenative. I am sure we all would rather be spending our time doing more constructive things, like working toward higher academic standards and building bird houses or bird feeders. But not new athletic facilities that cost hundreds of million dollars that need not be spent when renovation to include upgrades can achieve the same basic objective. Afterall we are talking about a venue for playing football a handful days a year, not a new state of the art laboratory or teaching facility.

Just because we find ourselves in the current situation, it not too late to mend fences and do what’s in the best interest of the university and the community as a whole. I hope you can find it in your heart to do this.

Regards, C. Minks

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
Fort_Collins_Coloradoan_20130211_A02_1 (2).pdf

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.
Good afternoon, Mr. Henrie:

This confirms receipt of your follow-up email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the proposed on-campus stadium. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board. Thank you for your continuing interest.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

From: chs1952@gmail.com [mailto:chs1952@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Bernard Henrie
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 2:13 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject:

Dear Ms. Horrell:

This is a follow up to my August letters to you and President Frank concerning a proposed on campus stadium. I attended both: (a) the October 2012 meeting at which a proposed on campus stadium was discussed, and (b) the October 2014 Board meeting at which a two month extension was proposed to make a final decision. Obviously, the fact that in a two year period only a small part of the needed funding was raised reflects a real lack of interest and commitment by CSU supporters.

The many negatives have already been pointed out by many knowledgeable persons, but more ominous aspects seem to arise such as the firm hold the major conferences hold on collegiate athletics, especially football. There is little chance of increased revenue from football to meet the huge bond debt that would be required to build a stadium. This would be a great risk to CSU’s financial status. It would be much wiser to improve Hughes year by year as needed, thus saving a great site and considerably reducing the risk to the University.

Probably the worst aspect is the huge negativity that exists and continues to grow among Ft. Collins citizens. To force this project on the local community would be a public relations disaster for CSU. How would Board members feel if something as intrusive as a huge stadium was imposed upon their neighborhoods?

Let’s not make a huge mistake by forcing this issue.

Sincerely,

Bernard G. Henrie
CSU Alum and former staff member
From: Tamara Schmidt <tamara121876@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 6:37 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No New Stadium! EOM
Good afternoon, Mr. Rasulis:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed new stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Norm Rasulis [mailto:nrasulis@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 3:25 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Stadium hustle

As BOG members you must fully realize by now what a dumb idea a new stadium in Ft. Collins will mean for the domestic tranquility of everyone. NO NEW STADIUM is a no brainer.

Norm Rasulis
Good afternoon, Mr. Pruznick:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the CSU stadium options. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

-----Original Message-----
From: mikepruz@gmail.com [mailto:mikepruz@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 3:15 PM
To: CSUS Board; cityleaders@fcgov.com
Subject: Stadium Comments -- need an option 5

CSU Board, Fort Collins City Leaders,

SUMMARY:

I support the options in the following order: 5 (explained below), 1, 2. Options 3,4 not acceptable.

GENERAL VIEW:

I understand the value a main-campus stadium DONE CORRECTLY can have for both the university and the city. However, all current main-campus plans are detrimental to both the university and the city for all the reasons you've already heard.

PROBLEM:

Tony Frank is acting like a dictator. The university and city have a long history of working together. Tony is building his stadium for his university without adequate concern for the negative impacts on
our community. "Tony Frank field at Jack Graham Stadium" has already failed. Now he is trying to build "Tony Frank field at BOG Stadium." This will also fail.

**SOLUTION:**

Build "Fort Collins Field at CSU Stadium." Ask the people what a Fort Collins friendly stadium looks like. Ask the people what a tax payer friendly stadium looks like. Keep the people involved. Give us a stake in the stadium, make it our stadium, make us want to go to our stadium. Cooperation and partnership is what you need. If Tony won't embrace it, then we will find someone else. The people of Fort Collins love their community and take ownership in it. We consider the university part of our community, even though their is not legal connection. Honor us in your planning and we will honor you as customers. Don't be afraid to admit you made a planning mistake and fix it.

**TOOLS:**

We have two independent surveys showing roughly 2:1 opposition to a main-campus stadium. No local business in their right mind would risk offending 2/3rds of their customers by supporting the stadium. What investor would buy your bond knowing that 2/3rds of the customer base are opposed to the stadium?

This is like the bag fee repeal. Most people supporting the repeal use reusable bags. We wanted a "smart bag policy". Most SOSH members support college ball. Its not A main-campus stadium we oppose, it is THIS main-campus stadium they oppose. It is the closed-door process that reeks of corruption that we oppose. For the same reasons the bag fee was repealed, this stadium will fail.

City Council's job is to protect the people of Fort Collins from negative stadium impacts. While our current council is unwilling to take a stand, with 2/3rds of the people opposed, the new council members (April election) will all be anti-stadium. That will make at least 5 anti-stadium votes. The city has many tools in its tool box. The city doesn't need to focus on the stadium, but on hitting the university in its fiscal pocket and reputation. Just some examples: DUI checkpoints to protect our city from your drunks. Declaring a war on crime starting with the two biggest crime areas in town (downtown square and campus west) in which college students are the primary perpetrators. We'll make sure high school seniors know we are declaring a war on one of Playboy's party schools and they need not accept this spring nor apply next fall. My favorite is offering the asphalt plan an economic incentive package to move to a location that will maximize the amount of pollution that lands on CSU. Enrollment will drop and Tony Frank will get fired. The new president will renew Hughes or build a community stadium.

Public records will be very helpful. I personally will be able to
show the university and city denied my request to film the CDDAC meetings. Tony will have to explain why they were not on CTV, but ended up on Channel 14 only after I filmed the May meeting for FCPAN (now FC Public Media). Why would Tony want to hide the CDDAC meetings from the public?

Don't get me wrong. The goal isn't to get Tony fired and create a war between the university and city. The goal is to get Tony to realize he is starting the war, we will defend, and he will lose. The goal is to get Tony to realize this and go with Option 5, 1, or 2.

OPTION 5:

For me this begins with a 10,000 seat Texas high school type stadium away from non-university housing. 10,000 seats is no more impact than a few extra Moby events. People will support that. Of course division 1 ball require 35,000 or so seats. To start with the main-campus stadium is for other events. Add 10,000 seats every five to ten years, growing with the city. If you build the seats home side-line, visitor side-line, home end-zone, visiting end-zone as four independent sections, they can be upgraded independently through many small expansions that also grow as the city grows. Continue to use Hughes until you have 35,000 at the main-campus. Make sure you have a community-friendly post-use Hughes plan. Make sure the new stadium is designed to be net-positive. Build us, "our stadium," and you will have a sell-out problem that will justify higher ticket prices. This is a win for you and for us.

Michael Pruznick Fort Collins Citizen

Michael Pruznick, Fort Collins
Good afternoon, Mrs. Slovick:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

To the Board of Governors:

Please vote to save Hughes Stadium as the venue for CSU football:

- Picturesque Mt. setting
- Avoiding public debt
- Ample parking and room for expansion
- Success in football is fleeting
- Academics is the purpose of College
- Avoiding major campus disruptions
- Avoid taxing Ft. Collins residents for millions of dollars for new infrastructure
- On campus stadium is purely optional

NEW ON CAMPUS STADIUM REVENUES WILL NOT BE SUFFICIENT TO MEET THE DEBT SERVICE ON NEWLY ISSUED BONDS.

Thank you for your support of the Hughes Site.

Edythe Slovick
Good afternoon, Mr. Acott:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Board,

I have not written on this issue before. I am a CSU alum, fan and longtime resident and business owner in Fort Collins. I am not in favor of the on campus stadium. You have heard most if not all the reasons for that point of view. The more pertinent ones to me are:
1. Lack of overwhelming support from all quarters, city, students, townspeople and even ram fans based on the fund raising.
2. The space required for a on campus stadium can be used alternatively for other CSU uses.
3. Traffic and infrastructure demands for an on campus stadium.
4. Football use 6X a year.
5. The existing location allows more space and flexibility.
6. Cost

Thank you for your attention.
Dennis Acott
Fort Collins CO
Good afternoon, Mr. Neidert:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80220

From: travisneidert@gmail.com [mailto:travisneidert@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Travis Neidert
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 10:18 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: From a Ram Fan and Business Owner

CSU Board of Governors,

I am a CSU graduate and longtime CSU Ram fan. I have attended approximately half of the home games for the past 17 years. In 1998 I camped out near the lagoon for tickets to the first Rocky Mountain Showdown. I have traveled to attend numerous bowl games and road games. These past several years I’ve enjoyed taking my family to Hughes and passing on the enthusiasm to my children.

I also own several businesses in Fort Collins including the closest privately held business to the proposed new stadium site. My businesses have sponsored the athletic department with thousands of dollars for many years.

Despite these things, no one has ever contacted me to ask for my opinion or support of the stadium one way or the other. However, if given the chance I would tell anyone that as an alumnus, fan, father, business owner and athletic contributor I am opposed to the stadium project and have good reasons that have not been discussed much in public.
As a father I will take my family to the new stadium less. It’s a simple financial question. I expect the price of tickets to double (at least). Paying twice as much means we can afford half the tickets. Instead of 3 or 4 games per season, we will attend 1 or 2. My kids don’t care if the Rams play SEC teams or some tiny Division II conference and for the most part neither do I. We go for the fun of watching football. If the Rams win half the time (or a little more) then that’s exciting enough to keep our interest.

As a business owner I have enjoyed our partnership with Ram athletics that dates back to the early 1990s. However, if the football team moves to a new stadium I’m afraid and saddened that our financial sponsorship may have to cease.

I know you’ve heard significant opposition to the stadium, but my concerns are beyond traffic and parking. You may think local businesses are unanimous in their support, but the only restaurant within one block of the proposed site is NOT excited about the new neighbor. You may attract new sponsors, but one of your longest standing sponsors will most likely be forced to take marketing dollars elsewhere.

Thank you for reading. I realize you are facing a difficult decision and appreciate you listening to my opinion.

Travis Neidert
Owner
Green & Gold Subway LLC
Good afternoon, Ms. Webb:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80220

---

From: Ann Webb [mailto:hikerannie@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 08, 2014 11:52 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No on-campus stadium

Board of Governors:

I urge you to take to heart the points raised in Jean Yule’s letter to the Coloradoan, Nov. 8. The town does not want an on-campus stadium of any sort; we need to fix up Hughes—or build a new stadium in that location.

We also need to bring this project back under the eyes of the FC community and the CSU community. Decisions are not being made in daylight, deadlines are moved to accommodate people who are not part of the community, too much pressure is being put on Tony Frank.

We need to scrap the idea of an on-campus stadium and start letting CSU and the FC communities plan the reconstruction of Hughes. That is the will of the majority of the community.

We definitely need to make this a CSU/Fort Collins project and get rid of donors and developers.

Ann Webb
Fort Collins
Thanks, Rod, for the continued input.

Anthony A. Frank, President
Colorado State University

Greetings.
You have heard from me before regarding the on campus stadium issue. I pointed out that a clear cut majority of the retired faculty I contacted were against the proposal! Now I am back to call your attention to the soap box letter from Jean Yule published in the Coloradoan, 11/8/2014. pg. A9 (ATTACHED).
This contains many very important points that I, and any others, beg you to consider very carefully. How can we really allow this to proceed when there are so many against it?
Rod Skogerboe
Professor and Chairman Emeritus
Good afternoon, Dr. Charlie:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: wcharlie@engr.colostate.edu [mailto:wcharlie@engr.colostate.edu]
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 6:44 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No New Stadium!

As a Professor Emerita (Civil and Environmental Engineering), I agree with the editorial by Bob Vangenmeersch in the Coloradoan, October 13, 2014. Dr. Frank has set up a series of hurdles and deadlines. They have not been met. The on-campus stadium is a dead issue. Let it go. CSU is an academic institution, not a football team. As the board, it is your job to say "enough...let's move on".

No new stadium!

Wayne Charlie, PhD, Professional Engineer Professor Emerita, Civil and Environmental Engineering CSU
Dr. Frank,

My name is Logan Turner and I am a sophomore here at CSU majoring in Business Administration. With only about a month until your final recommendation regarding the on-campus stadium I wanted to make a few points and have my opinion heard. I will try to make this as brief as possible but as you well know that can often be a difficult task :)  

First of all I would like to comment on a recent article in the Collegian that was referring to surveys of CSU students showing a majority of students against an on-campus stadium. I would like it to be known that my experiences could not be any more different. The vast majority of the people I have talked to have been in favor of an on-campus stadium. The only people who were not in favor were completely uninformed of the situation and the layout of the four options. After showing them the four options and the true facts of the situation their opinion was changed to in favor of the stadium. It is my opinion that any surveys submitted to you or the BOG by the Collegian or by ASCSU should be taken with a grain of salt because of the impossibility of getting the true results of an informed student body. The vast majority of those partaking in these surveys are uninformed students simply being against the stadium for the sake of being against something. I support this stadium and so do many of my fellow students. The fact of the matter is in 5 years incoming freshmen will visit this university and see a magnificent facility on a beautiful campus and will not have any knowledge of the "drama" that came with it. 

Secondly I would like to bring up that I was in the Lory Student Center during the time of the October BOG meeting. I was standing next to a group of five or six people who were not students and represented themselves as apart of a "Save the Stadium" organization. Not only did this group of people make snide remarks about the CSU football team but about CSU in general. As a student I was appalled by their comments and attitude towards my school and I would be greatly offended if this organization had any say whatsoever on this matter. That's all I will say about that. 

In effort of keeping this as brief as possible I would like to leave you with this. Three years ago you hired Jack Graham and with him an amazing football coach from Alabama. The possibility of an on-campus stadium was brought up shortly thereafter. It was this "bold" attitude that brought myself to gain interest in CSU and ultimately come visit. When I visited I found an absolutely gorgeous campus, an amazing town, and outstanding Business Program. Thus, I decided CSU. When having conversations with friends of mine that attend the University of Colorado about the advantages and disadvantages of each campus their stadium is always brought up. 

I am proud to be a CSU Ram. I think of CSU as second to none and this School deserves a stadium where it should be, on-campus. Some of my relatives had the opportunity to come up and watch the CSU vs. Utah State game last month. What they said was "...why is there even a debate? It looks like you guys needed a new stadium 20 years ago". Dr. Frank we have raised 50 million dollars toward this project which is an outstanding accomplishment. We also have an opportunity for a private partnership. So my question to you is why is this even a debate? Building a stadium on campus should be the only option whether it is Option 3 or Option 4.
When I chose CSU I chose it based on a bold attitude and not settling for mediocre. It would be a shame and a real disappointment if three years later CSU went back on that way of thinking.

I appreciate everything you do for this University and for being bold.

Logan Turner
Good afternoon, Ms. Robert:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Please, go ahead and update Hughes Stadium. It is part of our Western culture as far as having "wide open spaces" and "plenty of room to spread out." Several east/west main streets from east Fort Collins & I-25 go all the way through to Overland Trail and they all can provide one-way "easy in and out" for sports events from Overland Trail.

Do not put us into millions of dollars of debt that we will never be able to pay off unless you ultimately decide to find a way to make the tax-payers pay for it by raising taxes in the future. Do not go into that kind of debt to put a 12-story concrete monster around Whitcomb and West Lake on campus. Two-lane Prospect is the only direct "in and out" thoroughfare from there (main campus) to I-25. What a nightmare!

Upgrade and renovate Hughes. Please use common sense. Thank you for your consideration. Joan R.
Good afternoon, Mr. Pink:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Board members,

I have lived in Ft. Collins for 38 years and care about my city. As the decision time is near for what is to be done about the stadium, I feel obliged to speak with up my opinion. For any number of reasons I feel it is poor judgement to put It on campus. There just isn't enough room! Why should you inconvenience the entire city with additional traffic,(its bad as it is) just because of a college football game right in the middle of town. Prospect Street is not capable of carrying such traffic. The lighting, size of structure, are also worrisome in what still is very close to residential neighborhoods.
The years of construction and congestion caused by the tight quarters of its proposed locations are baffling. I could go on, but it is so sensible to improve Hughes Stadium.

I ask myself again and again, are you proposing this to build a monument to yourselves?

Stephen F. Pink
Good afternoon, Dr. Durnford:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: durnford@engr.colostate.edu [mailto:durnford@engr.colostate.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 3:22 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No on-campus stadium

As an alumni of CSU (M.S. 1973, PhD 1982) and Professor Emerita (Civil Engineering), I agree with the editorial by Bob Vangenmeersch in the Coloradoan, October 13, 2014. Dr. Frank has set up a series of hurdles and deadlines. They have not been met. It is time for the board to say enough! The on-campus stadium is a dead issue. Let it go. Let’s talk about the future of CSU as an academic institution, not a backdrop for the football team. No one I have talked to thinks an on-campus stadium is a good idea. As the board, it is your job to say "enough...let's move on". It's time.

Deanna Durnford, PhD
Professor Emerita, Civil and Environmental Engr.
Good afternoon, Dr. Grant:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: grantjh@aol.com [mailto:grantjh@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, November 03, 2014 3:59 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Stadium 2050 deserves support:

Greetings, Board Members of the CSUS, from a Ft Collins resident & former Visiting Prof. of Management ...........

--Although I live 4 miles SE of the proposed on-campus stadium site, I have a strong belief that the "football stadium" should remain in its current location and be upgraded as circumstances require & permit. A dedicated pedestrian pathway should be developed from the main campus to the stadium to accommodate cyclists ... will "drones" deliver prosperous supporters 15 yrs from now?? Predictions here are VERY difficult.

--A greater priority for CSU at the present time should be the "ramping-up" of the great & immediate OPPORTUNITY to develop and build its role as the joint "USA's global Secretariat hub" for www.FutureEarth.org (FE), the decade-long, global project to address the ominous emerging effects of Climate Change in its many manifestations.

--The prominent institutions along the Front Range from NREL and the School of Mines in Golden through Boulder & up to Ft Collins will be responsible for leading thousands of researchers dealing with dozens of topics and major FE "engagement" activities with the general public. These will attract the attention of thousands of potential applicants & millions of possible supporters IF the Colorado institutions can move forward aggressively from the renovated facilities in Johnson Hall (next to the Admin Bldg on the Oval) and adjacent to the School of Global Environmental Sustainability (SoGES).

I realize the readers' times are limited, so let me close in opposition to devoting space, $$ and attention to an on-campus stadium.

CSU has many world-class academic units, & the FE opportunity can lead to even greater POSITIVE visibility!!

Sincerely, Dr. John Grant
Good afternoon,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Ladies and Gentlemen
A recent poll showed that for every 10 citizens who supported this stadium there were 24 who opposed it. I am one of those 24.

NO NEW STADIUM!!!!
Regards Tracy
Good afternoon, Mr. and Mrs. Nystrom:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. As has been done previously, your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your continuing interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Although we have repeatedly contacted CSU in the past several years regarding our opposition to a new stadium, we would like to reiterate that in spite of everything we have recently read in the newspaper about the four new options, we remain steadfastly opposed to a new stadium on campus. The capacity use of Hughes Stadium in the past few weeks only serves to highlight what will really increase attendance (& therefore the revenue you are seeking): a winning football team.

Reserve & use the precious remaining land on campus for academic purposes that perhaps you cannot yet envision.

John & Karen Nystrom
Good afternoon, Mr. Curtis:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

CSU Board:

Please do not "Build a New Stadium". I have attended games at Hughes Stadium for many years and just love that site with its beautiful views and spacious area for parking and tailgate fun. Building a new large expensive stadium will put us in the position of trying to do something of which we are not and will probably burden us to the limit. Unlike Lincoln, Nebraska and other schools where football is king and the stadium if full for all home games, we have too many other important and successful attractions for but few of our people to be that interested in focusing primarily on football as at Lincoln.

Byrd C. Curtis
Good afternoon, Ms. Rennels:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

From: Cheryl Rennels [mailto:cheryl@webblessyourheart.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 2014 9:31 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU Stadium

I am not in favor of building an on campus stadium at CSU. I think Hughes stadium is in a unique and great location that only needs to be upgraded. The on campus stadium proposal is very disruptive to the community as will be the stadium if it is built. My daughter Kellene Rennels is a CSU alumni. Cheryl Rennels
Good afternoon, Mr. and Mrs. Nystrom:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Board of Governors,

We would like you to know that we are both emphatically against the construction of a new football stadium on campus and hope that you will bring this Quixotic quest of Dr. Frank’s to a quick end.

John & Karen Nystrom
Good afternoon:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins and your positive comments on the student volunteers. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

I agree with Bob Vangermeersch in the Coloradoan today. Even the students who were volunteering for me last year had no interest in it. This year’s cohort came today (a whole crowd, who came from a fraternity) so I polled them too: four were pro a new stadium and seven were anti. And unlike last year, when none of them did, two or three of this crowd do go to games.
By the way these guys did a wonderful job for me clearing up the yard, as the students who come every year always do. And I love talking to them because these days I don’t have much contact with young folks. They were great: our future is very encouraging with such people in the lead.
Good afternoon, Mrs. Bandsma:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, #2440
Denver, CO 80202

-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Bandsma Jr [mailto:ellenjoe3@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 4:07 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No new stadium!

I want to express my opinion as a resident of Fort Collins that a new stadium is neither necessary nor advisable for this community. I am completely opposed to the project.

Sincerely,
Ellen Bandsma

Sent from my iPad
Good afternoon, Mr. Koppenhofer:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

---

From: Bernie Koppenhofer  [mailto:bbck7@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 1:17 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU

To CSU Governors:

I am worried about the future of CSU. I just listened to Tony Frank’s interview with the Coloradoan editorial board, 75% of his long answers were about the proposed 300 million on campus stadium. There is entirely too much time, energy and money being spent on the stadium issue. Especially since CSU already has a functional stadium in a beautiful setting and is the same size they plan to build. The glaring issue his administration should be addressing is tuition affordability. At one point Frank said he does not think tuition affordability is a risk factor for the future of CSU. I simply disagree, because attending CSU is already way beyond middle class income affordability. Sooner or later if students cannot afford CSU they will turn to alternatives, like community colleges and/or the internet. Please get CSU on a course of simply cutting expenses, starting with a 10% reduction in every department budget. Put the plans for the new stadium (which cost six million dollars) in a file to be opened sometime in the next decade.

Bernie Koppenhofer
3014 County Fair Lane
Fort Collins, Co. 80528
970-232-4102
Good afternoon, Mr. Rodgers:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

--

From: JJ RODGERS [mailto:ludlowandrogers@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 12:30 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: NO NEW STADIUM!

Dear CSU Board,

No options put forth by President Frank warrant building a new on campus stadium. I've been witness to the last several years of stadium discussion in the media, at several private fundraisers, discussion amongst CSU professors, concerned neighbors, business owners, and CSU alum. The legacy President Frank will now leave behind will be one of being known as the most polarizing president in the history of the University. Frank is not a visionary, nor a leader in the true sense of the word. There is still time to take this blight on the university in the right direction, and make Hughes stadium the focus again. A stadium in a more beautiful, unique location doesn't exist in this country. Do the right thing for this entire community, and stop driving a wedge between the people who call this town home and the University. This beautiful, charming college town may lose it's wonderful vibe forever if this stadium is allowed to go through in any form, not to mention the people will forever resent the University. NO NEW STADIUM!!

Respectfully,

J.J. Rodgers
Northern Colorado Native/Fort Collins resident
Student in the CSU System:
Colorado State University - Global Campus
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 1:27 PM  
To: John Sprackling  
Subject: RE: On Campus Stadium

Good afternoon, Mr. Sprackling:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440  
Denver, CO 80202  
303-534-6290

From: John Sprackling  
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 12:20 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: On Campus Stadium

Board Members; Although the football team is doing very well this year and enthusiasm is high, I believe that the best decision that CSU can make is to renew Hughes Stadium, bring it up to date, as it is perfectly located for parking, tailgating, and is in a beautiful location. Attendance will remain high if the team is winning and the location of the stadium will not matter. John Sprackling CSU Alum. 1968
Good afternoon, Mr. Potyondy:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

I would like to add my voice to those opposed to building an on-campus stadium at CSU and ask for your consideration and support for this who favor a more well thought our approach that involves renovating Hughes Stadium.

Your job on the board is to look out for the long-term benefits of the university and not to satisfy the wishes of University President Tony Frank. You need to listen to the will of the people and not Dr. Frank's recent assertion that even though Fort Collins residents don't support the on-campus stadium, support for it exists elsewhere. I would like to simply point out these simple undisputed facts: (1) A majority of Fort Collins residents do not support the on-campus stadium and (2) A majority of CSU's faculty and students do not support the on-campus stadium. In light of these facts, it seems odd to go ahead with this option. Think about it! If these folks don't support it, who will fill the seats on any Saturday?

Realistically, an on-campus stadium will not get CSU to the financial nirvana envisioned by Frank. Out of state students won't come in droves to CSU because of football. They come for the academic excellence that the school provides. Assuring the containing success of academics should be the main charge of the board. While some donors may support football, others like myself will no longer support CSU until it gets back to giving priority to academics.

Also, the dream that CSU can enter one of the Big 5 Power conferences by building a 36,000 seat stadium is also a pipe dream. Let's remember that Fort Collins is not a large market in the grand scheme of things. We
have a great university here. Let’s not destroy it with this crazy scheme.

On a final note, I have been extremely disappointed in the university and Dr. Frank in particular in how this whole stadium issue has been handled. He has an agenda and will likely carry it forward. Most of the residents and the university community have seen through the charade that’s been going on. Personally, I used to have the highest regard for university presidents. Dr. Frank by his conduct has totally hanged the positive attitude and regard I used to have for this position.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

John Potyondy
Fort Collins resident

My connection with CSU has mostly been to bring hundreds of thousands of federal research dollars to the university over the past 20 years due to the excellence of your faculty and students. Let’s remember that it’s not just the football team that bring revenue to CSU.
Good afternoon, Mr. Avery:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Avery [mailto:pavery99@me.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 12:06 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: CSU Stadium Proposal

Dear Members of the Board,

I wish to state my strong opposition to the plans for building a new stadium on campus as proposed, for the following reasons:

1. The current Hughes stadium site provides ample space for expansion and parking. Traffic flow does not impact the central business and residential core of Fort Collins and can be handled well by existing roads and infrastructure, as has been demonstrated during the recent sold-out games. It is CSU’s willful neglect that has resulted in the current condition of the old stadium.

2. CSU appear to be basing the project on large scale borrowing since the predicted alumni donations have not materialized. This would be a huge leap of faith, or more realistically, a giant gamble. The revenues from 6 home games a year and 12 smaller soccer and lacrosse games could not possible justify adding $200,000,000 or more to the long term obligations of the University. The public-private partnership now mooted appears to involve giving the Hughes site away to a developer, and allowing the main campus land to be used by a private organization for profit. This would not be in the best interests of those who have spent a lifetime here, building their homes and raising their families.
3. The people of Fort Collins, including students, faculty, alumni, parents and residents have made it abundantly clear that they do not want CSU to build the new stadium in the proposed location. Several polls, petition efforts and letter writing campaigns have consistently shown that 60% of respondents do not want to see this project advance.

4. The motives of those promoting the new stadium appear questionable. It is obvious that the beneficiaries of such large scale development will not include your neighbors. The home owners and residents of West and Mid Fort Collins will experience considerable degradation of their lifestyle, caused by increased traffic, reduce parking capacity and compromised access to emergency service. The proposed structure will tower over many residential areas and CSU's own studies have predicted sound levels well in excess of current City noise ordinance limits over many neighborhoods.

Growth at any cost has never been the philosophy of the Fort Collins community and an on-campus stadium would represent a massive imposition by the State on our City. It would be far wiser to perform any necessary repairs to Hughes and to use the land on campus for academic purposes, as befits the behavior of a Land Grant University.

Yours respectfully,

Paul A. Avery
Fort Collins
Good afternoon, Mr. Skraba:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

---

I am a CSU Alumni 1972, and My daughter is a CSU alum. I was a freshman at CSU when Hughes stadium was opened. We went to the CSU/Wyo game this last week and had a blast. It is a great location great stadium, lots of room for tailgating. Quit this nonsense about an on campus stadium. Talk about Alumni support, If you build a new stadium I will never attend another CSU game! I also remember events that filled the place, like the Rolling Stones opening their US tour at Hughes, do some more with the stadium and pay for whatever improvements needed and tell Frank to quit changing the game.

Phil Skraba
Good afternoon, Mrs. Foxley:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

I live in Fort Collins, and my son is a graduate of CSU. I want to add my voice to those who say we do not need a new football stadium at CSU.

1. The one we have is in a beautiful setting, sitting near the foothills.
2. It can be renovated.
3. On campus space should be used for academic uses. Isn't land on campus finite? Surely there are better uses for what remains.
4. How can any public institution justify spending millions on a structure that will only be used a few times a year? (Especially since an adequate one already exists.)

I can't believe you are even seriously considering such a use for the public's space and tax dollars.

Nancy Foxley
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 1:23 PM
To: bnelson2312@frii.com
Subject: RE: NO NEW STADIUM

Good afternoon, Ms. Nelson:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

From: bnelson2312@frii.com
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 9:18 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: NO NEW STADIUM

PLEASE CSU BOARD – NO NEW STADIUM!!
Beth Nelson
From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 9:07 AM  
To: JoAnn  
Subject: RE: No new (on campus) stadium!

Good morning, Ms. Kison:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440  
Denver, CO 80202  
303-534-6290

---

From: JoAnn [mailto:jkison@comcast.net]  
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 9:06 AM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: No new (on campus) stadium!

I read, with absolute and total concurrence, Bob Vangermeersch’s letter to the editor in the Coloradoan this morning, stating only a couple of the very good reasons that an on-campus stadium is a BAD idea.

And, what part of “NO” to a new, on-campus stadium does Tony Frank not get?? Not hear?? Not acknowledge?? I have not yet spoken to one single person in Fort Collins (and I'm a very social person) who thinks an on-campus stadium is a good idea, or who supports it. Even my 40-something working-adult children, and their teen children, think it's a BAD idea. I SO agree with Vangermeersch in that CSU needs to fill to capacity Hughes stadium seats before we go off and build an even more costly, bigger stadium that will have even MORE empty seats at most games! “Build it and they will come” does NOT apply in this case.

JoAnn Kison,
Good morning, Ms. Barnes:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Lynne Barnes [mailto:imbarnes@lamar.colostate.edu]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 9:01 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Please.....

..no new stadium! This was a cockeyed idea from the very beginning, and most Fort Collins residents, most CSU faculty do NOT see any wisdom behind this notion that a ridiculously expensive and rather ugly new stadium, plopped into the center of our lovely campus, will bring money, fame or anything good to our community. All this for....6 games a year?

As a retired Adjunct professor from CSU, I humbly ask you to please reconsider this decision....and use donations to improve instruction, classrooms, and salaries.

Thank you,
Lynne Barnes
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 9:04 AM
To: robin
Subject: RE: No new stadium!

Good morning,

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: robin [mailto:robin.nielseng@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 7:41 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No new stadium!

No new stadium!
Good morning, Mr. Kamm:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80220
303-534-6290

I am a graduate and retiree of CSU and I say absolutely NO to a new stadium on campus.
Good morning, Ms. Henke:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Ann Henke [mailto:maryannhenke@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 6:05 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: No new stadium!

No new stadium!
CSU alumni from class of 1966.

Sent from my iPad
Mary Ann Henke
3313 Camelot Drive
Fort Collins, Co. 80525
970-223-8725
Good morning, Mr. Adkins:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

I must express my agreement w/ Mr. Vangermeersch's "sound-off" in the Coloradoan. And I have many more reasons to encourage the Board of Governors to walk away from this potential On-Campus Stadium "albatross", that seems so reasonable and logical to sooo many people. These are all personal opinions from a person who's a huge CSU Football fan, who's son played & started extensively @ CSU under Sonny, and who personally played D1A Football at another school (Wichita State Shockers) in the 1970's.

1) The school I played for had a beautifully modern re-modeled & expanded (to 31k) On-Campus Stadium (OCS) and was the 1st to install artificial field turf & track. Yet unless our team won consistently, we could rarely attract over 20k attendance, even though our stadium was On-Campus. As you know on-Campus Stadiums do not provide significant volumes of "incremental" attendance.

I know you are fully aware and have duly noted that Hughes has had 2 sellouts the past 2 weeks, in spite of any/all of Hughes' down-sides & its distance from campus. These sellouts were due completely to the consistent Winning by the Football team. Lots of consistent Wins attract sell-out crowds... not beautiful new stadiums located on-campus!

BTW, this same volume of consistent Wins generates Bowl games, top #25 rankings, and also attracts G5 conference invitations... not beautiful new stadiums located on-campus that are only 2/3's full.
2) I will guess that 90% of D1A programs have On-Campus Stadiums, and yet approximately 80% of those schools do not have enough attendance for their programs to profit or break-even based on ticket sales & all other sources of revenue (TV, marketing deals, concessions, etc.). This proves that OCSs do not by themselves provide a wonderful crowds and attendance. In fact for CSU, an OCS will be likely to provide very marginal volumes of "incremental" attendance/revenues vs. a remodeled & expanded near-campus stadium like Hughes.

3) Most Alums visit their Campus to re-connect, because their Campus is beautifíc & holds wonderful memories. CSU Students have far more opportunities to make new memories, and Alums to revisit those Campus memories & re-connect with those "memorable impressions" @ CSU via Basketball (Mens + Womens) & Volleyball games of which there's about 50/yr... versus only 5 CSU Football games/yr. If Alums require 5 Football games/yr in order to get them to revisit & re-connect with their Campus... I suggest there's more and greater issues at play than "not having an OCS" for Football.

4) Like most excellent & popular universities, CSU is a land-locked campus. The 15 acres of land that CSU must dedicate permanently to an OCS becomes more & more precious and valuable as the Student population and the need for Education buildings grow over time. Since the #1 mission of CSU is Education (not Sports), I suggest that dedicating 15 acres for 5 to 6 games/yr (plus whatever other events one can dream up) is quite short-sighted at this time... bordering on foolish.

5) As you know, the Hughes stadium located @ the Foothills is a uniquely beautiful & large area that is idyllic for 5-6 high-traffic Football games/year (plus whatever other events one can dream up), that require 10k+/- of Tailgating & Parking spaces @ a minimal cost to CSU. It also off-loads a great deal of traffic congestion, noise and trash from the Campus. It is time that CSU embrace it's unique & beautiful Near-Campus Stadium, and stop trying to follow the crowd (80% of whom are bleeding red ink).

BTW, where in CSU's mission is "helping local business generate more revenues" mentioned, implied, or prioritized to a high level?

6) Hughes Stadium is a beautiful, spacious & stately 1960's era "cement" Stadium that evokes tons of substantive grandeur (unlike the tinker-toy stadiums of some MWC & even B12 competitors). CSU has recently invested $20M into upgrading the Stadium, Playing Field, Exterior landscaping, Video & Audio capabilities, and many other areas. Should all of that be just "written off"? How will that make CSU's donor feel?

Hughes is not far from being upgraded to be on par with Kansas State's 1960's stately "Bill Snyder" stadium. KSU's 1960's stadium seems to have as many cracks in its foundation as Hughes (as observed via a recently televised game). KSU should be CSU Football's targeted goal to aspire to with a 50,000 seat stadium and and Athletic Dept with $26M in profits ($18M of which is from the B12). CSU's targeted goal should not be Minnesota, Stanford, Louisville or SMU. As one can learn from KSU and its brilliant Football Coach & AD, CSU needs to major on the majors, and minor on the minors... a la KSU's Winning Football team & the Bill Snyder Family Stadium.

7) IMHO the designs, cost estimates, and thoughtfulness of re-modeling & expanding Hughes Stadium are out of date, vastly over stated, and carelessly thrown together with minimal aesthetics... in order to make the OCS options look vastly more attractive. It's no wonder the OCS option looks like a no-brainer.

8) Has anybody monetized the "flexibility" that only Hughes offers to CSU, in terms of utilizing Phased Construction projects, over multiple years (vs. a 9 month race to get the entire stadium built)? This allows CSU to properly and accurately right-size capacity & affordability as more annual data is available from Attendance, the Economy, Football Conference shifts, etc. This flexibility cannot be accommodated with a Stadium project built on a Campus due to the on-going toll inflicted
on the Education mission by large heavy duty construction. Hughes year #1, #2, #3 phased construction flexibility is very valuable to CSU in order to reduce it's decision-making risks. One great decision made possible by such flexibility could save CSU multi-millions of dollars.

And what happens if the OCS is not completed on time? Does CSU have to incur incremental costs to re-open Hughes, or to rent Mile-High, or rent Folsom? Only Hughes provides the ability to break the entire Re-model & Expansion into reasonable and manageable phases... saving CSU $$'s & avoiding risks.

9) Finally, OCS promoters continually suggest that the ground under Hughes is unstable making it too expensive to re-furbish and expand. I suggest that CSU has an excellent Civil Engineering school that has dealt with "expanding soil issues" since its inception, and therefore can design cost-effective solutions for such a common challenge that is well known, well researched & commonly solved.

Finally, the OCS seems like a wonderful idea. And yet it could become a debt-ridden albatross for CSU's Athletic Department in today's market-place where D1A football attendance is trending downward. This trend, combined with customer aversion/sensitivity to 30% to 60% higher priced tickets, could impair CSU financially and physically (15 dedicated acres) from achieving its #1 Mission over the next 50 years. Unless CSU can guarantee it will consistently win 9 to 12 football games almost every year, or unless $100M more donations pour in, there's no financial justification or break-even in sight. We know the opposite is likely true... CSU can guarantee there will be a number of consecutive years where it's Football team will not have a Winning record.

I am a football Fan-Fanatic... and I do not see the benefits that outweigh the expenses & risks associated with building a brand new OCS for the Football program. Hughes can be a great flex-sized stadium, in a gorgeous location.

Sincerely, Greg Adkins - Austin, TX
From: dash_loaded <dash_loaded@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 6:00 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Re: no new stadium

Thank you.

From: CSUS Board <csus_board@mail.colostate.edu>
To: dash_loaded <dash_loaded@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2014 8:56 AM
Subject: RE: no new stadium

Good morning, Mr. Barth:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel
Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: dash_loaded [mailto:dash_loaded@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 3:58 PM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: no new stadium

I am an alumni and am strongly against the new stadium.

Folly
Kurt Barth
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 3:07 PM  
To: Gillette, Thomas W  
Subject: RE: Colorado State University New Football Stadium

Good afternoon, Mr. Gillette:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel  
Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440  
Denver, CO 80202  
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

---

From: Gillette, Thomas W  
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 2:22 PM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: Colorado State University New Football Stadium

As a proud Colorado State University graduate, I just wanted to voice my opinion again on the new on-campus stadium issue.

I'm very much in favor of building the new on-campus stadium. I will stand behind Tony Frank and his decision. Should the decision be to build it, I've have already reached out to the Athletic Department to let them know that I will donate to the new stadium, along with several friends who are matching my donation. I was taken aback during my meeting with the Athletic Department, when my friend said point blank, with an on-campus stadium, I'm sure I'll be reconnecting again with the Engineering Department on campus and would enjoy the opportunity of reconnecting with old and new professors. That folks, is what it is all about.

Respectfully,

Tom Gillette
Carrier Sales Engineer | Windstream
1200 17th Street, Suite 250 | Denver, CO 80202
o: 720.529.7613 | m: 720.979.6974
thomas.gillette@windstream.com | windstreambusiness.com
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 3:05 PM
To: Bill Beitz
Subject: RE: New Multi use building on campus including a "Stadium".

Good afternoon, Mr. Beitz:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

Bill Beitz [mailto:bbeitz@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 10:43 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: New Multi use building on campus including a "Stadium".

Good morning board,

Build it!

Cheers,
Bill Beitz
CSU Class 1966
Good morning, Mrs. Yule:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors and President Frank.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

---

From: Jean Yule [mailto:jouyule@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2014 11:17 PM
To: CSUS Board
Cc: John Yule
Subject: An Open Letter to Dr. Tony Frank---The Conversation We Did Not Have

Dear President Frank,

I am Jean Yule, third of four generations of CSU graduates. I love the institution and all that it stands for! As a Fort Collins native, I also love this Choice City. I was thrice denied the opportunity of an appointment for conversation with you about your proposal for a main-campus stadium. I would have preferred a productive and engaged conversation in person. My open letter to you today has become my only option.

The silent phase, your pricey consultants, endless studies, and stacked committees perplex me. Have you any idea the distress and insult these practices have inflicted on our community? How does the pretense to mitigate an aggravate situation work? How would you explain the disapproval registered by some 65-70% of faculty, students, and the public at large? Please explain how these numbers, which represent real people, count for nothing.

Were you sincere when you said in the Winter 2013 Alum Magazine, “The last thing we want to do is divide the community over this project”, and, “We have to do this in a way that is respectful of this community”? I would submit, your approach has not been respectful, inclusive or transparent, and the community is divided and angry.
I am more than tired of the dollars debate. The egregious intimidation of expression, the “shifting of the goal posts”, and the “shell game” are extremely concerning. University/community values have been trampled and trashed:

1. Are you and the Board of Governors not sworn to uphold the mission of this Land Grant University? Please help me understand how a massive main-campus stadium, intended to attract out-of-state students, supports or enhances CSU’s Land Grant mission? The university’s focus and priorities seem terribly skewed.

2. Naming rights should never be for sale to the highest bidder. In my view, naming rights are reserved for those who have earned them, who deserve them, and who inspire (e.g. Sonny Lubick Field at Hughes Stadium, Amy Van Dyken Way).

3. How is it possible that the course, culture, and landscape of the university, as well as our community, is held hostage by anonymous donors “flying under the radar”, pledging 6-8 figures to fund the new stadium? This seems like a sell out and hostile takeover.

4. You were quoted as saying “it would be just this side of criminal” (Denver Post, September 22, 2014) to spend anymore money on Hughes. Who is accountable for the neglect and “deferred maintenance” at Hughes?

5. Former athletic director Jack Graham informs us (Coloradoan, October 2, 2014) of an “alternate” plan and “internal target” which would “redirect $30 million of General Fund money, (currently allocated to maintain Hughes), toward fundraising for the on-campus stadium”. Is this not also potentially “just this side of criminal”?

6. Are you aware of the loss of significant donations from the Estates of alumni of my generation, if the main-campus stadium is built? The names/amOUNTS lost will never be known.

There is so much more to this “saga”, to borrow your word. Perhaps the most important question is the one asked often in conversations with Dr. Frank fans and admirers: “What ever happened to Tony?” “Why would Tony tarnish his sterling reputation over this sorry saga?”

Can you help me understand, by addressing the questions asked in this letter?

Sincerely,

Jean Yule, Fort Collins

Jean Yule, Fort Collins
970-482-5486
jlouyule@gmail.com
Check out this article from Fort Collins Coloradoan:

Soapbox: Hughes outdated, won’t serve CSU of the future

http://noconow.co/1wqVGT5

Anthony A. Frank
President, Colorado State University
Soapbox: Hughes outdated, won’t serve CSU of the future

Attending the Utah State game on Oct. 18 provided all present a clear example of why Hughes Stadium is inadequate for CSU, now and in the future. A capacity crowd made it clear that the stadium is grossly inadequate for near-capacity crowds in at least three critical areas.

First, the concourses are not wide enough for the foot traffic. Every concourse was a traffic jam throughout the entire game, and it was difficult to get anywhere via the concourses. This was both inconvenient and potentially dangerous.

Second, the number of restrooms is a joke. The number of rest rooms needs to be tripled. Waiting lines throughout the entire game were backed up across the concourses, contributing to the traffic problems.

As usual, the women had a worse problem than the men, but both were ridiculously backed up.

Third, the number of food service sites is inadequate. The number of food service venues should be at least doubled, and possibly tripled.

Even in the third quarter, I stood in line to get a hot dog for two-thirds of the quarter, and that was in the shortest line available.

Given the current architecture and layout of Hughes Stadium, none of these problems can be corrected without huge expenditures that would have to be paid from the University general fund, since donors are not interested in augmenting an out-of date, inadequate stadium. The concourse width issue is also a safety problem, and it cannot be corrected.

The fact is that Hughes is an outmoded, inadequate facility. The one thing in its favor compared to an on-campus stadium is parking, but that can be dealt with using strategies that are used at on-campus stadiums all over the United States. My hometown is 30,000 with an on-campus stadium seating 35,000. The university uses shuttle parking with bus service from all parts of town, combined with reserved parking filling secondary campus streets on game days. Information on managing parking is easy to get from institutions with on-campus stadiums. And let’s not forget that football home games are only about six events a year, so this is not an every-weekend issue.

Getting to Hughes is a pain for on-campus students. My daughter says that she and many of her friends would go to more games in an on-campus stadium. Getting to and from Hughes is a pain for students who could walk to an on-campus stadium but don’t want to fight traffic and pay $10 for parking at Hughes. Student attendance is something to encourage, not inhibit.

A stadium is not just a place to play football. It’s where the single most valuable sport to the university is played. It accounts for valuable TV visibility, supports alumni involvement and giving, and it’s part of the evaluation universities face to enter the power five conferences. In the
long run, CSU needs to join a power five conference like the Big 12; Tony Frank and many of us clearly recognize this, and the planning needs to move forward immediately.

A phased approach to a new on-campus stadium makes sense for CSU. The current stadium is clearly inadequate for large crowds attending games, and upgrading it is a waste of money relative to CSU's long-term future.

Albert Powell is a Fort Collins resident.
**Teufel, Sharon**

From: Frank, Tony  
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 10:22 PM  
To: Teufel, Sharon  
Subject: Letter: It's not about the stadium; it's about winning

Check out this article from Fort Collins Coloradoan:

Letter: It's not about the stadium; it's about winning

[http://noconow.co/1tRB3Zk](http://noconow.co/1tRB3Zk)

Anthony A. Frank  
President, Colorado State University
Letter: It’s not about the stadium; it’s about winning

(Author’s Note: The following narrative took place without the use of recreational or medicinal pharmaceuticals). I woke up on Oct. 20 to another magnificent day in my native Fort Collins and saw the photo of the Rams game on page A3 of the Coloradoan — I was stunned. The glorious sunset — the packed stands. Wow — I must have done a Rip Van Winkle. The new stadium must have been built on campus a mere couple miles away from Hughes. The son-of-a-gun pulled it off despite all logic, facts, grossly inflated/misinterpreted financials and reasoning showed it was a blatantly absurd scheme running contrary to everything CSU is supposed to be about — education.

Further delving into the news, I realized the same politicians were spreading the same lies and it hit me — I hadn’t slept for 20 years. How utterly foolish of me to think the location of a football stadium has a bloody thing to do with attendance. It’s a winning team that packs the stands! Duh. Have my tickets for the Border War. Looking forward to a fantastic time tailgating with friends in the mammoth parking lot at Hughes as so many times before; I have my truck and flatbed trailer with grill ready to go. I loved my time at CSU, but I really doubt that I will be daydreaming about the Clark Building or the updated Lory Student Center. I will be focused on friends and football and waiting for another glorious sunset behind Hughes. Go, Rams!

Rob Phillips,

Fort Collins
From: CSUS Board  
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 10:26 AM  
To: Steve J.  
Cc: Frank, Tony  
Subject: RE: No new stadium

Good morning, Dr. Johnson:

This acknowledges receipt of your email to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System regarding the issue of a proposed on-campus stadium at CSU in Fort Collins. Your correspondence will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Thank you for your interest in Colorado State University.

Sincerely,

Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel  
Office of the Board of Governors  
Colorado State University System  
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440  
Denver, CO  80202  
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Steve J.  
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 7:50 AM  
To: CSUS Board  
Subject: No new stadium

Board members...I urge you not to support an on campus stadium at your December meeting. The Fort Collins community is strongly against such a stadium as had been reported in the local newspaper. Tony Frank has ignored the sentiments of the community and severely damaged CSU-community relations with his insistence on this waste of money. Despite assuring us this would only be donated money, he recently revealed up to $50 million of general find money would be required. We all knew this all along. With funds for actual education in such short supply, wasting any of it on athletics is inexcusable. I urge you to stand up for the mission of CSU and stop this nonsense.

Thank you,
Steve Johnson -DVM  
CSU graduate 1982, 1986  
former State Rep. and Senator and member of the JBC.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone.
Anthony A. Frank, President
Colorado State University

From: vntrs@aol.com [mailto:vntrs@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2014 9:53 AM
To: Frank,Tony
Subject: New Stadium. I hope it gets built

Dear Dr. Frank,

I am 100% plus in favor of a new stadium. For around the last 20 years, I have had season tickets for all sports at CSU. Ladies and men’s sports. I have 11 season football tickets, and have donated $10,000 toward the new stadium and $130,000 for a scholarship in earth resources, which I hope and plan to elevate to $250,000 to $300,000 hopefully within the next 2 or 3 years (M E McCallum Scholarship), and even more funding in future years.

The best years of my life was while I was a graduate student at CSU. The school treated me as well as they could. Even with not much money at the time, I got along fine.

I know you have many things to consider regarding a new stadium. In my opinion, it will be wonderful having the graduates back on campus and fans get to know what a great campus we have. If the new stadium could be built to be multi-functional, that would be a plus. It should be good for 100 years and hopefully many more.

There are many many more positives I can mention in building a new stadium.

Finally I need to say I am amazed at the new and restored buildings at CSU and how much better the campus appears compared to 10 years ago, grounds and new and restored structures. You are a large part of this. You have done a great job.

Charles Mabarak
Class of 1975
Teufel, Sharon

From: CSUS Board
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2014 2:31 PM
To: henry dougan
Subject: RE: Support for Dr. Frank and his vision

Good afternoon, Mr. Dougan:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding your support for Dr. Frank and his vision for Colorado State University. Your communication will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-2522. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

---

From: henry dougan [mailto:douganhenry@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 10:35 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Support for Dr. Frank and his vision

Good Morning,

I am writing to express my support for Tony Frank and his vision for Colorado State University. His goal of excellence in all facets is greatly appreciated by both my wife (’04) and myself (’03). We have been very impressed with the Campaign for Colorado State and the many recent campus improvements. We fully support Dr. Frank’s plans to raise the profile of our university by committing to athletic as well as academic success and building an on campus stadium.

Thank you,

Henry Dougan ’03
Season Ticket Holder
Ram Club Member
Campaign for Colorado State University Donor
Good afternoon, Mr. Shannon:

This acknowledges receipt of your email regarding support for the on-campus stadium at Colorado State University. Your communication will be shared with the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,
Sharon Teufel

Sharon Teufel
Office of the Board of Governors
Colorado State University System
410 17th Street, Ste. 2440
Denver, CO 80202
303-534-6290

Notice: This email (including attachments) is protected by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC 2510-25221. It is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Tyler Shannon [mailto:tyler@incide.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 8:43 AM
To: CSUS Board
Subject: Support for an On-campus Stadium is Growing Exponentially!

Dear CSU's Board of Governors,

Just a testament to the strength of the football program and the increasing support for an on-campus stadium.... Since the win over Nevada 10 days ago, support for CSU's On-Campus Stadium has been growing astronomically. Page "Likes" (aka follows) to the "I Support CSU's New On-campus Stadium" Facebook page increased over 2500% in less than 10 days, our total reach has increased over 30,000% to over 35,000 people (and growing) which happened all organically (no paid promotion). And our engagement index is up over 27,000% to over 3000 unique people viewing more than 1 page of content. This is absolutely incredible and is a testament to how involved people are right now with CSU and CSU football. Also, our followers to the page have increased by more than 400 people in that time to 2032 (and increasing) as of 8:30 this morning (10/21). In comparison, the Save Our Stadium Hughes Facebook page has added 3 total followers in the same amount of time to 373 as of 8:31am after losing 18 followers in the weeks proceeding. People are more excited about building a stadium on-campus than ever before! The recent sell-outs at Hughes have fans frustrated over 30-40 minute bathroom and concession lines. Heads were pounding against the walls when Hughes that only has access from the East (as opposed to N/S/E/W as is available on-campus) took 2 hours for many fans to drive from Taft & Prospect or Drake to park because Hughes is one road in and one road out. Fans are excited about being able to show off our campus to so many fans! When the Homecoming parade was 15 people deep lining the streets on-campus, Ram Fans were able to see just how big of a benefit this will be for our university! Go Rams.
and let's build this on-campus stadium! I hope this information helps you in your decision making and proving that a bold focus on supporting CSU football and building a stadium on-campus is best for CSU.

I urge you to take a second an look at the "I Support CSU's New On-campus Stadium" Facebook page right now, I assure you we have already surpassed greatly, the numbers I have posted above!

Regards,
Tyler Shannon
Sent from my mobile device.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jeff Kukuk <jeff@thekukuks.com>
Date: October 21, 2014 at 7:06:25 PM MDT
To: <Tony.Frank@colostate.edu>
Subject: Fwd: BOG Meeting - One fans perspective

Hi Dr. Frank, I just wanted to make sure you were able to see this message.

Just wanted to “throw my support” behind the new stadium.

GO RAMS!!!!

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jeff Kukuk <jeff@thekukuks.com>
Subject: BOG Meeting - One fans perspective
Date: October 2, 2014 at 5:02:39 PM EDT
To: Tony.frank@colostate.ed
Mime-Version: 1.0
Received: by 10.114.93.230 with HTTP; Thu, 2 Oct 2014 14:02:39 -0700 (PDT)
X-Originalating-Ip: [198.178.8.81]
Delivered-To: jeff@thekukuks.com
Message-Id: <CANdb_v6gRmcF2xXMiM-AfeeuJx-ZBKL7ywuxGi67SDgVUwadA@mail.gmail.com>
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=089e013d1e0ecb7a65050476ef29

Dr Frank,

I just wanted to write you a brief note to express my extreme desire to see the Board of Governor’s move forward with the option of building an on-campus stadium. Since I am a fan that lives in the south side of Denver, I will not be able to make the meeting tonight to express my support for the new stadium. As a result, I am passing on my strong interest and desire for the new on campus stadium via email.

I have been a season ticket holder for almost every year since I graduated in 1996 and continue to be a Ram Club contributor. Additionally, my wife and I also donate to our respective colleges. The point being that we support CSU on the field AND in the classroom.
My immediate family (and extended family) are die hard CSU supporters. All of us truly believe that building an on campus stadium is not only the right move from a fans experience perspective but also provides the ability for fans to reconnect with the university.

For the past 20 years (almost), I have visited the university or downtown Ft Collins only a handful of times as part of coming up to a football game. Many times have my family and I talked about wanting to have dinner or tour the university more as part of our trips up but since Hughes is so out of the way, we either forget or it seems like too much of a hassle to make the additional effort/commitment to go back to the university. Having an on campus stadium would resolve that issue and would allow many alumni to reconnect with the university and to see all of the wonderful things going on there. The few times I have been by the campus, I am shocked to see how much better things look than when I was there.

We have so much to be proud of with OUR university and I believe the on campus stadium provide a great welcome mat to the fans and to the world about all of the wonderful things going on at CSU.

I am excited and see the new stadium be approved so I can add my financial donation to the mix as well as my continue my evangelism in my personal and professions circles about the stadium and the university itself.

I also want to personally thank you for all of your efforts in this endeavor as well as the outstanding job you are doing leading and representing this university. We are in extremely good hands.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jeff and Jill Kukuk
Teufel, Sharon

From: Molly Baldrige <mollytb@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2014 5:45 PM
To: presofc@lamar.colostate.edu
Cc: Teufel, Sharon; chancellor@colostate.edu
Subject: The unfortunate name: Resources for Disabled Students

Dear Doctor Frank, et al:

My daughter Parry Kring is a new student at CSU this year. She entered as a junior with an Associate’s Degree from Landmark College in Putney, Vermont. She has had learning differences all her life. I have never thought of, nor referred to, her as “disabled”. Rather, she is challenged in ways that make scholastic life more difficult for her, since most education is geared towards traditional learners. (For those of you versed in these things, she has to deal with dyslexia, auditory processing and executive functioning issues. In every other way she is “normal” – happy, outgoing, popular, fun.)

Landmark College is a school for kids who learn differently. Its teachers present information in many different ways, and from the minute they get there, students learn exactly what their own challenges are, how best to deal with them, and how to advocate for themselves. Parry shone there. She felt supported and appreciated and understood, and she quickly became a campus leader.

After Landmark, Parry was full of hope that she could make it in the traditional campus scene, fitting in with “regular” college kids. Imagine her distress that the center at CSU that might help her most has the word “disability” in it. We discovered that unfortunate moniker this summer at Orientation. We spent time at the Resources for Disabled Students center. (It hurts me to even write that name - imagine how it must make kids feel who suffer from differences, learning, physical or otherwise.) The staff there was wonderful and funny and friendly and helpful. We arranged for Parry to take tests there. And look for tutoring if necessary.

So, what’s the problem? Parry won’t go there for help because of its name. Especially as a new upper class student, which is hard enough, she doesn’t want to be labeled, or have anyone know that she needs extra help or accommodations. She wants to fit in, which is pretty difficult when she is labeled “disabled”.

I can’t believe that in your big University someone hasn’t pointed out this thoughtlessness. Politically correct verbiage is such an old issue, I don’t understand why the insensitivity has been allowed to continue. With all the information out about learning “differences” and “challenges”, how can you still use the word “disabled” in the name of your resource center? Hey, how about simply calling it the Resource Center? Everyone who needs it would understand it, and it wouldn’t encourage ridicule from those who are blessed enough not to know what it means.

Of course, Parry should get over this stigma. Probably all kids with disabilities should toughen up and not worry about silly things like the name of the center that’s supposed to be helping them. But that’s not the reality of this complex and sensitive situation. You are the leaders of a great institution that is supposed to be teaching and caring for kids, helping them grow into their greatest potential. And Parry, who is trying hard, sitting in the front row, going to class and doing her homework, is missing out on something that you provide that would help her a lot, because you provide it in a way that discourages her from using it. I should say that she is doing well, except for tests, which she freezes on and can’t see the right rows of bubbles, or she knows the answer but reads the questions backwards so she answers incorrectly. She could benefit from slower, quieter test taking, and from tutoring, and from someone to make sure she understands the test questions before she answers them. But she won’t go get help from the RDS because of its name and labelling potential.
I finally got her to e-mail one of her teachers directly to explain her situation and ask if she could do anything in place of tests, even if it involved more work. He said, “I wish you had come to me earlier so we could have arranged something.” And then he referred her to the Resources for Disabled Students.

It would break my heart if she gets too discouraged to continue, and it should break yours too for any student to fall through the cracks over something so insensitive and easily (I imagine) changed. More importantly, it will tell her once again that she can’t make it in the “normal” world. What a waste and a shame that would be.

Please change the name to something dignified and respectful of it users, immediately.

Thank you very much.
Molly Baldrige
PO Box 269, Hygiene, CO 80533
(303) 818-6482
mollytb@comcast.net

By the way, her grandfather is the man after whom Congress named the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. He’d give the naming of the center an “F”! And the businessman that he was before he was Commerce Secretary would not have stood for a second for something that made the underdogs suffer any more than they already do. He would take personal responsibility and change the name today, regardless of committees and protocol and red tape and bureaucracy. That’s what made him a great leader.
Teufel, Sharon

From: Carl Wangsvick <cwangsvi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2014 10:30 AM
To: Teufel, Sharon; chancellor@colostate.edu; melanie.gearry@colostate.edu
Subject: Stadium Options Soapbox
Attachments: Replace CSU's Blue Book docx.pdf

Dear Chancellor and Board:

I have attached the Soapbox sent to the Coloradoan with alternative analysis of the costs. Dr. Frank told you his numbers were controversial, but they are more than that. I do not trust the Summary of Options’ ambiguities, and counterintuitive results on costs of options. Neither should you. I have studied the issue extensively, and new stadiums cost lots more than renovations, which is why schools with concrete ones redo them, rather than replacing them.

I am likewise surprised, given the truly bad news of CSU’s inevitably overspending its debt capacity and a ratings drop in bonds for three of these options, that you have not stopped the project. The news that CSU is significantly weaker than most of its peers is amazing, really. How will you recover from that, given new limits on tuition increases and less grant revenue?

Carl Wangsvick
Dear Editor: REPLACE CSU’S “BLUE BOOK” WITH FACTS

Please replace CSU’s *Summary of Options* with this document. CSU says its information is “internal and external,” but it’s unattributed, “cherry picked,” and biased. Information below is verifiable via internet. It uses *CSU median numbers* for costs and for donations, unless blatantly erroneous. It considers important circumstances impacting the General Fund. One, is a football program that at best breaks even. Two, is a football program that consistently produces top 25 teams and corresponding profits, calculated as $240,000,000 over 30 years.

**Minimum Hughes: $31,500,000**

Initial Cost is $39,000,000 (*CSU median figure*). If donations are $7,500,000 (*CSU median figure*), Net Cost is $31,500,000 from the GF (General Fund). With “top ranks and corresponding profits” (possible even next year), the General Fund gains all revenues above the cost of the program.

**Hughes 2050: Cost equals $3,800,000/year/30 years.**

Initial Cost is $97,000,000, including: Hughes Minimum at $39,000,000 and adding 4,000 seats at $17,000,000 (source, *CSU*). Then, to build the equivalent of Boise State’s 2008 *Stueckle Sky Center*, a stadium upgrade virtually identical to “Hughes 2050,” costs $41,000,000 today (source, *Insee*)... $37,500,000 in 2008. Stueckle has all the “premium” aspects CSU plans, 80,000 more square feet than CSU plans, two elevator towers, and the world’s largest movable window. If donations are $30,000,000, Net Cost is a $67,000,000 revenue bond. With “program at best breaks even,” the GF pays $115,000,000; with “top ranks and profits,” the GF gains $125,000,000.
Campus, Phase One: Cost equals $11,100,000/year/30 years

Initial Cost is $236,000,000, including: Hughes Maintenance at $9,000,000 (cost of maintenance until Fall, 2018), the CSU construction estimate of $189,000,000, and a minimum 20% cost overrun (that every concrete stadium has had) of $38,000,000. If donations are $42,500,000, Net Cost is a $193,500,000 revenue bond. With “program at best breaks even,” the GF pays $332,600,000; with “top 25 ranks and profits,” the GF pays $192,600,000.

Campus P3: Cost equals the equivalent of $15,900,000/year/30 years

Initial Cost is $295,000,000, including: Hughes Maintenance of $9,000,000, CSU’s construction estimate of $225,000,000, a 20% cost overrun of $45,000,000, and a Debt Reserve Fund (financed either privately or by CSU) of $16,000,000. Net Costs first include $28,000,000 for Hughes Maintenance and Debt Reserve (if financed). Second, the “lease” payments—after applying $47,500,000 in donations—are $477,000,000 ($15,900,000/year/30 years). With “program at best breaks even,” the GF pays $505,000,000; with “top 25 ranks and profits,” the GF pays $265,000,000.

What about promoter CLS’s revenue projections? Forget them. Their unrealistic analysis pretends the football program’s free. But program profit and not projected revenue determines the stadium’s cost to the General Fund. Boise State (in a stadium now having everything CSU wants) gives an apt example of “program profit corresponding to top 25 ranks,” $6,800,000 revenue above program costs for 2012 (source, Sportsmoney). If the Rams have tremendous success most seasons, earnings
like Boise's would provide about $240,000,000 profit, over 30 years, towards a stadium. (That's factored in above.) Remember, that in attendance, location, admissions, game-day experience, donations, etc., sports economists see no benefit in this project realistic enough to justify spending general funds. And Options 3 and 4 seriously harm the General Fund. Remember also, though the local economy benefits temporarily from any CSU building project (Options 2-4), the opposite's true for students. They will have to pay for it. So honesty about costs matters.
Stephenson: CSU needs to be a bolder, better neighbor

FTC 7 a.m. MDT October 7, 2014

Now is the time for CSU to be bold.

I have been writing this column for less than two years. In that time, there have been three riots involving students in our city.

Three — in 17 months.

The latest riot occurred Saturday, Oct. 4, in a neighborhood on the south edge of campus, off Blevins Court and South Whitcomb Street, right near Prospect Avenue. That's the same neighborhood where a similar party got out of control in April and about a mile down the street from the April 2013 riot.

Fort Collins police, campus police and Larimer County Sheriff's deputies responded about 11 p.m. to what someone called a block party and someone else called a drunken mob.

Another described the scene as similar to the Los Angeles riots in the 1990s. Those riots included days of looting, arson and assault, and 53 people ended up dead — so of course, that was an overstatement. It does, however, point to the anxiety of a Saturday night in Fort Collins — that things can escalate to dangerous levels with little or no provocation.
COLORADOAN
Police respond to large, hostile party near CSU

There were no reports of injuries, but there was evidence that at least minor injuries had occurred. Police said they did not use tear gas, but some people said they saw it. There have been no arrests, but police and the university have not ruled out the possibility. The investigation is ongoing.

Officials haven't yet confirmed that the rioters are students at Colorado State University, but that's just damage control. There's no doubt at least some of the people in that mob attend CSU.

Classes began just a month ago — welcome to the neighborhood.

The thing is, it takes more than a common street to be a neighbor; and those students, who have shown us again and again that they don't share our values, are not learning that lesson at CSU.

Other than alcohol, what would make people think it was OK to disrespect the neighborhood, the university, the city that embrace them as its heartbeat? What is it, other than the alcohol, that would make people — even young people — think it was a good idea to gather in numbers that are uncontrollable and anonymous? Or that other people's property — their planters and yards, their driveways and cars — was fair game for a mob. Or that it was acceptable to meet police officers — even those you didn't call and don't welcome — by ripping out street signs and tossing glass bottles?

Where is that message coming from?

As students come and go, graduate, change schools, get expelled, the common denominator that remains is CSU.

COLORADOAN
Thrown bottles and blood baffle party's neighbors
The university is saying the right things: "If you do something that's criminal, and it doesn't even have to be criminal, you can do something that simply is not in line with our code of conduct; it can affect your academic career," CSU spokesman Mike Hooker told Channel 4 in Denver.

But those words aren't penetrating — not if Fort Collins is cleaning up after a riot every six months.

Instead of getting out the well-worn script and the broom, the university needs to consider preventative steps in line with the serious nature of these incidents and the damage this is doing to the reputation of the school and the city.

Maybe CSU needs to contemplate a return to the in loco parentis style of education that universities used to practice, in which the university acts as parent and sets rules. Maybe students need to be required to live on campus past their freshman year. Maybe they should have to pass a class about what it means to be a neighbor before they're allowed to move out of the dorms.

Maybe CSU should disavow lists that call it a top party school. Maybe instead of ratcheting up its involvement in the alcohol industry, it needs to aggressively de-emphasize the drinking culture. Maybe alcohol violations, including underage drinking, should be met with swift expulsion instead of a blind eye. Maybe CSU should become a dry school.

Maybe something bolder.

CSU students are a constantly changing entity in our community. CSU is a constant.

Maybe CSU needs to be reminded of what it means to be a good neighbor.

_Erin Stephenson is a publishing editor at The Coloradoan. Contact her at ErinStephenson@coloradoan.com._

_IN APRIL, 2013, FORT COLLINS CITIZENS AND CSU NEIGHBORS EXPRESSED CONCERN TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ABOUT THE RIOT THAT HAPPENED DAYS BEFORE THE MEETING. THOSE NEW TO THE BOARD, IF INTERESTED, COULD ACCESS THE MINUTES TO SEE IF OUR STATEMENTS ARE INCLUDED. THE LOCATION OF THE MOST RECENT, AND THE MOST RECENT BEFORE LAST SATURDAY'S RIOT, IS JUST A COUPLE OF BLOCKS FROM THE PROPOSED SITE OF THE NEW STADIUM._

_LINDA VROOMAN, FORT COLLINS._
Anthony A. Frank
President, Colorado State University

Begin forwarded message:

From: Eric <ewhite_34@msn.com>
Date: October 3, 2014 at 12:06:21 PM MDT
To: "tony.frank@colostate.edu" <tony.frank@colostate.edu>
Subject: On Campus Stadium

Dr. Frank,
I just wanted to send you a quick note of thanks for your vision and hard work for making CSU great not only today, but well into the future. Obviously I am thinking of the on campus stadium but your vision for the school has done so much more with the academic upgrades since you became president. I am in total support and agreement with your thoughts regarding the on campus stadium that it will not only help us field better athletic programs which will lead to more national attention but also in the fact it can generate revenue for the school. Having a up to date venue that can be used 365 days a year for events, business meetings, community programs, concerts, etc. and generate revenue constantly compared to a venue mostly in disrepair that is used 6 times a year could do wonders to the schools bottom line. On top of that having a new centerpiece in the middle of campus will bring alumni back to see the changes which have been extreme and not only modernized but also beautified campus. People will be amazed!

Thanks for all your hard work and all that you do for CSU.

Eric White

GO AGGIES

Sent from my iPhone
Dr. Michael Martin, Chancellor, Sharon Tuefel, Executive Assistant to the Board:

Today the Coloradoan headline reads: “CSU President still wants On-Campus Stadium.” That’s exactly right – the “President” wants this stadium. Fort Collins has always had the most unique location for a stadium – along the foothills. I am not aware of any other stadium in that position. To benefit FTC further, the “President” needs to truly step down as his goal is simply to have a Legacy via an on-campus stadium. Academics take a secondary position to athletics. Be nice to have CSU known as both academically & athletically – parallel popularity. I don’t expect anyone to respond, but did want to express my opinion on this matter. Should Frank win and an on-campus stadium is built, this will forever alter the character of FTC and the reason so many move here. I’m not saying this in a flattering manner; rather this will be a huge detriment. In a metropolis, a huge stadium simply blends in. That is NOT FTC. I truly hope that one or more in the position to determine this outcome considers what I – and so many in FTC – say about this matter. Like so many issues, no one is truly listening. Those few who are financially able to contribute huge dollar amounts to this “cause” truly do not favor the aesthetics of our town. I do hope someone takes this into consideration.

Beverly
Beverly Hill’s, Inc.
Beverly Hill, Broker/Owner, B.A., GRI, SFR, REO
Mobile: 970-215-0307
Fax: 970-226-2014
Email: BHill.RealEstate@gmail.com
Appendix II

Construction Status Reports
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Bond $</th>
<th>Bond Project Status Picture</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Status as of 11/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Village (formerly Academic Village North)</td>
<td>$46,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>Project is in budget and complete. Residence halls were open for student move in and Pavilion Building opened in November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget: $46,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lory Student Center Revitalization</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
<td>Project is in budget and complete. Food court opened for start of classes and the rest of the building opened in October 2014. Interior art installation and branding graphics will continue through the end of 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget: $70,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Bond $</td>
<td>Bond Project Status Picture</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>Status as of 11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Sciences Revitalization</td>
<td>$11,400,000</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Animal Sciences" /></td>
<td>Aug 2014</td>
<td>Construction is approximately 98% complete. Classrooms, labs and administration suite were ready for start of classes. Basement offices will be completed by January 2015 with staff move-in during February 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget: $13,400,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>Remaining funds from department and donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard O. Eddy Hall Renovation</td>
<td>$11,800,000</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Willard O. Eddy Hall" /></td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Construction is approximately 55% complete. Budget includes new building entrance and upgrades to building envelope, including reclading the north and south exterior walls with “CSU” sandstone and installation of new window systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget: $12,500,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>Remaining funds from classroom upgrade project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Bond S</td>
<td>Bond Project Status Picture</td>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>Status as of 11/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggie Village North</td>
<td>$112,265,000</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bond Project Status Picture" /></td>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
<td>This project is a redevelopment from the low density Aggie Village married student housing to high density undergraduate and international student apartments. Demolition is complete. Bids are due December 8. Anticipate phased occupancy May, June and July of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget: $112,265,000</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bond Project Status Picture" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Construction Project Status Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Budget &amp; Funding Source</th>
<th>Construction Start</th>
<th>Scheduled Completion</th>
<th>Status as of 11/17/2014</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Extension @ Student Recreation Center</td>
<td>$856,260 Student Rec Ctr Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Completed January 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Campus Entry Drive, Parking Addition, Foyer addition, Internal Renovation @ Buell Communication Center Building</td>
<td>$1,067,500 Student Fee $300,000 Parking funds $100,000 Building Repair/Replacement $462,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Completed February 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oechsle University Center Renovation and Addition</td>
<td>$30,000,000 Debt to be repaid with student fee facility fees &amp; auxiliary services revenue</td>
<td>Oechsle University Center program plan update completed Board of Governors reviewed and approved project 8/2/2013 Project Manager selected Design-Build Team of Nana Construction/Slater/campbell Architects selected Project Completion estimated 08/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Construction Documents completed and ready for building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Door Security Access Control at all Academic Buildings Phase II</td>
<td>$988,331 Controlled Maintenance</td>
<td>01/2015</td>
<td>08/2015</td>
<td>Add electronic card access/monitoring, new keyways, and replace worn exterior entrances at 13 academic buildings Construction Documents underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New General Classroom Building</td>
<td>$160,000 Capital Funds</td>
<td>Construction Start 06/14 Estimated Completion 08/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction is 25% complete On time and on budget G H Phuett Construction Co., General Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer/Lacrosse Complex</td>
<td>$3,100,000 grant funded project from grants and donations</td>
<td>Construction began 3/2014 Construction Phase 1 field June 2014 Phase 2 Building and Bleachers estimated December 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2 building foundation and bleachers completed Floor framing underway (Phase 1 Synthetic turf field substantially complete and in use) H W Houston General Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III

Higher Education Readings
The Chronicle – Colleges Saw a Flood of Student’s at Recession’s Peak and Discouraging Results

After college enrollment increased 12% in 2008 during the peak of the great recession, only 55% of those students had completed their degree by May 2014. That’s down from 56.1% of the class entering in 2007, with the biggest drops being among older and part time students, and hitting the four-year, for-profit college sector the hardest.

The Chronicle – Maryland’s Distance Education Giant Will Stay Public and Part of University System

The president of University of Maryland University College has decided not to ask for permission to convert the college into a private nonprofit institution, separate from the University of Maryland System. President Javier Miyares was considering the shift in order to gain more managerial flexibility and compete with other more aggressive universities in the distance-education market.

The Chronicle – Cornell U. to Put Community Work at Center of Undergraduate Education

Cornell University is establishing a new, $150 M program, “Engaged Cornell,” which aims to make community engagement a pillar of the university’s education model. All graduating students will be expected to have taken at least one course with a community component by 2025. The project is being established with a $50 M gift from the Einhorn Family Charitable Trust; the university hopes to raise the rest.

The Chronicle – The Plight of the Public Regional College

Across the Midwest and Northeast, faculty and administration are at odds with how best to proceed in the face of budget cuts and declining enrollment at institutions that largely serve a place-bound student body and lack the prestige to build big endowments or research portfolios.

The Chronicle – NSF-Backed Scientists Raise Alarm Over Deepening Congressional Inquiry

More than 50 NSF are currently being investigated by the Republican-controlled House science committee and many professors are becoming increasingly frustrated. Rep. Lamar Smith, the committee chairman, leads the latest attack, focusing mainly on grant titles and aiming to impose new restrictions on the NSF’s grant writing abilities, particularly in regards to budgetary matters in the social sciences. So far, his efforts have been met with resistance in the Democrat-controlled Senate, but it’s possible they could make more headway when the new Republican Senate takes over in January.

The Chronicle – How One University Became Exhibit A of Marketing Success
Five years ago, when Southern New Hampshire University was facing a steep decline in enrollment, they embarked on a marketing campaign focused on television advertising, particularly promoting their online programs. Today they enroll more than 44,000 online learners. The Chronicle talks with the president, Paul J. LeBlanc.

**The Chronicle – Goals for Enrollment and Tuition Revenue Elude Many Colleges**

A recent survey shows a significant number of small to midsize colleges did not meet either their goals for freshman enrollment or their goals for net tuition revenue this fall. Smaller schools were hit particularly hard, and private institutions fared slightly worse than public ones. The main drop off in interest occurred at the application/deposit/enrollment stage – much of this has been attributed to rising costs of both tuition and supplemental expenses like housing, gas, or supplies.

**The Chronicle – Fastest Growing Colleges, 2002-12**

Colorado School of Mines and University of Colorado-Denver both make the top 20 fastest growing public doctoral institutions with CSM ranking #8 and UCD ranking #12.

**The Chronicle – Senate Democrats’ Bill to Renew Higher Education Act: Many Ideas, Little Hope of Passing**

Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) introduced legislation on November 20 to renew the Higher Education Act. His bill would extend and reform the Perkins loan program; restore year-round Pell Grants to part-time students; off Pell bonuses to institutions that enroll low- and moderate-income students; and create a unit-record system of tracking students with privacy protections built in. The measure is unlikely to pass in the current Congress, and Senator Lamar Alexander (R-Tennessee), who takes over as chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions in January, has his own ideas for a bill. If lawmakers can’t agree on spending levels by the end of this Congressional session, they may opt to continue funding things like the education bill at existing levels, meaning no new money until at least October 2015.
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Colleges Saw a Flood of Students at Recession’s Peak—and Discouraging Results

By Katherine Mangan

Six years after a flood of students entered college, many seeking shelter from a sinking economy and a leg up in an uncertain job market, their progress report is in, and it isn’t encouraging.

Only 55 percent of the students who entered college in the fall of 2008, at the peak of the Great Recession, had earned college degrees or certificates by May 2014, according to a report released on Tuesday by the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. That’s down from 56.1 percent for the cohort that started in 2007.

That doesn’t seem like a lot, but it comes at a time when colleges, foundations, and policy makers have been pulling out the stops to prod more students along to the finish line.

And it follows a year when completion rates failed to budge.

The biggest drops were among older and part-time students struggling with rising costs and the competing demands of their jobs, colleges, and families. The sector with the sharpest declines was four-year for-profit colleges. Those are the very students and sectors that accounted for the largest increases in enrollment during the recession, so it is perhaps not surprising that overall graduation rates slipped.
Full-Time Students Are More Likely to Reach the Finish Line

A new report shows that students who are enrolled full time are more likely to earn degrees or certificates from two- or four-year colleges. The report tracks the six-year outcomes of students who started in the fall of 2008.

It is nonetheless disappointing to colleges that have been beefing up their academic-support programs and streamlining transfer requirements as the pressure to graduate more students intensifies. President Obama’s proposed college-rating system is just the latest of such high-profile efforts.

Those two external trends—a national completion push and an influx of at-risk students—"were kind of at odds here," Doug Shapiro, executive research director at the center, said in an interview on Monday.

"We were a little surprised that the student demographics won out over the improved institution efforts," he added. "A lot of colleges are doing all they can to keep students on track to graduate."

' A Buffer Against Hard Times'
College was a popular destination in 2008, as widespread layoffs helped push enrollments up 12 percent over 2007.

"When the cohort for this study entered college, the prospect of a degree as a buffer against hard times was top of mind for many who found themselves newly unemployed," the report notes. "Yet, while the labor market lowered the opportunity cost of enrolling,
rising college tuition continued to drive postsecondary degrees out of reach for many Americans."

The clearinghouse’s report, supported by a grant from the Lumina Foundation, focuses on first-time, degree-seeking students who enrolled in two- and four-year colleges. It also includes the growing number of students who took classes for college credit while they were still in high school.

It examines graduation patterns for students by age, part-time or full-time status, and sector, and follows them as they transfer to other colleges.

Graduation rates held steady for traditional-age students who enrolled full time, but those students make up a shrinking minority of today’s college students.

Also in the good news, bad news department: Students who started in four-year, private nonprofit colleges saw a 0.7-percentage-point increase in their completion rates, but their share of the total cohort in 2008 was down 1.2 percentage points, compared with the 2007 cohort.

Among the other key findings, comparing the 2008 and 2007 cohorts, the report says:

- The completion rate fell 2.6 percentage points, from 40.9 to 38.3 percent, for students age 21 to 24, and 1.4 percentage points, from 43.5 to 42.1 percent, for those older than 24.
- Completion rates for students starting out in two-year public colleges dropped 0.7 percentage points, from 39.8 percent in 2007 to 39.1 percent in 2008.
- Students had a tougher time transferring from two-year to four-year colleges, with 16.2 percent of those who started at community colleges going on to earn degrees from four-year colleges, compared with 17.2 percent the year before.

So what does all this mean for higher-education policy?

For one thing, the report’s authors note, it highlights the importance of considering the widespread variations in completion rates based on student demographics and the types of colleges they entered. Colleges have long complained that federal
completion calculations leave out many of their students, including those who transfer or attend part time. The clearinghouse’s figures capture many more of those increasingly mobile students.

Policies that make college more affordable will allow more students to attend full time and will increase their odds of success, the report notes.

**Caveats About For-Profits**

The findings on low completion rates among for-profit colleges are likely to intensify the controversy over the federal government’s gainful-employment rule, which will judge career-oriented programs on the basis of their graduates’ ability to repay student-loan debts.

Four-year for-profit colleges saw the biggest surge in enrollment and corresponding drop in completion rates. Their rosters were up 35 percent in 2008, but their six-year completion rates dropped four percentage points, from 42.3 to 38.4, from the class that entered in 2007.

The for-profit sector has been criticized for its aggressive recruiting and high costs, but the authors also point out several caveats when interpreting their students’ high attrition rates.

Even though the research center tried to include only students who were seeking college credentials, it isn’t easy to identify them, particularly at for-profit institutions. Some students stick around long enough to get industry credentials but leave without college certificates or degrees, Mr. Shapiro said.

In addition, many students who enrolled in 2008 had recently lost jobs and "may have been seeking shelter from the economy," he said. "If they got a degree, great, but if a job opened up earlier, they were more than happy to take it and leave college." Those students, most would agree, shouldn’t be counted as dropouts or failures.
The report’s focus on first-time college students also leaves out many students who previously attended college and enrolled in for-profit institutions to retool for different careers.

David S. Baime, senior vice president for government relations and research at the American Association of Community Colleges, said he was disappointed in the findings.

"Students who went to college in 2008 were being clobbered with horrible economic conditions," he said on Monday.

"A lot of people enrolled hoping it would help them get another job or because they were unemployed and didn’t have other options, but the financial and other realities were too much for them," he said. "It probably would be unrealistic to expect the completion efforts that were just getting going when this cohort was enrolling to make a difference in the outcome."

Strengthening ties between community colleges and four-year colleges will continue to be crucial, the report says.

"For many disadvantaged students, enrolling in community college is the only entry point to postsecondary education," it notes. As a result, "improving community college/four-year institution partnerships is even more important."
Maryland’s Distance-Education Giant Will Stay Public and Part of University System

By Goldie Blumenstyk

The president of the University of Maryland University College, rejecting a recommendation from an outside committee, has decided he won’t ask the state to let the university convert to a private nonprofit institution or break away from the University System of Maryland.

UMUC’s president, Javier Miyares, had been considering such changes as part of a broader effort to shift course on what some had characterized as the university’s flagging profile as a national player in distance education. Several faculty members and others at the institution had questioned whether such radical steps were necessary or even wise.

Since the idea of going private was first floated this past summer, UMUC has held a series of meetings for faculty and staff members to air their views. "People felt very strongly" that the university should stay public and part of the university system, said Robert Ludwig, a university spokesman.

Mr. Miyares shared his decision during a live-streamed "town hall" meeting last week with about a thousand of the university’s faculty and staff members. While announcing that he would not seek to take the university private, Mr. Miyares said he would push for changes in policy to give the institution more managerial flexibility, which could allow it more autonomy from state regulations in selecting vendors and the authority to pay bonuses to attract talent.

Because of its traditional role of serving students at military installations around the world, enrollment at UMUC relies heavily
on active-duty and former military students, plus those from Maryland. At the town-hall meeting, Mr. Miyares also discussed the idea of creating a new board of nationally recognized leaders in business, academe, and the military to help advise UMUC on ways to expand beyond those two core markets.

Mr. Ludwig said details on the role of such a board, relative to the University of Maryland’s Board of Regents and UMUC’s 13-member advisory Board of Visitors, had not yet been set.

The push to reconsider the governance of UMUC was prompted in part by lagging enrollment at the institution and concerns that it needed the changes to better compete with more-aggressive nonprofit universities in the distance-education market, like Arizona State and Southern New Hampshire Universities, and for-profit institutions like American Military University, which is owned by the American Public University System and which surpassed UMUC in military enrollments in 2009.

But last month Mr. Miyares reported that UMUC’s enrollments were rebounding both domestically and internationally. "As of October 15, stateside total enrollments are up by 5 percent from last fall," he told university personnel. He also reported that enrollments in Europe and Asia, which had been hurt by cuts in military tuition assistance because of the federal cuts known as sequestration, had also improved.
Cornell University announced on Monday (http://news.cornell.edu/stories/2014/10/university-launches-engaged-cornell-50-million-gift) an ambitious plan to make community engagement a pillar of its undergraduate education model, and give all students the technical, academic, and personal skills to become “engaged citizens of the world.”

The university says it will spend $150-million over the next decade to develop the program, called “Engaged Cornell,” which is expected to be fully in place in 2025. The goal is for all graduating students to have taken at least one course with a community component by then. The project is being established with a $50-million gift from the Einhorn Family Charitable Trust, (http://www.efct.org/) and the university plans to raise the rest.

The money will be used to create introductory and advanced courses, administer competitive grants at the departmental level, and support a leadership program open to all students.


President David Skorton and other Cornell officials called the effort transformative, The Ithaca Journal (http://www.ithacaajournal.com/story/news/local/2014/10/06/engaged-cornell-program/16802093/) reported. “We intend for Cornell to be nothing less than a recognized educational leader in community engagement,” the president said.
Susan Murphy, vice president for student and academic services, said Engaged Cornell was “going to be transformative because it’s going to build partnerships on the campus in a formal way that we haven’t had before.” Some students will achieve participation through formal course work, while others may take part in research projects or participate in community partner organizations, she said.

The project plans to establish and sustain hundreds of multiyear partnerships at local, national, and global levels.

University officials hope the effort will create a new cultural norm for Cornell that will attract students and faculty members while having a meaningful impact in communities. They also hope it will create a new model and direction for higher education.
The Plight of the Public Regional College

By Eric Kelderman

Fill in the blank: Faculty members and the leadership of ___ state-college system are at odds over a proposal that aims to streamline how the institutions work, to save money, and to improve student performance through technology and administrative cooperation.

That story is playing out in several states in the Northeast and Midwest, where falling enrollments and shrinking state dollars are putting an especially tight squeeze on regional colleges. In contrast to public flagships, the regional institutions have two strikes against them: They largely serve a place-bound student body, and they lack the prestige to build big endowments or research portfolios.

The most recent example was in Connecticut, where faculty members at both two- and four-year institutions in the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities system have revolted against a plan that calls for enhancing online learning, aligning courses with the state's work-force needs, and sharing some administrative functions.

Connecticut has plenty of company. A similar scenario is playing out in Minnesota, where students and faculty members in the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities are resisting a plan, put forward by the system's chancellor, that makes many recommendations similar to those in the Connecticut proposal.

Meanwhile, the same tensions are causing students and faculty members to protest program and staff cuts in the University of Maine system and in many of the universities that make up the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.
The disagreements about those plans are "natural and not necessarily unhealthy," and reflect some of the common differences between the approaches of faculty members and administrators, said Daniel J. Hurley, associate vice president for state relations and policy analysis at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

In both Connecticut and Minnesota, faculty members have also raised concerns about the involvement of private-sector consultants in developing the recommendations. "My reading is that the process is as important as the final product," Mr. Hurley said.

**Broken Processes**

The processes in Connecticut, Maine, and Minnesota seem muddled, at the moment, by widespread discontent among both faculty members and students. On Monday, for example, students staged a protest at a meeting of the trustees of the University of Maine system, at one point even occupying the chairs of the trustees. Earlier this year, trustees had approved extensive cuts in academic programs and faculty jobs at the University of Southern Maine, which is facing a $16-million deficit in the coming fiscal year.

In Minnesota, the chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities is calling for mediation with the system’s two faculty unions to resolve disputes over his plan, called "Charting the Future."

Faculty members were initially upset at revelations that the system had hired McKinsey & Company, the consulting firm, at a cost of $2-million to help formulate the plan. Charting the Future calls for a systemwide transfer agreement between community colleges and four-year institutions in the system, the use of competency-based education and credit for prior learning, an increase in online courses, more courses and programs tailored to the state’s workforce needs, and shared administrative services among campuses.

Aside from feeling left out of the process, faculty members are also concerned that program cuts will leave some campuses unable to meet the needs of their parts of the state. And there are fears that a
systemwide transfer agreement will not account for the widely varying quality of instruction among the institutions.

The chancellor, Steven J. Rosenstone, was not available for comment.

In Connecticut, the plan to overhaul the state-college system has a similarly vague and futuristic name, "Transform CSCU." And many of the complaints from faculty members sound similar, too.

"I want to make it clear that faculty aren't opposed to change per se," said Patricia O’Neill, an associate professor of psychology at Western Connecticut State University and president of that campus’s’s chapter of the American Association of University Professors. "Our issue is that the initiatives were developed without us."

Many of the proposals sound good, Ms. O’Neill said, but they may have unintended consequences. For example, she said, increasing online and blended learning could strip the institution’s faculty members of their role in setting curricula.

Over all, the tone of the initiative also seems to put a premium on efficiency at the price of academic excellence, she said. "The board president says this is supposed to help declining enrollment, to make higher education more streamlined and less expensive," Ms. O’Neill said. "But this is another instance of education being treated as a business."

**Losing Battles**

While the fights between administrators and faculty members get much of the news-media attention, the real battle is against forces neither side can control: the economy and the nation’s shifting demographics.

Those forces are more troublesome for regional colleges and universities than for the large public flagships, which have a greater ability to rake in new fund-raising and research revenue, and a leg up in attracting out-of-state students, who often pay full price to attend. Instead, the regional institutions depend heavily on local students and state appropriations.
Higher-education appropriations are rebounding in many states but often are below prerecession levels after sharp cuts following the economic downturn. And the states with university-system unrest tend to be feeling budgetary pain. In Pennsylvania, for example, tax dollars for higher education are down more than 20 percent from 2009, according to figures from the Grapevine Project of Illinois State University, which tracks state money in higher education.

In Minnesota, higher-education appropriations are just over 10 percent less than they were in 2009; in Connecticut, they are down a little more than 3 percent. In Maine, state appropriations for higher education remained largely flat over that period.

And then there are the enrollment issues. While many colleges across the country saw record enrollments during the most recent recession, the number of students in most institutions in the Connecticut and Minnesota systems either fell or grew only slightly, with the largest increases generally occurring in the community colleges of both systems.

The situation is unlikely to improve: The number of high-school graduates has peaked in both the Midwest and the Northeast, and is now on a long, slow decline, according to figures from the Western Interstate Compact for Higher Education.

In the Northeast, the number of high-school graduates has already fallen nearly 6 percent since the 2009-10 academic year, and it is projected to slide 5 percent more by 2028.

In the Midwest, the number of high-school graduates has fallen more than 7 percent since 2009-10, and is expected to decline 10 percent over the next 14 years.

It’s not just the declining numbers that are a challenge for regional systems, said Larry Isaak, president of the Midwestern Higher Education Compact, a regional advisory board for colleges and universities. The average student at a regional institution is no longer the typical 18-to-22-year-old, he said. He or she is now often older, and more likely to work and have a family.
That puts the public regional colleges in a bind, with a choice between clinging to familiar but unsuccessful methods or leaping to unfamiliar practices with uncertainty about success.

"The type of student being served is very different than it was 30 years ago," Mr. Isaak said, "but we still have a system built for traditional students."
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NSF-Backed Scientists Raise Alarm Over Deepening Congressional Inquiry

By Paul Basken
Washington

Two years into the latest round of attacks by Congressional Republicans on federally sponsored research, an escalating effort by the House science committee to find fault with the National Science Foundation is taking a growing toll on researchers.

NSF grants to some 50 professors across the country are now being investigated by the Republican-controlled committee. More than a dozen of the researchers, in comments to The Chronicle, said they had little idea what the politicians were seeking, but warned of a dangerous precedent in what they described as a witch hunt.

"This is an outrageous politicization of science," said one of the researchers, Glenn Gordon Smith, an associate professor in instructional technology at the University of South Florida who has used NSF money for work involving climate change.

"This is a ludicrous waste of taxpayers’ money," said Celia Pearce, an associate professor of game design at Northeastern University who studies the work applications of large-scale, multiplayer online worlds. "It saddens me that elected officials are attacking science in this way," said Robert M. Rosenswig, an associate professor of anthropology at the University at Albany, a campus of the State University of New York, whose NSF-financed grant involved studying Mexican history.

Aides to the chairman of the House committee, Rep. Lamar Smith of Texas, have been visiting NSF headquarters, just outside Washington, for the past several months to study the grants—primarily in the social sciences, many in anthropology—approved in recent years.
It’s the latest step in a saga that dates to at least last year, when Mr. Smith began criticizing NSF grants largely on the basis of the project titles, such as "Picturing Animals in National Geographic" and "Regulating Accountability and Transparency in China’s Dairy Industry."

Similar questions have been raised for years by members of Congress, usually Republicans in more recent times, including Sen. Tom Coburn of Oklahoma. The tactic regularly drew headlines decades ago when it was practiced by a Democrat, Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin.

‘Higher Priorities’
The NSF has staunchly defended the integrity of its grant-review process, in which panels of outside researchers judge the scientific merit of funding applications. In cases where some research topics might not show obvious value to a layperson, the agency has taken the time to explain the underlying purpose of its studies.

One heavily publicized example cited by Congressional Republicans as wasteful involved NSF-sponsored research that included a video of shrimp walking on a treadmill. Less publicized was the value: investigating the effects of low oxygen levels on marine life, an increasingly common problem with significant economic implications.

Mr. Smith hasn’t precisely explained the basis for choosing which research projects to subject to scrutiny by his staff. In a written statement, the chairman said taxpayers deserve explanations for NSF decisions, involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, on projects that include musicals about climate change, studies of bicycle designs, and a video game that lets users "relive prom night."

"We all believe in academic freedom for scientists, but federal research agencies have an obligation to explain to American taxpayers why their money is being used on such research instead of on higher priorities," he said.

Under Mr. Smith’s leadership, the committee has made a series of efforts to impose new restrictions on the NSF’s grant-writing
ability, with a particular emphasis on cutting its budgetary authority in the social sciences. Those efforts have largely hit a roadblock in the Democratic-controlled Senate. Mr. Smith might have more success next year, however, if Republicans gain control of the Senate—as predicted by many political analysts—in next month’s elections.

Real-World Value
The NSF’s director, France A. Córdova, a former president of Purdue University, took office in March and almost immediately engaged Mr. Smith in a running discussion of the conditions under which his staff would be able to examine grant applications and associated paperwork.

Their negotiated resolution allowed the legislative staff members to inspect the paperwork at NSF headquarters and take notes, but not leave with any originals or copies. The goal, Ms. Córdova said, was to maintain promises to researchers and outside reviewers of confidentiality in the process. In one letter to Mr. Smith, she defended the integrity of the NSF’s grant-award process but welcomed constructive suggestions for improving it.

The grant for studying bicycle design was awarded to Mont Hubbard, an emeritus professor of mechanical and aerospace engineering at the University of California at Davis. His work involved incorporating aerospace technologies into "the design of bicycles for a wider population audience and for a wider range of tasks," according to an NSF summary.

"Although I respect the oversight right and responsibility of Congress," Mr. Hubbard told The Chronicle, in one of more than a dozen written responses provided by the affected researchers, "I find it disturbing that the committee apparently thinks they can do a better job of deciding what is in the nation’s interest scientifically than NSF can."

Another of the researchers, Mr. Smith of the University of South Florida, used an NSF grant to develop a curriculum on climate change for high-school students. He suggested pure political motivation lay behind the committee’s focus on his work. "When you are selectively in denial of overwhelming scientific evidence,"
he said, "you seek out ways to discredit investigators who research in that area."

Studies in anthropology, a frequent target of the legislative inquiry, may appear to have little real-world value to Americans in the present day, said Paja L. Faudree, an assistant professor of anthropology at Brown University who made the investigative list for a study of how connections among people, words, and other items collectively shape global trade in indigenous plants.

Yet one needs only to look at current headlines on the global threat of the Ebola virus to see that value, Ms. Faudree said. Anthropological studies, she said, have "done a lot to help us understand how local cultural norms affect important priorities like public health."

*Correction (10/16/2014, 9:55 a.m.):* This article originally included an outdated title and affiliation for Celia Pearce. She has left Georgia Tech and is now an associate professor of game design at Northeastern University. The text has been corrected.
How One University Became Exhibit A of Marketing Success

By Lee Gardner

Five years ago, few observers would have bet on Southern New Hampshire University’s conducting one of the most buzzed-about marketing campaigns in higher education. Facing a serious enrollment decline, it gambled on drawing more working adults to its online-education program with an aggressive effort, including lots of television advertising—a strategy seldom seen among nonprofit colleges.

Today it enrolls more than 44,000 online learners alongside its traditional student body, and Paul J. LeBlanc, its president, has become a de facto spokesman for the upside of marketing in higher education. Here are excerpts of a recent interview with him:

Q. One of the aspects of Southern New Hampshire’s marketing that has gotten attention recently are the television ads that featured a bus that drove around delivering diplomas to online-education students who couldn’t attend graduation.

A. My fear was, you get it wrong, you look like those Publisher’s Clearinghouse ads, with Ed McMahon on the bus. But why I think those ads worked really well is that we were also bringing faculty and advisers who those students had worked with but had never met. Those moments are really genuine human contact and joy and emotion.
Marketing Your College
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How One University Became Exhibit A of Marketing Success

A Small College Sells Marketing to Its Cautious Faculty

I think people have a greater antenna now for the genuine and authentic, and we didn’t want to look like a television version of the typical viewbook—you know, the Benetton ad with everyone sitting under a leafy tree. That’s not really what we’re about.

Q. You’re not just spending money on advertising to make your online program work, it seems.

A. Our real focus has been that we’re going to offer the best support and service to students to get them across the finish line. Everyone can tell you, "We care," but we try to show you how we care.

We just hired 48 new full-time instructors, and all of those instructors are targeted toward the initial gateway courses, because we know that’s a key point for adults who are coming back to school. And we have put a lot of folks on writing, because we know that’s the key academic ability that seems to correlate with success and persistence.

There was a time in our past that advising was a question of waiting for a student to call and say, "I need advice." Today advising for us is driven by a really robust [customer-relationship management system] that gives us a 360-degree view of the student. We are doing predictive analytics, we are monitoring every section of a class. We know when students have performed...
well or not on everything from a quiz to a paper. We know if they’re making repeated calls to the tech-help desk—that’s a big signal.

That’s got nothing to do with content, but it’s got everything to do with our ability to deliver on our brand promise. You’re always trying to be as good as what you say about yourself.

Q. What’s your take on the language of marketing entering academe? Many seem to react poorly to it.

A. The academy is a place where words matter. So if you work in the world of marketing and [come on campus and] talk about "product experience," that’s like poking the bear. You won’t be taken seriously. But you can come on campus and talk about the "student experience," and you mean exactly the same thing.

I don’t use "customer service" with the faculty, but I can use "student experience" with the faculty, and they buy that all day long. They may disagree on what it may look like, but they understand that.

Q. Of course, marketing isn't new to higher education, even though many may not think of it in the current sense of the term.

A. There are lots of ways people try to establish their reputation and their brand. I see a lot of schools who want to build a national brand around their traditional-age students, and one of the ways you do that is to spend millions of dollars on moving up into Division I sports programs. And what is that? That’s marketing. I’m not trying to sound judgmental about it, but I don’t think it gets recognized for what it is.

Q. Southern New Hampshire was able to capitalize on its online-education program, but that’s not going to be a good solution for most other colleges. What should their thinking be?

A. The thing that scares the hell out of marketers is that the school you’re trying to market is one of the nondescript places that you could tear the viewbook cover off and switch it with somebody else and it would look exactly the same.
There are real dangers in this landscape. Some would say, don’t squander distinctiveness, because the worst place to be is in the great unwashed, hardly differentiated middle ground. Another would be don’t chase market and be inauthentic to yourself.

Like all of these axioms, they stand typically in tension with another truism, which is don’t be so true to yourself that you are no longer relevant to what people want.
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Goals for Enrollment and Tuition Revenue Elude Many Colleges

By Scott Carlson

As far back as January, Stevenson University’s enrollment models and consultants were sending warning signals about the fall—that retention would go down, that students’ family incomes were probably hurting, that the applications streaming in might not produce students in the flesh.

The signs turned out to be accurate. After its lowest-ever yield of accepted students, Stevenson missed its goals for enrollment and net tuition revenue this fall. That’s a blow at a hard-charging institution, near Baltimore, that has significantly raised its enrollment and profile in the past decade. Administrators had budgeted for a decrease, but such thinking is "not part of the culture here," says Paul D. Lack, executive vice president for academic affairs. "You can get addicted to growth."

Stevenson has plenty of company. A new survey of 368 small private colleges and midsize state institutions shows that 38 percent met neither their goals for freshman enrollment nor their goals for net tuition revenue this fall. Even so, a similar share of the responding colleges met both enrollment and revenue goals, and significant minorities met one or the other—indicating that these segments of higher education are far from doomed, as some pundits have suggested.

The second annual survey, conducted by The Chronicle in partnership with the Council of Independent Colleges and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, shows small private colleges faring slightly worse, compared with last year. More than half of the private colleges had trouble with enrollment and/or net-tuition goals, with the smallest colleges likeliest to struggle. Meanwhile, the enrollment picture for state
colleges had improved slightly, and they had an easier time meeting their revenue goals.

**Colleges Report Successes and Shortfalls in Enrollment and Revenue**

Significant proportions of members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and of the Council of Independent Colleges did meet their goals this year for freshman enrollment and net tuition revenue. But some had lowered those goals as the year progressed.

**Percentage of AASCU institutions meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both enrollment and revenue goals</th>
<th>Neither revenue nor enrollment goals</th>
<th>Enrollment goals but not revenue goals</th>
<th>Revenue goals but not enrollment goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of CIC institutions meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Both enrollment and revenue goals</th>
<th>Neither revenue nor enrollment goals</th>
<th>Enrollment goals but not revenue goals</th>
<th>Revenue goals but not enrollment goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After Shortfalls, Then What?

Among institutions that missed their goals for freshman enrollment or tuition revenue, greater proportions this year than last were planning layoffs, early retirements, or furloughs.

AASCU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidoffs, early retirements, or furloughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce campus services or operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate low-enrollment academic programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start new programs to attract students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise discount rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more resources into marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve enrollment-management operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIC

Note: Based on information provided to The Chronicle from 114 members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and 254 members of the Council of Independent Colleges regarding their enrollment strategies for 2014-15. (The figures for 2013-14 are based on 144 members of The American Association of State Colleges and 291 members of the Council of Independent Colleges.) Some figures are for subsets of those surveyed, since not all colleges answered all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve enrollment-management operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more resources into marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise discount rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start new programs to attract students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate low-enrollment academic programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce campus services or operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layoffs, early retirements, or furloughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each institution faces situations and challenges of its own, but experts in recruitment and admissions say the findings fit what they see. After two decades of a steady supply of high-school graduates, projections indicate declining numbers nationally. Those numbers bottomed out this year, notes David A. Hawkins, director of public policy and research at the National Association for College Admission Counseling. With an improving economy, a number of colleges in the survey reported that some prospective students had gone to work instead. Other respondents sensed a general anxiety about college costs and job prospects for graduates. Those factors make for an unpredictable enrollment picture for most kinds of colleges.

"While we may settle down into new patterns, right now we are still in this phase where colleges are having a hard time figuring out what students are going to do," says Mr. Hawkins. It's not yet
clear, he adds, "whether this is a sustained systemic challenge for higher education."

Despite striving for enrollment growth, mere stability may be an achievement for colleges these days. "Very few are up, and among those that I know that are up, it's on the heels of a bad year last year," says John T. Lawlor, founder of the Lawlor Group, a Minneapolis-based market-research firm in the private-college sector. Most colleges "are even or down," he says, "and there are some that are way down."

The credit-rating agency Moody's and other observers of higher education have raised concerns about the viability of the smallest colleges, and the survey seemed to validate that: Smaller colleges were generally worse off. Of private colleges with fewer than 1,500 students, nearly half missed their goals for both enrollment and tuition revenue. Many of them are not well known. Among public institutions that missed their goals, most have fewer than 5,000 students and don’t stand out even within their state systems.

But experts also point out that while small size can have disadvantages, strong leadership and self-awareness can make all the difference. Institutions that thrive know whom they serve; offer attractive, relevant niche programs; and market themselves well. The survey’s list of colleges that had hit or exceeded their targets included many that are relatively obscure, but have some combination of those qualities.

**Shallow Pools, No-Shows**

This year’s survey found private colleges struggling a bit more than public institutions. About one in three private colleges missed their enrollment goals by more than 5 percent, compared with one in five public institutions. More than 40 percent of private colleges didn’t meet their goals for freshman enrollment or for net tuition revenue, compared with 34 percent of public colleges.

Colleges that missed their goals reported where they saw the biggest drop-off in interest: at the inquiry, application, deposit, or enrollment stage. Among public colleges, 31 percent saw fewer applicants and 60 percent saw students fail to enroll. Private
colleges reported applicants’ disappearing when it was time to pay a deposit.

Participants in the survey were promised anonymity, but some elected to be contacted to discuss their experiences. One is Albion College, which didn’t hit its goals and hasn’t in some years. Mauri A. Ditzler, Albion’s president for a few months, says that enrollment is up 4 percent over last year, but that the 1,300-student college needs stronger growth as it reaches for 1,600. "We would have liked to be up 10 percent," he says. "I suspect that there are a lot of people out there who said they met their goals but in fact didn’t."

Recruitment in rural Michigan has been tough. In the past, says Mr. Ditzler, "we threw out a blanket recruiting statement and imagined that every name that we could get ahold of was a good prospect for Albion College, and in fact that is not the case."

At Jacksonville State University, in Alabama, stable enrollment came as a disappointment. "We were hoping for an increase, and we anticipated it, but we did not experience it," says Rebecca O. Turner, the provost. Like other administrators, she worried that enrollment was affected by students’ ability to pay.

At Jacksonville State, where students are primarily from low-income backgrounds and the first in their families to go to college, tuition is just one burden. Rent, food, books, gas, and other costs have outpaced tuition, which the university has held steady for the past few years, says Ms. Turner. But financial aid can’t cover it all. She sees students working two jobs while deferring classes, or dropping in and out, or "swirling" from one institution to another.

Some colleges in the survey commented on their situations generally, offering splashes of color amid the columns of numbers. A public college in the West said it faced steep challenges in demographics and competition from other state institutions and resorted to "brute-force tactics" in marketing and recruitment. It met its goals for enrollment and tuition revenue, but only after revising them down.
In the survey, 16 percent of private colleges and 10 percent of public institutions revised their goals downward once, and about 10 percent of the former and 8 percent of the latter did so more than once.

Some respondents couldn’t hit their targets even after lowering them. One private college in the Midwest missed its goals for both enrollment and tuition by more than 5 percent after revising them downward more than once. "Tiny raises," an administrator at the college commented, were an "unfortunate result."

Other situations presented bad news and good. A private college in the Northeast missed both goals but had a very low discount rate, 21 percent. "We are actually somewhat better off than most of our local colleagues," an administrator wrote. "Demographics in the NE are brutal."

Discount rates—the average share of tuition covered by institutional aid—have reached all-time highs of 45 percent, on average, in recent years. That’s a source of anxiety for colleges, leading some to slash their sticker prices to a figure closer to what students are actually paying.

Yet the survey showed that discount rates would probably climb: A quarter of public colleges and nearly half of private colleges reported raising their discount rates, a few of them by more than 10 percent.

Beyond ‘One-Hit Wonder’
More than a few institutions had good years—38 percent of private colleges and 43 percent of public ones met or exceeded their goals for freshman enrollment and tuition revenue. And successes came in parts of the country that one might not have expected.

Baldwin Wallace University, in suburban Cleveland, had record enrollment last year and raised its goal for freshmen to 730 this year. It fell short by only about 10, bringing in the class with a lower discount rate than administrators had expected, close to 40 percent.
Still, price was a key issue, particularly for the university’s top-ranked music program, says Stephen D. Stahl, the provost: "We lost some people who went to places that were less well esteemed but less expensive." The college recruits heavily from northeast Ohio and wants to expand its reach. It has been able to sell itself on its personal touch, he says. "If we can get students to campus, they will experience a sense of community, and if we are at all the sort of place they’re looking for, we do very, very well."

Elsewhere, success was tempered by past shortfalls. Mount Ida College—an institution of 1,320 students in competitive, demographically challenged Massachusetts—saw a 20-percent increase in freshmen this fall, exceeding both enrollment and net-tuition goals. But in years prior, the college had weak enrollment.

Along with a new president in 2012, Mount Ida revamped its admissions strategy, focusing on students who are a good fit for the college both academically and financially, says Ronald Akie, the provost. It also added admissions staff, renovated several buildings, emphasized career outcomes, and added programs, particularly to its School of Design.

Mr. Akie is optimistic but cautious. "You can be a one-hit wonder and see it fall apart the next year," he says. "Our hope is that by staying focused and not diluting our efforts and getting sidetracked, we’ll be able to continue the enrollment growth."

‘More Self-Aware’
For colleges that missed their goals, the survey asked how they might decide to respond. Twenty percent of both public and private colleges said they would lay off employees; similar proportions planned to discontinue programs with low enrollment. Around 60 percent of both public and private institutions, meanwhile, said they would start new academic programs. Both strategies, observers noted after similar numbers in last year’s survey, are unlikely to produce fast results.

This year public colleges in particular stretched outside their traditional geographical boundaries to find students: One in four of them enrolled 5 to 10 percent more out-of-state and
international students, and one in eight increased that proportion by more than 10 percent.

Most of the respondents, like last year, said they would put more emphasis on improving enrollment-management operations. In this unpredictable environment, observers say, many colleges have come to see their enrollment officers as rainmakers, or even miracle workers.

At the annual meeting of the National Association for College Admission Counseling this fall, Mr. Hawkins "heard the word ‘scapegoat’ a lot," he says. "I tended to hear real concerns among those who worked at institutions where the administration has a philosophy of ‘ever upwards’—that in order to survive, there has to be more of everything": inquiries, visits, applications, and students.

But the group's research director also heard encouraging stories from administrators who said their institutions were refocusing their energies on their best programs, planning budgets that could absorb declines, and including everyone on campus in solving enrollment challenges.

"That just seemed to be a little more self-aware," says Mr. Hawkins, "as opposed to these institutions that are driven by growth and prestige."

At Stevenson, administrators are regrouping, says Mr. Lack, the executive vice president for academic affairs. Because the college anticipated a decline, he says, its finances "have not been shaken to the roots."

The enrollment manager is sticking around, working with other administrators to rebound from the tough year, Mr. Lack adds. "Enrollment is everyone’s responsibility here."

Stevenson has strengths, like its location near a major East Coast city and longtime focus on students’ careers. This fall the university is putting more resources into campus visits, which tend to lead students to enroll.
No college should be a victim of demographic declines, or the economy, or the national conversation about the value of a degree, says Mr. Lack. "We have control over our own fate, and we are determined to do well in the future."
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Fastest-Growing Colleges, 2002-12

Only one research institution, Benedictine University, more than doubled in size over the 10-year period, but all the private nonprofit master’s institutions on the top-20 list did, and so did six of the public master’s institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of increase</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>City U. of New York Graduate Cen.</td>
<td>3,874</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Texas Woman’s U.</td>
<td>8,594</td>
<td>15,168</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M U. at Kingsville</td>
<td>6,556</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>U. of Alabama at Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>19,584</td>
<td>35,505</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>47,359</td>
<td>73,378</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>U. of Central Florida</td>
<td>38,501</td>
<td>59,601</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>U. of Arkansas at Fayetteville</td>
<td>15,995</td>
<td>24,257</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>U. of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>13,229</td>
<td>18,727</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Missouri U. of Science and Technology</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Iona U.</td>
<td>9,902</td>
<td>14,289</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>U. of Colorado at Denver</td>
<td>15,596</td>
<td>22,396</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>U. of Mississippi</td>
<td>13,135</td>
<td>18,784</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sam Houston State U.</td>
<td>13,091</td>
<td>18,461</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Oregon State U.</td>
<td>18,761</td>
<td>26,363</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>U. of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>23,821</td>
<td>35,239</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M U. at Commerce</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>11,871</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina at Charlotte</td>
<td>10,916</td>
<td>26,252</td>
<td>138.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Florida International U.</td>
<td>13,349</td>
<td>46,171</td>
<td>238.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>U. of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>22,016</td>
<td>30,474</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of increase</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Benedictine U.</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>123.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Wilmington U. (Del.)</td>
<td>6,597</td>
<td>12,581</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Regent U.</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>5,655</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alliant International U. at San Diego</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Drexel U.</td>
<td>16,345</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>3,837</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Polytechnic Institute of New York U.</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Spalding U.</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>California Institute of Integral Studies</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank for size of</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2002</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2012</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>4,633</td>
<td>6,484</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Biola U.</td>
<td>4,535</td>
<td>6,503</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Edgewood College</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Georgetown U.</td>
<td>12,856</td>
<td>17,357</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Azusa Pacific U.</td>
<td>7,693</td>
<td>10,184</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Trevecca Nazarene U.</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>St. John Fisher College</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td>30,682</td>
<td>36,068</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>New School</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Maryville U. of Saint Louis</td>
<td>3,265</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Columbia U.</td>
<td>20,680</td>
<td>26,471</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public master's institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>California State U.-Channel Islands</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>681.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Florida Gulf Coast U.</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>163.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>U. of Washington at Bothell</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>155.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>U. of West Alabama</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>4,945</td>
<td>146.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Thomas Edison State College</td>
<td>9,225</td>
<td>20,606</td>
<td>123.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fort Hays State U.</td>
<td>6,392</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>108.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>U. of Houston-Victoria</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M International U.</td>
<td>3,723</td>
<td>7,213</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Arkansas Tech U.</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>U. of Washington at Tacoma</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>3,919</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>U. of Maryland University College</td>
<td>24,030</td>
<td>42,268</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State U.</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>6,202</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Winston-Salem State U.</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Eastern New Mexico U.</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>U. of Texas at Tyler</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>6,858</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>U. of Arkansas at Monticello</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>California State U.-Monterey Bay</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>5,609</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kennesaw State U.</td>
<td>13,656</td>
<td>24,004</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Coastal Carolina U.</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>9,335</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>U. of North Georgia</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private nonprofit master's institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Western Governors U.</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>41,369</td>
<td>6,019.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Liberty U.</td>
<td>7,799</td>
<td>74,372</td>
<td>884.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bethel U. (Tenn.)</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>485.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Davenport U.</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>10,687</td>
<td>383.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Saint Joseph's College (N.Y.)</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>368.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tiffin U.</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>551.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Hodges U.</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>267.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Baker U.</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>262.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>King College</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>219.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Concordia U. Chicago</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>202.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Southern New Hampshire U.</td>
<td>6,926</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>159.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Concordia U. (Ore.)</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>182.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>California Baptist U.</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>178.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank for size of increase</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2002</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2012</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Mount St. Mary's College</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>U. of the Cumberlands</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>146.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Keuka College</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>2,772</td>
<td>145.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Bellevue U.</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>9,942</td>
<td>142.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Endicott College</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>4,408</td>
<td>128.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>American International College</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>127.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Concordia U. Texas</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>124.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of increase</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Keiser U. at Ft. Lauderdale</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>16,713</td>
<td>363.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mid-Continental U.</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>296.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mid-America Christian U.</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>233.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bryan College (Tenn.)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>172.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Notre Dame College (Ohio)</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>143.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Brigham Young U.-Idaho</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>23,261</td>
<td>117.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Morris College</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>115.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Bay Path College</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>114.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Wiley College</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>110.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Belmont Abbey College</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Lasell College</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Huntington College</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Lane College</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Elms College</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Southeaster U. (Fla.)</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Marian U. (Ind.)</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Baker College of Jackson</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Anderson U. (S.C.)</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>U. of Pikeville</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank for size of increase</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2002</th>
<th>Enrollment, fall 2012</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>509.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Northwest Louisiana Technical College at Minden</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>2,633</td>
<td>344.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bluegrass Community and Technical College</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>13,210</td>
<td>332.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Northshore Technical College Sullivan Campus</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>306.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Minnesota State Community and Technical College at Fergus Falls</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>6,786</td>
<td>290.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Treasure Valley Community College</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>283.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Acadia Technical College</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>282.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>South Louisiana Community College</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>274.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Saint Louis Community College at Forest Park</td>
<td>7,610</td>
<td>26,603</td>
<td>249.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Metropolitan Community College Longview (Mo.)</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>20,141</td>
<td>247.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>West Georgia Technical College-Murphy Campus</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>244.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>L.E. Fletcher Technical Community College</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2,562</td>
<td>217.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2002</td>
<td>Enrollment, fall 2012</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Stark State College</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>15,655</td>
<td>202.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Capital Area Technical College, Baton Rouge Campus</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>3,762</td>
<td>196.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Mayville Community and Technical College</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>180.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Arkansas State U.-Newport</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>175.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Somerset Community College</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>7,878</td>
<td>166.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Southern Maine Community College</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>7,574</td>
<td>165.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>South Central Louisiana Technical College-Young Memorial Campus</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>165.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Western Oklahoma State College</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>157.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The figure for the City University of New York Graduate Center includes enrollment at four administratively linked university programs: the CUNY Baccalaureate for Unique and Interdisciplinary Studies, the CUNY School of Professional Studies (including the Joseph S. Murphy Institute for Worker Education and Labor Studies); the CUNY Graduate School of Journalism; and Morningside College.

Note: Data are based on a fall head count of full- and part-time undergraduate and graduate students. Percentages are rounded, but institutions are ranked based on unrounded figures. The table includes only U.S. degree-granting institutions with at least 500 students in 2002. Growth at some colleges reflects online-only students, who are not reported separately from students on campus. The categories shown are based on those issued by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 2010. The category of public two-year colleges does not include four-year colleges that grant primarily associate degrees. Two-year colleges that report enrollment on a system rather than campus basis were also excluded.

Source: Chronicle analysis of U.S. Department of Education data

---

### 2 Comments

**digithead** · 3 months ago

The University of Colorado-Denver's growth should be flagged because part of that growth was from adding the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. UCD and UCHSC were distinct campuses in the CU system until 2004.

There is also an issue with the University of North Georgia, which didn't exist until last year. It was formed by combining North Georgia College & State University with Gainesville State College. Georgia combined many of their institutions last year including Augusta State and the Medical College of Georgia into Georgia Regents University.

Hence, the real growth for some of these institutions is much smaller than it appears in the list or there was no growth at all except for the founding of a new institution.

**Emma** · Any data on for-profits?
November 21, 2014

Senate Democrats’ Bill to Renew Higher Education Act: Many Ideas, Little Hope of Passing

By Kelly Field
Washington

With only days remaining until his retirement, the Democratic chairman of the Senate education committee, Tom Harkin of Iowa, formally introduced legislation on Thursday offering his vision for renewing the Higher Education Act.

The 874-page bill builds on a draft that Senator Harkin released in June, adding provisions that would extend and reform the endangered Perkins loan program and the other campus-based aid programs; restore year-round Pell Grants to part-time students; and offer Pell bonuses to institutions that enroll low- and moderate-income students.

The bill would also create a unit-record system for tracking students, with privacy protections aimed at preventing the disclosure of sensitive information on students.

But many of Mr. Harkin’s ideas face a difficult road ahead. The measure is unlikely to advance in the current Congress, which ends just after the New Year. After that, Republicans will take over the Senate, and Sen. Lamar Alexander, Republican of Tennessee, will become chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, or HELP. He has his own ideas about reauthorization, and plans to draft his own bill.

Even so, Mr. Harkin’s bill represents a starting point for negotiations between the parties. And some of the ideas may make it into Mr. Alexander’s measure, if the new chairman keeps his promise to involve Democrats in the drafting.
In an email, an aide to Senator Harkin described the measure as "the culmination of all the chairman and the HELP Committee’s work on higher education."

"The chairman wanted to lay out Democratic priorities for the next Congress," said the aide, who spoke on background to keep the focus on his boss.

Senate Democrats had been gearing up for Thursday’s introduction of the bill since last September, when the committee held the first of what would be 12 bipartisan hearings on reauthorization. Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives have also held multiple hearings, but they have opted for a piecemeal approach to renewing the bill—a contrast with the Senate’s comprehensive bill.

Thursday’s introduction came shortly after Mr. Harkin met with other top appropriators to discuss spending levels for education and other programs in the 2015 fiscal year, which began on October 1. (Since then, the government has been funded by continuing resolutions, at last year’s levels.) The meeting was reportedly contentious, with lawmakers disagreeing over a Democratic plan to cut $2-billion from Pell Grants to pay for other programs, according to Congressional Quarterly. Such a move would create a shortfall in fiscal 2016 that the next Congress would have to cover.

Lawmakers are racing to finish work on the spending bills before December 11, when the current stopgap measure expires. If they can’t agree on omnibus legislation incorporating all of the spending bills, they may opt to continue spending at existing levels for some of the thornier measures, like the education bill. That would mean no new money for education programs until at least next October.