

Criterion 5 Committee Meeting Minutes

Criterion 5 – Focus Group B
October 20, 2022, 12:00pm-1:00pm
Lowell Heiny Hall 219

Members Present: Andrew Connolly, Bryan Davis, Deborah Kennard, Robert Kinson, Justin Little, Tracie Seurer, John Stewart

1. Committee Chair Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 12:00pm.
2. Rosenbaum reiterated the plan for Fall 2022, confirming that he was drafting the assurance argument for Criterion 5 while periodically meeting with smaller focus groups to discuss individual Core Components.
3. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.B.1: “The institution has qualified and trained operational staff and infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.”
 - Concerning what to cut, committee members questioned whether the information about the training of new employees was necessary in its current form.
 - Along those lines, the committee discussed whether detailed information about a single training presentation might be excessive.
 - Regarding the hiring process, one committee member pointed out that the process has changed for staff searches, which no longer require a search committee.
 - Shifting attention to the physical infrastructure of CMU, another committee member suggested including total square footage numbers for the new buildings, which Kent Marsh could provide.
4. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.B.2: “The goals incorporated into the mission and any related statements are realistic in light of the institution’s organization, resources and opportunities.”
 - Concerning what to add, one committee member asked if we should address the Strategic Planning Process here. Rosenbaum indicated that this topic would receive more attention in Core Component 5.C, which focuses on planning.
 - Discussion then centered on the paragraph addressing “abundant opportunities for... the larger community to grow intellectually.” One committee member clarified that the “Learn for Less” initiative was only available to in-state students, while the number of Golden Scholars was negligible.
5. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.B.3: “The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring its finances.”
 - Discussion of this sub-component concentrated on what we could cut, like the Tim Foster quote on CMU’s credit rating.

- Similarly, the committee considered how to address external review of CMU's finances. Should this section cover clean audits as well as the Moody's Credit Rating agency, or just emphasize one?
 - One committee member added that the state produces a list of Colorado institutions and their audit findings, perhaps allowing for more of a comparative perspective.
6. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.B.4: “The institution’s fiscal allocations ensure that its educational purposes are achieved.”
- Discussion of this sub-component concentrated on how to provide more examples given that the section was too focused on faculty. In other words, could we talk about other allocations outside of sabbaticals and professional development funds?
 - One committee member identified the equipment used by students in the hard sciences, not to mention university vans for field trips.
 - Program-level budgets could provide additional evidence of how fiscal allocations ensure that academic purposes are achieved.
 - It was also noted that documentation maintained by the budget director could clearly demonstrate how funds are distributed. Rosenbaum indicated that he would be receiving more budget-related evidence soon.
 - More discussion of investments in TRIO-sponsored programs could bring staff members back into the story while also broadening the understanding of how fiscal allocations work toward achieving educational purposes.
7. The meeting ended at 12:35pm.