154 faculty members (representing around 10% of all faculty) responded to an email sent by CPD director Martín Carcasson on February 23rd asking them the five questions below:

1. Regarding the potential building of a new on-campus stadium at CSU, I am excited about...
2. I am concerned that...
3. What additional information would you need to decide about this issue?
4. What is the most important thing you want the advisory committee to understand about your view of this issue?
5. What questions/concerns/suggestions do you have for the public engagement process?
6. Additional questions or comments

In the same email, faculty were invited to attend one of the 10 CPD deliberative forums that were held from February 23 – March 7. Faculty represented only 5 of the 258 participants at those forums.

From a CPD analysis of the online faculty input, roughly 8% of respondents supported the stadium, 84% opposed, and 8% expressed arguments on both sides. All the faculty data is posted online at the CPD website: [http://www.cpd.colostate.edu/facultyinput1.pdf](http://www.cpd.colostate.edu/facultyinput1.pdf). The answers to questions 1 and 2 were coded by CPD staff and students, primarily coding them with regard to the argument areas provided on the CPD backgrounder in order to identify which arguments were expressed most frequently, and what arguments were made that were not included in the backgrounder.

Overall, the most commonly expressed arguments in the online input were:

**Concerns about the funding of the stadium** (99 coded instances)
This argument was made in a number of ways. Most common was simply highlighting other current needs (36), such as increasing salaries, new hires, fixing classrooms and offices, janitorial services, scholarships, and lowering tuition and fees. A number of respondents specifically mentioned the lack of cost of living raises for the past 3 or 4 years (17). Several also expressed concern that even if the funding for the stadium was from private sources, that those donors could potentially be convinced to donate to academic causes or that there were opportunity costs to focusing so much on raising money for the stadium (19). Several also questioned whether the private funds would primarily cover the cost of the initial building, or if they would also cover potential cost overruns and ongoing maintenance (18). Some of the most emotional language was provided within these comments, with respondents highlighting the current low morale of faculty and staff and expressing frustration toward the symbolism and timing of the stadium proposal.

**Concerns about the impact of the stadium on the surrounding community** (52)
Traffic and noise were the primary points made within these comments. Respondents also expressed concern that the university was potentially harming its relationship with the community, particularly if the process to decide about the stadium was not legitimate.
Concerns about the location of the stadium (38 opposed, 8 in support)
This data was gathered before specific potential locations were provided, but nonetheless a number of concerns were raised generally about fitting a stadium on a campus that is already seen as rather cramped and limited in growth possibility. General space concerns were primary, particularly having space for future growth both for academics and student housing. Parking was also a major concern expressed here, with many frustrations expressed about current parking limitations. A handful of participants expressed concerns about losing views of the foothills, or that campus would be negatively affected by the crowds on game day.

Arguments concerning the role of athletics at a university and the impact of a new stadium on academic and the core mission (total of 36)
This coding was split between two of the issues on the CPD backgrounder that have some significant overlap (issues G and K). Overall, respondents emphasized that academics, including both teaching and research, are the core mission of the university, and thus assurances must be made that athletics complement academics and do not distract from them. The recent increased funding and focus on athletics, particularly after years of cutbacks on academics, was seen as a troubling development both financially and symbolically.

Arguments concerning the current state of Hughes (27)
A number of respondents made comments supporting the current Hughes Stadium. Some simply see Hughes as an excellent facility so are unclear on the need for a new stadium at all. Others believe Hughes is adequate and could be further renovated to meet our needs, while others were concerned that Hughes was just recently renovated and moving from it would waste those recent improvements.

Arguments concerning the impact of a new stadium on the team, fans, and national profile (26 opposed, 3 in support)
One of the primary arguments made for the stadium as laid out by Jack Graham at the initial Stadium Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting was that it would make a positive impact on the team, energize the fans, and improve CSU’s national profile, which will then in turn have other positive impacts on CSU, including financial impacts. Faculty respondents generally pushed back on this argument, and questioned the impact of a new stadium on these issues, particularly long term. Other respondents supported these goals, but believed they could either be achieved through Hughes Stadium, or that the new coach should first be given time to achieve them before investing in a new stadium. Three respondents argued in favor of the new stadium having these positive impacts.

Arguments concerning the environmental impact (17)
Some respondents specifically invoked the branding of CSU as a Green University and how abandoning what many saw as an at least functional facility for something new seemed to go against that ethic.

Considering a strong majority of the respondents were opposed the stadium, there is less representation of the reasons people gave to support the stadium. The most common argument focused on the benefits of having a stadium on campus (8), particularly how it increases excitement and improves the overall game day experience.
Arguments beyond the CPD backgrounder: A few arguments were provided that did not fit within the CPD backgrounder, but none with significant consistency.

Overall CPD response to the faculty data: The role of the CPD in the process is to support the committee in engaging the public and gathering responses from the various key stakeholders, as well as to make recommendations to move forward that will improve the quality of the discussion and support high quality decision-making. The goal of our work is not simply to identify who is for and against the stadium, but rather develop clearer understanding of why people are for or against it in order to inform the committee’s deliberations. It is clear at this point that the faculty that responded to the email are strongly opposed to the idea of the stadium for multiple reasons. It should be noted that these responses were gathered in late February, when few details about the potential stadium were available beyond the concept (i.e. location, design, cost, funding, etc., were still being studied). Nonetheless, identifying where the energy resides at this point is important to mapping the issue and identifying next steps in the process. We feel it is relevant to note that, for the most part, the arguments made in favor of the stadium outlined at the February 3rd meeting and expressed by other supporters were either not engaged or were questioned. Similar to the broader public input, this input is polarized in that respondents generally expressed only one side of the issue (and again, for faculty, that was primarily opposition). Only 8% of the online respondents clearly offered arguments both for and against the stadium. It is also clear that many faculty—as well as staff based on their similar input—are seeing the stadium proposal through the lens of the last several years of budget cuts, which is a source of particular frustration and pushback. These concerns were consistent enough to warrant attention.

Next steps: As reported by CPD director Martín Carcasson at the March 29 SAC meeting, six key issues were identified through the public engagement process thus far for further research and public engagement in order to improve the broader discussion of the stadium proposal.

Those six issues are:

- Impact of the stadium on community
- Impact of the stadium on team, fans, and national profile
- Appropriate role of athletics on campus
- Impact of the stadium/athletics on university finances
- Funding of the stadium
- The current state and future use of Hughes

Clearly most of these issues connect with the particular concerns of faculty highlighted in this report. These issues represent the issues most often discussed in the public discussion, as well as issues were particular tensions exists. In many cases, supporters and opponents of the stadium tend to talk past each other on many of these issues—often with very different assumptions about impacts—so ideally information can be collected to inform the discussion moving forward. Various mechanisms are underway to help collect additional information on these and other issues and provide a stronger, mutual base of information for the discussions. Additional opportunities for engagement and input will follow.