

MINUTES

Boulder Faculty Assembly

December 1, 2005

Attending:

Jerry Hauser, Chair

R L Widmann, Vice Chair

David Kassoy, Secretary

Barbara Bintliff, Former BFA Chair

Pamela Diggle

Mark Dubin

David Fagerstrom

Eric Juenke

Samuel Junod

Daniel Kim

E. Christian Kopff

Richard Laver

Jeffry Mitton

Uriel Nauenberg

Rolf Norgaard

Jerry Peterson

Andrew Pleszkun

Joe Rosse

Ravinder Singh

Alexey Wolfson

John Cooper, Retired Faculty

David Hill, Retired Faculty

Barbara Battenfield, ASC Chair

Mark Bradburn, UGGS

Mario Flores, UCSU

Media:

Jeff Dodge, Silver & Gold Record

Guests:

Jacci McKenna, Employment Services Director

Interim Provost Susan Avery

University Perspective:

Linda Browning

Valentine Roche

Chuck Earnst, Staff Council

Not attending:

Wayne Angevine

Marty Bickman

Sedat Biringen

Deane Bowers

Greg Carey

Frances Charteris

Cathy Comstock

Don Eron

Robert Ferry

Hardy Fredricksmeyer

Lori Hunter

Roger King

Robert Kuchta

Bill McGinley

Tad Pfeffer

Kathryn Pieplow

Bob Regoli

Terry Sawchuk

Petger Schaberg

Eric Small

Simon Sparks

Ted Snow

Deward Walker

William Kunzweiler

A regular meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly was held on December 1, 2005 in the Fleming Law Building, Room 156. Chair Jerry Hauser presided. The meeting convened at 4:00p.m. and adjourned at 5:30p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes

The Chair asked for a motion to approve the minutes from November 3, 2005. There being no further comments, corrections or changes to the minutes, the motion to approve the minutes carried.

B. Chair's Announcements

- The Presidential and Chancellor search committees are going forward;
- In response to racial incidents on campus the provost and chancellor have met with students with a second meeting scheduled for December and the students have asked for additional scholarship money and Hauser intends to discuss the importance of this need with the Chancellor;
- The Provost has assured Hauser that a BFA faculty member will be represented on whatever committee is formed to discuss the development of a common course on diversity;
- A Blue Ribbon Commission will be formed to develop a report on the diversity climate at CU; Hauser asked the provost about the composition of the committee and was told it was an external committee created to get a distance perspective; it will be up to the faculty and the administration to do what is deemed appropriate with the report;
- A biotech initiative and feasibility study for developing a lab facility at a research park which would have a positive effect in terms of generating revenue for the university and tenure track lines has been put forward; the administration is concerned about the current 29 to 1 student to faculty ratio (five years ago it was 22 to 1); the provost has made strong statements to Hauser and the Executive Committee about aggressively addressing this issue;
- The Regents budget retreat focused on what to do now that Referendum C has been approved; Porreca reported that the retreat produced a new awareness for President Brown about fiscal conditions on the Boulder campus with the data showing us slipping behind our peers in terms of state support;
- Course repetition will be up for vote on February 2, 2006 and the motion will be introduced at today's meeting; the Chair urged faculty to initiate a discussion among faculty on the proposal so that the deliberations and vote will reflect faculty views;
- The Holiday Reception is scheduled for December 8 and faculty are encouraged to notify Shernick if they plan to attend.

C. Committee Reports

The Chair asked to defer deliberation on the Academic Affairs motion on course repetition to the next meeting, February 2, 2006. Widmann moved the motion that comes from the BFA Academic Affairs Committee be deferred and encouraged the faculty to read the motion and narrative and prepare questions for the next assembly meeting. The motion comes from committee and does not require a second.

Dubin read changes to the libraries resolution before the assembly to increase annual funding for library materials. The first change strikes the dollar value as a dollar amount is available through the accompanying report, and the second changes the statement that the resolution is for perpetuity to a period of five years by adding the sentence "this resolution will be active through AY 2012 as the sun sets in five year unless otherwise dealt with." He explained that the inflationary rate for journals tends to run at 8% per year while the materials budget increase comes in about 4% a year. Further cuts will be necessary if no increases to the budget occur.

The Libraries Committee asks the faculty to resolve whether journals be among the highest priority for the next five years in the university budget. Five years from now the situation with journals may change. The current planning budget for next year does have an 8% increase, and in future years the amount can be indexed to the 8%. Hauser clarified where "for the next five years" would be inserted and asked if there was any objection to closing deliberation and calling for the vote within thirty minutes. Hearing no objection, Hauser turned over the floor to Mitton after explaining that a BFA policy passed in 2001 requires any motion that has fiscal impact be costed before a vote is taken. Mitton as chair of the Budget & Planning committee along with Ric Porreca and Bill Kaempfer created the Fiscal Impact Review attached to the resolution. Mitton confirmed that it is true that the cost of library materials has been increasing about 8% per year due to the fact that corporations have purchased journals. Four percent is actually budgeted for library materials every year which means \$405 would have to be given up by faculty for each year they are employed at the university to support the increasing cost of journals and materials. This has real budgetary implications for the faculty. Mitton stated that personally he could not support a motion that gives first budgetary priority to library subscriptions while we have salary compression and faculty leaving the university for higher paid positions elsewhere. He concluded that the BFA would quickly disenfranchise the faculty by passing the resolution.

The Chair opened the floor for debate. Dubin pointed out that there are things in the budget besides the library and faculty salaries and that there are other ways to slice the budgetary pie. Cooper disagreed and said calling the library materials budget the "highest priority" goes against what the BFA has supported for the past ten years. He could not sanction telling junior colleagues to give up a certain amount of their salary to support the library. If the library wants to invite faculty to voluntarily donate \$500 of their salaries that would be fine, and he agreed with Mitton that the BFA would quickly disenfranchise its colleagues if it insisted that library funding is of the "highest priority" rather than "a high priority."

As a junior faculty member, Junod said that the monograph collection is a vital resource for his research and his teaching and the collection is already rather limited compared to that of other research universities. If, in the future, the budget for monograph acquisitions is going to be severely reduced, one of his primary tools for research and teaching will be deficient and is therefore not less important than salary issues. Having to work in a university which is not able to allocate sufficient resources to its library, and especially the monographs (which are essential to the Humanities) could be a reason to leave CU.

Kopff said this proposal was discussed at a meeting of the Arts and Sciences Council and he reviewed the points made at that meeting, which included that a motion that prioritizes any ancillary institution over students and faculty is a mistake; to change a long term priority of the BFA in face of this crisis would be wrong as the advantage to a tenured faculty is that we represent a settled body of opinion that puts things into an appropriate perspective; with regard to the sunset provision, the faculty are reviewed every year and there is no reason why the library should be exempted from a review process every year; and finally, no one at the meeting believed that other resources other than faculty salaries couldn't be found to help cover the cost of journals.

Singh asked why faculty salaries were chosen among to support the library budget instead of other budget items and Mitton said there are fixed costs in the budget that can't be cut like heating campus buildings, the costs of retirements, and insurance costs that will increase at the rate of inflation.

Norgaard suggested using "among the highest priorities" as preferable language in the motion while understanding the importance of library materials for academic work.

Dubin said he would not object to a friendly amendment to alter "the highest priority" to "among the highest priorities" and Widmann so moved. The motion to amend was seconded, and the motion will now read "and that this is *among* the highest priorities." The proposed amendment was then up for discussion. Cooper challenged the efficacy of the English and Nauenberg suggested the resolution read "it is a *high priority*." Hauser asked for further discussion on the proposed amendment and Kopff asked if there was any reason to think support for the library wasn't already a high priority with regard to the administration. Mitton responded with statistics which indicate the library budget has gone up 26 percent while faculty salaries went up 21 percent over the last five years. Rosse said that without the original language the motion would be meaningless and Hauser asked for further discussion on the proposed amendment. There being none, he called for a vote on the amendment of the resolution to say, "and this is a high priority of the faculty for the next five years, recognizing that it will impact other high priority items." All those in favor of amending the motion as read signified their vote by raising their hands. Ten faculty were in favor and six were opposed with one abstention to the amendment, so the amended language passed. Hauser asked for further discussion on the motion as amended, and hearing none, called for a vote which resulted in eleven in favor, seven opposed to the motion. The motion carried.

**Boulder Faculty Assembly
Executive Committee**

Resolution on Annual Increase for Library Materials

BFA-X-R-101705

RESOLVED: The BFA requests that the Libraries' annual increase allocation for materials acquisitions costs be indexed to at least the actual annual publishers' inflationary increase, without negative impact on the remainder of the libraries increases, noting that the projected publishers' inflationary increase for AY 06-07 is 8%, and that this is a high priority of the faculty for the next five years, recognizing that it will impact other high priority items.

From BFA Committee: Libraries Committee

Notice of Motion to Executive Committee: November 14, 2005

Resolution presented to the BFA: December 1, 2005

Amendment presented by the BFA: December 1, 2005

Resolution as amended approved by the BFA: December 1, 2005

D. Special Reports

Employment Services Director Jacqui McKenna offered a brief update on the children in the workplace project which originated with a request from Vice Chancellor Tabolt. A committee was formed to obtain a cross-section of input and once the document is finalized it will go to chancellor's executive committee. The new policy attempts to find a balance between supporting a family friendly environment while remaining in compliance with legal constraints. When children are brought to campus there needs to be a dialogue between the faculty person and the student or the supervisor and the employee so that the appropriateness of the visit can be discussed and ensure work is not disrupted due to the visit. Safety concerns also identified environments where children should not be present, such as the power plant, mechanical shops and other high-risk work areas. These guidelines can be used as a policy or as a tool or starting point for dialogue between supervisors and employees as to when it might be appropriate to have a child in or around a classroom.

Dubin questioned the wording of D. 1 as it negates the goal to have the same rules apply to everyone on campus as a matter of precedent so no one could claim discrimination and asked if D.6. would apply to faculty offices which can be the same as a campus laboratory. McKenna said the issue was safety and the goal was to encourage supervisors and employers to discuss when it would be appropriate for children to be in the workplace rather than narrow the definition and exclude children from campus. She welcomed suggestions to make the guideline statements more clear. Dubin

recommended substituting “should not be allowed in hazardous situations.” McKenna said that if a person wanted to bring a child into one of the places listed in S.6.a-e, that permission from an associate dean or director would be required.

Buttenfield said guideline item 6 in effect creates two classes of citizens on campus: if you work in an “unsafe” environment, permission is required whereas if you work in a “safe” environment, permission to bring a child to work is optional. She recommended the university work on creating a form of daycare rather than continue working on the workplace guidelines. McKenna said that an employee needs to dialogue with their supervisor to obtain permission to have a child in the environment, safe or unsafe. When the level of safety is at issue the level of permission must be moved to the level of associate dean or director because the liability is greater.

Bintliff praise McKenna for creating good preliminary guidelines and suggested they were not ready for submission to the chancellor’s executive committee as the policy’s terms weren’t understood. She recommended taking more time to address the issues, include basic definitions and clarify terms, and then conduct a thorough grammar check on clauses and phrases. McKenna said the committee decided to include a cover memo with the guidelines that recognizes the lack of any form of daycare available on campus and that it will identify this as a critical need. Hauser asked about the “Bring Your Child to Work” event that takes place yearly and McKenna said the guidelines address specific university sponsored events. Norgaard said he hoped there was awareness as to calendar issues which prompt faculty to bring children to campus and he urged McKenna to adopt a broader view of why faculty sometimes bring children to work.

Peterson offered that the solutions presented by the guidelines outweigh the problem the document is trying to address and that it is an indication of the erosion of trust for faculty. McKenna disagreed and said that in fact there have been two problematic cases involving children in the workplace on campus and possibly others and she has heard positive feedback from members of the advisory group and supervisors have said this is a good tool to have. She added that these are guidelines and not rules. Widmann said the cover memo could include specific comments about risk management issues and why this kind of document is necessary. Rosse echoed Bintliff’s comments and asked whether it is a privilege to bring a child to campus be considered. Cooper said having to ask an associate dean for permission to bring a child to a department is unworkable and at the very least a departmental chair should take responsibility for those types of decisions. Hauser hoped the feedback from faculty was helpful and recommended further questions could be directed to Diggle or McKenna directly.

The Chair introduced Provost Avery who thanked the faculty for opportunity to speak and began by outlining three specific initiatives she is supporting:

- CU as a comprehensive research university with an excellent undergraduate experience and curriculum has lost ground in its ability to deliver over the years due to budgetary problems, resulting in an initiative to increase faculty lines by

100 in targeted areas; an announcement may come out this spring and a lot will depend on resources available;

- The concept of residential colleges has been proposed as CU's residence halls need renovation and its current academic programs are under review; residential colleges have been successful delivering new experiences for freshman and beyond at other universities;
- Faculty discussions revolving around renewable and sustainable energy have resulted in opportunities for funding and the preparation of a white paper; faculty can expect to see workshops and a distinguished speakers program as ways to engage faculty and students with the subject, beginning in spring of 2006.

The Provost then opened the floor to the faculty. Kassoy asked Avery to describe the long term objectives of the proposed renewable energy program, and the Provost answered that CU is positioned nicely to make this an innovative program and a number one economic driver for the state. If you look at university scientists who are working on renewable alternative energy sources, engineers who are working on distribution of those resources, faculty working on policy associated with alternative and conventional energy use, social science faculty looking at behavior patterns and what it would take to move a carbon based society to use other resources, and then add the humanities faculty who have a vested interest in American West values and energy and its role in the west, you have a rich portfolio of interests that can be pulled together. Avery said new partnerships could be formed with groups like NIST and NOAA and the initiative would also create graduate and undergraduate curricula.

Kopff said faculty are not happy with the academic calendar as reading days have been abolished and these changes affect teaching. Avery said the BFA has supported the fall break change and added that the campus is constrained in many ways by the calendar. The fall calendar in place for 2006 mimics that of spring and the goal now is to see how these changes work over the next few years.

Bintliff asked about the status of the "CU 101" university class proposal made last year. Avery said the "CU 101" study group consisting of students and faculty is expected to produce a report in the next several weeks with a focus on course content as well as how to deliver it. A pilot study is also a possibility. Bintliff asked what process was being used to determine whether the class should be given and how it would be delivered, and Avery said the proposal would be brought first to the Council of Deans with an opportunity to deliver it to the BFA. Department chairs and ultimately departments would also be engaged in the discussion of the packaging of the course and its delivery this spring.

Cooper said the Provost's list of initiatives were impressive and asked what resources are available as funds are likely to be constrained. Avery said program development requires a number of building blocks: faculty, research infrastructure, teaching infrastructure, and start up packages. Avery's approach involves looking at the return on investment as it pertains to campus goals and she will look at what CU is currently involved in to identify which campus projects continue to be viable. The research park off 30th Street is being

looked at for potential evolution as a campus, and Avery pointed out this kind of thinking and vision are what enabled the Fitzsimmons expansion to get started.

Norgaard asked if a BFA representative sat on the CU 101 committee as such initiatives have important curricular impacts. He urged her to consult faculty and include a BFA representative on these committees as faculty need to have sustained impact when it comes to these initiatives. Avery agreed it is important to have faculty on these committees and assured him the initiative will come to BFA Chair Hauser and into the BFA's hands.

Butenfield reported that departments are excitedly discussing the proposal for 100 new faculty lines but added that in the past junior faculty had to serve in two departments, creating tension between those faculty and the departments involved, and she asked how this can be avoided in the future. Avery said she was sensitive to this problem while acknowledging that there is also a need for persons to interface between two programs so an understanding as to expectations of faculty with safeguards put in place between units will be essential for future dual appointments.

Kim asked if the provost was aware of the library budget problems and Avery said it is a problem that transcends Boulder as the discussion about the high cost of periodicals and books is national and she promised to work on this ongoing problem. The current trend is to look at libraries as not only repositories for knowledge in the traditional sense but as learning centers, and she added that once a strategic plan was in place she would take a look at fundraising opportunities.

The Chair thanked the Provost for coming and the meeting was adjourned.

