

MINUTES

Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
April 2, 2007

Chair Jerry Hauser called the meeting to order at 3:30.

Minutes of March 12, 2007 were accepted as distributed.

A. Chair's Report

Chair requested clarification on the placement of a revision to the By-laws to add section six under Article V, section 2, Chairs will have term limits. Members agreed to change the number to 5 so as to conform to numbering in Article V, section 2.

B. Committee Reports

Budget and Planning Committee

In the absence of Budget and Planning Committee Chair Mitton, Vice Provost Kaempfer reported on AAU Salary Comparisons. He noted the premium the average full professors are paid on this campus is 62% more than the AAU assistant professor. In general, CU follows the same pattern as AAU peer group which is 70%. He noted that it implies our assistant professors are closer to AAU peers, and full professors are further behind. In salary relative to evaluations, each category is worth 1% additional increase in salary, whether looking at dollar raises or percentages. He also looks at gender equity to test to see if there is significant gender variables. Six or seven years ago Chancellor Byyny and Provost Distefano contributed \$250,000 in salaries to try to get rid of the negative factor on salaries. The gender variable became insignificant and remains insignificant. Before long it might again become a significant variable, which means we will have a gender issue in salaries. Kaempfer noted that he looked at A&S data and he was concerned at the mid-year increase. A larger percentage of women got bigger increases than men. The percentage increase was 9% for men and 6% for women. He said he will continue monitoring and have discussions with the deans to get them to move to rectify the situation.

Compensation and Benefits Committee:

Uriel Nauenberg, chair of the Compensation and Benefits Committee, reported the committee discussed a motion that the Compensation and Benefits committee request the BFA to constitute a task force to devise a

proposal to improve the working conditions of our contingent faculty, including research faculty, at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Nauenberg stated he would like to see instructors considered automatically (not have to be in a pool with outside candidates, if they have served for a certain # of years). Members discussed various instructor related work conditions citing, feelings of injustice, low pay, hiring practices, and contracts terms. Hauser stated the appropriate action would be for the assembly to adopt the resolution. He will place it on the BFA agenda.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Motion on Grievances

Paul Levitt, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, stated he would circulate the document to the group. Hauser stated it may be on the agenda for BFA meeting on April 5.

Diversity Committee:

Alphonse Keadley, chair of the Diversity Committee, reported concerns about the position for the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Community Engagement. He noted the position is not being advertised as tenurable. He stated the committee thinks it is important for the person in the position to hold tenure. Committee members cited compelling reasons for a tenured position, noting responsibilities with direct involvement with faculty; serving on faculty searches; assurance of employment; concern for the ability to speak for campus needs. Hauser stated the appropriate action would be for the assembly to adopt a resolution. He stated it will go on the BFA agenda as a resolution from the Executive Committee.

Silver and Gold Record

Chair Hauser cited an article from Mark Dubin, BFA representative on the S&G Editorial Board, regarding the retirement of Editor, Susan Barney-Jones. The S&G Editorial Board is conducting a search and in the course of this process the question arose about who has appointing authority, and to whom the S&G Board reports. Counsel Charles Sweet discovered that the President has appointing authority. It was never ceded to the Board, but the President now wishes to have appointing authority and he would also have dismissal authority. He also wants to change the status from classified to professional exempt. The editor would become an At-Will employee. Dubin felt the BFA needs to take a stand on this.

The Committee discussed concerns about an At-will position; not restricting the editorial independence; the need for an APS to clarify the status of the position; and how the board and chair are selected. Hauser noted that Robert Trager, who is on the S&G editorial board would be meeting with VC Sweet to clarify the status of the Board's need to be accountable to the President. The Committee suggested that Dubin draft a resolution to address the following key issues:

1. The Editorial Board appoints the editor--Freedom of the Press would be compromised if appointed by the very person it has to report on and may criticize.
2. The classification of the editor is critical in that changing the current classification to an At-Will appointment would mean the editor could be dismissed by the President if the President does not like what is being published. The editor needs autonomy regarding what and who the S&G reports on, the Editorial Board is the appropriate body s/he should report to.
3. The Editorial Board must be an independent body that reports to its constituencies, of which the administration is one, and which appoints its own member. Otherwise the autonomy of the Editorial Board is compromised.
4. There is a need to clarify the status of S&G. It is not a house organ, a company news letter--we already have one. It is the university's newspaper and, as such, should be governed by the guarantees of a free press, just as any other newspaper and for the same reasons.

Special Report:

PRP Review

Hauser introduced Jeff Cox, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs. Cox gave an overview stating they wanted to figure out a way to make PRP have a stronger connection to the planning process. It was suggested to form aggregate units in comparable groups, i.e., the entire humanities section at one time. They looked for places of connections between units. The Task force's version for aggregate groups was not met with much favor. A new version makes it easier to make comparison across units. One strength is accountability—it would have deans and the Provost report on an annual basis. Currently, the PRP says X unit needs 2 more lines. It never materializes and there is no explanation, action or decision. Cox added that they do not want to reorganize the college, but find a mechanism to address problems. Cox noted the PRP reviews by calendar, it's randomized. The task force is proposing a review by division, maybe split in half. It would be an opportunity for departments with multiple missions to be part of the conversation in multiply years. Cox stated the task force's charge was to make the process effective. They are trying to make it less work, and faster; it now takes two years to complete the process. They want it done at the unit in one year. They are working on ways for intuitional analyses. Cox stated that units under review would be brought together and someone would rank order a set of recommendations. Department Chairs were unenthusiastic about that model, as it placed an element of competition unnecessarily on units. Hauser asked about the second recommendation for lines, are they by unit or colleges. Cox replied that currently it is by unit. Under the new system the same thing could arise. Hauser asked why not recommend over next five years, that 5 lines be added, i.e., in social sciences. Cox said that may well be the process. Hauser said the first two recommendations are critical quality decision, and someone has to be responsible in making decisions. Cox said the way they envision PRP would be for an aggregated group to rank order its' recommendations (from the group). PRP asks units to look at curriculum and

research, and lines are based on combination of research needs and courses in the units. Hauser noted the 3rd question is what is the process on the selection of panel members. Cox said selection is done jointly by Faculty Affairs and the BFA. Cox said expertise at the campus level is extremely important. He said they go back and check with units to make sure they are not missing something. Levitt asked about the Comparative Literature department. Cox replied that the PRP panel recommended the department status be dissolved back into two faculty committees. The Program would still be able to deliver, but it would not be a tenure bearing department. Buttenfield said the Provost has signed off but there is no formal posting until the dean meets with the unit. PRP will issue its decision at the end of the term. Hauser stated we need a system policy, he will take it up with RL Widmann. Cox noted that program discontinuance would get rid of the unit and tenure lines. This is just an administration reorganization.

Hauser pointed out effect on selection of panel. He noted that with an appropriate panel, members may be able to find ways in which committees can make evaluations.

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned.