

MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
September 15, 2008

Attending

Biehle, Ryan
Bradley, Liz
Buttenfield, Barbara
Carey, Greg
Cumalat, John
Cooper, John
David Hill
Juenke, Eric
Kaempfer, William
King, David
Kleeman, Terry
Kopff, Christian
LeCompte Margaret
Lewis, Clayton
Nauenberg, Uriel
Rosse, Joseph
Schulzinger, Robert

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, September 15, 2008, in UMC 353. Chair Uriel Nauenberg presided. The meeting convened at 4:05 and adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

- **Guests:**
 - **Lew Harvey, Chair of Psychology**

- **Documents:**
 - **Graph: “Special Admits” at the Nation’s Biggest Public Universities**
 - **Excerpt from Ed Greenberg’s letter nominating Dick Jessor for Distinguished Professor**
 - **Phi Kappa Phi information with a letter from the Chancellor recommending establishment**

- I. Approval of the minutes: The minutes of September 8, 2008, were approved.

- II. Chair’s Report
 - a. New Faculty Reception: October 16, 4-6, Koenig Alumni Center
 - b. President Benson will be meeting with the BFA on October 2.
 - c. CU’s Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics won a \$485 million grant to lead an exploration of Mars slated to launch in 2013.

- d. We are the only university in the Big 12 that has no special admits. According to the Chancellor, we have the highest standards for athletic admissions in the Big 12.

III. Discussion of Joe Jupille as BFA representative to BAB—Liz Bradley

- a. The Boulder Athletic Board and the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee are designed to share two members. Joe Jupille has agreed to represent the BFA IAC on the BAB. Joe Jupille's appointment was approved unanimously.

IV. Discussion regarding a motion to present Dick Jessor (longest serving CU Boulder faculty member) an award at the BFA Holiday Reception—Greg Carey.

- a. Jessor is UC Boulder's longest serving faculty member with a start date of September of 1951. He is slated to retire after this semester. Greg suggested that the BFA present him with a Special Service Award at the Holiday Party.
- b. There was discussion regarding the fact that a Special Service Award requires formal nomination and a committee process.
- c. There was discussion about presenting an award that appears to have longevity on the faculty, rather than merit, as its basis. Faculty members who have stepped aside because they felt an obligation to let new faculty in might not approve of an award for "hanging on." If longevity is the only basis, will the "next longest serving faculty member" have to get an award next?
- d. There was discussion regarding whether this recognition would stand out unfavorably against a background of NOT recognizing others.
- e. There was discussion about whether the award would actually be recognition for Jessor's distinguished record and service to the University. Is Dick a unique case beyond longevity because he still has active research grants, ongoing projects, travels all the time, etc.
- f. There was discussion about presenting Jessor with simple recognition rather than an "award"—similarly to how the BFA recognized Paul Tabolt at the Holiday Party last year.
- g. The discussion was tabled until September 29. Greg will draft a recognition statement deemphasizing longevity and circulate it for a vote on September 29.

V. Discussion regarding establishing a Phi Kappa Phi Chapter at the University of Colorado at Boulder:

- a. There was discussion about the fact that Phi Beta Kappa is the "standard" society", but only open to Arts & Sciences undergraduates. Phi Kappa Phi is open to all undergraduate disciplines.
- b. There was discussion about the fact that there has been a proliferation of "honor" societies, which makes it difficult for students to make decisions about which to join. As a result, the yield of students accepting invitations to Phi Beta Kappa is getting smaller—its reputation has been diluted. This will be yet another society competing for the students. CU Boulder was in danger of losing its Phi Beta Kappa chapter for a time because of faculty apathy—couldn't get faculty to head it. It may prove difficult to find faculty leadership for yet another honor society.

- c. There was discussion regarding the procedures required for presenting the issue to the BFA. Students or faculty must petition for a chapter and then the BFA might weigh in. The Executive Director of the society should not be making the request.
- d. Uriel will draft a letter to the Chancellor explaining the procedural problem.

VI. Discussion regarding canceling classes for weeknight football game—Christian Kopff

- a. The Provost sent an email out that involved canceling classes for the Thursday evening football game. The BFA was never presented with any information about canceling classes for the football game and never approved the proposition. This is among a number of issues involving the football game and affecting the academic and teaching mission of the university that were not brought to relevant BFA committees. Had the administration adequately discussed the issues with the BFA, it would have learned of issues they may not have contemplated. As it happened, it appears there was little to no A & S input at the various stages of the decision.
- b. There was discussion about the Chancellor's view that scheduling the football game seemed to be an obviously "good thing", but many don't think it is so obvious and this needs to be addressed properly.
- c. There was discussion about being seduced by the amount of money involved. Academics is negatively affected yet all the money goes to athletics.
- d. There was discussion about the fact that the football game scheduling is emblematic of the administration not adequately discussing important issues with the faculty.
- e. Uriel and Liz will draft a letter to the Chancellor describing the appropriate process required in making sure the administration adequately discusses issues such as the football scheduling with the faculty and respects its concerns. They will bring the draft to the Executive Committee on September 29.

VII. Discussion regarding Colorado Commission of Higher Education's allocation choice—Community College System Option

- a. Last week the CCHE chose the Community College System Option as the formula for allocating funding to the various institutions of higher education in Colorado. This is likely to be the formula used for the foreseeable future. The chosen option first allocates an across the board inflationary adjustment to each institution. The remaining funds are then divided in half. One half will be allocated according to the NCHEMS gap taking into account non-resident tuition revenue. The other half will be allocated according to the cap placed each institution's ability raise tuition rates. The allocation to institutions that can raise tuition rates a smaller amount than, for example, CU Boulder, will receive a state allocation to cover the difference in revenues. There was discussion about the fact that we are being penalized on every count for our success. We are being penalized having a reputation that attracts non-resident students that are willing to pay a high tuition. We are being penalized because the legislature allows us to raise tuition more than community colleges, etc. It is time for the faculty to speak out about this. We are being "taxed" and

underrepresented among the institution's Chief Executive Officers working with the Executive Director of the Colorado Commission of Higher Education. All four of CU's campuses are represented by only one CEO.

- b. There was discussion about the adequacy of the proposal put forth by the CU System. Did they ask for too much money? Some said the high percentage allocation requested by the System was needed to make up for lost ground

VIII. Discussion regarding Regent Steve Bosley's meeting with the Executive Committee on September 22.

- a. Regent Bosley will be present for the entire meeting. He said he has some issues he would like to discuss with the Executive Committee, but did not detail them. What should be included as discussion items?
 - i. The CCHE allocation choice.
 - ii. The Presidential Search issue. What progress has been made on setting up a subcommittee to look at the process?
- b. There was discussion about whether CU Boulder can gain some autonomy enabling it, to some extent, to control its own revenue streams and expenses.

IX. Faculty dependant tuition benefits:

- a. Uriel asked how much funding was provided to the Dependent Tuition Scholarship Program and whether funds gleaned from the vending machines was appropriately applied to that purpose. Bill Kaempfer will provide Uriel with the Dependent Tuition Benefit Task Force report/recommendations. As of now, its recommendations have not been adopted by the administration.

X. Parking on Saturdays:

- a. Uriel commented on the fact that the faculty are completely closed out of certain parking lots on the Saturdays when we have home football games. This is a hardship to the many faculty who conduct research on Saturdays.
- b. There was discussion about the fact that charging for such parking helps Athletics pay back its debts to the university.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35.