

Attendance:

Chair John Daily presiding, Barbara Bintliff, Susan Dean, Tom Geers, Dick Ham, Robert Schulzinger, Martha Jo Sani, Phil Tompkins, UCSU rep Chris Armijo, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Phil DiStefano

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, February 2, 1998, in Porter Biosciences Room B121. Chair John Daily presided. The meeting convened at 3:35 p.m. and adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

*MOVED by Bintliff and seconded by Tompkins that the minutes of the 01/26/98 BFA Executive Committee meetings are approved.*

*The motion carried.*

**B. Announcements**

Tompkins commented that the BFA Motion on Grading would have to have met with the approval of faculty on all four campuses and was not. Tompkins further commented that the Regent rules had not been thoroughly examined before the BFA motion on grading had been passed.

**C. Proposed BFA Reform**

Daily discussed the reorganization of the BFA functional committees (not counting the executive committee), reorganization in terms of membership on the executive committee, and election procedures.

Copies of e-mail messages regarding the reorganization from Tom Geers, Martha Jo Sani, Mike Preston and Daily were distributed for consideration on how to present recommendations for discussion to the BFA on Thursday.

Geers stated that to date the BFA is a representational body and that the BFA Executive Committee is functional and asked to what degree, if any, the executive committee should have a representational component.

Daily suggested the gaps of communication between the general faculty and the BFA and other organizations, such as the Arts and Sciences Council (ASC), and the BFA on the UCB campus are due to structure. Daily commented that currently there is not a strong, democratic, representational tie with BFA constituents. Daily stated, for example, that the minutes of a recent

Council of Chairs meeting stated that the BFA has a position on ASP. Daily stated that the BFA has not taken a position on ASP but has instead had discussions on the pros and cons, important parts to implement, and what aspects of ASP in which to be concerned. Tompkins commented that the person quoted in those minutes was not present at the BFA Executive Committee meeting to hear John Cooper's report on ASP and the concerns of the BFA. Daily stated that the BFA Executive Committee does not make major policy decisions, the BFA does and that a representational executive committee would avoid such miscommunications.

Bob Schulzinger asked what the ultimate size of the BFA should be. Schulzinger commented that the current membership of 49 could be larger but should not be smaller. Schulzinger said that most of the representatives to the BFA coming from departments and units do report back to their units after the BFA has acted. Schulzinger suggested that if a change is adopted for the membership of the BFA to be a subset of the membership of the college representative bodies that it is likely to become smaller and it's likely not to be able to communicate directly to units. Schulzinger further suggested that it might become what the faculty council became over the years, that the faculty council has almost disappeared at the unit level. Schulzinger recognizes the similar and different issues of discussion of the BFA and the ASC. Schulzinger stated however, that he would be very skeptical of BFA membership being selected from the legislatures of other colleges.

Tom Geers stated that the BFA Executive Committee members should accomplish tasks and handle the issues of the day in an efficient manner and cover the various aspects of those issues. Geers expressed concern that by having representation outside of the functional committees that the executive committee will turn into a deliberate body rather than an effective executive body. Geers stated that the executive committee does pre-process and vote on issue recommended to the BFA. Geers commented that currently the BFA Executive Committee has a better opportunity to participate in issues along with administration. Geers suggested a first-class/second-class membership of the BFA Executive Committee; regular BFA standing committee chairs that oversee the day-to-day activities of their committees and communicate their activities to the executive committee. And an associate membership of the BFA Executive Committee that could be part of the communication structure in the executive committee but not have the same level of representation and voting power of the people who are actually doing the work. Daily suggested that by giving these "associate members" voting status, it would increase their incentive to attend. Barbara Bintliff agreed and stated her concern that the BFA does not create "second-class" members and the importance of the BFA's decision whether the executive committee will have a functional representation or a democratic representation and to move forward and figure out how to accommodate that decision. Bintliff asked the executive members to consider whether the BFA should have each member of the executive committee be a liaison to various committees or have each member of the executive committee be in charge of a specific standing committee and each be a voting member of the executive committee.

Daily stated that he sees the executive committee as serving two functions; getting jobs done and communication, both equally important but different.

Ham commented that as a representational committee, the Libraries Committee would be library faculty and that functionally it would be a group of faculty trying to keep the rest of the library doing what the faculty would like them to do. Ham pointed out the difference between the library faculty and the faculty at-large dealing in functional terms with library problems.

Geers discussed the many areas in which BFA is not currently involved. Tompkins commented that it has become more important for the BFA to approve people on administrative committees and that they report to the BFA. Geers suggested the BFA committees should be much broader than they currently are and that the chairs of these committees should be voting members of the executive committee.

Tompkins suggested that having liaisons as linking pins to organizations such as Council of Chairs and ASC may be an acceptable compromise. Daily stated that as members rather than liaisons, the service on the executive committee might be more effective. Bintliff asked if, in addition to the chair of the ASC, a college representative also serve, suggesting that Arts and Sciences might merit two seats on the BFA Executive Committee due to its size. Schulzinger asked if such a representative would be chosen from among the members of the general BFA, by the faculty of Arts and Sciences, or by the ASC? Schulzinger stated that until the decision is made on what kind of assembly the BFA will have, it is not possible to decide what kind of executive committee there will be.

Daily suggested that if a college does have a faculty organization, such as ASC, that a college select BFA membership from that organization to further communication.

Tompkins commented on the importance of maintaining the elections through the BFA office.

Schulzinger stated that the BFA Executive Committee should be a subset of the BFA. Schulzinger suggested that if the assembly is made up of delegates and the executive committee is made up of members not from the assembly, there would not be an interest of BFA members to attend meetings.

Bintliff asked if the function of the general assembly of the BFA was to communicate between the BFA and the faculty and the BFA and the executive committee. Tompkins responded that the BFA executive committee determined the agenda for the assembly based on the work of the BFA standing committees and whether issues would be returned to the standing committees or forwarded to the assembly. Tompkins believed that BFA members should get on their departmental agendas and report on the BFA meetings and for those BFA members to report back to BFA regarding their departmental views.

Daily stated that the BFA, by the Laws of the Regents, is the body charged with the responsibility of representing the faculty on academic policies. Daily further stated that in order for BFA to be the effective policy-making body then the BFA must have clear communication with all faculty and that the chain of command must be clearly understood. Tompkins suggested the chair of the Council of Deans and the chair of the Arts and Sciences Council have a voice in the BFA. Geers agreed, suggesting the BFA change their bylaws to reflect that involvement, at the assembly level,

not at the BFA Executive Committee level. Geers explained that the current BFA standing committees should be expanded to include many campus policy-making committees currently not covered by BFA standing committees and that the BFA Executive Committee should not be "loaded" to the point that it is no longer functional, but only representational.

DiStefano suggested having liaisons from the BFA Executive Committee represent BFA on the Council of Chairs and the Arts and Sciences Council rather than having two new positions on the BFA Executive Committee for the chairs of the Council of Chairs and Arts and Sciences Council.

Geers suggesting the BFA standing committees collaborate and communicate closely with their administrative counterparts such as academic affairs and student affairs. Daily agreed and stated that each of the committees Geers is suggesting lines up with administrative committees.

Susan Dean stated that the idea of combining the committee on women and the minority affairs committee is not a good idea, that it tends to be viewed as a way of removing power. Daily suggested a rotating representative on the BFA Executive Committee from the minority affairs committee or from the committee on women and Dean agreed.

Daily stated that he and Geers will have a verbal presentation suggesting the BFA adopt a committee structure similar to what Geers submitted, keep two at-large members to serve as liaisons of organizations to be determined by the executive committee and that the officer structure remain the same. Daily further suggested that the election procedures for the assembly remain the same. Daily suggested that a class be added for "special organizations", initially starting with representatives from the Council of Chairs and the Arts and Sciences Council and with the understanding that other well-organized faculty organizations from other schools or colleges, they could apply for representation on the BFA.

Martha Jo Sani stated the importance that the BFA bylaws clearly reflect the roles of each BFA standing committee.

#### **D. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee will be on Monday, February 9, 1998 in Porter Biosciences Room B121 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.