

Executive Committee  
Boulder Faculty Assembly  
Minutes  
January 25, 1999

**Attending:**

Chair John Daily, Secretary Barbara Bintliff, BFA at-large reps Cathy Comstock and John Cooper, BFA Academic Affairs Committee Chair Martha Jo Sani, BFA Budget & Planning Committee Chair Uriel Nauenberg, BFA Communications Committee Chair Tom Geers, BFA Student Affairs: Intercollegiate Athletics Chair Michael Preston, BFA Budget and Planning: Faculty Benefits and Compensation Chair Sanjai Bhagat, AVC Budget and Planning Academic Affairs Bill Kaempfer, UCSU Academic Affairs Student Rep Trey Lyons, Silver and Gold reporter Jeff Dodge, Campus Master Plan Coordinator James Baily, Vice Chancellor for Administration Paul Tabolt

Not attending: Vice Chair Bob Schulzinger, BFA Diversity: Committee on Women Co-Chair Chonin Horno-Delgado, BFA Diversity: Committee on Women Co-Chair Carla Farsi, BFA Infrastructure: Libraries Committee Chair Steven Bruns, ASC Chair Jeff Mitton, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Dan Liston

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, January 25, 1999, in Porter Biosciences Room B121. Chair John Daily presided. The meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. and adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

**A. Approval of Minutes**

*MOVED Barbara Bintliff and seconded by Michael Preston that the minutes of December 14 1998 be approved.*

*The motion carried with the understanding that changes proposed by Tom Geers on December 14<sup>th</sup> would be made.*

The BFA Executive Committee minutes will be forwarded to the BFA, Jeff Mitton, and UCB administrators each week after approval.

**B. Report from Chair Daily**

**Status of Administrator Search**

Daily reported that a new BFA administrator has been hired: Sierra Swearingen will be taking over for Kathi Hoskins as of today. The BFA office will retain the same phone number. Swearingen will initiate a request for a departmental e-mail account for the BFA. For the time being it is acceptable to use the following e-mail address for BFA business: **Error! Bookmark not defined..**

### **Health Care (UBAB)**

Daily spoke favorably of the recommendations made by Liz Leif in her report. Leif's suggestions in the report include the establishment of a separate office for benefits and a higher rate of employer contribution for faculty health care benefits. Daily reported that President Buechner basically approved everything in Leif's report.

Daily reported that President Buechner has hired Leif to lead us through the transition period (until the year 2000). Daily noted that current unresolved issues relating to the Health Sciences Center may hold up the process of issuing a request for proposals on an RFP, but that we are shooting for early March. Daily reported that President Buechner will hire a new benefits officer to take over from Leif for the year 2001 plan.

Cooper noted that if the administration had listened to Tompkins and Schulzinger of the faculty four years ago, we could have saved four years as well as the consulting fees related to Leif's report. Daily responded by citing the historical "incompetence" of the faculty in dealing with faculty health care benefits.

### **Campus Budget Hearings**

Daily noted that John Cooper and Uriel Nauenberg attend the campus budget hearings. Daily also noted that the hearing on Wednesday, January 27 will include Student Affairs and Diversity.

Tom Geers stated his belief that there is a need for Lou McClelland to carry out a study describing the current state of CU faculty benefits: one that would compare CU faculty benefits with those at CU's peer institutions. Geers noted McClelland's high level of credibility, and suggested that it would be easy for McClelland to make such a report in just a few days. Bill Kaempfer agreed, but stated that a few days would not be enough time. Geers then stated that the data has already been prepared and needs only a "stamp of approval" from McClelland.

Geers stated his further concern about the 1% above inflation faculty salary increase promised by President Buechner. Uriel Nauenberg reported that the 1% proposal relates only to salary, not to benefits. Geers added that if the proposed 1% increase does not include benefits, CU will still remain behind other Universities in the area of faculty compensation.

### **Committee Assignments**

Topic postponed.

## **C. Special Reports**

### **Update on 10% Research Funding Penalty:**

Uriel Nauenberg reported that Linda Johnson in the Treasurer's office suggested that the deficit calculation be redesigned to a contract-by-contract model. Nauenberg reported that this differing approach unfortunately results in the same deficit figures. Nauenberg stated that a 60 day grace period would result in the disappearance of the deficit in the eyes of the Federal Government. Nauenberg further stated that for those accounts that are flagrantly overspent, the departments

should be charged; not the University of Colorado, Boulder. Barbara Bintliff asked if 60 days is enough time, and Nauenberg answered in the positive.

Bill Kaempfer asked if the disparity between interest rates (charged vs. paid) to the departments had been examined. Uriel Nauenberg will ask that the disparity of rates be examined. Nauenberg will contact Bill Fisher and will ask for a vote on the issue at the BFA meeting on February 4<sup>th</sup>.

### **Campus Master Plan**

James Baily reported that he has distributed a partial draft of the Campus Master Plan. He stated that to prepare the plan was a process of two years, that the plan is required by the State of Colorado, and that the plan must be authorized by the Regents. He further stated that the plan addresses growth issues as well as non-growth issues (such as environmental factors), that 8 task forces were recruited to draft reports that were the basis for the plan, and that these task forces will reconvene to review the draft of the plan and provide comments. Baily stated that the parameters that influenced the Master Plan include enrollments, research, and employment.

Baily noted that Lou McClelland wrote the draft for the enrollment section of the plan. Baily stated that the plan is based on a moderate rate of enrollment growth, with a higher emphasis on graduate enrollment and a projection that research will continue to boom. Comstock noted CU's current disparity between graduate and undergraduate enrollment percentages.

Baily stated that CU's undergraduate population has more involvement with research than at other institutions due to CU's lower graduate enrollment percentage. Baily further noted CU's long term decline in the percent of graduate enrollment. He reported that the percentage is currently 18%, and that the Master Plan reflects a goal of 20%. He stated that this would not be a major change, but that the Master Plan rather focuses on stabilization of graduate enrollments and a reversal of the downward trend.

Uriel Nauenberg asked if a cap to the size of a University is appropriate, as opposed to planning for unlimited growth.

Baily commented that the Flatiron property was purchased by the University of Colorado to help deal with overflow related to the growth of CU. Baily stated that CU can continue to grow for 10 years without losing the look and feel of the campus as it is today. He stated that "outgrowth" after that time would impact the campus differently, i.e. it may result in the tearing down of buildings to build new ones on campus. He reported that these issues will be addressed in Chapter 3 of the Campus Master Plan.

Geers stated that growth can keep CU from being eclipsed by other institutions in the long term.

Baily stated that many services at CU will be moving to RL-3 over the next year, relieving current pressure for space on main campus.

Nauenberg introduced the issue of faculty to student relation, and that it is important that students are not left feeling like a number and not like a person who belongs on campus.

Michael Preston stated that Boulder is a small town with a residential University, and that UC-Denver is CU's downtown University. He further stated that residential Universities have a sense of space, and that growth can interfere with the tone and environment of the University of Colorado if it is not very carefully managed.

Baily noted the current trend that private higher education is growing dramatically faster than public, but that our role is likely to change for the better as a result of this trend. He stated that public universities are likely to specialize in education that requires students to be on campus.

John Cooper noted the cost of changes proposed in the Master Plan and asked if a detailed cost benefit analysis would be a part of the plan. Baily stated that costs would be reported in the plan, but that a cost benefit analysis might be too subjective for inclusion in such a report. Cooper responded that a cost benefit analysis is important, even without quantitative expense data. He requested that the framers of the master plan think through what expectations related to growth are going to be.

Bill Kaempfer stated that the Campus Master Plan does not reflect decisions that have been made, but rather sets up the parameters by which decisions will be made in the future. He stated that the action items described in the plan are more in the spirit of a "Dean's Wish List" than a plan of action. Baily added that the plan attempts to anticipate all possible options for the University, and that amendments to the plan are a part of the ongoing process of the plan's formation. Kaempfer then stated that a cost benefit analysis on these items would not be an appropriate part of the plan until a decision was made to implement a specific recommendation.

Preston noted that "cost" should be considered as referring not merely to dollars spent, but also to intangibles lost that have value in their ability to attract undergraduate enrollments. Preston's example was the ECO-Pass program. A digression on the merits or lack thereof of the ECO-Pass program followed.

Sani asked if the Ten Minute Circle issue was considered in the plan. Baily answered that in general the Campus Planners will stick with the Ten Minute Circle Rule, while acknowledging that it will not always be possible to actually make the trip between classes in 10 minutes or less. Baily then stated that the plan attempts to shift services away from main campus, not classes.

Cooper asked if the cost of parking at RL-3 would be the same as that of parking on main campus. Tabolt replied that it would.

Barbara Bintliff protested that the Campus Master Plan refers to the Law Library as a Reading Room. She stated that the Law Library is not a part of the campus library system, but is instead a separate library, one of the five University of Colorado Libraries recognized by the Regents. Baily reported his willingness to work with Bintliff on the wording of that section of the plan.

Baily finished his report by stating that he will deliver a final draft of the plan to the faculty at a later date, and by encouraging faculty to read the draft of the plan and supply comments on the

web site, or via e-mail, or in writing. Baily reported that the Master Plan Web Site is at **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, and that comments may be sent to **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Paul Tabolt added his support to Baily's request for comments.

### **Communication to Campus**

Tom Geers suggested an e-memo be sent to the faculty on a regular basis, to include highlights of BFA activities. Geers requested suggestions on the content of such a communication.

The suggestions were as follows:

Instructor's Bill of Rights (Comstock)

10% surcharge on research (Bintliff)

Restructure of the BFA, including information on opportunities to become involved (Bintliff)

Controversy over Academic Schedule (Sani)

Sexual Harassment Policy (Bintliff)

Salary and Benefits issues (Sani)

Commitment to higher employer contribution for faculty benefits (Comstock)

Discussion followed on whether President Buechner has approved this measure.

Commitment from the Administrative Streamlining Project (via Paul Tabolt and Jud Hurd) for more timely training (Cooper)

A discussion on the format of the e-memo was discussed. Geers suggested the use of the Administrative E-memo service offered on campus. John Daily stated that it is more important that the E-memo clearly project that it is from the BFA than that it details who wrote the memo itself. Barbara Bintliff stated that a "report prepared by" line at the bottom of the E-memo would suffice. John Cooper suggested that all communications coming from the BFA come from the chair. Geers noted that a bulleted style would be more effective than a letter style. Daily suggested that decisions of format be postponed until after a draft is made up.

### **Academic Calendar**

Bill Kaempfer distributed a report to the assembly; "Report on Possible Changes to the Academic Calendar." The report is the result of meetings between Ron Stump, Ric Porreca, Bill Kaempfer, Bill Haid, and Vice Chancellor Phil DiStefano. The report was written "in order to explore ways in which the academic calendar can be adapted to allow for both a Fall Break and a new May Term between the Spring Commencement and the start of Summer School." Copies of the report are available from the BFA office. Kaempfer reported that there exist a high number of technical difficulties in altering our Academic Calendar. He cited two examples: CCHE audits and the need to work with evening class schedules.

Kaempfer reported that the proposal for fall semester involves changing the final exam schedule such that finals each last 2.5 hours (currently they last 3 hours), with a half-hour break between them. (The current rule that students must not be scheduled for three final exams within a 24 hour period would stand, and students may still petition to have an exam rescheduled if they give notice within the first six weeks of classes. John Cooper asked how many more students would need to

petition for such a waiver, and Kaempfer responded that careful scheduling can avoid any more waivers being requested than are currently requested.) The proposed changes to the fall schedule would make CU's schedule parallel to that of CSU, with the exception that, rather than breaking for a week at Thanksgiving, we would have two four-day weekends per fall semester. Saturday final exams would be eliminated, and late fall commencements would be avoided.

Kaempfer reported that the proposal for spring semester involves beginning classes on January 10<sup>th</sup> in the case of the year 2000. Kaempfer did state that January 10<sup>th</sup> is already on the books as a start date, therefore his committee does not consider it an "early" start date. Starting Spring semester on January 10<sup>th</sup>, in combination with the proposed changes, is partly to compensate for the Martin Luther King Holiday, and partly to allow for a three-week term between spring and summer semesters. This three week term would allow the Department of Continuing Education to offer 3 week intensive courses that would meet the Colorado Commission on Higher Education minimum class time requirements for a three credit class.

John Daily and Tom Geers both asserted that the 10<sup>th</sup> of January is too early to begin spring semester.

Kaempfer stated that the Scheduling Committee approved the changes recommended in the report. Daily responded that the by-laws of the University of Colorado clearly state that the faculty is supposed to control the schedule. Kaempfer reported that some faculty are on the scheduling committee, and that this is a fair representation of the faculty. Kaempfer did note that alternatives to an early start date for spring semesters are listed in his memo, including longer classes (55 minutes for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday classes), one Saturday class meeting each spring semester, or giving credit for final exam periods in instruction time. Kaempfer reported that the credit for final exams time option has a high probability of being approved.

John Cooper registered his strong objection to shorter final exam periods. Michael Preston stated that in cases when teachers need more than 2.5 hours of final exam time, special arrangements can be made at the level of the classroom. John Cooper stated that the shortening of final exam periods reflects an overall decline in standards.

Kaempfer noted that a decision is needed soon in order to satisfy UCSU's desire to put the changes into effect by fall of 1999.

Geers reiterated that the changes to the spring semester are not acceptable, reporting that many of his colleagues are not in agreement with an early start to the spring semester. Geers further requested that more "real live faculty" be included in the formulation of the Academic calendar.

Barbara Bintliff asked if Kaempfer intends to get more input from the Faculty on this issue, and Kaempfer responded that he does. Martha Jo Sani then stated that her committee is ready to report on this issue at the February BFA meeting. Daily requested that Sani bring a motion to next Monday's Executive Committee meeting. Daily repeated that it is critical for the faculty to have early January to participate in activities like class preparation and proposal preparation, research, conference attendance, and other scholarly activities.

Geers predicted that the faculty would approve the changes to the fall calendar, but that the changes to the spring calendar would not be approved if they involve an early start date.

#### **D. New Business**

Trey Lyons asked that the student's Diversity Plan be presented at the next Executive Committee meeting. He also asked if the assembly would like to hear a presentation on student fees. Chair Daily answered in the affirmative.

Daily stated that Dean of Libraries Jim Williams is on the BFA Executive Committee agenda for the 8<sup>th</sup> of February.

#### **E. Next Meeting**

The next regular meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee will be Monday, February 1st in Room B121 in Porter Biosciences from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m.