

Executive Committee
Boulder Faculty Assembly
Minutes
November 30, 1998

Attending:

Chair John Daily, Vice Chair Bob Schulzinger, 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 Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Dan Liston, BFA Infrastructure: Libraries Committee Chair, Steven Bruns, BFA Student Affairs: Intercollegiate Athletics Chair Michael Preston, ASC Chair Jeff Mitton, AVC Budget and Planning Academic Affairs Bill Kaempfer, UCSU Academic Affairs Student Rep Trey Lyons, *Silver and Gold* reporter Jeff Dodge, Director of Budget and Planning Ric Porreca, Director of Telecommunication Services Dennis Maloney, and ITS representatives Bobby Schnabel and Jim Marshall.

Not attending: BFA Budget and Planning: Faculty Benefits and Compensation Chair Sanjai Bhagat, BFA Diversity: Committee on Women Co-Chair Chonin Horno-Delgado

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, November 30, 1998, in Porter Biosciences Room B121. Chair John Daily presided. The meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. and adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

A. Approval of Minutes

Approval of minutes will be at a later date.

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

Announcements:

Chair Daily announced that VCSA Jean Kim has resigned effective the end of the academic year.

Daily reported that ethnic living clusters were discussed during the last Deans Council meeting, an issue that should be further considered by the BFA Student Affairs Committee. Daily stated that there will be a system diversity summit on March 31, 1999 and that information will be forthcoming.

Committee Assignments:

- 1. Sexual Harassment Review Panel** (requested by Neil Ashby)

Schulzinger reported that Simone Chambers of Political Science has agreed to serve as a Sexual Harassment investigator.

After discussion, the following action was taken:

MOVED by Robert Schulzinger that Simone Chambers be approved as the BFA representative on the Sexual Harassment panel.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. FCQ Committee

Schulzinger reported that he has contacted Lorrie Shepard to serve or assist with the search to fill a position on the FCQ Committee. Schulzinger will report back to the BFA Executive Committee.

3. EPUS Subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

Daily reported that there is an urgent need for a UCB representative on the EPUS subcommittee on Faculty Evaluation and Rewards, beginning with attendance at a luncheon meeting on Friday, December 4 at 12:00 noon in Denver. Dan Liston, chair of the BFA Faculty Affairs Committee agreed to attend or find a committee member to attend. Daily commented on a President's Leadership Seminar he attended where barriers to appropriately reward faculty functioning in non-traditional ways were discussed. Schulzinger suggested the possible revival of a system-wide promotion and tenure process. Geers noted it had been agreed that BFA committee chairs would serve as liaisons to faculty council to enhance the communication process.

4. BFA Academic Affairs

Chair Martha Jo Sani reported that Michael Goldstein from Business and Michael Main from Computer Sciences have agreed to serve on the BFA Academic Affairs Committee.

After discussion, the following action was taken:

MOVED by Martha Jo Sani that Michael Goldstein and Michael Main be approved by the BFA Executive Committee to serve on the BFA Academic Affairs Committee.

The motion carried unanimously.

C. Special Reports

Update on 10% research funding penalty

BFA Budget & Planning Committee Chair, Uriel Nauenberg, presented an update on the 10% research-funding penalty. Nauenberg announced that treasury officials and CU accounting have recommended reporting by agencies rather than contract. This new reporting system whereby agency sums are pooled should reduce penalties and be in place by the next quarter. In light of this information, Nauenberg suggested tabling the motion previously prepared (BFA-M-3-1198)

and scheduled to be presented during the December 3 BFA meeting until the actual numbers are known and the motion can properly reflect the new information and issues. The second part of the motion that included a tracking system to identify those who overspend was discussed and Nauenberg agreed that this part of the motion should be kept. Nauenberg further reported that the University has not paid penalties to the Federal government for the last two years. The potentially sizeable funds remain in interest bearing accounts. Daily suggested, and it was agreed, that the issue of the research funding penalty remain as a notice of motion at the December 3 BFA meeting. However, it should be accompanied by an announcement that an amendment would be likely brought to modify the numbers contained in the content of the motion at the BFA meeting in February.

IRMS Update

Ric Porreca, Director of Budget and Planning, outlined five stages to implementing TLE:

- Setting objectives
- Prioritization
- Resources (assessment and acquisition strategies)
- Implementation framework (budget process)
- Assessment

Toward accomplishing IRMS stage 1 (setting objectives) Porreca reported the following progress:

A vision statement and strategies list has been widely distributed through e-mail and web pages and has generated approximately 150 responses to date.

Work is ongoing in refining the list to be presented to the Chancellor's Executive Committee, followed by integration into the budget planning process for fiscal year 1999-2000, with full integration by fiscal year 2000-2001

Porreca reported that IRMS stage 2 (priority setting) has involved discussion and creation of ten characteristics of an outstanding public research university of the future. Porreca commented that these multiple priorities and limited resources imply trade-offs. Utilizing a multi-year planning approach to investments will help to mitigate these trade-offs, but Porreca emphasized the importance of seeking consensus regarding urgent and important priorities.

In IRMS stage 3 (resource needs an acquisition) Porreca indicated that program managers and VCs will be asked to identify needed resources for the strategy list items. Simultaneously, units are being asked to come forward at budget hearing to identify a three to five year vision as well as preliminary needs. Porreca stressed the importance of identification of strategies to increase the resources such as through the TKE campaign and other fundraising, partnerships and enterprise opportunities. He commented that this is not purely a central responsibility of the Chancellor and president, but should include deans, faculty, directors, and others via a mechanism that maintains incentive while distributing resources across to everyone.

Liston asked whether resource allocation would maintain the current differential between resource-rich departments and others and would there be resource sharing. Porreca responded that formulating a mechanism or framework for pursuing and distributing resources is a next step.

Daily commented development money is unlikely to be shared, but departments such as English and Education get a larger percentage of their budgets from the general fund. Daily also commented that he saw potential for humanities programs to increase the funds they can raise. Daily sees the development office in engineering as key to the school's success in raising funds.

For IRMS stage 4 (resource allocation framework) Porreca emphasized a performance-based approach. Porreca foresees the following challenges: advocating for issues that cut across organization lines, aligning all budgets with capital and space, successfully implementing multi-year planning and assessment, and developing processes for new and existing investments as well as entrepreneurial opportunities.

In IRMS stage 5 (measures and assessment) Porreca stressed the importance of determining what information would be needed--trend, peer, best practices--for evaluation over time when implementing a performance-based approach. Porreca stressed easier and more reliable access to data, which would involve cleaning up existing data, writing new queries and reports, and integrating new systems such as ASP. Last, Porreca noted the need for agreement on the appropriate measures of improvement.

In conclusion, Porreca outlined other outstanding issues affecting IRMS implementation. These include the external environment such as TABOR, internal governance issues, transformational activities, and "unplugs" (activities CU will halt). Porreca emphasized this does not mean cutting out departments.

Discussion followed concerning how a department would get started with this process. Porreca advised fund raising and institutional and corporate partnerships. Daily said that every college has a development officer who should be available to every department chair. Geers reviewed the concept of the Deans chart whose vertical scale charts yearly sums spent per faculty on research expenditures while the abscissa plots the number of Ph.D. graduates per year, resulting in a measure of research productivity. This can be done yearly and a trend noted that could be compared to other institutions such as MIT, Berkeley, Stanford, etc. Schulzinger stressed that momentum would be key to the generating of funds in a capital campaign because fund raising feeds on itself. Porreca indicated funds raised were well ahead of last year, but still slightly short of goals.

Information Technology Strategic Plan

ITS Director, Jim Marshall, reported on the progress of the present strategic planning initiative in information technology that has been in place since last February. Marshall stated that a new approach has involved 150 others throughout the campus including Chancellor Byyny who has been very supportive of IT strategic plan initiatives. Although the plan is still in draft form, some initiatives are currently being implemented.

Telecommunications Director, Dennis Maloney, present a progress report card of the current IT strategic plan. Maloney reported that the faculty/staff computer program began fall of 98. The student computer requirement is currently under study by students and faculty. Maloney reported that student lab support has been increased by ten additional student FTEs and three additional

staff FTEs. These additional resources were made possible by the doubling of student information technology fees to \$120. Also, a second student satisfaction survey is in progress for feedback on hours and service provided.

Regarding campus networking, Maloney reported that ResNet (resident hall networking) was scheduled for completion by fall of 1999 while 900 new modems are to be installed spring of 1999. Daily asked how many modems are currently on campus, Maloney responded that there are currently 172 modems and that new installations would provide a 1:20 ratio of modems to potential users, a typical ratio supported by research studies. Liston asked about the technological upgrading schedule and Maloney responded that there is a three-year replacement plan. Schnabel added that new, available technology would direct equipment replacement depending on future produce development.

Maloney reported that wireless trials are under way. Bintliff commented that the wireless trial involving twenty laptops in the law Library is an almost unqualified success. Maloney said that a special network task force was being formed as well as a telephone system replacement assessment study underway with a replacement target date of 2000.

Maloney announced a four tier IT support model that includes an IT Service Center that is scheduled to open in January 1999. Schnabel commented that they are in the process of negotiating to place people by spring semester in every school and college on campus who would provide instructional technology support to faculty. Maloney also reported that there are additional resources for renovation and operating costs for SMART (technology supported) classrooms. Maloney stated that another focus is access for students, faculty, and staff with disabilities where new technologies are being evaluated.

Regarding computer asset management, Maloney reported a total cost of ownership program has begun with the objective to reduce TCO over time. Library access (digital library initiative) is also being studied as well as information technology architecture (campus standards of support). While ASP and student odyssey are underway as part of the decision support systems, IT recommends that a CIO be named and an IT council be created whose membership would be drawn from a broad spectrum across campus.

Comstock commented that a major block to faculty use of instructional technology resources, especially the Internet and e-mail is the inability to get on the system from home. Comstock asked whether extra modems would positively affect the situation and Maloney responded that the extra modems are expected to provide some relief.

Regarding the current initiative to build a new science library, Nauenberg asked if IT had been contacted about what should be in the library from the point of view of telecommunications. Bruns stated that they are still in the process of architectural planning and communicating with the architects will include faculty from science. Bruns assumes that the IT component would be included. Nauenberg expressed concern that the new process was already far along without input from technology experts on how libraries will be accessed in the future. Bruns stated he did not think that was the case because the process had been delayed. Bruns stated that the library

committee has been reviewing the IT plan and that Scott Seaman sits on the architectural committee. Discussion followed without concluding whether additional meetings are already in progress.

Nauenberg asked whether the three agencies (Telecom, ITS and Video conferencing) were communicating and working together. Schnabel acknowledged separation in the past, and emphasized current commitment to more effective communication. Cooper commented that he sees no communication between the deans and IT with different schools going in different directions and stressed the importance of standards. Cooper requested the involvement of deans in cost studies.

D. Standing Committee Reports

BFA Committee on Academic Affairs

Chair Martha Jo Sani reported on the consideration of the student request for a 2-day break during the fall semester. A number of creative solutions to structure the break without adding to the length of the semester included relinquishing the Labor Day holiday and/or a reading day, having longer class days or class periods, and restructuring the final exam schedule. The Committee on Academic Affairs sees the need for a faculty poll. Daily suggested that an e-memo could accomplish this. Sani asked if the fall break issue should be presented for discussion during the December 3 BFA meeting to which Schulzinger stated that it is a significant matter and should have maximum faculty comment.

E. Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee will be Monday, December 7, in Room B121 in Porter Biosciences from 3:30 to 5:00 p.m.