MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting,
Boulder Faculty Assembly
January 14, 2013

Attending
Jerry Peterson, BFA Chair
Paul Chinowsky, BFA Vice-Chair
Peggy Jobe, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Karen Ramirez, BFA Administrative Services & Technology Committee Chair
Ruth Ellen Kocher, BFA Diversity Committee Co-Chair
Ted Stark, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
Adam Norris, BFA Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Robert Parson, BFA Libraries Committee Chair
Mike Klymkowsky, BFA Student Affairs Committee Chair
David R. Kassoy, Retired Faculty Association Representative
Robert Ferry, Arts and Sciences Council Chair
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator

Special Guests
Pam Jones, Vice President for Development, Boulder Campus, CU Foundation

Not Attending
Carmen Grace, BFA Secretary
Greg Carey, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Jerry Rudy, BFA Budget and Planning Committee Chair
Asunción Horno-Delgado, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Co-Chair
John S. McCartney, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Co-Chair
Elizabeth Bradley, BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Chair
Joe Rosse, Former BFA Chair
Steven Koenig, UGGS President
Nikki Comer, CUSG Director of Academic Affairs

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, January 14, 2013 in Norlin Library room N410. BFA Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report

a. Commencement Brunch – Faculty attendance remains very low, in spite of the BFA’s efforts to increase it. Discussion followed on whether the BFA should continue to provide financial support for the brunch.

b. Chancellor’s Executive Committee – This week’s agenda includes a draft UCB smoking ban, student behavior, and drug and alcohol policies. BFA Vice Chair Paul Chinowsky will attend C.E.C. meetings this semester.

c. Committee on Use of University Facilities (CUUF) – A proposed CUUF policy states that non-academic use of facilities may not impact the liability, reputation, or academic mission of the University.

d. Firearms regulations – Exemptions in Colorado’s existing “Concealed Carry” laws do not include Higher Education campuses. A new bill before the legislature would add public
Higher Ed. Campuses to the exemption, but it does not propose to return to the Regents their historic power to regulate guns on campus.

e. Commencement Committee – The BFA has been asked to appoint a faculty member to the Commencement Committee. The next meeting of the Committee is February 13.

f. National Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics – COIA is an alliance of Faculty Senates which works with the NCAA on matters of concern to faculty. Peterson asked for discussion on whether the BFA should pay travel expenses for the BFA Chair to attend. Discussion followed. It was agreed that the BFA should continue to do so.

g. BFA Election – All are requested to make nominations for the BFA’s various vacancies. [Please visit www.Colorado.edu/BFA/elections for more information.]

h. Initiative to revise BFA Committee Charges – Chairs are encouraged to finalize their committees’ revised charges and bring them to the Executive Committee’s next meeting.

i. BFA Census – The BFA conducts a review of its representative apportionment at least every five years [see Bylaws Art. II, Sec. 1.]. This census is to be conducted by the Nominations and Elections Committee [see Standing Rules, Art. V. Sec. 2. k)].

II. Special Report: Progress of the CU Foundation’s Faculty and Staff Campaign

The CU Foundation’s Pam Jones, Vice President for Development for the Boulder Campus, reported on the progress of this year’s Faculty and Staff Campaign. Her comments included:

- The Creating Futures Campaign recently exceeded $300 million for UCB, on a goal of $508 million, in the $1.5 billion system-wide campaign. The campaign has raised $1.314 billion towards that system-wide goal. The campaign began July 1, 2006.

- There is a faculty and staff component to the campaign. The several different components of the campaign include capital, an unrestricted component, and an endowment component. The Boulder side of campaign has been trending toward capital contributions since the campaign began, but that focus is now shifting into endowment contributions, which focuses more on faculty projects and the student experience, which is also the area of greatest impact of faculty giving.

- Faculty and staff have given $49 million to the campaign over the last five years. After controlling for anomalously large gifts, the faculty portion of UCB’s $300 million in gifts is about $30 million. Staff have given about $4.6 million. Faculty have given an additional $30 million in gifts directly to the Campus.

- Total endowment funds are almost $1 billion, $413 million of that are for the Boulder Campus. A portion of the returns on endowment funds go directly to the Campus, if those funds are designated by the donors to do so.

- More than 90% of CU’s biggest donors give at the system level.

- The cost of an endowed chair is typically $1.5 to $2 million, depending on discipline.

Discussion followed. There were requests for additional data, including:

- An summary of distribution of gifts, for example how much, and to which programs.
- What percent of active versus retired faculty give, and how much they give.
- How much and how many are gifts from estates?

Jones offered to provide data for the entire campaign period. Peterson and Jones will work together to examine the data to answer these and other questions.
Peterson proposed thanking the faculty for their financial support to CU, beginning with an announcement at the February BFA meeting. There was a suggestion that the CU Foundation write a story on the topic for the CU Connections, or CU-Boulder Weekly electronic newsletters.

III. Old Business

Possible Response to UCB’s action to Terminate the Football Coach’s Contract

Ruth Ellen Kocher, Chair of the Diversity Committee, reminded the Executive Committee that it had requested the Diversity Committee approach the Vice Chancellor for Diversity for information on how the decision to terminate the football coach was made, perhaps in the context of a BFA resolution in support of due process in employment for everyone, including coaches. She reported that there was no consensus between the Diversity Committee and the Vice Chancellor for Diversity as to whether a resolution would be warranted if the coach's firing was an Athletics Department decision and Campus Administration has no role in Athletics Department decisions. She added that, in the absence of greater support, the Committee has declined to move forward with a resolution at this time.

Possible Report from the Online Education Committee

There was a request that the Chair of the system-wide online education committee attend a BFA meeting to report on plans and progress. [Mike Lightner is scheduled to attend the BFA meeting on February 7th.] Peterson suggested asking how that committee and its subcommittees at the campuses will present their proposals to the faculty for approval of curriculum items.

IV. New Business – Draft of APS 1009: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

Peterson reported that CU is reviewing Administrative Policy Statement 1009 (“APS”), and requested review and input. [https://www.cu.edu/policies/aps/academic/1009.pdf]

Discussion followed, including these points and perspectives:

- The policy does not refer to learning.
- The policy has a direct relationship to the evaluation of professors.
- The Faculty Council Personnel Committee will discuss APS 1009 on Friday, February 1st. As Chair of that Committee, Chinowsky requested feedback be sent to him as well.
- This APS review process is relatively new: in the past APS statements were issued with less faculty input. The University now has an established process to allow those affected to systematically examine policies. This particular policy is a good example: it was given to faculty leaders for review because this policy directly impacts faculty.
- Peterson reported that the BFA may have funding available to provide grants to support faculty research projects related to pedagogy.
- It is difficult to define, and expensive to measure, learning success.
- It is the University’s responsibility to evaluate learning, but it is the faculty’s responsibility to evaluate the measures of learning that are being used to rate faculty.
- There was a proposal to replace the word ‘teaching’ with the phrase “teaching and
learning," always.

- There is a large body of research literature on quantifying learning. It would be useful to ask a researcher to aggregate that information and report on what systems are used to quantify learning in different disciplines.
- The Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, Michael Grant, is engaged in a project to measure UCB students’ improvement in critical thinking. The BFA could ask him to report on what the University is doing to build assessment programs.

Motion to Revise BFA Diversity Committee Description:

Diversity Committee Chair Ruth Ellen Kocher presented the following motion:

![BFA Diversity Committee Motion to Revise the Bylaws Describing the BFA Diversity Committee]

Be it resolved that the Section of the Bylaws describing the Diversity Committee be revised as follows:

The Diversity Committee shall address issues affecting faculty from historically under-represented groups and protected classes, including faculty with diverse gender identities, sexual orientations, races, ethnicities, nationalities, religions, spiritualities, social-cultural backgrounds, and physical and cognitive abilities.

Approved by the BFA Diversity Committee: December 11, 2012
Approved by the BFA Executive Committee for forwarding to the BFA: Jan. 14, 2013

Discussion followed.

Kocher commented that the Diversity Committee in fact represents everyone: the decision to list several groups and classes is to help the reader understand some of the Campus’ need to address issues facing diverse groups, because it may not be obvious to some people.

Moved on behalf of the Diversity Committee that the motion to revise the BFA bylaws describing the Diversity Committee be approved.

The motion passed unanimously.

The motion will come before the full Assembly at its meeting on February 7th.

V. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:29.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.

Addendum below: APS 1009, Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation
Policy Title: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation - #1009

POLICY DETAILS

Effective Date: July 1, 2009
Responsible Office: Office of Academic Affairs
Academic Officer: Kathleen Bollard
Approved: President Bruce D. Benson
Brief Description: This policy is designed to provide information that can be used to improve the quality of teaching and to facilitate an equitable and comprehensive evaluation of teaching across the graduate and undergraduate curricula of the University.

I. INTRODUCTION

The following policy has been developed in response to discussions with the University Faculty Council and the Faculty Senate Committee on Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS), and is designed to provide information that can be used to improve the quality of teaching and to facilitate an equitable and comprehensive evaluation of teaching across the graduate and undergraduate curricula of the University.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

A. Responsibilities of the Primary Unit (Department)

1. It is the responsibility of each primary unit (department) to evaluate the teaching of its individual faculty members for the purpose of making informed decisions regarding all merit-based salary adjustments and reappointment, promotion, and tenure actions.

2. Each primary unit on the campuses shall identify the components to be used in the evaluation of teaching. These components shall include at least three items. One of these must be a student evaluation, which must include, but is not limited to, the data from the Faculty Course Questionnaire or a similar, campus-approved system and form. Each primary unit, in keeping with its individual role and mission, may implement additional components. Such instruments must be sufficiently flexible to be applied across departmental workloads. Attached is a non-exhaustive list of suggested components that the unit could include (see Attachment A).
3. It shall be the responsibility of the primary unit to make available to each faculty member a complete description of each component to be considered. Each primary unit shall file with the appropriate dean of the school/college a description of the components that will be used in the evaluation of teaching, any required items to be included in the components, and the frequency of pre-tenure and post-tenure evaluations. The dean shall forward all statements from the primary units in the school/college to the chief academic officer of the campus, who in turn shall make the information available to the campus chancellor. Any elimination/revision of the components, or addition of new components, shall be reported in the same manner.

Faculty shall be advised of any elimination/revision of existing components, or addition of new components, no later than April 1 for application in the next academic year.

B. Responsibilities of the Faculty Member

The primary unit shall specify the documentation materials required of all faculty members. In addition to the required materials, the individual faculty member may submit any additional materials deemed appropriate to the evaluation process.

C. Implementation

1. A written description of the components for multiple means of teaching evaluation for each primary unit shall be distributed to the faculty of each primary unit.

2. It shall be the responsibility of the chief academic officer of the campus to facilitate effective and efficient implementation of this policy with the deans and the chairs of the primary units.

III. CONTACTS

The Responsible Office will respond to questions and provide guidance regarding interpretation of this policy.

The Office of Academic Affairs

IV. REVIEW OF POLICY

This APS should be revised periodically.

V. HISTORY

Initial Policy Effective: AY 1994-95

Attachment A - Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

A representative, but not exhaustive list of suggestions for components to be used in the evaluation of teaching: *

- Alumni opinions
- Chair evaluation
- Classroom visits
- Colleagues' opinions
- Committee evaluation
Course syllabi and examinations
Dean evaluation
Enrollment in elective courses
Student evaluations as reported on Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQ's) or a similar, campus-approved system and form
Grade distributions
Informal student opinions
Instructional materials
Long-term follow-up of students
Professional awards
Scholarly research and publication on teaching
Self-evaluation or report
Special incidents
Student examination performance
Student mid-term evaluations
Willingness to teach undesirable courses