The Boulder Faculty Assembly held its regular meeting on February 7, 2013 in Wolf Law 207. Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. and adjourned at 5:31 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report - Jerry Peterson

a. Top TA Awards – The United Government of Graduate Students will grant two awards this year to top performing Teaching Assistants Visit www.colorado.edu/uggs for more information.

b. ICJM Process – The Campus continues to consider the reorganization of various disciplines and units after its decision to discontinue its Journalism School. As part of that process, five external visitors will be on campus this week. An open forum is scheduled for Wednesday, February 20th, from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. in the UMC. There will also be other fora with the visitors for specific sets of units.

c. Professional Rights and Duties of Faculty (PRD) – The BFA and Campus
Administration have been working since 2008 on a major revision of the PRD. The Provost signed the revision in January, making it official Academic Affairs policy.
d. **Faculty Gifts to CU** – The CU Foundation reports that, over the past five years, CU faculty have made 22,000 individual donations totaling $49 million to support CU, including a few very large gifts. The BFA may wish to recognize this generosity.
e. **National Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics** - The BFA Chair attended the January COIA meeting, along with about 85 faculty governance leaders from across the United States. NCAA representatives at the meeting reported that the NCAA plans to partially deregulate, delegating power over some parts of its very large rulebook to the campuses. COIA has recommended that faculty should be involved only in those parts of the rules that relate to academics.

II. **Special Reports**

**Budget Update - Senior Vice Chancellor and C.F.O. Kelly Fox**

Fox commented that she is interested in open dialogue and that questions are always welcome. She also thanked the BFA Budget and Planning Committee for welcoming her to Campus and assisting her in making the transition into her new position. She then gave an update on the Boulder Campus budget:

- The budget this year is facing challenges because continuing operating funds from the state continue to decrease, and because of a dip in enrollment. There has also been an unexpected increase in student conversions to resident status.
- To address its funding issues in the future the Campus will need a diversified approach to its revenues, and tuition will need to be a part of that strategy. It must also figure out how to remain accessible to Colorado students. The Chancellor’s new Innovative Advisory Group, composed of business leaders in the state, will assist the Campus to look at its funding in new ways and develop creative, new solutions.
- In the next few weeks the Campus will discuss its budget with the Board of Regents.
- Because of the Campus’ dip in enrollment it will need to cut about $11.5 million in the current fiscal year. The proposed budget for next year will probably remain relatively flat, with two key investments: a compensation salary pool, and an investment in the new merit aid program.

A discussion session followed, including these points and perspectives:
- Most of the cuts required to cover the current year shortfall of $11.5 million can be taken on the administrative side. Fox is currently working with the Provost to figure out how to take the remainder.
- CU’s purchasing system is still not flexible enough to ensure that CU is getting the best deals in the most efficient way possible.
- There was a request for more detailed information about expenditures in certain sections of the University’s budget, including IPEDS areas like instructional support and student services, in part to look at cost control ideas.
• Last year the BFA Budget and Planning Committee issued a report analyzing how the Campus spent tuition increase revenue. This year the Committee is waiting for clarity as to whether there will be any increase in revenue. If so, the Campus must make some decisions about various types of expenses that would compete for the revenue, for example retention packages and health benefits.
• CU is already extraordinarily efficient in terms of any national benchmark. CU’s challenge is to find ways to cut costs and reinvest those savings for even better value, while also protecting CU’s quality.
• There was a request for information about current debt service loads. Fox commented that each campus has its own debt, for which it is solely responsible.

UCB Esteemed Scholars Program – Director of Admissions Kevin MacLennan

MacLennan’s report included these highlights:
• UCB has fallen behind its peers in scholarships to recognize academic achievement in high school. The CU Boulder Esteemed Scholars program is designed to attract Colorado’s top students. Awards are based solely on GPA and test scores so that offers can be issued as early as possible and thereby have the greatest impact.
• The scholarships are named for CU’s first three presidents: Joseph A. Sewall ($5,000 per year), Horace M. Hale ($3,500 per year), and James H. Baker ($2,500 per year). Each is renewable for up to four years. Criteria for renewing the scholarship are a minimum 3.00 cumulative GPA and completion of 28 credit hours per academic year.
• The Campus is hoping the program will increase UCB’s highly qualified freshmen but also encourage other Colorado seniors to apply. Currently about 27% of UCB’s resident freshmen had a 4.0 high school GPA or higher and 43% had 3.8 or higher.
• All those offered one of these scholarships are invited to campus for an all-day campus visit Saturday, March 2, highlighting UCB’s many opportunities for top performing students.
• New this year, each of the Deans will write individual letters to top in-state applicants, encouraging them to choose UCB. Those letters will be followed by letters from department chairs.

A question and answer session followed, including these points and perspectives:
• College-bound High School seniors apply to an average of seven different colleges and universities. Families have become very smart shoppers, often asking UCB to match generous offers from other institutions.
• The Campus determined the program’s target test score and GPA by the cost of granting awards to 781 students, the number of eligible applicants that will likely choose CU next year if the program has the effect the campus is hoping for.
• The program will improve not just socio-economic diversity on campus, but also geographic diversity, drawing students from all areas of the state.
• Esteemed scholarships will add to, not displace, existing scholarships. They can be applied to full cost of attendance, including housing. There followed discussion as to whether the awards will be made from General Fund money, and whether
expenditure on auxiliaries such as Housing is therefore appropriate.

- It was suggested that existing students, who are not eligible for the new program, may complain they were unfairly left out.
- The program is starting up this year using one-time money: there is no continuing budget line yet for future classes. Future funding depends in part on the Regents and on potential donors.
- UCB invests a significant amount into need-based scholarships and will continue to do so: the new program does not compete for the funds that support need.

Desire2Learn Update

Peterson introduced Larry Levine, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and CIO; and Marin Stanek, Office of Information Technology (OIT) Director of Support Services and Communications. Levine gave a brief history of Desire2Learn (D2L) on Campus, on the current status of the company, and a description of the conditions that caused the Boulder Campus’ problems with D2L this spring. His comments included:

- An RFP evaluation committee, composed mostly of faculty, chose Desire2Learn in 2008-2009. The Campus chose at that time to allow the D2L company to host the program for the Campus, as most of D2L’s customers do.
- D2L’s outages this semester were caused by an attempted data migration.
- Members of D2L’s leadership team are expected to visit campus to discuss the problems UCB has experienced. [The team met by conference call instead, but will visit campus at our request. OIT may also send a team of D2L’s headquarters to conduct an audit of their computer facility.] UCB’s two main options for the future include abandoning D2L and selecting a new learning management system, or choosing to host D2L ourselves on the Boulder Campus. Changing to a new system would be very disruptive. Setting up the Boulder Campus to host its own D2L operation would take several weeks and a new investment in hardware, software, and personnel.
- OIT is creating a faculty committee to help decide how to proceed, chaired by Professor Jeffrey Luftig of the Engineering Management Program. Anyone who has interest in serving on the committee is asked to please contact Levine.
- The Committee will be asked to make a decision before spring break. If the committee decides we should adopt a new system, it will choose that system by the last day of classes and the Campus would again run it in parallel with the old system (D2L), to address as many issues as possible in a trial period.
- OIT is also holding focus groups involving faculty and students about D2L’s outages, to collect data and ideas.

A question-and-answer session followed. Levine reported that the current cost to the campus of hosting D2L itself is about $650,000 per year.

III. Committee Reports and Updates

Libraries Committee Chair Robert Parson presented a notice of motion to adopt an UGGS Resolution to Provide Open Access to Research and Scholarly Information (addended
below). Carly Robinson, UGGS representative on the BFA Libraries Committee, gave a brief history of the issue and of the resolution.

IV. New Business

Ted Stark, Chair of the joint Academic/Faculty Affairs Committee, reported that the Student Affairs Committee has begun a discussion of whether UCB’s currently curricula sufficiently inform students of what they need to know for their lives after college. He commented that Mike Klymkowsky is on sabbatical this semester and could not be here to present his letter on the topic. Stark called the Assembly’s attention to a handout containing Mike’s open letter to the Campus community, titled “Commitment to a Coherent & Effective Curriculum” [addended below]. The letter has grown out of a long conversation Mike has been having with the Provost, who supports the ideas expressed in the letter.

Stark requested that BFA members take the ideas expressed in the letter back to their departments and collect feedback from their colleagues.

Discussion followed.

V. Adjournment

There being no further business, Peterson adjourned the meeting at 5:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator, and Haley Goddard, BFA Student Assistant
[ADDENDUM I.] Resolution to Provide Open Access to Research and Scholarly Information

Whereas the cost of scholarly, peer-reviewed journals in all disciplines has increased to such heights as to preclude many institutions of research and academia from providing access to new knowledge gleaned by researchers and scholars;

Whereas the development of the Internet is making it possible for authors, as well as publishers, to benefit from more open access to their scholarship through electronic archiving of published articles and other materials, a concept known as “Open Access” scholarship;

Whereas only some publishers support the trend toward open access, permitting authors to place an electronic version of their published work in publicly accessible websites or archives upon the fulfillment of certain conditions;

Whereas the University Libraries and the UGGS have joined the nation-wide open access effort as members of organizations like the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (University Libraries) and Right to Research Coalition (UGGS). University Libraries is engaged in open access education efforts at CU-Boulder, has launched a fund to help CU-Boulder faculty and students publish in open access journals, and is developing an electronic repository for faculty members and students to use as an open access option for their research and publications.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the UGGS supports this CU Open Access Initiative resolution and upon passage will share with the BFA Executive Committee in the hope of BFA passing of a similar resolution. The following recommendations provide a guideline for graduate students, BFA members, and university faculty and staff in this endeavor. The CU Open Access Initiative calls for:

- The University Libraries to continue to provide education and information on open access for the faculty through their departments and professional associations.
- The University Libraries to continue the development of an open access repository, providing advice, technical assistance and electronic “tools” to help faculty with copyright and publishing questions concerning the use of this repository.
- The CU-Boulder faculty and graduate students to become familiar with the business practices of journals and publishers in their disciplines and to consider submitting their work to publishers who offer open access (for examples, see http://www.arl.org/sparc/author/).
- The CU-Boulder faculty and graduate students to support open access publications in their service as editors, on editorial boards, and in article reviewing.
- The CU-Boulder faculty and graduate students to negotiate with their publishers when possible for the right to make versions of their publications available via an open access repository (for example, see http://scholars.sciencecommons.org/).
[ADDENDUM II. – Coherent Curriculum]

An open letter to the UC Community,

President Benson’s recent email calling for support of the athletics program got me thinking about the purposes of the University and how its performance is assessed. A unique aspect of athletics is that there is a highly visible and widely accepted measure of success: wins and losses. This is (perhaps unfortunately) often the primary basis of how an athletics program is judged.

Monitoring success in research is less straightforward, but grant and royalty dollars and faculty prizes serve as accepted proxies for a program’s overall success or failure. These can be balanced against the costs for faculty and facilities when judging our successes and identifying our weaknesses.

This raises an interesting question: how does the University monitor its effectiveness in terms of educating students? A naive answer would be by evaluating student learning, but sadly we use few objective measures to reveal the effectiveness of our teaching programs. This despite the fact that the majority of the University’s operating budget comes from students who pay, presumably, for a well-designed, well delivered and cost-effective education.

We are moving into a new era of educational and institutional challenges, brought on in part by on-line courses and degree programs and made more urgent by growing costs to students and their families, both in terms of dollars per semester and time to degree completion. In this competitive new world, it seems critical that we commit at least as much energy to the design and delivery of effective educational programs as we do to athletics and research.

On talking with Provost Moore, I believe that we agree that a critical discussion, based on the following policy statement, and involving faculty, administration, technical experts and students, could help guide us to successfully adapt and improve our educational efforts through this potentially revolutionary period.

Commitment to a coherent & effective curriculum: The Faculty and University Administration recognizes and is committed to the premise that students can expect that each department’s common requirements for a degree (a major’s core) represents a thoughtfully considered, realistic, and effective course of study and that producing and maintaining such a “coherent core curriculum” requires an administrative commitment to provide faculty and departments with the necessary pedagogical resources. This implies

- that each course in a major’s required core be justified in terms of explicit learning objectives and performance expectations;
- that these same standards are applied to on-line courses;
- that periodic audits are carried out to insure that a department’s curricular goals can and are being attained by the majority of students; and
- that the results of outcome audits are used by departments to reconsider, and where necessary, revise their core course requirement to optimize student learning outcomes.

Sincerely,

[Mike Klymkowsky]
Professor, MCD Biology, Co-Director, CU Teach,
Interim Chair, BFA Student Affairs Committee, and Founding Fellow of the Center for STEM Learning