I. Special Report – Preparations for April 20

Peterson welcomed Vice Chancellor for Administration Louise Vale and Senior Managing Associate Counsel John Sleeman. Sleeman gave a brief report and then invited input. Sleeman noted that plans will likely look very similar to last year’s, but the operational details are not yet finalized. Sleeman asked for feedback both about the impact of last year’s event, and about possible impacts of this year’s event, given that it will occur on a Saturday.

Discussion followed, including these points and perspectives:

- Last year, credentials for access to campus included wristbands and CU IDs. There was discussion about how to facilitate the process for getting credentials for authorized visitors and simplifying access for those people.
- The Psychology Department conducts projects involving research subjects on Saturdays, which were affected last year. Psych students are pushing to collect data for their end-of-
semester reports at that time, and many participants in research studies can only be tested on Saturdays, because they are community members who have traditional Monday-through-Friday work schedules away from Campus. The Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences may have similar issues.

- Engineering runs demonstrations and high-school outreach events on Saturdays.
- Norlin Library is heavily used by students on 4/20 because the date is close to the end of a semester. Disruption of the students’ efforts to study at the library is problematic.
- It will be hard to know in advance what will occur on the Boulder Campus. If Campus closes and that turns out to be unnecessary, it will re-open as quickly as possible.
- Large, marijuana-related events are being planned in Downtown Denver and at Red Rocks on 4/20 and it is hoped that these events will reduce the numbers of non-UCB Community members on campus.
- The State of Colorado has legalized possession of limited amounts of marijuana, but it continues to be illegal under Federal law, it remains illegal under Colorado Law for those under 21, and remains illegal to consume in public. It is not known whether changes in legal status will have an effect on the 4/20 turnout this year.
- In discussions about the process for addressing 4/20 last year, student representatives reported that some people felt intimidated and unwelcome because of the strong presence of police on campus, especially members of under-represented communities. Plans this year will include a way for people to register complaints, and to resolve those kinds of problems as they arise as well as an emphasis on making sure that members of the UCB community fell welcome on Campus.
- The Campus remains committed to creating the absolute minimum level of disruption while also ending the gathering.

II. Chair’s Report

a. Athletics-Related Brain Trauma – COIA has been compiling information on brain trauma injuries in college athletics. The BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee has reviewed UCB’s procedures and is satisfied with prevention, monitoring, treatment, and record-keeping efforts.

b. Articulation Agreements for Transfer Credits – The Colorado Commission on Higher Education has a system to guarantee that credit transfers for certain classes. It may need review, as classes may have changed. Parson offered to give a report on the system.

c. UCB Acceptance Rates – At the Regent’s last meeting UCB’s acceptance rate was brought to the Regents’ attention. Peterson requested discussion. Comments included:
   • Average GPA and test scores of UCB’s freshmen have steadily increased for several years. This is due in part to improved guidance in high school and UCB’s efforts to recruit top students. Quality is more important than the acceptance rate.
   • Non-resident students tend not to apply unless they are going to be accepted. Their acceptance rate is higher, but their yield is lower (20%).
   • Greg Carey offered to oversee an analysis of acceptance rate data.
   • UCB should monitor its Esteemed Scholars program, designed to attract top in-state High School students, to ensure that if successful, it continues to be funded.

d. Coalition of Pac-12 Faculties – Peterson has a schedule conflict for the next meeting, April 12th and 13th in Tempe, Arizona. Joe Rosse was nominated to attend in his place.
e. **Environment Sustainability Visioning Committee (ESVC)** - Peterson asked for an update. Chinowsky reported that the ESVC committee will report to the Provost by the end of March. Videos of its meetings are online: [http://www.colorado.edu/esvc/](http://www.colorado.edu/esvc/). Comments are welcome. A variety of units may be impacted. It was suggested that ESVC’s Chair, Sharon Collinge, give a presentation to the BFA.

f. **Scholars of Conservative Thought Speeches** – Those who have feedback are asked to send it to Selection Committee Chair Keith Maskus at Keith.Maskus@Colorado.edu.

g. **Faculty Governance Speaker** - Phil Cole was Chair of Idaho State University’s Faculty Senate in 2011, when the State Board of Education voted to suspend the Senate and direct ISU to replace it. Prof. Cole will speak on April 9th from 12:00 to 2:00 at the University Club Lounge. BFA members are invited. Box lunches will be served.

### III. Special Reports: Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning

#### Campus Enrollment Changes

Kaempfer gave a five-year history of UCB’s enrollment. His report included these highpoints:

- Five years ago enrollment peaked at over 30,000 students. It has decreased every year since then. We have about 800 to 850 students fewer than we had five years ago.
- The decline has not been steady: it was about 100 students per year for three years, then about 500 students last fall. Reasons for decrease include the national recession, a decline in Colorado High School graduates, and changes and bugs in recruiting processes.
- Five years ago 30,000 students were too many for UCB’s infrastructure to support. Since then the Campus has increased its instructional space on East Campus, which could help lighten the stress on Campus infrastructure.
- This semester enrollment is 27,600, which is too few, creating economic issues. Spring is typically about 1,500 below fall enrollment. UCB continues to increase its enrollment efforts this year, including the Esteemed Scholars Program.
- Not all units are experiencing the same degree of enrollment changes. Roughly a quarter of last year’s reduction was due to reduced numbers in the program in Environmental Design (which fell from 900 to about 600). Most of the rest of the decline was in Arts and Sciences. Engineering has seen an increase over the same period. The Business School and other small schools have seen little change.

[Fiscal Year 2013 Faculty Salary Report](http://www.colorado.edu/AcademicAffairs/VPAVCreports.html)

Kaempfer stated that he has prepared several reports of this kind in years past but not for the last four years. He then gave a summary of the report he is developing for 2013:

- The numbers in the graphs are composed of average salaries of professors, weighted by each ranks’ share of the total number of tenured and tenure track faculty on campus.
- One goal in the report is to look at the size of the salary pool over time. Another is to compare UCB’s faculty salaries with that of its AAU peers.
- In late 1990s President Buechner attended a meeting of the BFA Executive Committee at which it discussed the low level of UCB salaries relative to its AAU peers. At that
meeting Buechner agreed with the concept of a faculty salary pool of at least 1 percent above inflation every year until the campus achieved parity with its peers. The Campus’ policies supported that concept for several years. In 2001 UCB was 7.7% below its AAU peers. From 2001 to 2009 the percentage increase in the salary pool every year exceeded the 1% goal. By 2009 the disparity had been reduced to 0.6%, a difference of only about $500 per year per professor, below AAU peers. The improvement did not occur evenly.

- In 2010 the economic picture changed. UCB beat the 1%-Above-Inflation goal in 2012 but otherwise the disparity has grown since 2010. The 2013 data for the AAU peers will not be available until the end of the academic year, but UCB is likely to have lost about 4.5%, since its highpoint in 2009. UCB is back where it was in the early 2000s.
- Another section of the report includes panel data sets, noting a pronounced difference between salaries of faculty who have been on campus for seven years, and salaries of those who have been on campus for five years. The five year group is 886 faculty that were here in 08-09. The seven year group is 769 that were here in 06-07.
  - The five year group’s mean cumulative salary growth is 7.2% compared to a 9% cumulative inflation rate. The percentage of faculty in this group whose salaries have beaten inflation is about 20%.
  - The seven year group’s mean cumulative salary growth is 26% compared to a 15.5% cumulative inflation rate. The percentage of faculty in this group whose salaries have beaten inflation is about 85%.
- The report also provides data showing a strong correlation between salary increases and merit evaluations. The graph does not, however, account for differences in units between what proportion of the faculty are rated as “far exceeds expectations.”
- Compression is also addressed in the report by comparison with salary compression percentages at AAU peers in 2012 (70%), looking at the spread between average full professor pay and assistant professor pay at UCB in 2006, 2009, and 2012. The data shows that full professors are less compressed in the Humanities. The most compressed units are Computer Science, Math, and Business. The Campus has become less compressed as a campus since 2006, while the AAU peers are becoming more so.

Discussion followed. Jerry Rudy commented that most of the new revenue CU has been taking in has been used to reduce the decline in faculty salaries for the last several years, and that if CU stays on this course it will have to choose between compensation and doing anything else.

IV. Old Business – Review of APS 1009, on Multiple Modes of Teaching Evaluation

Peterson reported that the policy is currently being reviewed by the Faculty Council Personnel Committee, Chaired by Paul Chinowsky. Chinowsky reported that the list of modes by which faculty at CU are evaluated has not been updated since 1984. He added that the wording of the policy states that each faculty member is allowed to use up to three methods of evaluation, but one must be FCQs. The Committee is looking into a proposal to allow faculty to opt out of FCQs in certain scenarios, such as when experimenting with new technologies, or when fewer than x% of students complete the FCQ in a given class.

Discussion followed. Peterson requested that Executive Committee members discuss the policy and its proposed changes in their units, and provide feedback to Paul.Chinowsky@colorado.edu.
V. Committee Reports and Updates

Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee (ITFAC)

Committee Co-Chair Rolf Norgaard distributed a handout on questions and potential problems with changing policies on instructor workload and pay. His comments included the following:

- Bill Kaempfer and Greg Carey, both in attendance today, have worked closely with instructors on the 2010 Task Force on Instructor Status, and are familiar with the issues.
- The traditional instructor workload was a 3/3 75% teaching 25% service load with a starting salary of $30,000. Overloads were largely unregulated.
- In about 2007-2008 overloads began to be better regulated. In Spring 2012 the former Dean of Arts and Sciences instituted a new policy which included a 3/3 load at $40,000, a 3/4 at $41,000, and a 4/4 at $42,000. That policy has caused confusion and pushback, and the new Dean has largely abandoned it.
- Dean Leigh is now in the process of revising the policy and ITFAC is very interested in appropriate discussion before the policy is permanently fixed, because of the difficulty in moving back from an announced policy if all the ramifications have not been considered.
- The apparent outlines of Dean Leigh’s proposed policy are a 3/3 load at $40,000, a 3/4 at an unknown amount, and a 4/4 at $48,000. ITFAC’s concern is that 4/4 will become the explicit and default workload for all instructors, and require faculty and units to bargain their way down to loads that include more than an insignificant service component.
- Other questions about the proposed policy are whether the $48,000 is for new hires only, creating big salary compression, equity considerations, and loss of unit service efforts. Many units rely on significant service by instructors. A 4/4 workload would also decrease the campus’ ability to deal with population changes by allowing overload courses.
- Instructors make up 25% to 30% of Arts and Sciences full time faculty. They have an important impact on undergraduate education, both inside and outside the classroom.

Discussion followed, including these points and perspectives:

- A draft of the new policy has been circulated to Academic Affairs. The Provost’s office will soon meet with the Associate V.C. for Academic Affairs to develop a response.
- The implications of the new policy affect many people. Most instructors have been at UCB for at least 10 years, and their pay is therefore likely to be negatively affected.
- This topic requires significantly more discussion. More time should be devoted to it at a future meeting of the Executive Committee.
- The service component in any workload calculation is not a measure of effort, but of the weight given in evaluation. Any instructor who is evaluated at only 5% service is unlikely to put much effort into service.
- Activities that are teaching-equivalent service are treated differently than other types of service, and may count as instruction.
- If teaching loads are in the 4/4 range with almost no service component, the question must necessarily be raised what is the difference between a lecturer and an instructor?
- Arts and Sciences Council will discuss the changing policy on Thursday, March 21st.
- As the Arts and Sciences policy has implications for the Campus, the Executive Committee will ask Dean of Arts and Sciences Steven Leigh to attend its meeting on
March 4th, to discuss the new policy.

**Nominations and Elections Committee**

Committee Chair Carmen Grace reported that the BFA electronic ballot will go live tomorrow. She encouraged everyone to vote, to encourage colleagues to vote, and to write in the names of candidates on the ballot, especially where no contest exists. She also reminded the Executive Committee that access to the ballot is via unique links, delivered via email: the links are not transferrable.

Peterson added that at the April 4th BFA meetings, the BFA will elect its new officers and at-large representatives on the BFA Executive Committee.

**VI. Adjournment.** There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:36.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.

**Addenda below:** Instructor Workloads and Pay
Instructor Workload and Pay:
A Short History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Teaching/Service</th>
<th>Starting salary</th>
<th>Overloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to about 2008:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>75% / 25%</td>
<td>$30K</td>
<td>unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 2008:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>75% / 25%</td>
<td>$40K</td>
<td>regulated, max. 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Gleeson’s Policy (Spring 2012):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>75% / 25%</td>
<td>$40K</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>85% / 15%</td>
<td>$41K</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>95% / 5%</td>
<td>$42K</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent Outlines of Steven Leigh’s Policy (Spring 2013):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>75% / 25%</td>
<td>$40K</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>85% / 15%</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>95% / 5%</td>
<td>$48K</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerns:
- 4/4 becomes the explicit and default workload for all instructors
- $48K floor only for new hires, or for all instructors?
- Loss of service to units and the campus
- Uncompensated workload increases
- Severe salary compression, especially for those making just above $48K
- Inability to teach overloads for many instructors (with an actual *loss of pay* of $9K per year)
- Impact of overload restriction on the campus (e.g. RAPS, Honors)

Two Scenarios:
- Instructor with 10 yrs of service, making $42K = will 4/4 load bring salary increase to $48K?
- Instructor with 20 yrs of service, making $49K = 4/4 load with no bump in salary (severe compression) and no ability to teach overloads (with an actual *loss of pay* of $9K)
Talking Points regarding Instructor Workload and Pay Issues

History

- Todd Gleeson’s policy ideas regarding moving to a 4/4 instructor load were discussed over the last three years before the ASC, with considerable questions and pushback from faculty, as instructors also perform vital service in key areas. Current A&S policy was enacted without ASC approval.

- The BFA task force on instructors was very concerned about the work load issue raised by Todd Gleeson. Recommendations approved by the entire BFA in April 2010 specifically speak against the workload proposals being floated at the time.
  https://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/committees/MOTRES/BFA-X-M-022210.pdf

- A March 2012 resolution was passed by the entire BFA addressing the need to consult with individual instructors regarding any possible workload changes:
  https://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/MOTRES/BFA-R-030112.6.pdf

Current Policy Discussion

- Existing A&S policy (3/3 at 40K, 3/4 at 41K, and 4/4 at 42K) has been the subject of considerable criticism from Faculty Affairs (Jeff Cox) and the Provost’s Office (Bill Kaempfer), and A&S departments have expressed their concerns as well.

- My (perhaps incomplete) understanding is that a policy is now being explored that would raise the salary floor for newly-hired instructors but also assume a 4/4 teaching load (4/4 at 48K). Existing instructors whose salary may be slightly above 48K (these folks have typically been here for 15 years or more) may be subject to a 4/4 load, but with no bump in salary. This policy leads to huge problems with compression. Academic departments rarely address such compression issues on behalf of instructors.

- This move to a default 4/4 teaching load runs up against another A&S and campus policy that limits overloads. Those currently teaching a 4/4 cannot teach an overload, and those teaching a 3/3 can only have one overload per semester. Given the difficult economy and high cost of living in Boulder, many instructors currently teach a 3/3 load with a 1/1 overload, while still doing considerable service. With the move to 4/4 loads, this amounts not just to compression and no additional pay, but to an actual pay cut of $9,000, given that overloads would no longer be possible. Many instructors rely on overloads to meet the mortgage. This proposed policy takes advantage of the most vulnerable members of CU’s full-time faculty, and also those with years of loyal service.

Moving Forward

- Ensure that individual instructors are party to any discussions in the unit regarding changes to their workloads, per the BFA resolution of March 2012.

- Ensure that any differential workload policies address compression issues for long-term, loyal instructors.

- Ensure that any new workload policies do not create situations where instructors actually experience a real cut in salary, given prior histories of teaching overloads in an effective manner.

- Include instructors in College-wide discussions about workload changes.

--Rolf Norgaard, Co-chair, BFA committee on Instructor Track Faculty Affairs
January 30, 2013