MINUTES
Boulder Faculty Assembly
March 1, 2012

Attendance

BFA Members Attending
Frank Beer
Elisabeth Bloomfield
Elizabeth Bradley
Gregory Camilli
Greg Carey
Paul Chinowsky
Douglas Duncan
Antonia Green
Vicki Grove
Peggy Jobe
Lakshmi Kantha
Dave Kassoy
Buzz King
Catherine Kunce
Congming Li
Shelly Miller
Shivakant Mishra
Adam Norris
Robert Parson
Jerry Peterson
Melinda Piket-May
Michael Preston
Karen Ramirez
Isaac Reed
Joe Rosse
Jerry Rudy
Seth Spielman
Ted Stark
Bryan Taylor
Steve Vanderheiden
Jeff Weiss
Wendy Young

BFA Members Not Attending
Ernesto Acevedo-Muñoz
Haytham Bahoora
Eric Chwang
Andrew Cooperstock
Bill Emery
Frank Eparvier
Maw Der Foo
Sanjay Gautam
Carmen Grace
Phil Graves
Jim Green
Lynn Harvey
Martha Hanna
Robert Hermanson
Arthur Joyce
Mike Klymkowsky
Daria Kotys-Schwartz
Jeff Mitton
Susan Moore
Page Moreau
Robert Nauman
Reiland Rabaka
Maj. David Rozelle
Anne Sheehan
Kira Van Lil
Martin Walter
Ahmed White
Jan Whitt

Liaisons
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost and AVC for Budget & Planning
Dominique De Vangel, Staff Council Liaison

Guests
Former BFA Chair Uriel Nauenberg
Rolf Norgaard, Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Carla Farsi, Department of Mathematics
Asuncion Horno-Delgado, Department of Spanish and Portuguese
Frances Draper, Vice Chancellor for Strategic Relations

The Boulder Faculty Assembly held its regular meeting on March 1, 2012 in Wolf Law 207. Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. and adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report: BFA Chair Jerry Peterson

a. Congratulations – to BFA Vice Chair Bill Emery, elected a fellow of the American Geophysical Union Fellow for scientific contributions in the field of space sciences.

b. BFA Election – Access to the ballot will be distributed via email tomorrow.

c. Suspending the Rules – Some of today’s resolutions may be accompanied today by a request to suspend the ‘Notice of Motion’ rule, which would allow the resolutions to be voted upon at today’s meeting.

d. President’s Office Update – President Benson, with apologies, has notified the BFA Office that he cannot attend the BFA meeting today, due to an unavoidable conflict.

Discussion followed. The Assembly decided to proceed by developing a list of questions that the President might have been asked today, had he been able to attend, and sending
II. Questions for the President’s Office

- The publicly reported raises for senior administrators have created significant negative reactions from the public, state legislators, and the Regents, perhaps to the point of nullifying the tuition increase that the Boulder Campus worked to achieve. What is the President's Office going to do to try to mitigate these ill effects? Some reports say that the Regents were surprised by the raises; what will you do to try to avoid such surprise in the future?" – Bradley Monton

- What can the President’s Office do to try to focus the popular attention on what really matters, which is that Colorado’s institutions of Higher Education have suffered over $100 million in budget cuts from the State, while the executive raises represent only a tiny percentage of that amount? – Douglas Duncan

- The state legislature is considering a bill this year to mandate the creation of a searchable database of faculty salaries, travel expenses, teaching loads, grant money, and a host of other details, to be updated every five days. The bill appears to be a legislative response to the news accounts about the raises for upper-level administrators, but it clearly targets faculty instead. Does the President support the bill? – Catherine Kunce

- Recent bad press about CU, along with the responses from some Regents and state legislators, suggests that CU may not receive sufficient state funds for its operations in the next fiscal year. The most likely people to suffer from this will be lower-level staff and students. Does the President’s Office have a plan to soften the blow for these folks, and what are the details of that plan? – Greg Carey

- How often do the Regents visit classes, and would they be willing to visit some classes this spring, in the interest of transparency? – Doug Duncan

- Would the President please share any notes from which he planned to speak at today’s BFA meeting, had he been able to appear, so that the BFA might react? - Ted Stark

- For most of the faculty, salaries are allocated based on the systematic comparison of merit. How do the recent high level administrator’s salary increases fit into the larger merit-based salary system? – Frank Beer

III. Committee Updates

Nominations and Elections Committee

Committee Chair Catherine Kunce’s report included the following:

- At its April 5th meeting the BFA will hold the election of its 3 officers and 2 at-large Executive Committee members for next year. Those eligible to run are the 60 new and continuing members of the BFA and the current Chair. Nominations can be made at any time, including from the floor during the election. The BFA office will prepare a written ballot. Please notify the BFA office [by 5pm on April 4th, the day before the meeting], to ensure your candidate’s name appears preprinted on the ballot.

- Tomorrow, the committee will distribute to the Faculty Senate (which includes most faculty) the electronic ballot to elect BFA representatives and BFA Committee members. The balloting deadline is March 16th.
IV. New Business

Faculty Affairs Committee

Chair Paul Chinowsky presented two motions: a proposed Interdisciplinary Faculty Seminar Series; and a proposed Internal Visiting Professors Program [addenda below].

Chinowsky reported that the Committee has worked closely with administration to create these programs, and that both reflect the goals in the Flagship 2030 initiative, specifically ‘transcending traditional academic boundaries,’ and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Discussion followed. Chinowsky reported that eligibility was to be limited to tenured professors and instructors on a multiple-year appointment, but he agreed that eligibility should be open and approvals based on the merits of applications, rather than tenure status. He also agreed the proposals should include a mechanism for evaluation.

Moved by Peggy Jobe and seconded by Michael Preston to suspend the rules and allow a vote on the two resolutions, today. The motion to suspend the rules passed.

Chinowsky moved on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee that the BFA approve the two resolutions. The motion to approve the Interdisciplinary Faculty Seminar Series passed, with one opposed. The motion to approve the Internal Visiting Professors Program passed with one abstaining.

Executive Committee

Chair Jerry Peterson reported that CUSG’s Legislative Council has passed a resolution to support removing the 4/20 event from the Campus, and presented the following resolution:

---

**Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee Resolution**

To Support Campus Efforts to Move the 4/20 event off of the Boulder Campus

[ BFA-R-030112.3 ]

*Whereas* the Legislative Council of the CU Student Government on the Boulder Campus has passed a resolution to support campus efforts to remove the 4/20 event from the Boulder Campus,

*Resolved* that the Boulder Faculty Assembly hereby adds its support to CUSG’s resolution.

Notice of Motion to the BFA: March 1, 2012

[Approved by the BFA: March 1, 2012]

---

Discussion followed. Some asked for more details about the Campus’ plan. Another reported that UCB has a 4/20 Committee that includes BFA member Mike Klymkowsky.
Moved by Catherine Kunce and seconded by Shelly Miller to suspend the rules and allow a vote on the resolution today. The motion to suspend the rules passed with four opposed.

Moved by Jerry Peterson on behalf of the Executive Committee that the BFA approve the resolution in support of efforts to remove 4/20 from campus. The motion passed with 24 in favor and 4 opposed, and with 3 abstentions.

**Budget and Planning Committee**

Chair Jerry Rudy presented the Committee’s reports about how the new tuition revenue was spent, and salary distribution. [On line at www.Colorado.edu/BFA.] He commented that faculty recently learned important news from local newspapers rather than from the University, and that these reports are meant to share the correct information but also provide an example, created in cooperation between the BFA and administration, that the Campus should follow in the future.

Rudy gave a few brief highlights of information in the reports, including that the average salary increases for faculty were very similar to those for officers of the campus.

Moved by Shelly Miller and seconded by Liz Bradley that the BFA accept the reports.

Discussion followed. The Assembly agreed the reports should be disseminated widely.

The motion to accept the reports passed with none opposed. [ BFA-M-030112.4 ]

Rudy presented the following resolution on behalf of the Executive Committee:

**Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee Motion**
To Increase Campus Understanding of How Tuition Increases are Used
[ BFA-R-030112.5 ]

*Whereas* the BFA Budget and Planning Committee has authored a report of how this year’s tuition increases were used; and

*Whereas* the reports contain the kind of information that the faculty would like to have in advance; and

*Whereas* the Budget and Planning Committee would like to support Administration’s efforts to communicate with faculty about the Campus budget;

Therefore **resolved** that the BFA expects Campus Administration in the future to prepare analyses of this type every year, share the analyses with the appropriate BFA Committees, and distribute the reports to the Campus.

Notice of Motion to the BFA: March 1, 2012
[ Approved by the BFA: March 1, 2012 ]
Moved by Jerry Rudy on behalf of the BFA Executive Committee that the BFA approve the resolution to Increase Campus Understanding of How Tuition Increases are Used.

Discussion followed. Bradley suggested removing the second clause as confusing and unnecessary. Rudy accepted the suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Moved by Greg Carey and seconded by Elizabeth Bradley to suspend the rules and allow a vote on the resolution today. The motion to suspend the rules passed.

The main motion passed with none opposed.

Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee

As an introductory matter Peggy Jobe moved, and Ted Stark seconded, that today’s meeting time should be extended by ten minutes, because of the importance of the Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committees’ resolution. The motion passed.

Committee Co-Chair Adam Norris introduced co-Chair Rolf Norgaard, and presented the following resolution:

```
Boulder Faculty Assembly Instructor Track Faculty Affairs Committee Resolution
Regarding Teaching and Service Loads of Instructor-Rank Faculty
[ BFA-R-030112.6 ]

Whereas instructor-rank faculty contribute in vitally important ways to the teaching mission of the campus and the service performed on campus; and

Whereas recent administrative initiatives mean variable teaching and service workloads and compensation have now changed to become a common feature of instructor appointment considerations and formal letters of appointment in some units;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT teaching and service loads be established in consultation with an instructor or senior instructor and his or her chair/director and/or personnel committee prior to the time at which the appointment is finalized, and that an instructor’s or senior instructor’s historic teaching and service load be deemed the baseline from which those negotiations would proceed.

Notice of Motion to the BFA: March 1, 2012
[ Approved by the BFA: March 1, 2012 ]
```

Norris reminded the BFA that its task forces and reports on instructor status in recent years contemplated a standard instructor workload close to a ‘3 and 3’ class load with 25% service. He added that the resolution is a response to a new policy in one of the colleges that seems to erode that standard, towards a ‘4 and 4’ load with no service and no possibility of teaching an ‘overload’ class for more pay. Norgaard reminded the BFA
of its motion last year that included an expectation of no uncompensated workload increases, which the new policy seems to conflict with. For example, under the new policy an instructor might receive a three-year reappointment letter that says ‘service load and teaching load will be determined later.’

In conclusion, Norgaard reported that the resolution attempts to accomplish two things: (1) establish an expectation that the instructor can participate in the conversation about his or her teaching and service load, and (2) that the previous workload should be the presumed basis from which any changes would need to be negotiated.

Discussion followed. Bill Kaempfer urged the Assembly to support the resolution, in part because of how important overload teaching is to the Campus.

*Moved by Peggy Jobe and seconded by Robert Parson to suspend the rules and allow a vote on the resolution today. The motion to suspend the rules passed.*

*The main motion, that the BFA approve the Instructor Track Faculty Affairs Committee Resolution Regarding Teaching and Service Loads of Instructor-Rank Faculty, passed with none opposed.*

V. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.
Interdisciplinary Faculty Seminars

Summary

The seminar series initiative builds upon successful seminar courses that have been put in place over the last several years. In this initiative, interdisciplinary collaboration will be supported through year-long seminars on a specific topic that bring 15 faculty together from across campus to discuss the topic and build opportunities for course or research collaboration. The faculty would be expected to develop a course or research proposal from the seminar. Each faculty would present an overview of their research during the first semester and work in groups to develop an interdisciplinary proposal for development during the second semester. It is anticipated that seminar proposals would be solicited each spring for implementation the following year. A maximum of three of the proposals would be selected for implementation. It
is estimated that the cost for each seminar would be a course buyout for the coordinator and a $1,500 stipend for each participant as well as a small amount for guest presenters. The total would be approximately $30,000 for each seminar.

Implementation

The implementation of the Seminars proposal can occur with minimal effort and expense with the first deployment of a Seminar in Fall 2012. The Faculty Affairs Committee is requesting the University (Research Administration) for the following:

- Assist in the coordination of the Seminar Series by collaborating in the advertising, collecting, and reviewing of Seminar proposals.
- Provide an initial seed allocation for a pilot of the Seminar Series. Anticipated costs for a Seminar include a course buyout for a coordinator of $6,000, a $1,500 stipend for each participant, and $2,500 for outside speaker invitations. This is estimated to be a total of $31,000 per seminar.
- The proposed implementation roll-out is to have one seminar in 2012-2013 and two seminars in 2013-2014. The cost of this roll-out would be a total of $93,000.
- Sustainable funding opportunities for the seminars will be pursued as a fundraising effort in collaboration with the CU Foundation.

Guidelines

The Interdisciplinary Faculty Seminars will follow the successful model implemented previously on campus by entities such as the Center for the Humanities and the Arts and funded through the CU Seed Grant program. Based on this model the Seminars will follow the guidelines set forth as follows:

- Seminars can be proposed to the Office of Academic Affairs (this may be the Graduate School if that is a more appropriate location) by any member of the Faculty Senate.
- Seminar proposals will be reviewed by a combination of past seminar organizers and AA personnel.
- Seminars must incorporate a theme that is interdisciplinary in nature that integrates multiple colleges and schools.
- The seminar proposal must incorporate a specific set of objectives with preference given to topics that will stimulate both potential research and teaching collaborations.
- Seminars must follow a pattern of one semester of weekly meetings followed by a semester of collaborative project development with monthly review meetings.
- Proposers must be willing to coordinate the seminar including the organizing of outside guest speakers and the schedule for the first semester of the seminar.
- Selected seminars will be announced to the CU-Boulder faculty in the spring semester preceding the start of the seminar the following fall. Interested faculty can then apply to be members of the seminar cohort for the following year.
• Participation in the seminars will be limited to 15 individuals and must represent a cross-section of the university community.
• Seminar organizers must present a report at the conclusion of the seminar including the results and potential follow-up efforts that have been initiated through the seminar.

Eligibility to apply for the seminar series shall not be limited to tenured professors and instructors on a multi-year appointment. Rather, approvals shall be based on the merits of applications, rather than the tenure status of the applicants.

The seminar series shall include a mechanism for its evaluation after its first year.

---

BFA Faculty Affairs Committee
Motion to endorse a new program for Internal Visiting Professors
BFA-R-030112.2

Whereas the University of Colorado has set as a goal to encourage and support interdisciplinary collaboration on the Boulder campus, including the setting of the Flagship 2030 Flagship Initiative, Transcending Traditional Academic Boundaries, and

Whereas the BFA Faculty Affairs Committee in consultation with the BFA Executive Committee has developed an initiative to support this vision through a program entitled, Internal Visiting Professors as documented in the accompanying pages, and

Whereas the initiative has received favorable initial comments by the Administration and the BFA Executive Committee has granted its endorsement of the new program,

IT IS MOVED that the BFA endorse the creation of the Internal Visiting Professor program as presented by the Faculty Affairs Committee and endorse the funding of a pilot launch of the program as indicated.

Notice of Motion to the Boulder Faculty Assembly: March 1, 2012
Approved by the Boulder Faculty Assembly: March 1, 2012

---

Internal Visiting Professor

The concept behind this initiative is that faculty would be able to arrange a semester or year-long “collaboration visit” to another department. The arrangement is not a sabbatical, but rather is an opportunity for a faculty member to work with individuals in another department to expand inter-disciplinary research and teaching connections. The exchange would allow an in-depth collaboration experience with faculty members from another department to enhance new research opportunities and to explicitly respond to the university’s push to an inter-disciplinary environment. The arrangement specifics could vary depending on the departments involved. The minimum arrangement would be a buyout of the faculty member’s course(s) back to the home department. The origination of the funds could either come from the visiting department or the university depending on the arrangement. The duties of the visiting faculty
member would be arranged with the host department. The duties may be limited to a research collaboration or may include teaching a course in the host department.

Guidelines

The Internal Visiting Professor (IVP) program will allow an individual faculty to:

1. Undertake the visiting position for one or two semesters depending on the arrangement between the faculty member and the host department.
2. Negotiate the responsibilities in the visiting department with the department chair in the visiting department.
3. Be exempted by up to two classes per semester in their home department unless additional course forgiveness is otherwise agreed to by the home department.
4. Move their office to the host department if space is available in the host department.
5. Negotiate appropriate reductions in department service in the home department if service assignments are being acquired in the host department.

Eligibility to apply for the program shall not be limited to tenured professors and instructors on a multi-year appointment. Rather, approvals shall be based on the merits of applications, rather than the tenure status of the applicants.

The program shall include a mechanism for its evaluation after its first year.

Implementation:

The Faculty Affairs Committee is requesting the University to:

- Put in place a program which would allow faculty to apply for Internal Visiting positions.
- Administer the program out of the Office of Academic Affairs (this could be done with assistance from the BFA FAC during a pilot stage).
  - Proposals will be accepted from faculty on an annual basis.
  - Proposals will be reviewed by a committee of previous awardees, but in the beginning this will be a combination of FAC and AA personnel.
- Allocate funding for a pilot of three Internal Visiting Positions for each of the first three years of the program.

Total cost of this commitment for the pilot stage is a maximum of (3 positions per semester * $6,000 per course * 2 courses per semester * 6 semesters) = $72,000 per year for three years

We request starting the program in Spring 2013 with a commitment of $36,000 to start the program.

Visiting Scenarios:

The scenarios in which the visiting faculty program may be undertaken are a combination of teaching and research arrangements. The visiting faculty member may:
• Have a visiting teaching arrangement where the faculty member teaches up to two courses in the Host department per semester in accordance with the faculty member’s standard teaching requirement. However, if the faculty member is still required to teach courses in the Home department due to their teaching requirement being greater than the two course forgiveness, then the teaching requirement in the Host department combined with the teaching requirement in the Home department cannot exceed the number of courses normally required of the faculty member.

• Have a partial teaching arrangement where the visiting faculty member has a reduced teaching load in the Host Department to facilitate a focus on research collaboration.

• Have a visiting research arrangement where the faculty member has a specific research goal which is being undertaken in the Host Department as outlined in the application made by the faculty member to participate in the program.

Long-Term Funding Scenarios:

The funding scenarios can be divided into four situations in terms of how to support the visiting positions. The support for the visiting relationship requires the teaching responsibility of the faculty member in the home department to be covered as outlined above. This may include hiring an adjunct, having another faculty member cover a course, or not offering a course depending on the specific requirements of the home department. The cost to cover teaching responsibilities in the home department is the focus of the scenarios.

Collaborative Support: In this scenario, both departments have the financial ability to support the visiting program. The Home and Host departments agree on the financial arrangement and no extra funds are required by the University. An example of this arrangement may be a faculty member from Business going to Law where both departments can afford to cover a visiting arrangement. In this optimum case, there may be no need for the University to provide support.

Home Emphasis: In this scenario, the Home department has the resources to cover the costs of the course forgiveness for the visiting faculty and agrees to bear the cost for part of or the whole teaching requirement. An example of this arrangement may be a case where a large department such as Computer Science supports a faculty member going to a small department such as Theatre and Dance which does not have the resources to support a visiting faculty, but which has a demonstrated benefit in the faculty member visiting the department.

Host Emphasis: This scenario is similar to the Home Emphasis except the Host department has the funds to cover the costs of covering the courses that the visiting faculty is responsible for in the Home Department. In this case, an arrangement can be made where the host Department covers the cost of hiring an adjunct for the Home Department.

University Support: In this final case, neither department has the resources to cover courses which are considered essential by the Home Department. In this instance, the university will cover the cost of up to two courses per semester for the faculty member to participate in the visiting faculty program.