MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting,
Boulder Faculty Assembly
March 4, 2013

Attending
Jerry Peterson, BFA Chair
Paul Chinowsky, BFA Vice-Chair
Carmen Grace, BFA Secretary
Peggy Jobe, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Karen Ramirez, BFA Administrative Services & Technology Committee Chair
Jerry Rudy, BFA Budget and Planning Committee Chair
Ted Stark, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
Chonin Horno-Delgado, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Co-Chair
David R. Kassoy, Retired Faculty Association Representative
Adam Norris, Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Rolf Norgaard, Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Joe Rosse, Former BFA Chair
Robert Ferry, Arts and Sciences Council Chair
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
Laura Michaelson, UGGS Executive Vice President
Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator

Guests
Steven Leigh, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Not Attending
Greg Carey, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Ruth Ellen Kocher, BFA Diversity Committee Co-Chair
Elizabeth Bradley, BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Chair
Robert Parson, BFA Libraries Committee Chair
Steven Koenig, UGGS President

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, March 4, 2013 in Norlin Library Room N410. BFA Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report

a. Names for Faculty Council Officers – Faculty Council will elect new officers April 25th. Please send suggested nominees to Jerry Peterson in advance. The pool of potential candidates includes existing Faculty Council members, and the newly elected BFA Executive Committee at-large members. The BFA will elect its new Executive Committee at-large representatives on April 4th.

b. Changing Service to Service/Leadership – Faculty Council is moving to replace Service with Service/Leadership, to highlight that service is a form of leadership. Nine system-level administrative policy statements will be revised accordingly.

c. CIGNA to be replaced by Anthem - As of July 1st, CU’s health insurance options will no longer include CIGNA. Anthem will be offered in its place.

d. BFA Election Update – The BFA’s second annual anonymous electronic ballot has been distributed to the 1,633 members of the Faculty Senate. Turnout so far is good again this
year. The deadline to vote is March 15th. Qualtrics software allows for ‘reminder to vote’
email messages only to those who have not responded, preventing spam.
e. Scholar of Conservative Thought – The Selection Committee is accepting feedback on
the three candidates, to the Chair at Keith.Maskus@Colorado.edu.
f. CU lapel pins for BFA members – University Communications has promised CU lapel
pins for BFA members. The pins could be distributed at this Thursday’s BFA meeting.
g. Review and Revision of APS 1009, on Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation –
Chinowsky reported that the Faculty Council Personnel Committee has approved the
proposed revisions, and can now be reviewed by the Campuses. He encouraged
comments to Paul.Chinowsky@Colorado.edu. [Proposed revisions addendum I, below.]
h. UCD Report on Status of Instructors – UCD’s Committee on instructors has issued a new
report. To request a copy please contact the BFA office at bfa@colorado.edu.
i. Instructor Workload and Pay – Peterson requested discussion on instructor issues, in
advance of the Dean’s arrival today. Discussion followed. Issues included:
- Instructors in some units are kept out of all decision-making: not allowed to
  attend faculty meetings, not allowed to vote, and used only for teaching.
- The student experience is improved when instructors are included as colleagues.
- Some degree programs rely very heavily on instructors.
- The ideal teaching load for quality instruction depends on discipline. In
  languages a 3/3 load is right. 1/4th of Arts and Sciences’ instructors are in the
  Program for Writing and Rhetoric. 1/8th are in Languages.
- Currency in a field requires compensation for more than just classroom hours. In
  some units Service is the only way to get time away.
- Definitions of Instructors’ leadership and service vary greatly between units.
- Some units hire researchers under the title ‘instructor’ in order to save money.
- The pay scale should be flexible enough to allow for market differences between
disciplines, and should pay more. Even those at the top of the pay scale are not
making a living wage.
- Better wages are a better idea than allowing course overloads. Poor wages are an
incentive to instructors to teach more classes, but adding more classes can harm
an instructor’s ability to provide instruction well. Therefore, market value is not
the best way to determine instructor pay.

II. Special Report and Discussion: Instructor Workload and Pay

Peterson welcomed Steven Leigh, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Leigh handed out a
graph from a proposed new pay schedule. [Below, as addendum II.] His initial comments were:
- The existing pay schedule pays just $1000 more per course after an instructor’s first six
courses within the same year. Because of general dissatisfaction with that schedule, Vice
Provost Bill Kaempfer and Associate Vice Chancellor Jeff Cox requested the Dean
propose a new system. [The existing schedule is online at http://tinyurl.com/aozb53x.]
- The current schedule is a minimum floor. Several instructors who have been here for a
long time are getting more than the minimum.

In the discussion that followed, Dean Leigh’s comments included these additional points:
- The new schedule does not allow overloads. [The A&S 2009 Overload policy is online at
http://tinyurl.com/a5g4msz.] Under the overload policy, a 3/3 teaching load ($40,000) plus two overload courses (at $4300 each) paid an annual salary of $48,600. Under the current schedule a regular 4/4 course load pays $42,000. Under the proposed schedule a regular 4/4 course load would pay $48,000. The proposed schedule allows departments to set their own floors: it is designed for new hires, not reducing existing faculty salaries.

- The proposed schedule will cost the College more money, but may encourage more service and improved instruction. The current schedule uses three different weights for the Service portion of performance review. The proposed schedule uses the average of the three for all instructors: 15%. Each percentage (85% instruction and 15% service) refers to the weight given in performance review. It does not refer to time spent.
- The proposed schedule adds a new category called “Other Instructional Duties” which would move much of what instructors currently think of as “service” into the instructional category for purposes of review. For example, Other Instructional Duties might include lab maintenance or coordinating Teaching Assistants, for which an instructor would get a course release. Departments should define their own lists of Other Instructional Duties.
- The Dean’s office will have oversight of the system only to the extent necessary for consistency, keeping in mind that each discipline has its own needs. A&S might develop multiple schedules to address different markets for instructors, between disciplines.
- CU pays instructors differently than tenured/tenure-track faculty because they are different kinds of jobs: research is part of the tenured/tenure-track expectation. Professors are also subjected to several retention reviews as well as frequent, multiple reviews of grants and publications. A&S does not evaluate instructors for research, and reviewed grants and publications are not requirements for career success. Units that wish its instructors to conduct research are free to request instructor lines be changed to tenure-track. Nothing precludes instructors who wish to be evaluated for research from applying for a tenure-track position, either at CU or elsewhere.
- The higher instructor pay, the more incentive units have to hire tenure-track faculty instead. The Dean’s office would like tenured/tenure track faculty to increase their teaching commitments. Course and instructional quality may be harmed by teaching more than six courses per year, and more so for teaching more than that.
- The proposed schedule does not mandate a default 4/4 teaching load. Workloads and course releases will continue to depend on what a department needs, and those decisions will continue to be left up to the departments.
- The Dean’s Office is working to encourage departments to update their bylaws.
- Increasing the weight of instruction to 85% sends a message that A&S values instruction. One goal of the new schedule is to increase the credit that instructors get in performance review for their duties which were once labeled ‘service.’ Another goal is to encourage a more clear definition of service. Instruction-related service to a department would fall under the 85% Instruction rubric. BFA service would fall under the 15% Service rubric.

Other comments from the discussion included:
- Pay from overload courses is not considered part of base salary. One advantage of doing away with course overloads, from the perspective of instructors, is that the income earned from teaching what were formerly overload courses will now be counted as part of base salary, and will then contribute to proportionately larger merit pay increases.
• It is hoped that Departments will be able to use the Distributed Workload Policy to allow Instructors to apply for a course buyout for time away from the classroom to refresh their courses. Currently, the policy allows only Senior Instructors to do so.
• Some units are less equitable than others in their treatment of instructors. The Dean’s Office should require departments to include basic fairness principles in their Bylaws. Grievance committees have upheld the validity of several complaints, but the departments in question continue to use unfair policies, free of consequence.
• Cutting the weight of instructors’ service to 15% sends a negative message about service. The Dean responded that his interest is in prioritizing instruction.

Dean Leigh also gave a general overview of Arts and Sciences budgetary challenges this year:
• Because of missing this year’s enrollment target, and having an unusually large proportion of students converting from out-of-state status to in-state status, the Campus has had to cut $12 million from its budget.
• Arts and Sciences has been asked to cut about $1.5 million. It plans to absorb the cut proactively by using temporary money this year and maybe next, to backfill in the short term and use the extra time to develop sensible budget reductions. Some ideas include:
  o Looking at the core curriculum, which is expensive, unwieldy, and out of date, requiring a lot of advising.
  o Ask departments to ramp up tenure review to improve faculty productivity.
  o Cut back on phased retirements.
  o Cut back on leave without pay.
• Making the cuts right away would cause national ratings to fall precipitously, because of increased class sizes and layoffs of instructors and lecturers.
• Summer school classes are separate from the pay schedule, and from the overload policy.

The Committee thanked Leigh for his time and attention to the complicated issues surrounding instructor pay.

The Executive Committee continued its discussion, including these points and perspectives:
• The 15% model could promote more service.
• It remains to be seen whether the Dean can address inequities between departments.
• There is a danger that the default workload for instructors will be 4/4.
• It would be helpful for the Dean to make explicit that the schedule is for new hires only.
• The proposed methods of cutting the budget seem to fall disproportionately on senior faculty: increased PTR and a reduction in phased retirements. The Dean should be asked to explain how A&S can initiate a more stringent PTR without being unfairly arbitrary in selecting its targets for review.
• The transparency of the development of all of these processes could be improved.
• The Dean’s office could develop a sample menu of options for ‘Other Instructional Duties,’ to help departments and instructors understand what will receive which weight.
• It remains to be seen whether the departments or the Dean’s office will step up to pay for professional development opportunities and course buyouts for instructors.

The Committee generally agreed to forward its comments to the Arts and Sciences Council, for their consideration. ASC Chair Bob Ferry, present at today’s meeting, agreed to bring the issues
to the ASC in the near future.

III. Committee Reports and Updates

Update on ICJMT External Visitors’ Events

Ted Stark reported that he attended several sessions of the events with the off campus visitors. He commented that there does not seem to be a common thread or a clear conclusion about how to proceed, but information was shared and discussed. He added that the visitors must now put together one or more proposals or recommendations.

Kaempfer added that the next step will be to review external visitors’ report.

Administrative Services and Technology Committee

Committee Chair Karen Ramirez presented a set of bullets developed by the committee for the Faculty Focus Study [addendum III below].

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

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.

Addenda below:
I – APS 1009 with proposed revisions noted.
II. Draft Chart of Arts and Sciences Proposed Instructor Pay Scale.
III. – Faculty Focus Study bullets
Addendum I:

Policy Title: Multiple Means of Teaching Evaluation

APS Number: 1009

APS Functional Area: ACADEMIC

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.

Effective: July 1, 2013

Approved by: President Bruce D. Benson (Pending)

Responsible University Officer: Vice President for Academic Affairs

Responsible Office: Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Policy Contact: Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Supersedes: N/A

Last Reviewed/Updated: July 1, 2009

Applies to: All faculty

Reason for Policy: 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. For each faculty member, a minimum of three components shall be included. 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. Data from FCQ’s or similar system shall comprise a maximum of 50% of the evidence or weights used to assess teaching. 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.

---

1 Faculty may omit FCQ scores (or similar scores) in several cases, as long as three alternate measures are used to evaluate teaching:
- Faculty may choose to omit FCQ scores for the first and/or second time teaching a new course, or a course that has been significantly revised to include new teaching technologies or courseware.
- Faculty may choose to omit FCQ scores when the student response rate is less than 50% of enrolled students.
- Faculty may choose to omit FCQ scores where massive cheating has been identified and that involved more than two students.
- Faculty may choose to omit FCQ scores when primary teaching technologies, courseware or data bases fail or present a significant impediment to student learning during the course.
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. DEFINITIONS

IV. RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES, FORMS, GUIDELINES, AND OTHER RESOURCES

A. Guidelines

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


V. HISTORY

Initial Policy Effective: AY 1994-95

VI. KEY WORDS (Insert list of key words, related terms or phrases both found and not found in the APS, which others might use to search for this policy – i.e. cell phones to find wireless telecommunications equipment.)
Addendum II: Draft Compensation Chart

Figure 1: Blue lines and symbols show the existing payment schedule. The red line and symbols show compensation at $6000.00 per course. The proposed schedule allows salaries within the boundaries of these lines below 6 courses, while allowing compensation on or above the red line for 7 and 8 courses.
Addendum III:

Administrative Services and Technology Concerns for Faculty in the “New” University

- **Online Education**
  - Control over the curriculum and credentialing
  - Fiscal implications of online education for University, and thus faculty
  - Faculty awareness of legislative action pertaining to online education

- **Technological educational tools**
  - Communication to faculty about technological innovations for teaching and learning
    - Identify a consistent communication process to share information with faculty and to train faculty
    - Work with departments/units for communication of technological innovation
  - Faculty encouragement to keep up with changing technology
    - Competitive grants and incentives offered to faculty and/or departments
    - Merit for effectively integrating technology into teaching

- **Fair use**
  - Clear and consistent communication about copyright laws, fair use, and changes brought by new technology
    - Initiate clearer communication about University guidelines, policies
    - Communicate about acceptable distribution of course materials
    - Communicate about acceptable distribution of research
    - Designate a contact person on campus for questions/concerns
    - Set up a symposium on fair use for interested faculty

- **IT security**
  - Clear and consistent communication to faculty on security issues arising with advancing technology, such as:
    - Policies regarding protection of student data on faculty/other computers
    - Role of faculty in securing personal and university information

- **Facilities/Parking Planning and Development**
  - Clear and consistent communication to/from faculty on key areas of concern, including:
• East campus build-out
• Campus Master Plan and its implementation
• Parking and Transportation to/from campus and on campus