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The Boulder Faculty Assembly held its regular meeting on March 7, 2013 in Wolf Law 207. Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. and adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

I. BFA Faculty Focus Update

Diversity Committee

Co-Chair Jennifer Knievel presented the Committee’s Faculty Focus Study slide, on The Changing Role of Faculty from the perspective of the Diversity Committee. The slide’s contents included these bullets:

- Everyone benefits from diversity and inclusivity
- Diverse faculty and staff ➔ Diverse students
- Recruitment… Retention
- Valuing Service and Mentorship
- Identifying privilege
- Communication
• Pursue assessment and meaningful action

The highlights of Knievel’s comments were:
• Diversity and inclusion is about more than race. It includes language, gender, GLBT status, physical disability, and others.
• The Committee would like the Campus to increase its awareness that everyone on campus benefits from a more diverse and inclusive group of faculty and students. For example, multiple studies have shown that students’ learning is more effective in a diverse classroom, regardless of topic.
• Most diversity efforts on Campus are focused solely on students, but diverse students will not come to a University where the faculty and staff are not diverse.
• UCB can recruit diverse students and faculty, but does not have good retention, in part because of a fairly hostile climate to difference, both on campus and in the surrounding community.
• Faculty service is not valued highly on the Boulder Campus, which discourages involvement in Diversity-related efforts.
• Identifying privilege here refers to the fact that responsibility for making an environment more inclusive belongs to the majority, not to the minority. But UCB faculty who are identified as diverse are often asked to be solely responsible for diversity efforts, including recruitment and mentoring of diverse students and other faculty. The Committee believes that the Campus should track diversity efforts in the FRPA. (Currently diversity efforts are tracked only in teaching.)
• Communication between the BFA and senior Campus administration could be improved. Higher participation in faculty governance would make diversity issues easier to address.
• There are many potential ways to assess our progress as a campus. We can make use of existing data and reports from ODECE, and the salary equity committee, to encourage implementation of change.

Administrative Services and Technology Committee

Chair Karen Ramirez presented the Committee’s Faculty Focus Study slide. [Addendum I below.] The highlights of her comments included:

• One of the Committee’s main concerns is that communication about on-line education improve, and that faculty retain control over curricular matters and credentialing.
• The Committee is also interested in encouraging funding and incentives to help faculty use technological tools.
• Clear and consistent communication is an over-arching theme of concern.

Discussion followed. Ramirez added that the Executive Director of Facilities Management will soon meet with the Committee, and AST requests the faculty share concerns about construction beforehand; please forward concerns to Karen.Ramirez@colorado.edu.

II. Chair’s Report - Jerry Peterson
a. **Health Benefits** – CU will replace its Cigna option with Anthem next year.
b. **President’s Task Force on Efficiency** – The Task Force is now conducting an opinion survey. It continues to streamline CU policies: the number of Administrative Policy Statements (APS) is now 85 policies on 265 pages, from a highpoint of 210 policies on 650 pages.
c. **Multi-Year Contracts for Instructors** – Faculty Council is considering a new APS to implement Colorado’s new legislation granting Colleges and Universities the right to offer instructors multi-year contracts.
   Discussion followed. Reservations were expressed that the new statute is meant to expand Instructors’ rights, but it may have the opposite effect at UCB.
d. **Open Access Publishing** – The White House yesterday issued an executive order requiring that all agencies with more than $100 million in annual research funding must arrange at some time in the future to publish the results in open access sources.

### III. Special Report: Improving Ease of Interactions with Industry

Peterson introduced Tricia Rankin, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research. [Rankin’s slides from her report are on line at http://tinyurl.com/dxo8vn4.] Her comments included:

- Increasing collaboration with local industry is an important strategic goal. UCB has joined the University Industry Demonstration Project (UIDP), a group of industry partners and research universities, working to create and discover best practices for collaboration with industry.
- UCB’s research portfolio includes $360 million in Federal funding and about $20 million from industry sources. UCB could increase industry research significantly.
- UCB’s Office of Contracts and Grants (OCG) has extensive experience working with Federal grants and agreements that are standardised. Industry funding often involves working with a new contract. We plan to have a special unit to work on industry contracts and build expertise in that specific area.
  - Industry contracts often are complex and we want to maintain a strong position on what kinds of terms we can and cannot accept and respond rapidly.
  - Industry agreements are less restricted with regards to what can be charged directly and the indirect rate is not capped. Changing our processes will allow us to charge appropriately.
  - Ways to engage industry include allowing them the use of our equipment, facilities, technical staff, and faculty expertise, and each type of interaction has different issues to resolve.
- Increasing our industry portfolio is an important outreach activity. It makes our connections to the state’s economy clearer. It helps local industries (most of which do not have their own labs).
- As we increase our industry research, we will remain committed to our principles. There will be no change to our policy of open publication.
- Creating a group on campus to centralize industry interactions will help avoid problems. Caroline Himes is heading a group evaluating our processes and possible improvements. A faculty advisory committee is forming now and will
begin to meet next month. Bruce Eaton will Chair it. The BFA has nominated Markus Rashke.

In the question-and-answer session that followed, Rankin made these additional points:

- Making processes more transparent will help avoid unexpected delays and manage expectations.
- We can reconcile our existing procedures with the usual non-disclosure agreements in industry. We want to make sure the parties understand our processes in advance and identify any deal breakers as early as possible to avoid disappointment. Most systems grant the right to industries to control their own proprietary information. We want to make sure we control our IP and any knowledge we bring to the table.
- All departments on campus can benefit from an increase in overall research support. This office could help any unit seeking funding from a non-standard federal source. Students may have increased opportunities to do internships.

**System Task Force on I.T. in Education, a.k.a. Task Force on New Technology**

Peterson introduced Mike Lightner, Chair of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering and Chair of the System-level Task Force on I.T. in Education.

Lightner gave a report on the history of the Task Force, and then an overview of MOOCs and the University’s new experiment with them. [Lightner’s slides are on line at http://tinyurl.com/aowe53f.] His initial comments included the following:

- The Task Force, co-chaired by Lightner and VP Kathleen Bollard, formed last fall.
- There about 13 faculty involved from the Boulder Campus.
- President Benson’s interests for the committee include:
  - Can technology increase access to CU and maintain its quality?
  - Can technology improve the learning experience for students?
  - Can technology reduce the cost of higher education?
  - Can technology provide more revenue for CU?
- The Task Force is a System-level group in order to determine if there are synergies and efficiencies from working across the campuses and sharing best practices.
- The group’s tasks include:
  - Gather information on what campuses are doing now to support learning.
  - Explore practices among cognate disciplines across the campuses.
  - Review and make recommendations regarding MOOCs.

Lightner’s comments about MOOCs included the following:

- MOOC stands for Massive, Open, Online Class. They are massive because large numbers can enroll; and open because there is no charge to enroll, although internet access is needed.
- ACE has recommended five of Coursera’s MOOCs for transfer-equivalent credit.
- UCB joined Coursera in February. CU’s participation will help promote CU worldwide. 70% of MOOC enrollments come from outside the United States.
- There are currently three major platforms for MOOCs in the US:
- Udacity, based on individual faculty proposals, not partnerships with schools.
- Coursera, a nonexclusive hub / intermediary between students and schools. In Coursera, CU’s IP would remain with CU, and CU can offer its own MOOCs.
- EdX, an elite, invitation only group. CU has not yet been asked to join. EdX requires significant investment, about $10 million.
- It is important to note that MOOCs are very new and their models are continuously being refined.

- UCB is entering Coursera with an experimental mindset, offering four non-credit courses: Intro to Physics with Calculus (freshmen); Comics and Graphic Novels; Linear and Integer Programming; and Power Electronics (graduate). Enrollments are currently more than 16,000.
- A Campus committee will review MOOC proposals and track progress and quality.
- UCB faculty offering MOOCs may get some support (e.g. course buyouts or TA support), but not additional salary.
- Other options going forward include offering our own MOOCs supported by D2L or its equivalent; participate in other MOOCs as they develop; or decide not pursue future involvement.

A discussion and question-and-answer session followed, including these points and perspectives:

- There are concerns about granting MOOC students access to CU Libraries’ online content, because of the presumably more expensive fees to provide it. - Access to CU resources is not provided to non-CU MOOC students.
- The apparent efficiencies of MOOCs are available only if what they offer is compatible with what traditional brick-and-mortar classes offer. How can we protect the value of brick-and-mortar experiences, and the faculty who are in it?
  - Lightner responded that we can refuse credit for MOOCs, but the critical question is how to effectively define the value that the brick-and-mortar experience adds. In the future CU must make a more coherent and compelling argument in order to convince people to come to college campuses. There is pressure towards granting credit, both nationally and at CU. The most important response is to have as compelling an argument as possible to parents, that a brick-and-mortar university is an incredible value, even as costs goes up.
- Is there an existing estimate for the amount of learning a MOOC can offer? How are assessments performed?
  - Lightner responded that there are online assessment tools, and Coursera uses the Western Governors Assessment model (a controlled environment in which the student is tested in front of a camera, using a computer that has keystroke monitoring software installed, with human monitoring). What one must accept is that, while we can use summative measures, they cannot measure learning in terms of a student’s ability to think, react, and work in groups.
- CU could develop its own MOOCs on a totally independent platform.
- Could a faculty member allow his or her students to take a CU MOOC for credit, if they are paying tuition?
  - Lightner responded that CU’s Coursera contract allows CU to charge tuition
for CU-produced Coursera MOOCs to its own students and up to 1,000 additional CU online enrollees per course. For example, it would be possible for students to take Masters programs online and get credit and degrees, using CU-produced Coursera materials, supplemented locally if we wish.

- From the standpoint of a faculty who is not getting paid to offer a MOOC course, why teach a class requiring interaction with potentially 15,000 individual students?
  - MOOC instructors are not required to hold office hours or respond to student email. MOOCs use crowdsourcing to provide that kind of instruction. Questions are posed on line and answers are offered by other students, which are then rated by their peers. The more interest students show in a question or discussion, the higher its rating goes towards getting the instructor’s attention. The instructor can look at normative measures, and at the top 1 or 2% most popular discussions to know how things are going.
  - CU’s Physics MOOC will be taught on campus in-person, with a video-taped section with live students participating, and the same content will go on Coursera.

- MOOCs allow Colleges to offer courses that might not interest enough students at a single, brick-and-mortar institution to warrant an in-person class.

IV. Old Business: Resolution on Open Access

Robert Parson, Chair of the BFA Libraries Committee, called the attention of the Assembly to the UGGS resolution printed on the back of today’s agendas [addendum II below], and gave a brief history of the Campus’ discussion on Open Access over the last few years. Parson stressed that the resolution does not instruct the Campus to do anything, but only to support Open Access and encourage participation in it.

Moved by Robert Parson for the BFA Libraries Committee that the BFA adopt the UGGS Resolution to Provide Open Access to Research and Scholarly Information.

Discussion followed.

The motion passed without dissent.

V. Committee Reports and Updates

Executive Committee

BFA Vice Chair Paul Chinowsky led a discussion on APS 1009, Multiple Modes of Teaching Evaluation. [The APS with suggested revisions is addendum III below.] Chinowsky commented that:

- the proposal is not to get rid of FCQs, but to improve department’s flexibility to use fair and appropriate methods for measuring faculty performance.
- The Personnel Committee is also interested in beginning a discussion about the relative merits of the FCQ system.
The discussion that followed included questions as to whether there is any consequence to violating the policy, given that many departments evaluate faculty solely using FCQs. There were also comments to the effect that the FCQ system penalizes faculty for experimenting with new pedagogical methods and technologies.

Chinowsky requested additional comments be sent to Paul.Chinowsky@colorado.edu.

**Elections Committee**

Committee Chair Carmen Grace reported that turnout so far in the BFA’s electronic election has been good, and that the deadline to vote is Friday, March 15th. She encouraged everyone to vote and, if there are questions or issues with the electronic voting system, please contact the BFA office at 2-6271 or bfa@colorado.edu.

**VI. New Business**

Martin Walter reported that CUSG will soon vote on a statement on what the University should do about global climate change. He requested that faculty who are interested in creating a faculty response contact him at Martin.Walter@colorado.edu.

**VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, Peterson adjourned the meeting at 5:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator
[Addendum I: Faculty Focus Study, AST Committee]

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

[Addendum II. ] 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 III. – APS 1009 with Faculty Council Personnel Committee’s suggested revisions]
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.1 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. DEFINITIONS

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.
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.)

[Insert key words here.]