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The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, April 29, 2013 in Norlin Library room N410. BFA Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report

a. BFA Chair’s Meeting with the Chancellor This Wednesday
   The Committee discussed issues to be raised with Chancellor.

b. Summer BFA Executive Committee Meetings – Our outgoing Chair Jerry Peterson will Chair a meeting June 10th at 4pm at a location to be announced. The Committee agreed to meet monthly thereafter in July and August, at dates and locations to be announced.

c. BFA Transition Discussion - Peterson requested comment on new and continuing issues for the BFA to monitor into next year. Suggested topics included:
   - Statewide articulation agreements\(^1\), both separately and as related issues, especially with regard to the faculty’s responsibility for curricular matters. There was a recommendation to consult with Richard Nishikawa as a resource. The BFA does not have a mechanism for addressing curricular matters, as those are generally governed by the Colleges and Schools. The Executive Committee recommended creating an ad-hoc Committee to research the issues. The Provost’s

\(^1\) The texts of these agreements are online at http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/Students.html.
campus-level Academic Advisory Committee may also include a BFA nominee.

- Enrollment Management. Enrollment may not be sufficiently connected to what’s happening on campus. Faculty input and involvement is important, because of the inter-relationship between admissions, enrollment, and academics. It was suggested that the BFA Student Affairs Committee have an official role in consulting with the Director of Enrollment Management.

II. Special Reports – Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning

Budget Update

Kaempfer gave a brief overview of recent budget news:

- The Regents have approved UCB’s budget request for 2013-2014, which included tuition increases of between 8% and 9% for resident undergraduates, and 1.9% for other tuition categories including incoming non-resident undergraduates and both resident and non-resident graduate students. Applying the same percentage increase to all graduate students, whose rates are divergent to begin with, may cause problems.
- Those increases, at a fixed level of enrollment, would lead to about $20 million in new revenue. The new budget allocates about 68% of that revenue to compensation for faculty (a 3.1% increase pool), staff (a 3.6% increase pool), and graduate students.

Discussion followed, including these points and perspectives:

- In the context of trying to maintain the same number of students, to avoid continuing to increase tuition in future years the Campus must either figure out how to educate the students with fewer faculty and staff, or accept no raises. Unduckable expenses like maintenance would continue to drive tuition increases, regardless.
- Kaempfer reported that budget shortfalls in the current year will be dealt with by increasing enrollment, but actual numbers will not be available until the Campus conducts a census of its student base in about the third week of fall semester.
- Kaempfer added that there is room for optimism: this year’s freshman class was less than 5,200 students. The goal for 2013-2014 is 5,650 or more. Housing is forecasting a 200 bed surplus next year at that number, and 700 additional beds will be available in fall 2015 when Baker Hall’s renovation is complete.

Academic Scheduling Matters, Changes in Commencement

Kaempfer reported that this semester students re-initiated a conversation with administration about possibilities for re-instituting a reading period after the last day of classes. He added that:

- This issue is timely because certain department-level commencement events have been encroaching on the final exam schedule.
- The Chancellor, the Division of Academic Affairs, and the students developed two suggested changes in the exam schedule, to create a reading period:
  - The first option would push the final exam schedule later, for a Sunday night through Thursday night schedule, rather than Saturday through Thursday morning; and would move the campus-wide commencement to Saturday. In the past the CU System did not allow UCB to hold a Saturday commencement
because it would have conflicted with another Campus’ commencement. Currently, each Campus’ commencement falls on a different weekend, so there is no longer a conflict.

- The second option would sacrifice the last two days of classes for reading days and maintain the current exam and commencement schedule.
- The Vice Chancellor for Administration is now looking into costs of shifting Commencement to Saturday. Areas of cost would include parking FTE, Police presence, Commencement Marshals, and faculty attendance. None of these are expected to increase costs to the Campus, and some may reduce costs and inconvenience. For example, parking will be easier for families as most faculty and staff lots will be almost empty. The cost of police presence may simply shift from Friday to Saturday. Marshals are currently granted administrative leave hours to participate, and these could also be shifted from Friday to Saturday. Potentially, there is an additional cost savings of making Saturday a reading day by reducing the need to staff department offices that day.

Discussion followed. Kaempfer reported that Administration needs a rapid resolution in order to enact the proposed changes in time for Spring, 2014. The Executive Committee agreed to compose a resolution in support of the first option (detailed above) in time for the meeting of the full BFA this Thursday, May 2nd.

---

BFA Executive Committee Resolution to Reinstitute Reading Days

Whereas the BFA supports the academic excellence of the University of Colorado; and

Whereas the BFA wishes to acknowledge the students’ commitment to academic excellence; and

Whereas CUSG has approved a Resolution to Support the Reinstatement of Reading Days, which would create a reading period after the last day of classes each semester; and

Whereas Campus administration, working with CUSG leadership, has developed a plan that would do so; therefore

Be it resolved that the BFA endorses the reinstatement of reading days for the Boulder Campus, and requests Campus administration enact the plan.

Approved by the BFA Executive Committee for forwarding to the BFA: week of April 29, 2013

The resolution will appear on the Thursday’s BFA agenda as a notice of motion. Peterson commented that it will be necessary to ask the BFA to vote to suspend its notice rule, in order to proceed with a vote.

---

III. Committee Reports and Updates

Libraries Committee

Committee Chair Robert Parson gave a preview of the Committee’s annual report:
The Libraries Budget has seen several years of average budget increases of 3% or less, while the inflation rate for journals and database subscriptions has averaged 5%. Due to the budget crisis this year there was no increase to the base, although there was about $270,000 in one-time money. As a result, unless the Campus increases the Libraries’ base budget, the Library will have to go through another round of cancellations of serial and database subscriptions. Cancellations occurred in about 2003, and again in 2010, to address budget shortfalls. There is no more room to make cuts.

The Committee has been discussing open access publication models for several years. Those discussions resulted in the resolution to adopt the UGGS resolution, to encourage open access publication.

The Committee also contributed feedback to the Faculty Focus Study, on the changing roles of faculty in the new University. There is a great deal of overlap between the concerns of the Libraries Committee, and the changing role of faculty.

The Committee discussed copyright and intellectual property issues in a joint meeting with the Administrative Services and Technology Committee and University Counsel. Many faculty are very confused about things that were once well understood, such as Fair Use, and the doctrine of first sale.

**Compensation and Benefits Committee**

Committee Co-Chair John McCartney reported that:

- The Committee met with Kelly Fox, Senior Vice Chancellor and C.F.O. in early April. She reported that the Campus could not implement the tuition benefit this year because of the campus’ budgetary issues. The Committee feels strongly, however, that the Campus should proceed with the benefit in a scaled manner, for example by capping the number of beneficiaries in the first year of its implementation.

McCartney handed out a draft of a letter to Kelly Fox, detailing the Committee’s proposal, which estimates the average cost per beneficiary and the number of expected beneficiaries each year, to estimate the annual cost to the Campus. (See addendum below.)

Discussion followed. It was suggested that the Campus analyze using part of the faculty salary increase pool to pay for the benefit each year.

**Administrative Services and Technology Committee**

Chair Karen Ramirez summarized the Committee’s Annual Report, including these highlights:

- The Committee met seven times this year. The Committee Chair also met separately with C.I.O. Larry Levine, Vice Chancellor for Administration Louise Vale, and Registrar Barbara Todd, to discuss the implementation of the Committee’s request that each of those offices (O.I.T., the Division of Administration, and the Registrar) provide vision and planning documentation to the Committee at the beginning of each year. Two of these for the current year are posted on the Committee’s website.

- The Committee also met on an emergency basis with the Registrar and with the C.I.O. in response to issues involving ISIS and D2L.

- Issues the Committee addressed this year include fair use in conjunction with the
Libraries Committee, and online education.

- The Committee also heard reports on capital construction, including the planned data center on East Campus.
- The Committee also produced feedback for the Faculty Focus Study, on the changing roles of faculty in the new University.
- Fair use should be an ongoing conversation for AST and for BFALC, because of the general lack of information available to faculty.

Discussion followed. There was a request that OIT’s frequent surveys of faculty develop a more user-oriented approach.

Budget and Planning Committee

Committee Chair Jerry Rudy summarized the Committee’s annual report:

- This year Kelly Fox, the Campus’ new C.F.O., attended every meeting of the Committee. Our dialogue with Kelly was candid, cooperative, and productive.
- Early in the year the Campus’ relatively low enrollment created fiscal challenges in the current year. The Chancellor then announced in his State-of-the-Campus address that the BFA Budget and Planning Committee would have a strong role in working through those challenges.
- In working through the causes of this year’s budget shortfall, the Committee considered various opportunities and plans regarding enrollment. As a result of those discussions, the Campus discovered an opportunity to reach out to Colorado’s top high school students, to encourage them to apply to CU. Those discussions may also have been the genesis of the C.F.O.’s plan to develop UCB’s new Esteemed Scholars Program.
- The Committee also heard several reports from Campus leaders about their units, and held candid and constructive discussions with them about challenges that the Committee might help them analyze and resolve by providing a faculty perspective. Guests included Chief Information Officer Larry Levine; Dean of Arts and Sciences Steve Leigh; Vice Chancellor for Administration Louise Vale; Executive Director of Facilities Management Steve Thweatt, and H.R. Director Candice Bowen.

Rudy commented that a theme of the Committee’s discussion on budgetary matters is that most faculty are not aware that the Campus must make choices with regard to budget matters, without always looking at all the possible alternatives, but that Kelly Fox is very interested in hearing from the BFA about ideas for budgetary investment in future years. He added that he will work with the incoming BFA Chair and the Committee on mechanics for how to ensure the faculty’s choices are part of the budgetary decision-making process.

Peterson commented that a positive theme to this year’s committee reports is the number of administration representatives attending BFA Committee meetings and interacting with them on the issues facing the Campus.

IV. New Business

Peterson presented committee chairs with certificates of appreciation for their service.
V. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:27.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator
Addendum – Draft Letter to the Senior Vice Chancellor and C.F.O.

MEMORANDUM

To: Kelly Fox

From: BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee

RE: Implementation Plan for Faculty/Dependent Tuition Benefit

Date: April 29, 2013

Overview:

The BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee would like to thank you for meeting with us on April 2nd to discuss the implementation of changes to the faculty/dependent tuition benefit described in our BFA resolution from November 2012. These changes include permitting matriculated students to use the benefit during any semester, and permitting students using the benefit to enroll at any time. We feel strongly that this benefit has important impacts on faculty retention and recruitment, and would like to help in developing a practical implementation plan for loosening the restrictions for the Boulder campus. This document presents the basis of a budget estimate that the committee developed as a starting point to help the administration implement the changes to this benefit as early as Fall 2013.

Overall Model for the Costs of the Tuition Benefit per User:

The current model of providing 9 hours of tuition as part of this benefit is complicated on the Boulder campus, due to the tuition structure. However, 9 hours can be considered as 30% of a typical full-time 30-hour course load. Accordingly, we believe that it is simpler to provide users of this benefit 30% of the average academic year tuition. Based on the new tuition rates approved by the regents, the tuition for a full load is $8760 for an Arts and Sciences student. Accordingly, the tuition benefit per user would be 30% of this amount ($2628 for Arts and Sciences). We understand that there are other dependent scholarships given to faculty and dependents (i.e., the $750 vending machine scholarship). If these dependent scholarships are used by the administration to offset the costs of the tuition benefit, the actual cost to the campus in providing the 30% tuition discount could be reduced (i.e., to $1878 for Arts and Sciences). We would also like to note that merit based scholarships can be used on top of the tuition benefit, which we believe is already the case.

Estimation of the Number of Tuition Benefit Users:

CU Boulder has approximately 7000 faculty and staff, including research faculty. Assuming that these individuals on average have 2 dependents who are interested in using the benefit (14000 total potential users), this means that there are 8 years out of a 40 year career where the tuition benefit may be of interest to the faculty member. This means that at any moment in time, there are likely 20% of the pool of total potential users who will be interested in using the benefit (i.e., 2800 people). Assuming that ½ of
all high school graduates go to college, and \( \frac{1}{4} \) of these students decide to attend CU Boulder, we assume that there will be approximately 350 dependents who are interested in using this benefit each year.

**Cost Estimates:**

If all 350 of these students use the tuition benefit, the cost to the campus will be $657,300 per year beyond what is already being spent through the vending machine scholarships. However, there is a potential that some number of these students wouldn’t have come to CU Boulder if this benefit did not exist. For example, if 50% of these students are new to the campus (and there is room to accommodate them), the 70% of the tuition that they pay in cash will generate an additional $1,073,100 per year \((175 \times 0.7 \times \$8760)\). This additional new income may help offset the increased cost to the university.

Because of uncertainties in the number of students that will use the tuition benefit after loosening the restrictions, the administration may want to consider capping the number of people who can use the benefit in the first year on a first-come, first-served basis. The table below shows the cost to the campus depending on the cap set on the number of users each year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cap on Number of Users</th>
<th>Cost to University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>$657,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>$468,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>$281,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>$187,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, we believe that the implementation of the changes to the tuition benefit will clear up confusion on how to use this benefit, and will provide a tangible recruitment and retention tool for faculty. From the Chancellor’s state of the campus address, we know that faculty retention is an important issue. We have also heard several anecdotes from current faculty members across campus (as well as faculty members being recruited) who have expressed interest in this tuition benefit. We think that the loosening of the restrictions should be done as soon as possible to bring clarity to this issue, and to make the benefit more effective for faculty and their dependents.