MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting,
Boulder Faculty Assembly
October 15, 2012

Attending
Jerry Peterson, BFA Chair
Paul Chinowsky, BFA Vice Chair
Carmen Grace, BFA Secretary
Greg Carey, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Peggy Jobe, BFA Executive Committee Member at Large
Karen Ramirez, BFA Administrative Services & Technology Committee Chair
Ted Stark, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
Asuncion Horno-Delgado, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Chair
Rolf Norgaard, BFA Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Adam Norris, BFA Instructor-Track Faculty Affairs Committee Co-Chair
Elizabeth Bradley, BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Chair
Robert Parson, BFA Libraries Committee Chair
Mike Klymkowsky, BFA Student Affairs Committee Chair Pro-Tem
Joe Rosse, Former BFA Chair
Robert Ferry, Arts and Sciences Council Chair
Nikki Comer, CUSG Director of Academic Affairs
Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator

Not Attending
Jerry Rudy, BFA Budget and Planning Committee Chair
Ruth Ellen Kocher, BFA Diversity Committee Co-Chair
David R. Kassoy, Retired Faculty Association Representative
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
Steven Koenig, UGGS President

Guests
Stein Sture, Vice Chancellor for Research
Steven Leigh, Dean of Arts and Sciences

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, October 15, 2012 in Norlin Library Room N410. Chair Jerry Peterson presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report

   a. BFA Election Season – The Nominations and Elections Committee is preparing a timeline for the BFA’s spring election process, on a schedule that will allow for the full participation of the Boulder Campus in the Faculty Council’s spring election.
   b. Coalition of Pac-12 Faculties – The Coalition’s next meeting is this weekend at the University of Utah. The topics for discussion are moving toward more specificity.
   c. Chancellor’s Executive Committee – Paul Chinowsky has been invited to the next CEC meeting to introduce the BFA’s Faculty Focus Study, on the ‘big picture’ for the Campus.
   d. Options for the BFA Executive Committee meeting room – After discussion, the Committee agreed it will continue to meet in Norlin N410.
   e. BFA Excellence Awards – Depending on the availability of former recipients to serve on
selection committees, some Executive Committee members may be asked to serve this year. According to BFA policy, selection committee members will not be recruited until after the February 11th application deadline. [Please visit the BFA website for complete nomination information: www.colorado.edu/BFA/Awards.]

f. **Concealed Weapons on Campus** – The Denver Faculty Assembly has produced a petition to return jurisdiction over weapons on campus to the Regents. The Denver Assembly has asked the BFA to forward it to Boulder Campus faculty.

   Discussion followed. It was agreed that each campus should move forward with its own initiative.

g. **Town Meeting on Concealed Firearms** – The next Town Hall Meeting on the subject of concealed firearms is this Wednesday. Executive Committee members are encouraged to attend the meeting to help maintain a respectful tone.

h. **Last Thursday’s Boulder Campus Football Game** –

   Several Executive Committee members reported that last Thursday’s operation went smoothly in their areas of campus. Bradley suggested the BFA ask the Athletics Department to set up a special recognition at its next half-time show, to honor David Wineland, the Boulder Campus’ latest Nobel Laureate. She also suggested the BFA acknowledge him officially. Peterson offered to compose a resolution to do so and to distribute it immediately.

   **Moved by Elizabeth Bradley and seconded by Robert Parson that Peterson compose a resolution to honor David Wineland, and distribute it.**

   The motion passed without dissent.

   [Whereas our colleague Dr. David S. Wineland has received the 2012 Nobel Prize in Physics; therefore the BFA hereby congratulates Dr. Wineland on his success and honors his contributions to science and to the Boulder Campus.]

II. **Special Reports – Opportunities and Snags in the Research Enterprise**

Peterson introduced Stein Sture, Vice Chancellor for Research.

Sture reported on the serious challenges presented by the great success of the Boulder Campus’ research enterprise. His comments included the following points:

- UCB’s research success has generated a significant increase in administrative effort, in part because the growth in number and amounts of proposals, grants, and contracts has been accompanied by an increase in the complexity and amount of compliance activities, without a corresponding increase in staff.
- CU’s research enterprise has grown from about $140 million ten years ago to nearly $400 million. Federal stimulus grants had pushed that number up to $454 million a few years ago, accompanied by a huge increase in effort to document progress and report monthly.
- The Office of Contracts and Grants (OCG) is responsible for managing the details of the research enterprise. The number of OCG staff has increased from 19 twelve years ago to 26 today, but not enough to keep up with workloads. Over twelve years, staff turnover in
OCG was around 4 positions per year, usually because staff found higher paid positions elsewhere. Over the last fourteen months, more than half of OCG’s staff has turned over. Nearly all the positions have been filled, but massive training is required to bring the new staff up to speed. This is happening at a time of continuous, heavy workloads. About one-third of OCG staff puts in overtime daily, and four or five also work weekends (and have for several years).

- To help deal with staffing challenges the Provost, the C.F.O., and the Vice Chancellor for Research have created a plan to invest more resources this year, adding 10 additional FTE, and making more positions “professional-exempt” in order to increase their compensation. UCB’s peer institutions with a similarly-sized research operation have staffs of up to 70 or 80 people.

- Among OCG’s responsibilities are reviewing proposals and budgets in time to submit them before their deadlines. OCG requests faculty submit their materials at least five days before the deadline, which may not be realistic. Many of UCB’s peers use a longer deadline. Faculty are sometimes unhappy with what they think is a relatively slow rate of processing applications, but those faculty are sometimes unaware that compliance issues require careful analysis, especially with regard to federal grants.

- The Campus is analyzing whether to merge OCG (which reports to the V.C. for Research) with the office of Sponsored Projects Accounting (which reports to the C.F.O). Many sponsored projects include grantors from outside CU, who often require using their own contract templates. All require careful review to ensure the campus’ interests (and the faculty members’) are protected. UCB’s industry-contract volume has increased from $8 million three years ago, to $29 million today. Nearly one half of the total contract-subcontract volume involves work with industry.

- For the past five years the CU System has been working on implementing an electronic tool for tracking research and cataloguing data (InfoEd). It will be ready for roll-out in mid-January, and is hoped to be immensely helpful to OCG and eventually to faculty. Faculty will be able to use a proposal development tool within InfoEd, including templates, which is hoped to be rolled out in summer, 2013. OCG staff is being trained on InfoED Proposal Tracking now, but faculty will need training in Proposal Development next year.

Discussion followed, including these points:

- Faculty can help reduce problems in this transition period by turning in their proposals and budgets well in advance of their deadlines.

- Training for the new system will be managed by University Information Systems (UIS), and the Office of the Jill Pollock, Senior Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer. OCG will also participate in its own training.

- 2,400 proposals were submitted to OCG last year. There are only six pre-awards analysts at OCG to process all of them. Contracts range in size from $10,000 to several million dollars each, in one case reaching $487 million. Each requires a similar amount of effort from OCG, regardless of how much money is involved.

- Institutes and many of the centers have proposal-packaging staff and budget analysts, which is very helpful to faculty scientists and to OCG.

- The 92 Federal agencies and labs are warning all institutions to prepare for a 10% reduction in grants next year, due to the January 2nd “sequestration” of Federal budgets.
As a result, competition for grants will be more intense, increasing the need for timely and accurate submissions. Faculty are asked to plan ahead, anticipate delays, and submit their proposals and budgets to OCG well in advance of their deadlines.

- It was suggested that OCG provide faculty with a template process, including a sample budget, to streamline the proposal process.

Peterson thanked Sture for his report and offered the assistance of the BFA for rolling out the faculty training. He added that the BFA has a grievance committee that could be activated as needed for faculty’s issues with the transition process, as they arise.

III. Committee Reports and Updates

Stark initiated a discussion on whether and how professional researchers should participate in faculty governance on the Boulder Campus. Discussion followed, including these points and perspectives:

- The BFA did not fill the two existing BFA seats for researchers in last spring’s election, in part because the BFA does not currently have a way to identify them for the purposes of holding an election, but also because the Campus does not have a way for them to communicate with their constituencies.
- The question of whether the BFA should attempt to represent the interests of UCB’s professional researchers remains unresolved. It was suggested that the two researchers that held the positions in the past be allowed to continue, to represent the interests of Boulder Campus’ professional researchers, until the issue is decided.
- Professional researchers do not normally have official contact with students, and are not compensated for or expected to participate in campus service.
- If their purpose is to have an avenue to bring their concerns to the administration through a representative body, professional researchers could organize themselves into a specialized representative organization, similar to Staff Council.
- Several years ago the BFA attempted to add a representative seat to the Assembly for Research Professors, but found little interest among them in campus-wide service.
- It was suggested that the BFA further clarify its role with regard to representation: it is elected from and represents the Faculty Senate in the Boulder Campus’ system of shared governance. Professional researchers are not members of the Faculty Senate. They are distinct from Research Professors, who are members of the Faculty Senate. The BFA has always in the past used the same definition of “Faculty Senate” as that used in the Laws of the Regents1, and that definition does not include professional researchers.

IV. Special Reports: Introduction of Steven Leigh

---

1 “The Faculty Senate consists of all members of the general faculty with the following titles whose appointments are fifty-percent or more: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, instructor, scholar in residence, and artist in residence. Adjoint, attendant, clinical, and research faculty with fifty-percent or more appointments in the above ranks are also members of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate’s powers and duties are acknowledged by the Board of Regents to be vested in the Faculty Senate, the Senate committees, the Faculty Council and its committees, the campus faculty governing bodies and their committees, and the faculty in each college or school in the university.” Regents’ Laws 5.E.2.A (1) - https://www.cu.edu/regents/Laws/article-05.html.
Peterson introduced our new Dean of Arts and Sciences, Steven Leigh.

Peterson asked the Dean where shared governance could make the biggest difference, and Leigh responded that helping improve student retention should be a top priority. Discussion followed. Topics and areas of concern included:

- Atmosphere in the classroom.
- Effectiveness of curriculum requirements.
- Increased use of adjunct instructors.
- Engaging students earlier in their college careers.
- Class size.
- On-line educational opportunities.
- Advising, particularly the Campus’ new advising system.
- Whether faculty should take on a larger advising role.
- How to objectively measure the success of on-line instruction.
- Residential Academic Programs.
- The impact of increasing numbers of international students in classrooms.
- Diversity as a key feature of the university in the future.
- How to promote the creation and sustainability of interdisciplinary courses, including overcoming budgetary challenges.

Peterson thanked Dean Leigh.

V. Old Business – Faculty Focus Study

Chinowsky reminded the committee that he sent a call for additional ideas for the first phase of the BFA’s Faculty Focus Study, and so far about fifteen people have responded. He added that he will send a similar call to the members of the BFA’s committees in the near future.

VI. Adjournment. The Executive Committee adjourned the meeting at 5:35.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.