MINUTES
Boulder Faculty Assembly
April 29, 2010

Attending:

Dickey, Kim  
Duncan, Douglas  
Emery, William  
Eron, Don  
Grace, Carmen  
Graves, Philip  
Hermanson, Bob  
Hoenger, Andreas  
Hollweck, Thomas  
Hudson, Suzanne  
Jobe, Peggy  
Joyce, Arthur  
Kassoy, Dave  
King, Roger  
Kopff, Christian  
Kunce, Catherine  
Lazzarino, Graziana  
Lee, Jintae  
Miller, Shelly  
Moreau, Page  
Muir, Carrie  
Nauenberg, Uriel  
Norris, Adam  
Parson, Robert  

Piket-May, Melinda  
Preston, Mike  
Ramirez, Karen  
Richter, Antje  
Rosse, Joseph  
Rudy, Jerry  
Scanlon, Col. Sheila  
Schulzinger, Robert  
Schutrumpf, Eckart  
Skewes, Elizabeth  
Squillace, Mark  
Toth, John  
Walter, Martin  
White, Ahmed  
Young, Wendy

Liaisons and Observers:  
Kaempfer, Bill  
Bradley Albus

Other Attendees:  
Himes, Carolyn  
Rusch, John

• Documents:
  - University of Colorado Guiding Principles, with revisions
  - Presidential Search Process, with revisions
  - Resolution on Increased Flexibility for Research Salary Increases (BFA-X-M-030810.1), with attached memorandum of explanation
  - Motion Regarding the Policy on Class Conflicts and Club Sports (BFA-X-M-030810.2), with attached memorandum to faculty, instructors, and sport club advisors
  - Motion to Request Amendment of Honor Constitution I.2.c.ii. (BFA-X-M-032910)
  - Motion Regarding a Weapons-Free Campus (BFA-X-M-041910)
  - UGGS Resolution supporting the BFA’s Motion Regarding a Weapons-Free Campus
  - Retired Faculty Association Motion Concerning Firearms on the Campuses
The Boulder Faculty Assembly held its regular meeting on April 29, 2010, in Wolf Law Building, Room 204. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:05 p.m. and adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

I. Approval of the Minutes: The Minutes of April 1, 2010, were approved.

II. Chair’s Report:

Rosse announced that BFA Coordinator Maureen Ryan has decided to retire from her position. Rosse noted that Ryan has been an incredible resource who will be greatly missed. Rosse thanked Ryan for her outstanding service and presented her with a framed photo print of the Boulder Campus.

Faculty Council Update

Rosse’s report included the following:

- Faculty Council’s EPUS and Personnel committees are reviewing the BFA’s Motion Regarding Faculty Rights with Program Discontinuance (BFA-X-M-101209).
- Faculty Council has reviewed the BFA’s Motion to Endorse the Recommendations of the BFA Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Status (BFA-X-M-022210), and has considered two motions of its own.
  - The first motion is that all campuses work with their respective faculty governance bodies, and with their Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs or equivalent, to have consistent standards and practices for evaluation of instructors. The Council returned that motion to its Personnel Committee without approving it, due to concern about possible confusion over the motion’s reference to tenure-track faculty. The motion will likely return to Faculty Council at its meeting on May 12th.
  - The second motion called for all campuses to establish voting eligibility criteria for all faculty. Not all units have clear descriptions of which faculty have voting rights. This motion was approved.
  - Boulder’s Chancellor DiStefano will, with Interim Provost Stein Sture and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs Jeffrey Cox, consider implementation of the voting eligibility recommendations, and report to the Council of Dean on May 11th.
- The Board of Regents and Faculty Council are revising a “University of Colorado Guiding Principles” document. Rosse called the Assembly’s attention to items 6 and 7 of the document, which purport to address the University’s need for diversity. [Attached.] Rosse reported the following:
  - To item 6, the Regents’ change adds the language “specifically including faculty diversity of political, intellectual, and philosophical perspectives,” and removes the language “including diversity of political, geographic, cultural, intellectual, and philosophical perspectives.”
  - The general feeling among Faculty Council members is that, while inclusion of political and intellectual diversity could continue to be
included, the inclusion of the word “faculty” in the sentence is unnecessary, and that the sentence as written defines ‘diversity’ in an overly restrictive way. Some are in favor of changing the language to conform to the Regent’s existing laws on diversity.

- Some Faculty Council members felt the use of the word “promote” in conjunction with the changes is troubling if it established a ‘diversity’ criterion for faculty hires similar to merit. For example, consider a worst-case scenario in which the best qualified candidate for a position is turned away because of not adding to the diversity of his or her respective unit. The Regent’s laws already include a non-discrimination policy.

Comments from the assembly included the difficulty of ascertaining a potential candidate’s political or intellectual affiliation if it’s not pertinent to their discipline, and that ‘sustainability’ should be added as one of the University’s guiding principles.

Rosse requested feedback as soon as possible, on how the BFA should respond.

Presidential Search Process

Rosse’s report included the following:

- The Regents’ revisions to the presidential search process are nearing completion.
- The most recent draft of the document seems to clearly distinguish the search committee from the deciding authority, which is the Board of Regents.
- Faculty Council’s recommendation that faculty make up 50% plus one of the search committee membership was not approved. As currently conceived the search committee would include four faculty, one from each campus. Faculty Council has requested an additional faculty member, from Faculty Council.
- The search committee also includes one dean, one regent, one student, two staff, two alumni, and four ‘community members.’
- The revisions require at least five semi-finalists be presented to the Regents for interviews, but do not prevent the committee from naming a sole finalist. If sole finalists are inevitable, the need for a highly credible search committee is clear.
- Major concerns remain.

Comments from the assembly included the following:

- The BFA should voice its strongest objection to the limited role of faculty because it is inconsistent with AAUP guidelines, which include “primary role” language.
- If faculty have a role, it should be proportionate to relative campus size.
- Making representation proportionate to campus size could erode faculty solidarity.
- The BFA should object in its strongest terms to including four ‘community representatives,’ especially since there would be six total, including the two alumni representatives.
- Including CU donors or funders among ‘community members’ or alumni on the committee may present conflicts of interest that ought to be disclosed.
Provost Search –

Rosse reminded the assembly that the search for a new provost for the Boulder campus failed when the sole candidate was not strong. Rosse reported that Chancellor DiStefano requested input on the provost search process, and that a poll of the BFA Executive Committee resulted in divided answers:

Question one: should the campus do an internal search versus a national search to include internal candidates? The Executive Committee has voted four for an internal search, three external, and two undecided.

Question two: should the campus do a fast internal search over the summer so as to have a provost in place for the fall, even though faculty would necessarily have less involvement because of the time of year? If this search were to fail, the campus would know in October or November, at which point an external search could begin. The Executive Committee feels the campus should wait until fall to ensure faculty involvement in the process.

Question three: if the campus uses an external search, should an external search firm be involved? The Executive Committee has voted three yes, three no, and two maybe.

Comments from the assembly included the following:

- The last search may have failed because of starting too late. By the time the campus was ready for interviews, the strongest candidates had been hired by other institutions. If the campus decides to conduct a national search it should begin as soon as possible.
- There should be multiple internal candidates.
- The existing search committee should be reconstituted since it did not present a strong final candidate.
- An internal search will be problematic unless the committee can create a list of strong candidates.
- The campus should use a national search firm, with a clear understanding that there will be internal candidates. The economic and political climate for higher education in Colorado is likely to dissuade qualified candidates, and a search firm will help persuade them to apply.
- Having a dean on the search committee may present a conflict of interest.

Rosse called for a show-of-hands poll, on whether the campus should hire an external search firm to facilitate the search process. 20 voted in favor, 15 opposed.

Faculty Council Election Results

Faculty Council’s new officers are Mark Malone – Chair; Skip Hamilton – Vice Chair; and Bruce Neumann – Secretary.
Approval of final minutes of the year via E-Mail

Rosse asked whether anyone would object to approving today’s minutes via e-mail, to avoid having to approve them in September. There were no objections.

III. Motions for VOTE:

a. BFA-X-M-030810.1, Resolution on Increased Flexibility for Research Salary Increases
   i. Jerry Rudy explained that the research institutes in Boulder have a very different funding stream than main campus, and many of them use very little general fund money. Research Institutes must, however, compete with local private research organizations for highly specialized personnel. This motion is to give administration flexibility to allow the institute directors to make rapid salary decisions as needed.
   ii. Comments included the following:
       1. The institutes and their research scientists bring in their own funding. The motion would cost the institution nothing, while at the same time increasing indirect cost recovery funds.
       2. Historically, institute directors had to come to administration with specific proposals to retain individual personnel, rather than giving a blanket raise.
       3. This motion will add resources to the institution, as the onus will be on the granting agencies to increase salaries.
       4. Faculty have already agreed to take a financial hit in the short term to keep the institution going through the financial crisis. We should ask institute researchers to do the same.
       5. While approval of this motion by the BFA is not necessary to induce administration to act, liberalizing the rules for institute researchers may have the effect of encouraging administration to avoid a third year of zero salary increases for faculty.
   iii. The motion was approved with five opposed.

b. BFA-X-M-030810.2, Motion Regarding the Policy on Class Conflicts and Club Sports
   i. John Toth explained that the Student Affairs committee was asked to address scheduling conflicts for students involved with club sports. The motion is modeled on the existing policy for students involved in intercollegiate athletics. The motion’s purpose is to inform faculty colleagues of their rights, advise students of their responsibilities, clarify roles, and inform faculty of the lack of oversight due to lack of funding.
   ii. There was discussion of enforceability. Toth reported students often have very little notice of having qualified for a particular competition but in spite of that, faculty have the power to respond how they wish.
iii. Toth reminded the assembly that coaches are not allowed to pressure students or to contact faculty directly with requests they allow a student to participate.
iv. The motion was approved with none opposed.

c. BFA-X-M-032910, Motion to Request Amendment of Honor Constitution I.2.c.ii.
i. Eckart Schutrumpf explained that the motion is to clarify that the Honor Council’s role is as a fact-finding body, and the privilege of imposing academic sanctions rests with the faculty.
ii. There was a brief discussion.
iii. The motion was approved with none opposed.

d. BFA-X-M-041910—Motion Supporting a Weapon-Free University
i. Eckart Schutrumpf reported that, ever since the Colorado Court of Appeals ruled that Colorado’s Concealed Carry Act applies to University campuses, the Faculty Affairs Committee has heard considerable concerns from faculty that many people will now carry concealed weapons on campus. This motion is to ask the University to “take action to maintain the weapon-free status of the university.” The graduate student government has passed a motion in support of this motion, and the Retired Faculty Association has passed its own motion in favor of banning firearms on campus.
ii. There was discussion that the ‘action’ the motion contemplates includes appealing the Appeals Court’s decision to Colorado’s Supreme Court, and also asking the state legislature to pass new legislation to impose a weapons-ban on the campuses of all educational institutions in the state.
iii. The motion was approved with one opposed.

IV. BFA Election

BFASecretary Sheila Scanlon took the floor to conduct the annual election of officers and standing committee representatives.

a. Boulder Faculty Assembly Officer Elections
   i. There were no nominations from the floor.
   ii. All candidates for officer positions ran unopposed.
   iii. Following the balloting, the election results were as follows:
       1. Chair: Joe Rosse
       2. Vice Chair: Ahmed White
       3. Secretary: John Toth
       4. Executive Committee Members At Large (two positions):

b. Boulder Faculty Assembly Standing Committee Elections
   i. There were no nominations from the floor.
   ii. There were contested elections for two of the committees.
iii. Following the balloting, the election results were as follows:

1. Academic Affairs Committee
   a. Austin Allen, Architecture
   b. Mathew Cleveland, PWR
   c. Carmen Grace, French and Italian
   d. Andreas Hoenger, MCD Biology
2. Administrative Services and Technology Committee
   a. Adam Norris, Applied Math
   b. Karen Ramirez, Sewall-RAP
3. Administrator Appraisal Committee
   a. Andrew Cooperstock, Music
   b. Elizabeth Skewes, Journalism
   c. Roger King, Computer Science
   d. Page Moreau, Business
4. Budget and Planning Committee
   a. Jeff Mitton, EBIO
   b. Bella Mody, Journalism
   c. Artemi Romanov, GSLL
   d. Jerry Rudy, Psychology
5. Bylaws Committee
   a. Antonia Green, Spanish and Portuguese
   b. Grazziana Lazzarino, French and Italian
   c. Karl Mueller, Geological Sciences
   d. Mark Squillace, Law
6. Diversity Committee
   a. Ernesto Acevedo-Munoz, Film Studies
   b. Austin Allen, Architecture
   c. Melinda Piket-May, Electrical Engineering
7. Faculty Affairs Committee
   a. Martin Walter, Mathematics
8. Intercollegiate Athletics Committee
   a. Elizabeth Bradley, Computer Science
   c. Anne Sheehan, Geological Sciences
9. Student Affairs Committee
   a. Andrew Calabrese, Journalism

V. New Business

Squillace suggested the BFA consider implementing an on-line resource, such as a blog, to try to replace the functions once served by the Silver and Gold Record. Squillace volunteered to set up a blog for the BFA.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen, new BFA Coordinator.