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Attending
Joe Rosse, BFA Chair
Ahmed White, BFA Vice Chair
Bill Emery, BFA At-Large Executive Committee Member
Melinda Piket-May, BFA At-Large Executive Committee Member
Carmen Grace, BFA Academic Affairs Committee Chair
Page Moreau, BFA Administrator Appraisal Committee Representative
Karen Ramirez, BFA Administrative Services & Technology Committee Chair
Susan Moore, BFA Diversity Committee Co-Chair
Paul Chinowsky, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
Elizabeth Bradley, BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Chair
Martha Hanna, BFA Libraries Committee Chair
David Kassoy, Retired Faculty Association Representative
Uriel Nauenberg, Former BFA Chair
Horst Mewes, Arts and Sciences Council Chair
Anthony De La Rosa, CU Student Union Liaison (CUSG)
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
Sierra Swearingen, BFA Coordinator

Guests
Frances Draper, Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Communications

Not Attending
Jerry Rudy, BFA Budget and Planning Committee Chair
Marki LeCompte, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Chair
John Toth, BFA Secretary, BFA Student Affairs Committee Chair
Andrew Poppe, President, United Government of Graduate Students (UGGS)

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, February 28, 2011, in ATLAS room 229. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report
   A. CU will implement a new travel system at the end of the semester. The new system is a module of Concur. It uses a single vendor, selected by a competitive process, in a move to get less expensive fares. The system will be available 24 hours per day.
   B. The Campus began a ‘tenure medals’ program last year to recognize faculty when they achieve tenure. This year the Campus decided all tenured faculty should have a medal, and asked Deans and Department Chairs to present the medals at a suitable event. Faculty are asked to wear their medals at Commencement.
C. The Campus continues to use a budget model that includes faculty salary increases in the 2-3% range, contingent on funds availability. If cuts are more severe than currently projected, priority is to give raises to faculty first, then to professional exempt staff. There will be no increase for Classified Staff this year as their salaries are in the hands of the State, and they may see a decrease in take home pay as their contributions to PERA are likely to increase. Rosse has asked the Compensation and Benefits Committee to review the issues presented by this situation.

D. Larry Levine, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and CIO, has presented the Campus with a new IT Strategic Plan. Changes include:
   i. CU Learn is being replaced by a new system called Desire To Learn (D2L), effective next Fall, after a pilot project conducted this summer.
   ii. The Campus is looking at replacing the phone system with an integrated voice/data/video system in the next few years.
   iii. The E-Memo system is to be retired and replaced.
   iv. CU will move to a standardized, single vendor system for new PCs for administrative staff, to lower costs and ease maintenance.

E. The Chancellor and the Provost have been briefed on faculty concerns with the recent addition of weekend football games on campus. The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee is preparing a set of recommendations to help minimize resulting disruptions to the campus.

II. Introduction of Frances Draper, Assoc. Vice Chancellor for Strategic Communications

Rosse introduced Frances Draper.

Her opening comments included the following:

- Draper has been tasked with working to bring strategic communications in alignment with the Flagship 2030 plan and CU-Boulder’s individual units, to share good news about CU in a more consistent way.
- University Communications will hold a strategic planning retreat soon to develop goals and avenues for successful communication both internally and externally, which it will then share with the BFA, both for information and to get feedback.
- University Communications is exploring fundraising opportunities to support some advertising, coordinating with the other campuses if possible to ensure fair distribution of exposure and funding.
- Draper would like to improve University Communications’ strategic alignment with faculty governance, and asked to speak at a BFA meeting to improve mutual understanding of priorities, and existing communication networks and tools.

Discussion followed, including these perspectives:

- All of Higher Education in the State should get involved in promoting the importance of the State’s investment in Higher Education. Without a major initiative to let the taxpayers know the positive economic impact of their investment, the public has no reason not to disinvest in Higher Education, and in CU.
- Draper reported that University Communications is working with Larry Levine, AVC for Information Technology, to improve UCB’s on-line presence. The purpose is not to
supplant good sites that departments have developed on their own, but to give them the opportunity to participate in a more robust site design if they need it, with powerful web-based tools for community development. Draper offered to report to the BFA on that initiative when it is more developed.

- Draper reported that University Communications will make a presentation to the research communicator’s group, which involves faculty from research departments across campus. The presentation will address effective use of stories coming out of the research departments including a discussion of which are newsworthy, what is good public relations material, and how to differentiate between them.
- Draper acknowledged a need to improve communication between University Communications and faculty and offered to meet regularly with the BFA’s new Communications Committee on goals, strategy, and tactics for effective communication.
- One committee member asked whether promoting the negative impact on Colorado families of the State’s dwindling contribution to CU, such as increased student debt and lack of access, should be part of CU’s outreach efforts.
- Draper reported that changing the public’s attitude will be very difficult. Surveys of Colorado citizens have shown that they generally think:
  - that the State’s budget continues to grow when in fact it has shrunk; and
  - that the State should continue to cut taxes and either reduce services or ‘just figure it out.’
- Several committee members commented that CU’s various P.R. professionals, even some that are highly placed, seem to have negative concepts around the importance of faculty and its contribution to improved communications both internally and externally. Draper asserted her position that the faculty (and therefore students) are the reason the University exists and that her goal is to make sure the environment for faculty is one that supports an extremely positive image of the University and the work of the faculty.

### III. Discussion: BFA Ad-Hoc Committee on University Outreach

Rosse reported that Faculty Council has called for nominations from all of CU’s campuses for its Communications committee. Three BFA members have expressed an interest in serving on that committee: Melinda Piket-May, Frank Beer, and Deward Walker.

In the meantime Rosse requested discussion on whether the BFA should proceed with creating its own BFA Committee on University Outreach. He also asked whether the new committee should be ad-hoc or standing, and whether the committee should focus on external outreach, internal outreach, or both.

Discussion followed:
- The Executive Committee agreed to proceed with an Ad-Hoc Committee for now to establish the focus and operations of the committee, perhaps laying the groundwork for a more permanent committee. Professors David Kassoy, Melinda Piket-May, Frank Beer, and Deward Walker will comprise its initial membership. Three of these (Piket-May, Beer, and Walker) are also new members of the new Faculty Council Communications committee.
- Draper offered to assist the new BFA Outreach Committee to develop a system of
networked communications. Draper expressed her intention to involve faculty by developing an inventory of research that can be used to provide timely interviews and other information for various media outlets, such as NPR. Elizabeth Bradley added on a related note that the BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee has proposed using the Folsom Stadium boards to showcase faculty achievements during football games.

- Rosse asked Melinda Piket-May to Chair the new BFA Ad-hoc Outreach Committee, meet with AVC Draper, and set up a plan for next year.

Draper encouraged communication about further ideas, to be forwarded to her at Frances.Draper@colorado.edu. The Committee thanked Draper for her attendance.

IV. Discussion: Pending Resolution of the BFA Diversity Committee

Co-Chair Susan Moore provided a handout of a substitute resolution titled Motion on BFA Support for Issues of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and asked for the Executive Committee’s input.

Discussion followed, including concepts around how the motion ought to be distributed, whether its distribution should be a part of the motion, whether other ‘deliverables’ should be included, and whether and to what extent the motion imposes new responsibilities on faculty.

Moore reported the Diversity Committee will meet Wednesday morning at 9:00 to generate a final draft, and will bring the final draft as a substitute motion to March 3rd BFA meeting.

V. Committee Updates

Rosse reported that the Deans have requested feedback on two initiatives for their meeting tomorrow: (1) Academic Affairs’ response to the BFA’s Motion on Instructor Status, and (2) input on the Professors of Practice proposal.

Faculty Affairs Committee Chair Paul Chinowsky reported the Committees’ reactions to both.

On the topic of Instructor Status, Chinowsky reported that:

- Academic Affairs’ response recommends a system whereby all instructors are hired on a three-year letter of offer, which is renewable once, with a review in the fifth year for consideration as a Senior Instructor. Those that do not pass the review are not renewed.
- The Faculty Affairs Committee supports the plan but requested clarifications:
  - How would the system handle existing long-term instructors? Would they all be subject to review in a single year, and how would the Campus manage the budgetary impact if they are all promoted at once?
  - How will the system manage instructors that do not wish to be Senior Instructors?
  - How is “long term” defined?
  - [An Executive Committee member asked] how will the new system handle instructors that want to take a break, for example for parental leave?

Discussion followed, including:
• whether the new system should include an oversight office and a uniform set of expectations for roles of the various reviewing and hiring authorities; and
• whether the grievance process should be centralized to avoid having Department Chairs in charge of grievances, but also in charge of fifth-year Senior Instructor reviews.
• Vice Provost Kaempfer reported that of the approximately 300 instructors on campus about 45% of them are already Senior Instructors.

On the topic of Professors of Practice, Chinowsky reported that:
• The basic structure of the proposed Professor of Practice position is:
  o it is similar to and with the same kinds of rights as an instructor or Senior Instructor, for example they would be at-will employees;
  o it is to be filled by professionals from outside Higher Education and the “Professor of Practice” title is meant to acknowledges their expertise; and
  o it has an equivalent rank concept as a full professor but without the privileges.
• The Faculty Affairs Committee discussed the proposal and developed a list of concerns:
  o Is the new position’s purpose merely to allow units to “sell” academic appointments in exchange for corporate donations?
  o The qualifications for hires are unclear. Would the new position allow units to install ‘professors’ that have no writing or publication record, thereby putting departments’ reputations at risk?
  o Would Professors of Practice, in terms of opinion and prestige, be above Assistant and Associate Professors?
  o The proposal should include a set of ‘typical’ qualifications for hires. Should there be a consistent set of standards for qualifications across campus? If so, who would make that determination?
  o At which level would hiring decisions be made?

Discussion followed, including these individual perspectives:
• Departments should have the independent ability to improve their academic programs by the addition of this type of professional to the roster. Using one department’s experience as an example, Mechanical Engineering hired a project manager from IBM to assist in the development of successful academic programs that involve senior-level, experiential learning. That professional was hired as and remains an instructor because that was the only designation available at the time.
• One of the reasons the ‘adjunct’ designation may not be effective to hire this type of faculty is that adjuncts are not regular employees and not eligible for benefits.
• The powers of the Dean’s offices vary between units. Would some Deans be able to install Professors of Practice without regard to faculty concerns, while others are not?

The Executive Committee agreed that Rosse should share today’s discussion with the Dean’s Council on March 1st, but note that the Committee has not fully vetted the Professors of Practice proposal and plans to continue that discussion.

VI. Adjournment. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.