MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
April 18, 2011

Attending
Joe Rosse, BFA Chair
Ahmed White, BFA Vice Chair
John Toth, BFA Secretary, BFA Student Affairs Committee 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
Claudia Mills, BFA Administrator Appraisal Committee Representative
Karen Ramirez, BFA Administrative Services & Technology Committee Chair
Paul Chinowsky, BFA Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
David Kassoy, Retired Faculty Association Representative
Uriel Nauenberg, Former BFA Chair
Horst Mewes, Arts and Sciences Council Chair
Bill Kaempfer, Vice Provost, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning
Sierra Swearingen, BFA Coordinator

Special Guests
Corey Bruner, Student Chair of the Honor Council
Jamal Ward, Director, Office of Student Conduct
Rebecca Bari, Honor Code Office Manager
Frank Bruno, Vice Chancellor for Administration
Philip Simpson, Campus Planner, Assistant Director for Facilities Planning
Megan Rose, Communications Specialist for Planning, Design, and Construction

Not Attending
Susan Moore, BFA Diversity Committee Chair
Marki LeCompte, BFA Faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee Chair
Elizabeth Bradley, BFA Intercollegiate Athletics Committee Chair
Martha Hanna, BFA Libraries Committee Chair
Andrew Poppe, President, United Government of Graduate Students (UGGS)
Anthony De La Rosa, CU Student Union Liaison (CUSG)

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee held its regular meeting on Monday, March 14, 2011, in ATLAS room 229. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:00 and adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

I. Chair’s Report
   A. Rosse distributed plaques of appreciation to BFA Officers and At-Large Executive Committee representatives, and certificates of appreciation to the BFA’s Committee Chairs of 2010-2011, and expressed thanks for their service.
   B. AVC for Budget and Planning Steve McNally has reporteded that all the
Chancellors and the President have asked the Regents to support faculty salary increases. Faculty have received no raises in 34 months.

i. Discussion included that CU should promote its efficiency:
   1. CU is almost entirely self-supporting. The money it brings to the state in tuition, fees, research, and services far exceed its state’s allocation.
   2. State income tax and sales tax on CU employees also exceeds the state’s allocation.

C. CU continues to consider tuition benefits for dependents of faculty and staff.

D. Schools in the Pacific-12 conference are considering a tuition reciprocity agreement.

E. The Campus is anticipating a 3 to 4% increase in parking fees for next year.

II. Proposed Honor Code Constitution Revisions

Rosse welcomed Corey Bruner, student Chair of the Honor Council and Jamal Ward, Director of the Office of Student Conduct.

Rosse announced that the issue of the faculty’s prerogative to assign grades remains unresolved: particularly troubling is the situation where a faculty member does not accept the Honor Council’s determination that a student is not responsible and issues a grade inconsistent with it. Rosse added that today’s discussion should therefore focus on whether the Code is clear enough, and how to deal with disagreements.

Discussion followed, including the following reports and perspectives:

• Bruner reported that the Honor Constitution does not require academic sanctions (grades) to match the Honor Code Hearing Panels’ determinations, but that CU Legal Counsel has requested that words to that affect not be included in the Constitution.

• Several requests were made:
   o That the Constitution state clearly that faculty members are encouraged but not required to report cases of academic dishonesty to the Honor Code system.
   o That faculty from the relevant academic discipline assist in each specific Honor Code case, to ensure that standards within that discipline are considered.
   o That where a student is found not responsible the record be retained for a longer time to allow the reporting faculty member to review it; and that the Code more clearly notify faculty that the record will be expunged, so they can keep copies.
   o That the deadlines for faculty responses and appeals be significantly extended.
   o That the Honor Code website include a section to help faculty understand what to expect, for example typical cases and their typical sanctions.

• The problem of faculty non-participation in hearings was discussed. It was proposed that, where a faculty member does not appear the case should not proceed.

• There were several requests that the Constitution make clear beyond doubt that Faculty retain control of grading. Rosse suggested reviving the language of the February 2001 draft of the Honor Code that “Faculty have exclusive control over the grading process.”

• It was recommended that the process be clearly identified in the Constitution as “advisory to the faculty member,” similar to existing language that the process is “advisory to the Dean” with regard to suspensions and expulsions.
The crucial points that the Executive Committee reinforced were -

- That faculty have exclusive control of the grading process.
- That the Honor Council is to advise faculty members, if requested, where there has been an accusation of academic dishonesty.
- That the Constitution should ‘encourage’ faculty participation, instead of requiring it or using language to that effect.

Bruner asserted that the Honor Code will work better when cheating is always reported, so that investigators can easily determine which students have a history of cheating. There followed a request that the Honor Code make clear what the benefit is to the faculty, of reporting cheating.

Rosse thanked Bruner and Ward.

III. Special Recognition

Nauenberg commended outgoing BFA Chair Joe Rosse for his service as Chair over the last two years, and presented him with a plaque of appreciation.

IV. Discussion: Master Plan

Rosse Welcomed Vice Chancellor for Administration Frank Bruno, Campus Planner Phil Simpson, and Megan Rose, Communications Specialist for Planning, Design, and Construction.

A question and answer period followed, including these individual perspectives:

- A concern was voiced that East Campus buildings should match the architectural style of main campus. Simpson noted that the plan is to use brick in all future East Campus buildings, to maintain a uniform style.
- UCB has space needs in every category, including research, instruction, and housing. The Master Plan is predicated on an analysis that the Campus cannot afford to build enough to meet the existing needs. Facilities is therefore working on a new version of the capital list of space needs, which will include many of the same needs that have been on previous versions of that list. The campus has been talking with the Regents about how to direct funding to address those needs.
- Recreation space needs may be partially met by the recent CUSG vote to renovate and expand the Student Rec Center. Athletic fields remain an issue, but knocking down older student housing, such as Smiley Court, will help alleviate that pressure.
- Other, specific needs include an auditorium for use by the Admissions Department.
- At an institution like CU Boulder, housing, athletics, and research can all fund construction projects, but academics cannot. Administration is very concerned about how to resolve that situation, and reduce the pressure for academic space.

Rosse thanked Bruno, Simpson, and Rose for their participation.

V. Discussion: Instructor Status Reforms

Rosse reported that the BFA Faculty Affairs Committee has been reviewing two documents that
touch on instructor status issues: (1) the revised Instructor Guidelines document (informally known as IBOR), and (2) the response from the Division of Academic Affairs to the BFA Task Force’s recommendations.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Chair Paul Chinowsky reported the following:

- The main challenge to the Division of Academic Affairs’ response to the BFA’s Instructor Status Motion is a proposed component that would require a fifth-year review for instructors that would result in either promotion or non-renewal. FAC’s concerns also include how the campus would manage: (1) existing instructors who are not interested in promotion, and (2) budget issues, given that some departments rely on instructors more heavily than others.
- FAC agrees that standard, multi-year contracts across campus are an important step towards employment equity for instructors.

Discussion followed, including these perspectives:

- The IBOR is a worthwhile attempt to standardize treatment but it lacks an enforcement mechanism. A relatively high-up supervisory office would supply that component.
- The 5th year ‘promotion or non-renewal’ review is not discerning enough to allow for differences between units in terms of their needs.
- The Boulder Campus employs instructors in four contexts: (1) in departments with just one or two, (2) in the Residential Academic Programs, (3) in the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (which employs about 70 of the Boulder Campus’ 314 instructors), and (4) the language departments. Instructors play different roles in each of these four contexts. Standardizing treatment is therefore problematic. The instructor Task Force had recommended that, if instructor tenure was not a possibility or would take too long to realize, a career track was called for instead: if an instructor has experience and has done well as an instructor, he or she deserves a promotion.
- A standardized career track across campus, with an oversight component, would not have to include the ‘promotion or nonrenewal’ provision. Units are already expected to give instructors a chance at promotion after six years, but it is not always followed.
- There was discussion of whether the ‘promotion or non-renewal’ component would result in mass non-renewals, and the conclusion was it would not have to. For example Arts and Sciences has more than 200 instructors, about 90 of which are Sr. Instructors.
- Units are already expected to review instructors annually.

Chinowsky reported that the FAC is interested in meeting with Vice Provost Kaempfer and AVC for Faculty Affairs Jeff Cox to develop a practical plan to address these issues.

Rosse reported that the FAC can report at the April 28th BFA meeting but there may not be enough time to pass a resolution. He announced that there will be an additional Executive Committee meeting in the first week of May to wrap up this item as well as a few others.

VI.  Adjournment. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:41.