I. Chair’s Report, BFA Chair Joe Rosse

Rosse’s report included the following:

- **Enrollment.** UCB’s fiscal year 2011 budget projection was based on 5,215 freshmen. The class is estimated at 5,150. Most of the gap is slots for in-state students.

- **Budget.** This is the first year that ERA funds are not available (Economic Recovery Act). Last year because so many facts were unknown the Campus expended significant energy on non-viable scenarios. This year the campus will wait to start the discussion until December when the State’s tax revenue report will be available.

- **Voluntary System of Accountability (“VSA”).** Faculty concerns with VSA include its principle, its “CLA” test, and its methodology. The BFA has invited Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Michael Grant to talk about VSA at the December BFA meeting. VSA is underway: students are being tested this month.¹

¹ VSA tests freshmen and seniors nationally, to attempt to provide parents with a metric of school quality.
• Internationalization. Dean of Arts and Sciences Todd Gleeson will chair a task force on this issue. Moore volunteered the BFA Diversity Committee to work with the Task Force, and suggested partnering with the Diversity Summit this November.
• Arts and Sciences Council. The BFA Chair has met with the ASC Chair to discuss ways to improve interaction between the two groups.
• Athletic Department costs and revenues’ impact on the budget. The BFA’s Intercollegiate Athletics and BFA Budget and Planning Committees are preparing a report. The BFA will invite Athletic Director Mike Bohn to a BFA meeting this fall.

Discussion followed. Bradley clarified that the campus created the CU-Boulder Athletics Board (CU-BAB) to address matters of Athletics Department policy and budget, but it has lost steam due to its Chair having left CU. The BFA's Athletics Committee normally concerns itself with matters related to academics, not policy. Bradley reported that the BFA Athletics Committee is unanimous that a single merged committee would be far less effective than the current IAC/BAB system.

II. Minutes Approval Process

Swearingen reported that neither the BFA’s Bylaws nor Robert’s Rules of Order require a vote to approve minutes. The Executive Committee agreed that the BFA should henceforth approve minutes on a “no objections” basis. In the future the BFA office will distribute drafts of minutes via e-mail, with a note that recipients should “reply within three business days with corrections, [and] if none, the minutes will be deemed final and approved for distribution.” The corrected minutes for August 30, 2010 were therefore deemed approved.

The Executive Committee agreed to vet drafts of minutes of full BFA meetings for the time being, before the BFA office asks the full BFA to review them, to improve accuracy.

III. Committee Report – Nominating and Elections Committee

Committee Chair John Toth reported that he will conduct a short election at the end of the October BFA meeting, to elect a BFA member to the Budget and Planning Committee.

IV. Chancellor Phil DiStefano – Provost Search

Rosse welcomed Chancellor DiStefano.

DiStefano announced he must make a decision this month on how to proceed towards hiring a new Provost. He described two options: (1) starting another national search this year, or (2) appoint Interim Provost Russell Moore to a term appointment, to be followed by an evaluation and perhaps a national search a year from now. He continued that national searches are costly and time intensive, but they draw from the broadest possible base of candidates. He added that now is not the best time for a national search because UCB is working on several major projects including a possible budget reduction, searches for Law School and Business School deans, and the program discontinuance of the Journalism School.
DiStefano requested guidance from the Executive Committee. Discussion included the following:

- Many institutions are struggling to find good candidates at this time and have hired internally as a result. The economy may be to blame for the small number of candidates.
- The Campus should hire a candidate who is already familiar with the special challenges presented by Colorado’s unique political environment.
- DiStefano reported that, if he decides to offer a term appointment to Professor Moore, his title would not be “Interim,” but would involve only a one year commitment.
- Many argued for a longer commitment, two or three years, in part to allow Moore to develop an agenda for the campus rather than acting as a mere ‘placeholder.’
- Internal searches are problematic because of the danger of ending with a single candidate, and because of the harm to candidates who are not selected.
- The process should be transparent, to avoid an impression that faculty are not consulted.
- The Chancellor’s active role with fundraising emphasizes the need to hire a Provost who is already familiar with the campus and can “hit the ground running.”
- There was consensus that the campus should offer a 3-year term appointment to Professor Moore, rather than starting a new search this year.

Rosse thanked the Chancellor for seeking input from faculty.

V. Discussion: CU Foundation’s Appearance at Upcoming BFA Meeting

Chancellor DiStefano reported the CU Foundation will be announcing a new capital campaign early next semester. Rosse reported that CU Foundation President and C.E.O. Wayne Hutchens will speak at the BFA meeting of October 7th, and requested discussion on topics the BFA should ask the Foundation to address.

Discussion included the following:

- The current fund-raising process makes deans is responsible for developing campaign goals. Faculty should be more involved in the new campaign.
- A bigger faculty role would improve the poor public perception of what faculty does.
- Involvement of faculty is crucial to promoting projects with potential donors.
- How much fund-raising is oriented toward individual departments, and how much of the money will go directly to departments? Students want to give to their departments, for example, and their positive feelings for their former departments seem to be untapped.
- The Foundation is working on a communication plan to prepare academic units to reach their alumni and to help them prepare information on giving opportunities in advance.
- An issue with increased fundraising is how the campus can maintain its independence.
- UCB has a very small set of endowments compared to peer institutions. Increasing UCB’s endowment is crucial to its success in the long term.
- In the new campaign the Provost, working with the Deans, will determine which faculty will be involved with each fund-raising project.

Rosse thanked the Chancellor for his participation in the discussion. The Chancellor thanked the Executive Committee for its input into the Provost selection process.

There followed an open-forum strategy session on the individual recommendations of the BFA’s resolution of last Spring, BFA-X-M-022210 [appended to these minutes], to determine which steps remain to be taken, what checks can ensure the campus continues to implement them, and which BFA committee or committees should take on individual items.

Rosse commented that the recommendations fall into in three categories –

(1) Do a better job of what the campus already does. The recommendations in this category will require working closely with Jeff Cox, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs. A broader issue is how to ensure the cooperation of deans and department chairs.

(2) Actions the BFA can take on its own, such as item 1G.

(3) “Instructor tenure,” recommendation 3A.

Discussion followed, including the following:

• The BFA Faculty Affairs Committee, or a sub-committee, should take up item 1G.

• The BFA could use the program review process to steer units on a one-at-a-time basis. It takes the campus 7 years to get to every department but once an expectation is part of the process, units have a permanent duty to respond to it on an annual basis.

• Options for checking on progress more frequently could include an annual questionnaire to the units, an annual BFA discussion, an annual survey of instructors, and more serious actions for less responsive units.

• The Faculty Affairs Committee could gather a library of units’ bylaws.

• Going public with a list of ‘problem units’ may not be advisable: it’s better to report the BFA’s findings to the Chancellor and ask him to provide consequences and incentives.

• Recommendation 1A echoes the Chancellor’s letter following the previous year’s task force, which asked the Division of Faculty Affairs to draft a model set of instructors’ bylaws. The BFA Faculty Affairs Committee should work with Jeff Cox, the Vice Chancellor of Faculty Affairs, to develop the model bylaws.

• Rosse asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to develop a rough plan of action and be prepared to report on it at the next Executive Committee meeting [October 4th].

On recommendation 3A, Rosse reported that Faculty Council and others have been discussing Legal Counsel’s memo. Many have questioned the accuracy of the memo and the applicability of the statute, asking if there are alternative ways of approaching instructors’ concerns. Faculty Council has referred the matter to its Personnel, and its Educational Policy and University Standards (EPUS) Committees.

Discussion followed. The Committee agreed to continue its discussion at its next meeting.

VII. Adjournment. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

Respectfully submitted by Sierra Swearingen-Todd, BFA Coordinator.
Boulder Faculty Assembly
Executive Committee
Motion to Endorse the Recommendations of the
BFA Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Status
BFA-X-M-022210

The Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee moves that the BFA endorse, and request the UCB Administration to implement, the following recommendations from the BFA Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Status (Report and Recommendations from the BFA Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Instructors):

**Clarification and enforcement of current policy.** These recommendations speak to many of the concerns about the status accorded to instructors and the sometimes negative climate in which they work:

1A: A firm requirement for departments to update and adhere to by-laws with respect to broad participation of instructors in unit affairs.
1B: All instructor letters of agreement (aka contracts) should consider workload requirements in ways that allow for performance and evaluation of service.
1C: Treatment of instructors (and other non-tenure-track faculty) must be a specific and required aspect of performance reviews of department chairs, program directors, and deans.
1D: Conflict resolution services and grievance procedures should be responsive to the needs of instructors.
1E: Each unit should put in place a system of instructor mentoring.
1F: Any lecturer who has taught at 50% or more for at least three years should be considered by the unit for appointment as a rostered instructor; the school/college and campus administration should assist the unit in making this change possible.
1G: The Boulder Faculty Assembly, in concert with the Office of Faculty Affairs, is charged with reporting regularly on the status and conditions of instructors, and on the implementation and coordination of policies pertaining to instructors.

**Contractual issues in employment and career management.** These pragmatic recommendations call upon existing policy and administrative tools that could be used more effectively and proactively.

2A: The campus must develop a climate of meaningful review for instructors that goes beyond current practices.
2B: The campus must clarify the distinction between instructor and senior instructor, regularize procedures for what should be a rigorous review, and offer rewards for this promotion.
2C: The non-renewal of an instructor’s contract should be related to one of three causes: poor performance, major programmatic change, or financial exigency; in the event of a non-renewal that does not meet this test, the unit should lose the instructor line.
2D: In the event of program discontinuance, the campus should make every effort to relocate instructors and senior instructors to other units; should program discontinuance require the termination of instructors or senior instructors, the campus must provide those Senior Instructors as well as those Instructors who have served seven or more years of full-time service or its equivalent to the University who have been identified in any plan for termination with one year of notice before termination.

2E: We recommend the active use of differential workloads as a tool for more effective instructor career management.

2F: The Committee urges campus administration in the strongest possible terms to reject a proposal for uncompensated workload increases, as they have an enormous negative effect not only on individual instructors but also on the status and climate for instructors, on the quality of undergraduate education, and on the very institutional initiatives that the campus seeks to preserve and develop.

2G: To the full extent permitted by law, the campus should offer long-term (multi-year), presumptively renewable contracts to both instructors and senior instructors.

2H: The campus should make high performing senior instructors eligible for an annual update or resetting of the terminal date of a multi-year letter of agreement (aka contract).

2I: The campus should award the title of “Senior Instructor of Distinction” to a subset of highly qualified senior instructors.

2J: Utilizing existing tenure guidelines, the campus should permit exceptionally qualified senior instructors to access tenured or tenure-track appointments through a process of line conversion.

**Instructor tenure as provided through the creation of a new series of faculty ranks.** This recommendation requires approval at the system level and a change in the Laws of the Regents.

3A: The Boulder Faculty Assembly and the campus administration should initiate discussions with the other campuses and with Faculty Council that would consider the merits of creating, with regential approval, new tenure-track ranks for teaching faculty, with the same differentiation in ranks (asst., assoc., full professor) as for research faculty, but with the designation “teaching professor” or some equivalent term. The current ranks of Instructor and Senior Instructor would continue. Both current faculty and future hires would themselves determine whether or not to pursue a tenured-tenure track teaching position or to apply for an advertised tenure-tenure track teaching position.
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