MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
February 08, 2010

Attending
Joe Rosse
Ahmed White
Sheila Scanlon
Carmen Grace
Jerry Rudy
Susan Moore
Liz Bradley
Ned Friedman
Dave Kassoy
Bill Kaempfer
Andrew Poppe

Invited Guests:
Barbara Todd, UCB Registrar
Kevin MacLennan, Director of Admissions
Anne Heinz, Dean, Continuing Education

Documents:
• Bylaws Committee memorandum
• Proposed Amendments to the Bylaws
• Proposed Amendments to the Standing Rules

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, February 08, 2010, in ATLAS 229. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:05 and adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes from January 25, 2010. The minutes were approved.

II. Chair’s Report

a. Joe reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Instructor Status will be sending him its final report on February 17 and that the February 22 Executive Committee meeting will be dedicated to reviewing and discussing that report. He said that University Counsel John Sleeman has not completed the “at-will” opinion and that Sleeman would give no estimate on when it would be done.

III. Update on ISIS issues: Barbara Todd, Registrar, and Kevin MacLennan, Director of Admissions
a. Barb Todd discussed issues relating to current and impending roll-outs of the new Integrated Student Information System.
b. Kevin MacLennan described the problems that admissions has experienced in going live with the new system.

IV. Budget Update: Vice Provost Bill Kaempfer
a. Vice Provost Kaempfer reported on the process and timeline for determining campus budget reductions. He stated that throughout December he, along with Senior Vice Chancellor Ric Porreca and Provost Stein Sture, met with all the individual deans and division heads as well as the heads of non-academic units on campus to identify possible areas of reduction in each unit. Following these meetings with the unit heads, they developed a strategy and timeline for making reduction decisions. By the third week of February, Senior Vice Chancellor Porreca, Provost Sture, Vice Provost Kaempfer, and Campus Controller Steve McNally will have met again with individual deans, etc., and will tell them which of the previously suggested reductions can be implemented with a minimum cost to the mission of the University. These reductions will be compiled into a plan that will be discussed with the Council of Deans, the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee (containing several BFA members), and the Chancellor’s Executive Committee in March. The Chancellor will announce the budget reduction plan at a campus forum in mid-April. The final plan will be forwarded to the Board of Regents for consideration at its April 22-23 meeting.
b. Kaempfer said that funding for faculty with signed retirement agreements might be shifted out of the continuing budget and that those lines would disappear. When the university is able to grow its faculty again, it will then be able to make wise strategic decisions about faculty positions.
c. Kaempfer said that budgets may also happen through consolidations and by asking units to give up hard funding for certain things in favor of soft funding.
d. Kaempfer warned that the Regents will expect to see the University give up some things—will want to see things that “are no longer done.”
e. There was discussion about the fact that the process seems to be moving along with very little opportunity for faculty input. Once the decisions are forwarded to the AABAC, it seems there is no opportunity to offer new ideas.
f. There was discussion about the elimination of the Critical Thinking requirement. This was major change in curriculum without any apparent faculty input. Most people found out about it by reading the newspaper. Bill stated that the elimination of this requirement was not related to the specific process he described above.

V. Bylaws Committee “Clean-up” Motions (see attached): Ahmed White
a. Ahmed stated that the motions to amend the Bylaws and the Standing Rules were intended to fix certain technical contradictions and inconsistencies in the current text. He referred to a memorandum describing the nature and purpose of each proposed amendment (see attached).

b. The following amendment to the proposed amendment to the Standing Rules was moved, seconded and adopted: Insert the word “voice” in the proposed amendment to Standing Rules Article VI.1.(k) so that it reads: “provided that, by a voice vote of the majority of voting members present . . .”.

c. The motion to amend the Bylaws was approved unanimously. The motion to amend the Standing Rules was approved as amended unanimously. Both motions will be forwarded to the Assembly.

VI. Discussion regarding “Outreach and Engagement” definition: Anne Heinz, Dean of Continuing Education:

a. Dean Heinz stated that, as part of the Flagship 2030 strategic planning process, UCB is redefining outreach and engagement. The goal is to create a more robust definition that clearly articulates the role and participation of faculty, staff, and students. The outreach and engagement draft definition as of February 4, 2010 is as follows:

At CU-Boulder, we define outreach and engagement as the ways faculty, staff and students collaborate with external groups in mutually beneficial partnerships that are grounded in scholarship and consistent with our role and mission as a comprehensive research university.

For faculty, outreach rooted in scholarship enhances teaching, research, creative work and service while addressing larger societal issues. For students and staff, community engagement and service projects link campus teaching and learning to civic responsibility and community well being. For communities, partnering with CU-Boulder increases the capacity to address important social, economic and cultural issues. At their best, outreach and engagement activities provide significant learning and growth opportunities to faculty, students, staff and partnering communities.

Whether through research projects, teaching activities, civic engagement or service learning, the reciprocal nature of outreach and engagement enriches both our academic mission and the communities we serve.

b. There was a discussion about whether the definition was one of faculty interest rather than community interest and whether it diminished the university’s role of outreach.
c. There was discussion about the fact that the new definition is intended to be a broader inclusion of those members of the university involved with an external audience.

d. The Executive Committee generally approved the definition.

VII. Standing Committee Chairs’ Reports:

a. No time was left for these reports, but Joe exhorted the Chairs to get their items on the agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35.
The Bylaws Committee of the Boulder Faculty Assembly moves to amend the Boulder Faculty Assembly Bylaws as follows:

Bylaws of the Boulder Faculty Assembly

*****

| Article III

*****

Section 3. The officers of the Assembly and Executive Committee Members at Large may be candidates to succeed themselves for a second term. Prior to election for additional terms beyond two to any particular office, officers or Executive Committee Members at Large may not hold that office in the Assembly for a period of at least one year.

*****

| Article V.B.

Section 1. The Standing Committees will be composed of eight faculty and two student members unless otherwise specified by these Bylaws or by the Standing Rules.

From BFA Bylaws Committee: February 8, 2010
Approved by the BFA Executive Committee:
Notice of motion to the BFA:
Approved by the BFA:
The Bylaws Committee of the Boulder Faculty Assembly moves to amend the Boulder Faculty Assembly Standing Rules as follows:

### BFA Standing Rules

#### Article VI. Meetings

##### Section 1. Procedures

- **c) The [Tri-Executives](#) of the UCSU and the [President of the](#) UGGS are invited to attend meetings of the Assembly, and may speak on matters of interest to students when requested to do so by the Chair or by vote of the Assembly.**

- **i) A roll call vote on any issue before the Assembly will be held when requested by three or more voting members present.**

- **j) A secret written ballot on any issue before the Assembly will be held when requested by three or more voting members present.**

- **k) If a roll call vote and a secret written ballot are requested on the same issue pending before the Assembly, and each request receives the support of at least three voting members present, the request for a secret written ballot shall prevail; provided that, by a vote of the majority of voting members present, the Assembly may set aside the request for a secret written ballot in favor of a roll call vote.**

- **l) E-mail votes. [When approved by the Assembly in advance, or upon recommendation from the Executive Committee](#), an e-mail vote may be taken on any matter. The procedures for an e-mail vote shall be established for that vote prior to it being taken. Such procedures shall be devised to effectuate the principle of democratic governance and, further, shall be appropriate to the nature of the matter under consideration.**
From BFA Bylaws Committee: February 8, 2010
Approved by the BFA Executive Committee:
Notice of motion to the BFA:
Approved by the BFA:
MEMORANDUM

To: Boulder Faculty Assembly

From: BFA Bylaws Standing Committee

Subject: Elaboration of Proposed Changes to Bylaws

Date: February 8, 2010

This memorandum will serve to further explain the import of changes to the BFA Bylaws and Standing Rules as proposed in the accompanying motions. The proposed changes concern issues that are largely technical in nature, in that they involve contradictions and inconsistencies in the current text. However, as is inevitably the case, clearing up these difficulties entails some substantive decisions.

The material that follows identifies and describes the difficulty that occasions each proposed change, and then describes the nature of the solution proposed by the Bylaws Committee.

Motion Proposing Amendments to the Bylaws

1. An ambiguity exists between the two sentences that make up Bylaws Article III, Section 3, which states, “The officers of the Assembly and Executive Committee Members at Large may be candidates to succeed themselves for a second term. Prior to election for additional terms beyond two, officers or Executive Committee Members at Large may not hold office in the Assembly for a period of at least one year.”

   The problem is evident in the following scenario: Jane Doe is elected as Secretary in year one. She is elected Vice-Chair in year two. Jane wants to run for reelection to Vice-Chair in year three. While the first sentence gives Jane the right to run for reelection as Vice-Chair, the second sentence seems to prohibit Jane from holding any office in the Assembly for year three.

   The motion proposed by the Bylaws Committee would amend the Bylaws in such a fashion that term limits will be retained with respect to specific positions while not limiting overall years of consecutive service on the Executive Committee.

2. A conflict exists between the Bylaws and the Standing Rules regarding the composition of certain committees. Bylaws Article V(B), Section 1 states, “The Standing Committees will be composed of eight faculty and two student
members unless otherwise specified in these Bylaws.” Five Standing Committees as described in the Standing Rules Article V, Section 1 violate this section of the Bylaws: (1) the Administrator Appraisal Committee, composed of 10 faculty and no student members; (2) the Bylaws Committee, composed of nine faculty and no student members; (3) the Diversity Committee, composed of “a minimum” of eight faculty and can include additional members beyond eight; (4) the Libraries Committee, composed of 22 faculty; and (5) the Nominations and Elections Committee, composed of nine faculty and no student members.

The motion proposed by the Bylaws Committee would amend the Bylaws such that the Bylaws would cohere with the Standing Rules.

Motion Proposing Amendments to the Standing Rules

1. The officers of the UCSU and UGGS organizations are incorrectly titled in the Standing Rules. Article VI, Section 1(c) states, “The Chairs (or Co-Chairs) of the UCSU and the UGGS are invited to attend meetings of the Assembly . . . .” These organizations have Tri-Executives and a President respectively; they do not have Chairs.

   The motion proposed by the Bylaws Committee would amend the Standing Rules to reflect the proper names of the representatives of these bodies.

2. A conflict exists between the Standing Rules calling for roll call and secret votes. Standing Rules Article VI, Section 1(i) states, “A roll call vote on any issue before the Assembly will be held when requested by three or more voting members.” Standing Rules Article VI, Section 1(j) states, “A secret written ballot on any issue before the Assembly will be held when requested by three or more voting members present.”

   The problem is evident in the following scenario: With respect to a motion supporting Instructor Tenure, Jane Doe and two others ask that the vote be taken by secret ballot. John Doe and two others ask that a roll call vote on the motion be held. It is unclear which request holds precedence.

   The motion proposed by the Bylaws Committee would amend the Standing Rules to provide that, in cases of conflict between the two procedures, a request for a secret ballot will take precedence, provided further that in this situation a vote of the majority of voting members present may nonetheless substitute a roll call vote.
3. An ambiguity exists in Standing Rules Article VI, Section 1(k), which states only: “E-mail votes.”

The provision is entirely unclear. It may have originated from the inclusion in the Bylaws of Article VI, Section 3, which states, “When approved by the Assembly in advance, or upon recommendation from the Executive Committee, an e-mail vote may be taken on any matter. The procedures for e-mail voting shall be as provided in the Standing Rules of the Boulder Faculty Assembly.”

The motion proposed by the Bylaws Committee would amend the Standing Rules to provide that e-mail voting procedures shall be developed on an ad hoc basis by the Assembly in such a fashion as best maintains the principle of democracy in voting and any such needs that may be peculiar to the matter with which the vote is concerned.