MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
August 31, 2009

Attending
Joe Rosse
Ahmed White
Bill Emery
Melinda Piket-May
Carmen Grace
Jerry Rudy
Clayton Lewis
Michael Main
Ned Friedman
Dave Kassoy
Bill Kaempfe
Andrew Poppe
Thomas Higginbotham

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, August 31, 2009, in UMC 247. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:05 and adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

- **Guests**
  - Paul Leaf, Campus Architect and Director of Facilities Management
  - Phil Simpson, Facilities Management

- **Documents**
  - Campus Plan Interview Questions
  - AAC memo regarding AAC Policies revisions
  - BFA-X-M-083109 Motion to Adopt Administrator Appraisal Committee Policies Revisions
  - AAC Policies Revisions (w/ track changes)

I. Approval of the Minutes: The Minutes from June 25, 2009 were approved.

II. Chair’s Report:

a. Joe noted the shortage of Executive Committee members from Humanities and asked the Committee take this into account when making decisions.

b. Joe reported that Maureen Ryan has agreed to be parliamentarian for the BFA.

c. Joe asked the Standing Committee Chairs to be prepared discuss their committee agendas at the next Executive Committee meeting.
d. Joe reported that the recently moribund Nominations and Elections Committee would be restored.

e. Joe reported that BFA Officers have been charged with creating an ad hoc committee on instructor issues and stated that the Executive Committee will discuss this next week.

f. Joe reported that Colorado intends to seek a waiver to the Federal Stimulus requirement that, to qualify for federal stimulus funding, Colorado could not cut higher education to levels below what universities received in state funding in 2006.
   i. Bill Kaempfer reported that UCB is not facing any additional rounds of cuts at this time because of backfill money from the stimulus package. This money will replace cuts for two years. This money falls out of the budget in July of 2011.
   ii. Bill Kaempfer reported that pre-census enrollment as of today is approximately 600 above last year. The non-resident undergraduate enrollment has declined by about 13 students, but non-resident graduate enrollment has increased.

g. Joe reported that the CU Faculty Council gave Benson the message that faculty want to be involved in budget decisions.

h. Joe reported that David Skaggs resigned as the Chair of CCHE unexpectedly and the implications of his resignation are unclear at this point.

i. Joe reported that this Thursday’s BFA meeting will include a presentation on H1N1 facts and UCB’s H1N1 plans and policies.

III. Paul Leef and Phil Simpson, Facilities Management: CU Master Plan Workshop
   a. Paul Leef state that UCB is in the “issues identification” phase of the master plan. This will be an iterative and inclusive process. The campus is trying to align the facilities planning with the Flagship 2030 goals. Paul Leef asked the Executive Committee to help distill some of the issues.
   b. The Committee brainstormed facilities issues involving academic life, student life, transit and parking, and other aspects of campus.

IV. Administrator Appraisal Committee: AAC Policies Revisions

Boulder Faculty Assembly
Executive Committee
Motion to Adopt Administrator Appraisal Committee Policies Revisions
BFA-X--M-083109

MOVED that the BFA adopt the following revisions to the Administrator Appraisal Committee Policies:
ADMINISTRATOR APPRAISAL COMMITTEE POLICIES
(revised 8/2009)

1. Purpose

- These policies are intended to guide the process by which the Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) Committee, under the jurisdiction of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA), conducts evaluations of CU-Boulder campus administrators.

   a) Timeline

   - Evaluations shall be conducted in the fall of each year, in time for the AAP Committee’s summary to become part of the administrator’s third- or fifth-year review process. The AAP Committee reports shall be submitted to the BFA Executive Committee by March 1. The BFA Executive Committee should schedule a meeting to receive the reports in the month of March. The Provost should meet with the deans being reviewed in the first 2 weeks of April. The reports shall be posted on the BFA web site by April 15, with an e-mail sent to all faculty members in the university letting them know that the reports have been posted and providing them with the appropriate web link.
   - The AAP Committee will review these policies each year in time for the next evaluation cycle, to determine whether changes to them are necessary.

   b) Positions evaluated

   - Campus-wide: Chancellor; Provost, and Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
   - System-wide: President
   - Deans of schools, colleges, and libraries having a faculty constituency. Evaluated only by raters in the unit, although responses are also solicited from other eligible faculty raters familiar with that dean’s work.
   - The College of Architecture and Planning (A&P) is part of the University of Colorado Denver, but A&P undergraduate students are Boulder campus students, some A&P faculty are housed on the Boulder campus, and the A&P dean is part of the UCB Council of Deans. Presently, the A&P Dean is not evaluated via the BFA Administrator Appraisal Program.

   c) Eligible raters

   - All individuals (except administrators who are being evaluated) with active faculty appointments on the Boulder Campus in any eligible job title are eligible raters. Those on paid leave (e.g., sabbatical) are also eligible raters.

   d) Eligible job titles

   - Regular, tenured and tenure-track, faculty and research faculty
     - Distinguished Professor
     - Professor
     - Associate Professor
     - Assistant Professor
     - Senior Instructor
     - Instructor
     - Research Professor
     - Research Associate Professor
- Research Assistant Professor
- Research Associate and Senior Research Associate, other than post-doctoral fellows
- Other eligible job titles
  - Museum Curator
  - Museum Associate Curator
  - Faculty Chair
  - Faculty Director
  - Institute Director

Ineligible job titles
- Adjoint, Adjunct, Attendant, Clinical, In-residence and Visiting faculty
- Post-doctoral fellows
- Professional Research Assistant and Senior Professional Research Assistant
- Lecturer
- Museum Associate

e) Notes
- The committee may make exceptions to these rules on a case-by-case basis in extraordinary circumstances.
- Final authority for determining eligibility of raters lies with the AAP committee.

f) Materials Provided to Raters
- A letter of invitation and instructions
- A Statement of Achievements and Activities for each administrator being evaluated
- A Satisfaction Survey focused on campus-wide issues and policies
- An Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire focused on the performance of the administrator being evaluated

h) Appraisal Questionnaire Construction
- Prior to each evaluation cycle, the AAP Committee reviews the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire and decides whether to modify, delete, or add items for all administrators being evaluated.
- Administrators being evaluated are offered the opportunity to suggest additional items for the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire. However, the AAP Committee is the final arbiter of what items are included.
- Raters are given the opportunity to evaluate each administrator on the set of common items, as well as on any items provided by the administrator that are included by the AAP Committee.

i) Information Collected from Raters
- Responses to items on the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert-type effectiveness scale (5 = Very Effective, 4 = Effective, 3 = Neither Effective nor Ineffective; 2 = Ineffective, 1 = Very Ineffective), with a response category of “Don't know/not applicable” also included.
Responses to items on the BFA Satisfaction Questionnaire. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert-type satisfaction scale (5 = Very Satisfied, 4 = Satisfied, 3 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 1 = Very Dissatisfied), with a response category of “Don't know/not applicable” also included.

Opportunity is provided on both the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire and on the BFA Satisfaction Questionnaire for raters to submit comments. Instructions to raters clearly state that all comments will be given verbatim (with no editing, including no removal of self-identifiers) to the members of the AAP Committee but will not be seen by anyone else.

Information that is necessary for monitoring response rates (e.g., e-mail address) and that would permit identification of individuals will be kept strictly confidential and disassociated from survey responses prior to data analysis or storage.

### j) Data Collection Methods

- E-mail invitations, with background information on the Administrator Appraisal Program, instructions for participation, and a link to the web-based questionnaires, are sent by the Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis (PBA) to all raters on the same day. These invitations typically are sent in the first half of October.
- Rater’s responses to the items on both questionnaires are collected online by PBA.
- A deadline for responding is provided to raters, which is typically the end of November.
- Approximately 7-10 days after the invitations are mailed, PBA sends a reminder e-mail to all raters who have not yet responded. This e-mail is followed by another reminder, approximately 7-10 days later. Additional reminders may be sent (by e-mail or other means, such as telephone) by PBA or by the AAP Committee Chair and/or members.
- Data collection ends when the response deadline has passed and the agreed-on 60% response rate criterion [http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/MOTRES/BFAm11-1101.html](http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/MOTRES/BFAm11-1101.html) has been satisfied for each administrator. If the deadline has passed and the response rate criterion has not been met, the AAP Committee will continue follow-up efforts until the criterion is met or until the second week of January, whichever occurs first.

### k) Data Processing

- Quantitative and qualitative data are handled only by PBA staff members who can be relied on to maintain confidentiality.
- Quantitative ratings will be processed by PBA using standard statistical procedures, and summary statistics will be given to the chair of the AAP Committee.
- Raters’ comments to the extended-response items are provided verbatim and anonymously (other than self-identifiers) to the chair of the AAP Committee.

### I) AAP Committee Report

- The AAP Committee will write a separate report on each administrator being evaluated that year.
- In addition to whatever other information is included in the report, the report will conclude with an evaluation made by the AAP Committee in terms of whether the administrator being reviewed “Exceeds Expectations,” “Meets Expectations,” or “Needs Improvement.”
- The AAP Committee reports are presented to the BFA Executive Committee, with the Provost invited to those meetings.
- The AAP Committee Chair and/or Vice-Chair may subsequently meet with the Provost to discuss the reports in more detail.
m) The role of the Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis

- Serve as a consultant to the AAP Committee, advising the Committee on logistical, statistical, and psychometric issues, and on policy issues
- Implement AAP Committee decisions (including any revision of the questionnaires)
- Collect data from raters
- Analyze the data acquired from raters and provide summary statistics of ratings as well as verbatim raters’ comments to the AAP Committee Chair
- Review AAP Committee reports and provide input to the Committee Chair
- Attend the BFA Executive Committee where the Committee reports are presented, if requested to do so by the AAP Committee Chair
- Maintain the AAP budget
- Maintain confidentiality of all ratings and comments provided by raters

From BFA Administrator Appraisal Committee: August 31, 2009
Notice of motion to the BFA:
Approved by the BFA:

a. Joe explained that the Administrator Appraisal Committee’s BFA-X-M-083109 Motion to Adopt Administrator Appraisal Policies Revisions accommodated the Executive Committee’s recommended changes from last spring. The Executive Committee approved the motion for referral on to the full BFA for the September 3 BFA meeting.

V. The following appointments were approved:
   a. Appointment of Richelle Munkhoff, English, to the BFA Diversity Committee.
   b. Appointment of Pam Diggle, EBIO, to the BFA Bylaws Committee.
   c. Appointment of Andy Hoenger, MCDB, to the CU Faculty Council Educational Policy and University Standards Committee.
   d. Appointment of Matthew Cleveland, PWR, to the CU Faculty Council Educational Policy and University Standards Committee.

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