MINUTES
Executive Committee Meeting
Boulder Faculty Assembly
October 26, 2009

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

A meeting of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Executive Committee was held on Monday, October 26, 2009, in ATLAS 229. Chair Joe Rosse presided. The meeting convened at 4:03 and adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

I. Approval of the Minutes: The Minutes from October 12, 2009 were approved.

II. Chair’s Report:

a. There was discussion about setting the date for the BFA Excellence Awards reception.

b. Susan Moore reported that the Diversity Committee has put together a panel of five faculty members for the Diversity Summit.

III. Discussion regarding Nominations for Provost Search Committee—Executive session.

IV. Discussion regarding Board of Regents Laws and Policies Committee request for input:

a. CU Guiding Principles: There was discussion about the following:
   i. The Principles are poorly written from a grammatical and stylistic standpoint.
   ii. The language “Strive to meet the needs of the state of Colorado” seems vocational and a poor statement of what the university does.
   iii. Move “maintain a commitment to excellence” closer to the top.
iv. Why such focus on innovation and entrepreneurship, what about the past.

v. The Principles do not focus on teaching and research.

b. CU Mission Statement:
   i. There was discussion about the fact that none of the suggestions requested by the BFA last month were incorporated.

   i. There was discussion about the fact that, although the Regents are seeking comment on a proposed search process, they did not provide any such proposed process to review. They only provided a literature review that seems somewhat selective rather than broad based. For example, the review contains only a subset of our peer institutions—perhaps chosen for a purpose. The report should contain an analysis of each of our acknowledged peer institutions on each point.
   ii. There was discussion about the “sole finalist” issue.
      1. How can you influence the process in the context of the age of the sole finalist? You must have a search committee you can have confidence in and that includes more representation of faculty.
      2. Do we have to accept the “reality” of this sole finalist requirement?
      3. What is the benefit to us as a faculty to have multiple finalists?
         a. Provides the ability to make comparisons between the candidates.
         b. Provides the ability to contact the previous institution and find out about the candidate.
         c. Leaves the possibility that the Regents will listen to the input from entities like the faculty.
   iii. There was discussion about the fact that succession planning (grooming from within) seemed like a theme in the literature review but the report contain no information about how you go about such planning.
   iv. There was a consensus that, at a minimum, the Regents should do a more thorough information search of the current situation--what all of CU’s peer institutions are doing. Also, if “sole finalist” is the new reality you have to make sure staff, faculty and students are strongly represented on the search committee.

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