

**Minutes of the joint meeting of the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate (ASFS) and
the Faculty of Arts and Sciences
April 11, 2023, 3:30–5:00 pm, Zoom**

ASFS Representatives Present: Cecilia Pang (THDN), Andrew Cowell (LING), Benjamin Brown (APS), Mark Whisman (PSYC), Jeffrey Cox (ENGL, AHUM Divisional Rep), Shelley Copley (MCDB), Matthew Burgess (ENVS), Cosetta Seno (FRIT), Vilja Hulden (HIST), Daniel Kaffine (ECON), Joe Bryan (GEOG), Shemin Ge (GEOL), Sebastian Schmidt (ATOC), Christopher Osborn (CINE), Jennifer Schwartz (HONR), Keller Kimbrough (ALC, AHUM Divisional Rep), Robert Parson (CHEM), Christina Meyers (SLHS), Mike Zerella (RAPS), Juan Pablo Dabove (SPAN), Nils Halvorson (APS, NS Divisional Rep), Marissa Ehringer (IPHY), Luke Evans (EBIO), Matthias Richter (ALC), Annje Wiese (HUMN), Andy Baker (PSCI, SS Divisional Rep), Lorraine Bayard de Volo (WGST), John D. Griffin (PSCI), Aun Hasan Ali (RLST), Zachary Kilpatrick (APPM), William Taylor (ANTH), Enrique Sepulveda (ETHN), Robert Rupert (PHIL)

Also in attendance: Mike Barnett, Hillary Amma Potter, Garrett Bredeson, Joel Chabrier, Katherine Eggert, Nidhi Arya, Peter Newton, Bud Coleman (Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Initiatives, A&S), Glen Krutz (Dean of A&S)

Representatives not present: Robert Kuchta (BCHM), Albert Bronstein (MATH), Elspeth Dusinberre (CLAS), Anthony Abiragi (PWR), Stephanie Su (AAH), Paul Romatschke (PHYS), Martin Boileau (ECON, SS Divisional Rep), Liam Downey (SOCY), Anastasiya Osipova (GSL)

The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:32 p.m. MDT

The Chair expressed the intention to record the meeting, solely for the purpose of writing minutes of the meeting afterwards. No reservations were expressed, and the Chair commenced recording.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair gives an update on the vote of the full Faculty of Arts and Sciences on proposed changes to the Arts and Sciences Faculty Governance bylaws. The vote has just gotten underway. The voting period extends for two weeks. Rupert encourages faculty members to vote and to encourage their colleagues to vote.

The Chair, whose term is coming to an end, bids the membership adieu and expresses his gratitude for the work the members have done and for their participation in faculty governance.

Dean's Remarks

The Dean thanks the Chair for his service.

The Dean announces that finalists for the Dean of Division searches in Social Sciences and Natural Sciences will be visiting campus soon and encourages those present to be involved in the process.

The representative from GEOG asks whether the Dean can share any further information about budget cuts faced by the College and, in particular, whether other colleges or schools will be asked to help cover the campus budget shortfall and about the ways supplemental funds are being used in the budgeting process.

Dean Krutz remarks that the College faces a 2.4 million dollar shortfall that must be met by July 1 with cuts to continuing funds and adds that several other colleges and schools also face a shortfall, though not all schools and colleges on campus are experiencing cuts. The Dean indicates that half of the College's shortfall will be covered by the Dean's budget and that he is engaged in discussions with various constituencies to figure out how to cover the other half. Dean Krutz says that there's not much the College can do, at present, to change the distribution of supplemental funds.

Reports from Chairs of Standing Committee

Budget Committee. Andy Cowell, Chair of Budget, provides the following summary. In the fall, Budget looked carefully at the new campus budget model and did a sensitivity analysis. It was clear from that analysis that increasing enrollment and improving retention of students is particularly important to the health of the College's budget. Budget released that sensitivity analysis, and it is now posted on the ASFS Web site. In the spring, Budget has focused on how to handle the 2.4 million dollar cut and on questions about the campus's distribution of supplemental funds.

Curriculum Committee. The Chair, Liam Downey, is not present. Rupert asks for input from members of the committee who are present. Various committee members collectively provide the following update. Curriculum has been engaged in its ongoing work of approving courses for the distribution requirements. The committee has passed a motion recommending the removal of the suspension of the 30-credit online limit for undergraduate students. The committee is initiating the process of reviewing courses that had been approved for the satisfaction of distribution requirements prior to the adoption of the current Gen Ed system. The curriculum committee will be in touch with departments to ask them to re-nominate these courses if the departments want these classes to continue to satisfy the distribution requirements in question. The committee has also been considering a draft proposal (coming from NS) to create Bachelor of Science degrees. Lastly, committee members described a potentially controversial case that involved the re-review of AP African-American Studies, as satisfying the Gen Ed Diversity requirement. In light of the changes that were recently made to the course in question, which changes were reported on nationally, the committee reversed its previous decision. The committee decided that the revised AP course does not quite meet the College's Diversity requirement.

Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Cecilia Pang, Chair of DEI, provides the following summary. Pang endorses the Dean's Innovation Fund competition, which generated over eighty proposals. The winners of that competition include DEI committee members Stephanie Sue and on Aun Hasan Ali, who proposed to create a mentoring partnership between CU-Boulder and the Border Valley School District. Pang announces the winners of the DEI committee's third annual ASCEND awards. Pang announces that Dean Krutz has agreed to continue to support this initiative with a five-year financial commitment.

Grievance and Professional Affairs Committee. The Chair of Grievance, Daniel Caffeine, reports that the committee dealt with only one case this semester, albeit a rather complicated one. The committee also discussed the document produced by the Faculty Salary Procedures Working Group.

Personnel Committee. The Chair of Personnel, Juan Pablo Dabove, reports that the committee considered a total of twenty-four cases in the spring: two comprehensive reviews, six hires with tenure, three promotion and tenure cases, and thirteen promotions to full professor. Approximately 60% of the cases were from the Natural Sciences, followed by Social Sciences with 25% of the cases and the Arts and Humanities with 15% of the cases.

Planning Committee. The Chair of Planning, Shelley Copley, provided the following summary. Throughout the academic year, Planning has considered various issues related to the working conditions of teaching faculty. In the fall, Planning passed a motion to create a personnel committee for teaching and clinical faculty. After considerable discussion, that motion failed in the ASFS. In the spring, Planning turned its attention to compensation and workloads, concluding that salaries for teaching faculty are quite low and that workloads for many, probably most, but not all teaching faculty, are quite high. Planning has written a report summarizing their overall work on this project, which will be circulated in the fall.

The representative from CINE asks whether the report is available and how to see it.

Copley responds that it hasn't yet been circulated. It will be available in the fall to the ASFS membership. If the membership votes to accept the report (that is, to enter it into the record), it will be posted on the ASFS Web site.

Possible Creation of a Campus-level Curriculum Committee

Senior Vice Provost Katherine Eggert made a presentation on this item and led discussion of it.

SVP Eggert indicates that she speaks partly on behalf of the Chair of the Boulder Faculty Assembly, Tiffany Beechy, with whom Eggert has worked closely in preparing the proposal to be discussed. The creation of a common curriculum, with learning outcomes, and the question about curricular duplication seem to require the creation of a structure that facilitates campus-wide discussion of curriculum. This committee would be made up of faculty playing a faculty

governance role. The committee would deal mostly, but not exclusively, with undergraduate education. The committee would be analogous to other advisory committees to the Provost, such as VCAC, for personnel cases; ARPAC, for program review; and the Academic Resource Management Advisory Committee. The proposal for the creation of a campus-level curriculum committee is in its early stages; it is being circulated and feedback is being solicited. Final adoption will be governed by the Policy on Policies, with final approval in the hands of the Provost.

The representative from ANTH asks whether, with regard to the constitution of the committee, it's possible for Arts and Sciences to have proportional representation, so that composition of the committee is structured to approximate the number of SCH's taught by various schools and colleges.

SVP Eggert acknowledges the suggestion and will take it forward as input, while also expressing the hope that such a committee would, regardless of its membership, be thinking about the good of the campus as a whole.

The representative from CINE asks whether this committee would resolve disputes and be a place for everybody to talk or whether those are meant to be two separate functions of two distinct committees. The underlying concern is that, when conflicts need to be resolved, proportional representation might be especially important.

SVP Eggert responds that the proposal is for only one committee, though it may have a subcommittee specifically tasked with overseeing the common curriculum. The proposal currently calls for representation from each of the three A&S divisions, which might be a matter of concern in other schools and colleges; they might think that A&S will have the numbers to exert undue influence on decision-making. SVP Eggert indicates that she hasn't previously heard any expression of concern about the resolution of conflicts.

The representative from CINE indicates that, in his experience, these conflicts do come up, for example, just within A&S.

The representative from MCDB asks how much of a problem this is already and whether the current discussion is driven mostly by anticipated effects of the incentives built into the new budget model.

SVP Eggert indicates that incentives (for so-called SCH hoarding) have been in place for years, but that, almost always, issues of curricular duplication are settled informally and amicably, at the faculty level or in conversations between deans. The current proposal encourages resolution of the conflict at the lowest or most local level.

The Chair asks about the nature of the committee and to what extent it should be considered a Faculty Governance committee, and also expresses the concern that it be faculty governance committee in the most robust sense, given the subject matter of curriculum. He compares the

proposed committee to the situation in A&S, where the curriculum committee is a standing committee of the faculty governance body.

The Chair expresses the concern that, although the members of the proposed campus-level committee are to be approved by the BFA, the committee does not seem to be a faculty governance committee in the structural sense. It is more like an advisory committee to the Provost's Office that has some faculty members on it. Is there reason why it wouldn't be a standing committee of the BFA?

SVP Eggert argues that this is a faculty governance committee. There are faculty members on the committee, and they are governing things, just as in the case of ARPAC and VCAC. Whereas the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee is advisory to Dean Krutz, the proposed committee would, by parallel, be advisory to the provost.

Rupert presses the importance of the narrower definition of faculty governance, the one that seems to be at issue in Regent Laws, where curriculum is listed as one of the domains in which faculty governance has primary decision-making authority. Article five of Regent Laws addresses governance in the sense of representative bodies with duly appointed or elected representatives from departments. Departments are the local root of faculty power. They go through a process that sends representatives to an organized body that therefore, by representative democracy, speaks for the faculty on matters of governance. The body has a structure, and part of that structure is committee work. Within a certain range of topics, the A&S Curriculum Committee's decisions are treated as determinative, even if, technically, the Dean could reverse some of those decisions (although if it was not done for clear reasons, that would violate Regent Laws). A merely advisory committee that is not part of the faculty governance structure does not seem to be a faculty governance committee.

SVP Eggert emphasizes the variety of conceptions of faculty governance to be found on campus; some smaller schools and colleges don't have a large enough faculty to form governance committees of the sort A&S has. Eggert also emphasizes the extent to which some campus-level committees that are not necessarily part of the BFA issue decisions (about tenure, for instance) that are very rarely overturned by the Provost.

The divisional representative from AHUM who is housed in ENGL notes that, although the membership of the VCAC is nominated by the Provost's Office, the committee membership must be approved by the BFA, and that the committee functions on behalf of the faculty. He also endorses the view that curriculum is, by Regent law, purview of the faculty and that committee structure in A&S is handled differently from, say, the VCAC.

The Chair observes that these are complex issues but expresses clear disagreement with the idea that a committee counts as a faculty governance committee simply because it has faculty on it, and the committee has been granted governance power. He emphasizes the connection between governance structure and fundamental notions of political authority, which runs through structural channels. The Chair emphasizes the importance of the division of powers

built into Regent Laws and accompanying idea of checks and balances that results from such distribution of power.

SVP Eggert invites further feedback going forward, to be sent to her or to Tiffany Beechy.

The Dean expresses support for the creation of a campus-level curriculum committee, both with regard to its proposed role in overseeing the common curriculum and its proposed role in addressing issues of duplication.

Chair's election

The Chair identifies the two candidates: Ben Brown, the representative from APS, and Andy Cowell, the representative from LING. The Chair describes the voting procedure and asks the candidates to make statements, in turn.

Benjamin Brown describes his history at CU, the service roles he has played at the department level, and his previous time in faculty governance; articulates his desire to move into a leadership role; and lays out what would be his priorities were he to be elected chair. Such priorities include continued work to improve the conditions for teaching faculty, the necessary work to navigate the new budget model and its implications, and the coordination of College-level efforts on DEI initiatives with the work of the BFA's diversity committee and other relevant bodies on campus.

Andy Cowell describes his history at CU, including his time chairing departments and directing a center. He describes his time in faculty governance, including chairing the ASFS Budget Committee and a previous period as ASFS Chair. Cowell's priorities include confronting the enormous challenges of continued DEI work, working to resolve difficulties connected to the College's budget, and continuing to find ways to increase enrollments and improve retention.

The Chair asks the candidates to leave the meeting. Substantive debate follows, with strong support expressed for both candidates.

The Chair directs voting members of the Assembly to access their ballot through email. The Chair and fellow Faculty Governance Executive Committee member Jeff Cox monitor the results on Qualtrics as the results come in. Rupert shares his screen showing the final Qualtrics tally, 19 to 8, in favor of Cowell.

The Chair invites the two candidates to rejoin the Zoom meeting. Rupert welcomes them and announces the result. He congratulates Chair-elect Cowell and extends his gratitude to Brown for putting himself forward and being willing to serve.

The Chair apologizes for not having time to discuss the remaining two agenda items and indicates that, if all goes normally, they will be at the top of the ASFS's agenda in the fall. Rupert notes that the DEI-related item is the more time-pressured of the two. If that motion passes, it

sets a deadline for departments to do their work (on incorporating DEI-related considerations into merit review) as November 30, 2023. The question about reinstating the 30-credit limit of online coursework does not need to be resolved until approximately mid-February of 2024, when the time comes to prepare copy for the new catalogue

The Chair closes the meeting by expressing his view that Article 5 of Regent Laws is clear about the nature of faculty governance. The heading of Article 5 is "Faculty Governance" and the article contains two subsections. The first states the general principles of faculty governance, including that faculty have primary decision-making power in the realm of curriculum. And the next section, the only other section of article, lays out the mechanics of faculty governance, and it talks only about formal faculty governance structure, about each college and school having a faculty governance body. Rupert states that he does not think there's a fair way to read that article as a whole without understanding faculty governance to mean the activity of duly elected and appointed members operating with the structure of formal governance bodies. Rupert encourages those present to commit themselves to that vision if they share it.