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Meeting Minutes

Attending: Peggy Jobe, Kathleen Bollard, Darren Chavez, Pam Laird, Jay Dedrick, John McDowell, Catherine Kunce, Joanne Addison, Laura Borgelt, Isabella Muturi Sauve, Melinda Piket-May, Carrie Makarewicz, Ravinder Singh, Dan Montez

On the phone: Bruce Neumann, Mandy Elder, Julaine Fields, Christina Martinez, Scarlet Bowen, Mark Knowles

Update on the Faculty Council Bylaws, Laura Borgelt

Laura discussed the proposed changes she had received so far. She reported that two voting sessions will be conducted during the April 24th meeting, one for changes in article 3 and one for the adoption of the bylaws. The votes will be considered successful if two thirds of the entire Council members vote in favor of the motions, therefore members are encouraged to attend the April 24th meeting.

The Council went on to discuss the formation of sub-committees. It was agreed that chairs of the committees can create working groups for issues within their committees’ purviews, rather than creating subcommittees.

Discussion with Regent Hybl

Program Prioritization

The following were noted:

- Appreciation that the Regents allowed faculty to take ownership of the program prioritization process.
- An acknowledgement that the workload on faculty and staff is uncompensated, enormous, time consuming and takes resources from research, scholarship and other important projects, which can impede the tenure and promotion process.
- The program prioritization process seems to be a duplication of efforts as each campus periodically evaluates their programs.
- More time should be allocated for a review of this nature. The 6 months’ time frame allocated is inadequate and could result in imperfect data.
- Regent Hybl asked for proposals on how faculty and staff time and effort can be recognized. Members did not indicate a particular amount but suggested that faculty be compensated for similar projects in the future.
- The notion of a prioritization process demands action. CU campuses review programs on a regular basis and cut what is not needed. There is going to be little that needs to be cut when data is collected from the prioritization process. If we realize that we don’t have the resources that we need, where are those resources going to come from? If the process is really about setting priorities, we need to look for fiscally responsible departments. Is the Board of Regents thinking about ways to bring more resources into the University?
- It seems like people can take the survey multiple times.
- What is going to be done with the data collected?

Responding to this discussion, Regent Hybl noted that the current program prioritization process will review all the programs at the same time, using the same rubric, unlike current review processes that are on a rolling and program by program basis. He added that he was hopeful that this would yield better results. Regent Hybl also acknowledged the demands on faculty and staff and agreed that the process was labor intensive.

**Climate survey**

Regarding the survey, Council members noted that it was possible to review the responses and identify survey respondents. If information is reported at an identifiable level, it will create a difficult work environment and put the validity of the data collected at risk. They also asked how the data collected will be used.

Regent Hybl discussed the issues raised with VP Pat O’Rourke, who briefly attended the meeting. VP O’Rourke noted that identifiable data will not be released and will be protected. Council members did not think this would be sufficient and suggested that the survey be expunged, given the loss of anonymity. They went on to request that if another survey is created, faculty be allowed to pilot-test it. It was also noted that:

- It would be helpful if the climate survey included open ended questions in order to capture more personal experiences.
- The next steps after the collection of data need to be defined.
• Faculty were not involved in the creation of the survey or allowed to pilot it.

In the follow up discussion, VP Pat O’Rourke noted the following:

- The survey is universal to all of CU and no particular department is being targeted.
- Data collected will be compiled and not sliced in a manner that will enable identification.
- Removing the departmental identification and leaving just the college level, as suggested by the Council, leaves vague data that is not useable. It is challenging to accommodate the demands for anonymity while collecting meaningful data.

Council members thanked Pat & Regent Hybl for their time and consideration.

**Search for Vice President of Academic Affairs**

Chair Melinda Piket-May thanked Regent Hybl for including faculty in the search for the vice-president of Academic Affairs and also for attending the Faculty Council meeting.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the March 6 meeting were approved as amended.

**OPE Update, Dan Montez**

Dan reported that the redesign of the new OPE website is complete and went on to discuss its functionality. He also discussed policies under review for implementation on July 1.

Members asked for an update on the APS on Service & Leadership. VP Kathleen Bollard noted that she will follow up and report back to the Council.

**Academic Affairs Report, Kathleen Bollard**

Kathleen gave an update on the Uniform grading policy and reported that winners for the Chase and Thomas Jefferson awards have been announced. She also noted that a job announcement has gone out for the position of the VP Academic Affairs.
Chair’s Report, Melinda Piket-May

Melinda’s report included the following:

- Letter from Regent Carrigan to governance leaders regarding the climate survey.
- Update on the procedures for selecting a University president when a sitting president is no longer able to serve.
- 2014 Faculty Council Awards.
- Funding for CU Boulder’s athletic department.
- Tuition dependent benefit on the Boulder Campus. Melinda reported that a 10% tuition discount will be given to faculty dependents and they will not have to wait until the first day of class to register.
- Faculty response to Dr. Steven Hayward. Melinda noted that was important to respond to Dr. Hayward’s recent comments and note that his statements were discriminatory and inflammatory and do not further the cause of building an inclusive campus and the CU policy of non-discrimination. The Faculty Council will respond in an open letter to the Regents and Council members given an opportunity to comment on the draft letter. The final version of the letter will be posted on CU Connections.
- Memo to President Benson and Regent Carrigan from the Budget Committee, as follows:

Dear President Benson and Chair Carrigan:

The Budget Committee of Faculty Council would like to request that shared governance protocols relating to budgeting at CU be followed. Specifically, our constitution and bylaws, which are part of the Laws of the Regents, requires:

“The Budget Committee considers matters concerning the allocation of university resources, including:

1. Reviewing the budget requests with representatives of the system administration prior to their submission to the Board of Regents and reporting the committee’s concurrence or nonconcurrence with the budget request to Faculty Council;”

In the Committee’s memory, there are few instances where the Budget Committee has been allowed to review budget requests PRIOR to submission to the Board of Regents. In the current year, the Budget Committee has not been privy to any recommendations on tuition rates or compensation pools. This is a failure of shared governance and it may lead to undesirable outcomes where the needs and interests of the CU faculty are not well-understood and where long-term considerations may be ignored or under-weighted.
We request that a budget schedule be developed that will permit and encourage shared governance, especially pertaining to budget recommendations prior to submission to the Board of Regents.

Thank you for your consideration.
On behalf of the Budget Committee,
Bruce R. Neumann, Chair

Melinda noted her support for the letter and indicated that she will discuss the letter with VP Todd Saliman & Regent Carrigan.

**Update on CU Health Rates/Benefits**, Tony DeCrosta

Gave an update on the proposed changes in health premium rates for the upcoming year.

**CURFA**, Richard Blade

Richard Blade sent the following report:

This last month CURFA was asked to distribute their directories of retired CU faculty emailed free to campus RFA members by password protected PDF files. Concerned about all the personal information in the directories, I sought and obtained approval from the CU Counsel Patrick O’Rourke as long as the file was directly emailed to recipients and not put on a public website. However, the CURFA board decided not to approve the free distribution because of the significant costs involved in the print copies, instead offering lower cost CURFA memberships to campus RFA members. I personally believe that it will not be long before enough CURFA members use email to largely replace the print copies by such a PDF distribution.

**Campus Reports**

**Boulder**, Peggy Jobe

Peggy reported that two committees are reviewing the Patti Adler case and a report to the BFA is expected soon. She added that the campus had discussed the $10 million donation to the athletics department and that the BFA elections were being held on April 3, 2014.

**Colorado Springs**, Mandy Elder

Mandy reported that the campus was wrapping up the program prioritization process and that the faculty assembly elections had been held at the end of March 2014. She went on to report that the assembly was reviewing its bylaws and putting a taskforce together to conduct a salary analysis. Mandy also reported that the campus was awaiting the outcome of House Bill 14-1319 and its impact on the campus’ master plan.

**Denver**, Joanne Addison
Joanne reported that the assembly had discussed House Bill 14-1319 at meeting with representatives from the office of government relations. They indicated that CU was not going to try to stop the bill from going forward and noted that the national trend towards supporting community colleges at the expense of 4 year colleges was worrying.

Joanne also reported that the CU South Denver campus has system level support and is expected to house programs from all campuses as needed.

Committee Updates

Personnel, John McDowell

John sent the following report:

On March 7, 2014, the Personnel Committee met with representatives of Aon Hewitt, Mark J. Friedman and Stephen Murphy. Mr. Friedman is a retirement planning consultant and Mr. Murphy is a health and benefits consultant. Both Mr. Friedman and Mr. Murphy presented information to the Personnel Committee regarding a 2013 benefits assessment study that was conducted on behalf of the University of Colorado. Aon Hewitt performed this study to benchmark the University of Colorado’s benefit programs against peer universities. A similar analysis was conducted in 2010 with the results of the more recent study compared to the 2010 analysis. The results of this study are summarized below:

- 3 years ago, CU ranked near the 50th percentile across all benefit areas.
- Although the CU “All Benefits” package is about 9% above our peers, this places CU at or near the top quartile of peers for both faculty and staff benefits programs,
- As described by the Aon Hewitt consultants, CU’s health plan costs are presently competitive with our industry and geographic peers.
- During the previous 3 years CU has made some benefit improvements to the savings plan eligibility requirement the LTD (long term disability) benefit and has made progress toward a system-wide dependent tuition reimbursement benefit.
- Because of plans and programs instituted by CU (for example, the University’s wellness plan, “Be Colorado”), it is expected that CU will makes steps toward effectively managing health care costs in the future.
- Over the previous 3 years, our peer institutions have generally increased health care costs at a rate higher than that of the University of Colorado.
- During the 2010-2013 time period, there was a decrease in retirement benefits by some (but not all) of our peer institutions. The majority of our peers made no changes to their retirement programs.
- CU’s position regarding benefit programs was described by Aon Hewitt as “competitive” when compared to our university peers.
- By using a complex “value rating system”, CU ranked 7th to 8th when evaluated for “All Benefits”. The “All Benefits” assessment was determined by combining the relative value of retirement, death, disability, all pre-retirement health care benefits, all post-retirement health care benefits and dependent tuition reimbursement benefit programs.

Aon Hewitt provided the Personnel Committee members with a notebook describing how the study was conducted and the results of this study. A copy of that notebook will be provided to the Faculty Council for review and comment.
Comparator Universities

- Colorado State University
- Indiana University
- Ohio State University
- Pennsylvania State University
- Purdue University
- University of California
- University of Illinois
- University of Maryland
- University of Michigan
- University of Minnesota
- University of Missouri
- University of North Carolina/Chapel Hill
- University of Texas system
- University of Virginia
- University of Washington
- University of Wisconsin

EMAC, Mark Knowles

Mark reported that the committee had discussed its proposal on the recruitment and retention of diverse students, as a follow up to the symposium on student retention held in fall 2013.

Budget, Bruce Neumann

Bruce’s report included the following:

- Subsidies to Boulder’s athletic department and whether there are plans to repay debt incurred previously.
- Financial statements of the Trust. The Trust budgets conservatively and does not carry forward reserves to the next year. How much reserve funds does the Trust need?
- Imbalance in the compensation pool for classified staff and non-exempt staff and faculty. This needs to be reexamined in light of the University performing well financially.

Bruce also reported that he had attended the March Regents Budget committee meeting and had been impressed by it. The regents seemed to back the proposals to increase salaries for faculty and exempt staff, which was encouraging, however it was discouraging that they thought that faculty salaries were at market rate.

EPUS, Ravinder Singh

Ravinder reported that EPUS was waiting for campus votes on the Uniform Grading Policy as well as feedback from the provost on the Program Discontinuance Policy. He added that the committee will start reviewing FCQ’s and how they are administered on each campus in an effort to understand the processes and if necessary, make recommendations.

Adjournment
There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned. The next meeting will be held on April 24, 2014 in the 1st floor conference room, 1800 Grant St. Denver, CO 80203.