FACULTY ASSEMBLY
University of Colorado Denver (UCD)
Minutes
September 19, 2003 Meeting

Attendees: Chancellor Shore, Mike Glode (Chair), Laurie Shroyer (Secretary), Richard Bakemeier, Dennis Lezotte, David Thompson, Elizabeth D’Antonio–Gan, Roxie Foster, Kim Glasscock, Clyde Tucker, Pat Moritz, David Port, Marilyn Krajicek, Mitzi Schindler, John Sbarbaro, Ed Abraham, Robert Schooley, David Thompson, Rob Berg, and George Gatseos

Excused Absences: Marie Hastings-Tolhsna, John McDowell, Madeleine Kane, Lewis Pizer, Kathleen Stringer

Guests: Saeeen Ambron, Howard Landesman, Pat Moritz, Rodney Muth, Tim Romani, Bob Olson, Leon Lunn, Mitzi Schindler

I. Call to order: Meeting was called to order at 8:00 a.m. Dr. Glode welcomed all participants and thanked them for coming. He preliminarily discussed the agenda planned for today. He noted that he had met with the Deans to express that Faculty Assembly to stress the importance of shared governance and shared decision-making. Thus, he requested that all participants feel comfortable to actively voice their opinion and share questions, challenges, and opportunities. Additionally, he thanked Ms. Vicki Starbuck for her extraordinary efforts to coordinate the meeting and speakers for the day.

II. Faculty Assembly – HSC/UCD Shared Governance: Dr. Lezotte raised the question of faculty governance. Dr. Muth shared his perception that this was an important question to discuss today. As Chancellor Shore was ready to begin his dialogue (and had to leave promptly at 9:30), the discussion was temporarily postponed to coordinate the Chancellor’s viewpoints.

III. Chancellor Comments: Chancellor Shore noted that he was pleased to be present and thanked the faculty for their active involvement in governance. Dr. Glode welcomed Chancellor Shore. As background, he asked for Chancellor to provide an overview of the challenges faced in the planning process: 1) facilities planning – the ground will be broken in the next six months for 12 new facilities; and 2) potential for consolidation for the UCD/HSC campuses with future activities.

Chancellor Shore noted that there were two critical challenges faced in the planning process: 1) facilities planning – the ground will be broken in the next six months for 12 new facilities; and 2) potential for consolidation for the UCD/HSC campuses with future activities.

Chancellor Shore noted that the budget challenges faced the Graduate School may require special consideration with a special protection (perhaps as a special initiative) may be required to assure that the Graduate School was able to be supported adequately in the future. He understood and recognized the special needs of the Graduate School for additional support to thrive in the future and continue to grow.

Additionally, Chancellor noted that the faculty salary and compensation comparisons were decentralized to each School. To-date, he reported that the Deans for the four main schools had reported that generally the salary compensation has been steady. Additional concerns were expressed that the School of Medicine had more variation and diversity in this comparison. Dr. Glode clearly expressed that the grants and contract function was critical. Dr. Shroyer clearly requested that the plans and contract investment in this research infrastructure needs to work today (where currently there are waits in excess of 3 weeks might be anticipated). Thus, Drs. Abraham and Schooley’s plea to Chancellor Shore was to make the infrastructure work better, even as an interim strategy, until full automation could be realized.

Dr. Shroyer raised two key budget questions, what the plans might be in the coming year to protect further erosion of the Graduate School budget and also how the total compensation for faculty (related to the erosion in several areas that were inherent associated with Tabor and/or State of Colorado educational funding reductions) might be addressed as part of a long-term collaborative plan with faculty. She noted that it was a blessing that University Benefits Advisory Board (UBAB) had coordinated health insurance options with premium increases lower than anticipated, it was important to view faculty compensation as a total package.

Chancellor Shore noted that the budget challenges faced the Graduate School may require special consideration with a special protection (perhaps as a special initiative) may be required to assure that the Graduate School was able to be supported adequately in the future. He understood and recognized the special needs of the Graduate School for additional support to thrive in the future and continue to grow.

Additionally, Chancellor Shore noted that the faculty salary and compensation comparisons were decentralized to each School. To-date, he reported that the Deans for the four main schools had reported that generally the faculty compensation has been steady. Additional concerns were expressed that the School of Medicine had more variation and diversity in this comparison. Dr. Glode clearly expressed that the grants and contract function was critical. Dr. Shroyer clearly requested that the plans and contract investment in this research infrastructure needs to work today (where currently there are waits in excess of 3 weeks might be anticipated). Thus, Drs. Abraham and Schooley’s plea to Chancellor Shore was to make the infrastructure work better, even as an interim strategy, until full automation could be realized.

As an evolution to the historical facility planning processes used, Chancellor Shore reported that the existing faculty committees would be used to address the expedited timelines with architectural teams. It was his plan that faculty representation on these Committees would be expanded to address the Certificate of Participation (COP) deadlines.

Specifically, he noted that sub-committees would be coordinated for different components of the project, such as educational buildings, administration buildings, and library. He noted that these listings of memberships will be posted for all faculty to use as a resource, as well as the latest plans available for more broad-based comment. He noted that key leaders from the faculty will be placed on these committees – with a focus of adding the faculty that are most likely to be impacted upon each of these committees. Recommendations for supplementing these committees would be welcomed. A new “UFO” committee to coordinate these committees by reviewing and approving the recommendations of other committees within the guidelines provided, as well as dispute resolution. Although the UFO committee is not a decision-making body (except in rare instances), he also felt strongly that enhanced coordination was required. The Chancellor noted that he would bring back these committee rosters and goals to the Faculty Assembly and asked that by working collaboratively with the Deans, that Faculty Assembly might coordinate suggestions for enhanced communication and coordination. He
noted that this planning process was a railroad track being built with a strict deadline with a $2.2 billion development effort that must be realized by 2008.

Chancellor Shore noted that a new process to evaluate the consolidation with HSC and UCD would be coordinated. There would be a new Steering Committee to be formed, where the Faculty Assembly Presidents would be requested to serve on this Committee. Additionally, two new committees as a first step were planned including 1) Academic and Student Affairs and 2) Administration and Finance. The Co-Chairman of these new committees had been forwarded to President Hoffman for her final review and approval. He welcomed the Faculty Assembly and other faculty members to decide how they might best participate (given the time and energy required) by picking and choosing on how to spend their time. For example, he noted that the question of governance might be deferred – until a final decision by the Board of Regents can be made. Dr. Glode noted that he thought the timing of faculty involvement was critical. Dr. Glode noted that from a HSC ICR question related to jeopardizing any financial status for HSC infrastructure is high priority and critical to going forward. Chancellor Shore noted that Faculty should evaluate how for themselves to defer the planning for different components of the consolidation (as there may be fatal challenges that arise – such as ICR being adversely impacted). Dr. Muth noted that in whatever goes forward, faculty need to have a voice. Chancellor Shore noted that there were two levels of faculty involvement: 1) input into the dialogues ongoing and keeping apprised of the progress forward; and 2) how the future of faculty governance for a consolidation might possibly work together in the future.

IV. Dean’s Report:

Dean Mortiz noted that there were ICR funding priority for the School of Nursing. Their total of $12 thousand was earmarked for both faculty development and for expanded inter-mural research funding support. She noted that the School of Nursing had lost 31 faculty (approximately a 1/3 faculty loss at the time of nursing shortage) over the past two years, and the ICR had declined correspondingly. This posed unique challenges, where the administration leadership of the faculty are required to actively teach classes and mentor students.

Dean Mortiz noted that the School of Nursing was very committed to shared faculty governance. She reported on several functions, where active participation by all levels of faculty were involved in administrative decision-making. Chancellor Shore noted that the student applications were increased (by around 50%) in excess of the projections, where a special request for tuition differential was forwarded to support the faculty to address the student needs. Dr. Glode noted that the Faculty Assembly of the Health Sciences Center would like to strongly support these tuition differential requests – either with the legislative and/or CCHE groups in presentations. Dean Mortiz noted that this support would be helpful and may contact Dr. Glode as these requests go forward.

Dean Landesman noted that being a public institution Dean has been an interesting learning experience. He noted in his previous position, in the private sector, where the Dean met with the VP of Development (where their merit increase was directly associated with the funding raising goals met). He noted that many of the activities of his office as Dean were directed towards fund-raising, given the State of Colorado reductions in support as an off-set strategy.

Dr. Abraham noted that fund raising in the School of Medicine was mainly on a Departmental or Divisional level. Drs. Glode and Schooley noted that there is not a connection of the faculty with the Foundation. Chancellor Shore noted that there will be a national search to coordinate the HSC leadership for the Foundation. He reported there had been large support growing, but the details of how much of the foundation fund-raising was related to bricks and mortar versus faculty versus infrastructure support. After discussion of differences in perceptions of the effectiveness of fund-raising, Dr. Schooley noted that the plea was to work together in fund-raising endeavors with faculty more directly in the future.

V. Vice Chancellor Update on the Fitzsimons – Tim Romani

Mr. Romani presented an overview of the current status of the Ninth Avenue redevelopment process and of the construction of the Fitzsimons campus. Mr. Romani reported that the current plan is that there would remain the two parking structures regardless of ultimate scenario. He discussed the 9th Avenue redevelopment options, where in Scenario 4, a semi-clean slate (keeping the parking structures and the newer buildings would likely be coordinated – such as BRB to be retained to maintain a transition plan with a comfort level). The Barbara Davis and Pharmacy School buildings have greater opportunities for re-use, as compared to the BRB (with intense wet lab facilities). Although there was quite a bit of flexibility and uncertainty, the longer-term plan was likely to be more oriented to residential housing (keeping the two parking building).

As a short term strategy during the transition period, there is a draft plan for about an increase in 10% in floor plan density, with an increase in the space per person. Dr. Glode asked if there was a CCHE or Regental plan or requirement related to redevelopment. Mr. Romani noted that if UCD would have plans for using the space at 9th Avenue that new programs, substantial program expansion, or new revenues would be required. Thus, dramatic increases in student growth in existing programs generating new tuition would be considered. New research dollars or new revenue streams would need to be identified for an approval of UCD to expand to the 9th Ave campus.

Mr. Romani noted that recently an RFQ went out to add a developer to this planning process. At this time 40 developers had applied. There would be a short list generated (perhaps 5 to 7 developers) that would be requested to put a more comprehensive plan together and ultimately a final developer selected.

The Fitzsimons plan related to the excitement of the recent COP to add a new (and previously unfunded) education component to the campus. Mr. Romani noted that he started the programming for the educational design and implementation. With the exception of Education 1B, there is an accelerated planning mode to move forward. The timeline was moved from 2012 to 2007 – a five year increased pace.

Questions were raised related to both the possibility to develop a student center and also the availability of low cost student housing. Dr. Glode suggested that a consideration of student center be added as a focus for Faculty Assembly to address in collaboration with the respective alumni organizations. Dr. Port requested clarification on the student housing options as many of the new graduate students were asking what options exist. Given that Mr. Bob Olson was scheduled to present housing options later in the retreat, the question was deferred. A copy of Mr. Romani’s slides will be added to the meeting minutes (and will be enclosed as an e-mail attachment by Ms. Starbuck). Dr. Glode thanked Mr. Romani for his presentation, as well as responsiveness and sensitivity to faculty questions raised.

VI. HSC/UCD Consolidation Update:

As introduction, Dean Landesman noted that President Hoffman’s UCD/HSC Consolidation Committee’s goals were to discuss the possibilities, challenges, benefits, and opportunities for consolidation. He encouraged questions and welcomed faculty input into this team process. He introduced Dean SueAnn Ambron as his partner from UCD as the Consolidation Committee Co-Chair.
The main CU website had a variety of documents that were publicly available. As an update, Dean SueAnn Ambron provided an overview of the HSC/UCD Consolidation update, as well as several faculty in the room that participated in the Committee process. The Committee represented a broad and diverse group of administration, faculty, staff, students, and business community. The original charge was to evaluate options to do something extraordinary in interdisciplinary areas, as well as have a new national and international presence. As the committee charge, she stressed the cost neutral requirement was key towards the goal of creating a great urban research university to serve the community, state and nation.

She noted that the questions raised related to research implications, educational training program implications, administrative/infrastructure questions, and coordination. There were a variety of public forums held, as well as individual testimony with anyone wished to present welcomed. Dr. Port noted that the interested parties were not participatory. Dr. Schooley noted that there was not faculty represented through the governance. Dr. Krajicek noted that the School of Nursing had been definitely represented. Dr. Rod Muth mentioned that it was agreed that perhaps the process was imperfect, the goal is to evaluate how the method to participate more actively and in an enhanced manner in the next phase of the discussions planned.

Dean Ambron noted that the challenges and opportunities were key to review. The findings of the report were shared. She shared Chancellor Shore’s testimony and highlighted several key points. The sensitivity to the challenges was discussed, as how to maintain the current strengths and build upon these strengths. A variety of goals for a successful consolidation were identified. She mentioned the next steps related forming implementation committees, as discussed previously by Chancellor Shore.

Dr. Schooley noted that different concerns had been raised by different constituencies. For example, leadership of both campuses as well as working with the University Hospital was raised as an issue. The overburdening of a single individual to fill all of the leadership requirements was raised as a key challenge. The possibility of having a combined leadership position and the role/responsibilities of this position might be a critical component to the success of this endeavor in the future.

The enhanced collaboration was evaluated from a variety of perspectives – with differences in opinions raised. Fundamentally, Dr. Glode raised the key question for the compelling reason to do this (and if this was a politically) – but is there any reason not to (no harm no foul). Dr. Port noted that it was his perception that consolidation was going to happen, with administrative reasons to do this from a coordination perspective. Dean Landesman noted with clarity that the consolidation would be assured to be cost neutral. Dr. Glode raised the question of space opportunities due to constraints. Dr. Muth noted that space constraints are challenging, but the question of new buildings were being explored. Dean Ambron noted that there is space available downtown – so that there is not a critical reason to consider space as the driving force. For example, she discussed the entrepreneurial program expansion.

A discussion about advancing the field of biotechnology and challenges with technology transfer was hotly debated. To define an approach that would work for the future, the 1/6th rule (which is not applicable in the SOM) may need to be revisited. Dr. Glode and Schooley noted that as an example of how this affiliation might be perfect if the 1/6th rule might be revisited, but the advantage may be in the trade-offs in biotechnology or sharing of intellectual capital. Dr. Lezotte expressed a concern of the teaching load differences and any inquality across campuses may be challenging. Dr. Muth noted that the UCD faculty may become much more involved in research, as well as enhanced opportunities for teaching may exist. Dean Ambron suggested that working through the implementation committees.

Dean Landesman noted that there are always multiple viewpoints on any topic. Dr. Glode raised the concern about the process used for faculty input, where the rationale and methodology for communication and coordination really does count to faculty. He noted that the decision has been made to consolidate and barring any major impediments – to go forward in a positive manner.

Deans Ambron and Landesman noted that the possibilities are nearly endless. They noted they could go into the Committee with no preconceived notions and no obligation to support or refute the consolidation.

Dr. Schooley noted that the key is for the faculty to be recognized for their diversity of viewpoints in the support of a successful integrated consolidated campus – as this is their dedication and devotion. In context of the charge provided to evaluate if consolidation was feasible, Dr. Sbarbaro noted that the role of the faculty and the Deans may be now to be invested together. As a means to this end, it would be the goal to enhance communication with the faculty, empower Committee members to tell administration what is the real viewpoint of the faculty.

Dr. Sbarbaro noted that the faculty reactions needed to be listened to and supported in a collegial manner – productively channeling their energies to work positively with administration. In context of the historical processes used, the challenges could be reviewed to evaluate the manner to improve the current processes.

Dr. Glode noted that the key was to evaluate the deal-breakers. A priority on ICR impact is critical. None of the faculty wanted to spend time working on the topic where the return on their investment is not returned in a manner multiplied. The focusing on the Chancellor’s Committees, could a sub-group of go versus no-go points be addressed to allow a prompt review. A time table of a Regental decision-making has been set for next June, which may limit meaningful participation. The goal might be to request the Chancellor’s Office (perhaps Teresa Bertyman’s office) to report back to a smaller Committee (perhaps a sub-group of the Executive Committee) of the ongoing information available related to the key go/no-go top questions to be addressed. Dean Ambron supported that a prioritized list for the initial tasks that are essential – to focus both faculty and administration. The Faculty Assembly recommendations need to be summarized for what is critical to the decisions related to the consolidation.

A copy of Dean Ambron’s slides will be added to the meeting minutes (and will be enclosed as an e-mail attachment by Ms. Starbuck). Dr. Glode thanked Dean Landesman and Ambron for their joint presentation, as well as openness to faculty questions raised to ensure that the consolidation was done in the right way.

VII. Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority

Mr. Robert Olson and Mr. Leon Lumm attended to share their perspective of the commons, Stapleton, and Fitzsimons Redevelopment Authority (FRA) housing, Bioscience Park, and future changes planned for the non-CU funded community aspects of this plan. Due to time constraints, however, their presentation was deferred to the next meeting – when they will be asked back to share an update with Faculty Assembly.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at noon. Dr. Glode thanked all faculty and guests for their participation, as well as support for the HSC Faculty Assembly’s goal of shared governance.