

Report on Governance Compensation

November 30, 2006

In early 2005, Faculty Council convened a committee composed of Council representatives, the chairs of the campus faculty assemblies, the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs or their designees, and a representative from the VPAAR office. Their commitment was to examine issues related to support for faculty governance at the system level and on each of the campuses, with three primary purposes: (a) to understand the different ways in which governance was supported systemwide, (b) to determine if inequities in modes of compensation needed to be addressed, and (c) to ensure that practical incentives are available to attract the very best faculty to governance service.

It became very clear early on that, even though faculty participation in shared governance is essential to effective university management, the topic was discomfiting to many, that each campus felt that it was doing what it could to support faculty governance, that either nothing could or should be done to change things, and that by and large support for governance and compensation for governance participation were primarily campus issues that should be addressed by the campuses and not in a systemwide discussion. Nevertheless, issues raised during the committee's short tenure still remain and need to be addressed. They can be summarized as follows:

1. the clear inequities among the campuses
2. one campus that does not compensate faculty for participation in governance
3. a compensation system in which campuses are required to defray the costs of faculty participation in CU-wide governance
4. the generally very low level of support provided for most faculty governance activities

Below, this report first elaborates these issues and then makes recommendations relative to each that should be examined by the various parties in shared governance. The end in view is to strengthen shared governance universally as well as to establish incentives that both attract high quality faculty and mitigate any costs to these faculty for their participation.

Inequities

As can be seen in Table 1, the support provided by the campuses varies widely both in terms of levels and range of support. This variance perhaps is described best as a function of campus economics, which is understandable, given the way in which the CU system has evolved through time. However, each campus may want to examine the range of incentives and types of support—or their equivalents—now available at CU Boulder, for example, while respecting the real differences in available resources on each campus. The importance of symbolic equity cannot be underestimated.

Health Sciences Center

As has been noted repeatedly in the last several years, the economics of the Health Sciences Center differ radically from those of the other campuses, given its BSI compensation model and its contractual relations with federal funders. Regardless, because no other campus expects faculty governance participants to provide service “out of hide,” recognizing that such service is much more time intensive than expected of normal service obligations (e.g., 40/40/20 with a 20% focus on departmental service), it is incumbent on the campus to determine ways to

support faculty governance participation such that the current inequities are lessened considerably or eradicated entirely.

System Issues

Besides the low level of support provided for system-level governance activities (less than \$150,000 annually with virtually no increases for the last six or seven years, not including monies for Privilege and Tenure), the more serious problem is the reliance on sacrifices at the campus level to support system-level participation. That is, while the system provides course buyouts for the Council and Privilege and Tenure chairs, the funds barely defray the full cost of a faculty member lost from a unit for a year or more, and in some cases, the current level of buy-out funds available do not cover the full cost of a lecturer and do not support the work that each must undertake to maintain faculty governance during the summer months. Further, the stipends available for Council committee chairs is insufficient now to support a course buy-out on any campus, meaning that committee chairs must layer governance service on top of all of their regular duties. Moreover, unlike two of the campuses, no compensation is provided to offset the costs of participation in faculty governance leadership to teaching effectiveness and research productivity, both of which figure prominently in annual merit reviews and increases. Finally, chairing Faculty Council, Privilege and Tenure, and in some cases Faculty Assemblies are virtually full-time, 12-month jobs, and the capacity of faculty governance to operate is effectively diminished by the current part-time approach. All of this compounds the very real problem of recruiting faculty to take part in faculty governance, and absolutely essential role in a strong system of university shared governance,

Low Level of Support

Less than \$400,000 annually is committed to support for faculty governance systemwide. Given an annual budget now of \$2 billion, this is less than .0002% of CU's budget. What a preferable outlay might be is unclear, and it is not expected that radical changes will be made overnight. How, where, and what level of dollar commitments occur over time needs to be discussed at all levels to determine solutions that both strengthen faculty governance and shared governance systemwide.

Decreasing Inequities and Supporting HSC Leadership

The challenge, then, is to develop incentives that make faculty governance attractive to the best faculty but also make it possible to support at HSC. Thus, the means for doing this will continue to vary by campus. In this regard, the models developed at Boulder and Colorado Springs are instructive because they both immediately reward participation and provide a cushion for faculty returning from governance to their regular responsibilities, perhaps lessening the impact of diminished attention to teaching and research while participating in faculty governance.

For HSC, the answers are not simple; that is, the support frameworks of the other campuses simply will not work, so alternatives are necessary. This is particularly the case in an environment in which faculty governance service is not well regarded. Two possible incentive structures can mitigate these issues. The first is unit merit in which departments which "lend" their faculty to faculty governance for a period of time are guaranteed unit merit so that everyone gains when one or more faculty commit to better the entire campus through participation in faculty governance. A second possibility is to use the medical school's educational incentive

funds to provide departments with replacement services, say a part-time visiting professor position that serves to augment the faculty and support departmental programs.

Regardless of the solutions, the problems need to be addressed if faculty governance is to flourish at HSC and inequities are to be lessened or eradicated. The alternative is continued loss of faculty commitment, weakening of faculty participation in shared governance, and increased costs to the university to support the functions now supported by faculty governance.

System Modifications

Whenever it appears that additional resources are necessary to support a university function, it is critical to ask about the value of the improved function and its general and specific benefit to the university. For years, faculty governance has worked hand in hand with administration and the Board to ensure that the university succeeds in its mission. Examples of this close cooperation include the extensive revisions to the Laws and Policies of the Regents precipitated by the development and implementation of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate and its implementing Bylaws. The principles of shared governance developed have provided a clear framework for productive collaboration as evidenced more recently by the crafting of the Boulder campus policies on academic governance of athletics and the tenure review process initiated by Faculty Council and supported by the Board of Regents. Both of these policy issues have brought significant credit to the university for being a national leader in these areas, and the faculty-administration-board collaboration on these issues have proved again the value of shared governance and strong faculty bodies committed to the mission of the university.

To improve faculty governance at the system level, full-time, full salary support is needed for the Faculty Council Chair and the Chair of Privilege and Tenure may need full-time support as case-demands require, and the total salary costs should be paid by the system, including summer salary and a one-time salary bump of \$5,000 for each chair on departure from the position. Additionally, stipends for committee chairs should be set at the average of the lecturer costs at the three comprehensive campuses and allocated locally according to the demands on each committee chair's time. Further, monies for support of goal-oriented and annually evaluated committee work should become part of annual operating expenses for Faculty Council. As well, to ensure accountability, panel chairs for P&T should receive stipends comparable to those provided to Council committee chairs.

Increasing Overall Support

It is vital to the health of faculty governance and thus the health of CU's system of shared governance that the proportion of funds allocated annually increase significantly overtime so that the very best among the faculty can be attracted to and retained in faculty governance because the incentives and rewards are commensurate with the performance expectations. While the university culture reveres individual effort. we are in an age in which collaboration, cooperation, and commitment to processes and outcomes beyond individual preference are valued more and more. The cost to the university of not encouraging and supporting this new culture can be great, as even accrediting agencies and funders now demand collaboration in program development and evaluation and in research and development programs.

Benefits

The benefits the to university of strong and well functioning faculty governance are virtually incalculable. In addition to the major engagements in the past several mentioned above,

besides being an adjudicator of faculty rights, P&T also is an advocate for the university, ensuring the university policies, procedures, and expectations are met. Faculty governance also provides services to the university, including communications and policy review and support, that are necessary to university welfare for which the university would be subject to substantial expenses if faculty governance bodies were not active and integral to the smooth functioning of the university. Simply calculating the amount of time that those in faculty governance spend on university matters would validate the magnitude of faculty contributions, which often go unrecognized, unappreciated, and unrewarded. Those in faculty governance are loyal to the university, spending time and energy to ensure its success. Increasing investments in faculty governance is prudent policy.

Further Observations

Systematically over the last five or six years, administrative functions and responsibility being have been "pushed down" the hierarchy as the percent of administrators to faculty and staff has decreased. Coupled with the loss of staff due to budget cuts, the cumulative effect on faculty has been significant: Faculty members are doing more administrative and clerical work than previously, diminishing the quality of their other responsibilities. This "upsizing" of faculty work also has taken a toll on faculty participation in faculty governance, as has the continuing denigration of faculty governance service by department chairs and deans. Thus, it has become more difficult to entice faculty members into governance responsibilities.

Over the last several years, given the furor over faculty misconduct, the tenure review process and its concomitant impact on faculty work, the political attacks on faculty and the university, it has become clear that the faculty needs to participate directly and often in "systems of communication," those structures, decision processes, and agencies internal and external to the university with and to which university personnel must engage and respond, particularly but not limited to external publics such as news reporters, the legislature, and other agencies important to the welfare of CU. Recognizing this functional requirement, Faculty Council developed a Communications Committee that has begun working with the Director of Communications, the Office of State and Federal Relations, and others in the system and on the campuses to "put a face on faculty," diminishing the disconnection between the university and its external communities, those that generally only see faculty in their service roles.

Getting faculty before the public in coordinated ways that benefit the university will require significantly more time than a very part-time committee chair can undertake. Thus, the position of Director of Faculty Communications, a half-time post that reports directly to the Faculty Council Chair and is supported by Council resources, should be developed immediately and charged to work with other university personnel in expanding the outreach and impact of faculty among the communities important to the support of CU.

Faculty Governance: Remuneration and Other Benefits
November 24, 2006

	System	Boulder	Denver	Health Sciences	Colorado Spgs
Assembly/Council chair stipend	\$2,500 for all officers, except Council Chair & P&T Chair	10% of AY salary		None	\$3,000 added to base salary
Assembly/Council chair course release	4 courses per AY Note: must be within the Council's budget	2 courses per AY	2 courses per AY	None	Teacher's 1 course per semester
Assembly/Council chair summer salary/stipend	None	1/9 guaranteed; option for a second 1/9 with Chanc/Provost approval	1/9	None	None
Assembly/Council chair differentiated workload	Negotiated with campus unit	60/20/20	Negotiated with campus unit	None	Note 1
Assembly/Council development/operating funds	\$22,000 operations and \$8,800 for travel	\$20,000	\$1,500	\$8,000 (includes food, videoconferencing, etc.) plus website support	\$2,802 operating funds + \$805 travel funds
Administrative assistant	Full-time	Full-time	Part-time	Part-time	Note 2
Committee chairs stipend	\$2,500 for all committee chairs	\$6,000 stipend to research account for Chair, Budget & Planning None	None	None	None
Committee chairs course release	4 courses per AY for P&T Chair.	None	1 course for standing committees (APC, EPPC, LETTS, BPC)	None	None

Committee chairs summer stipend	None	None	None	None	None
Committee chairs development funds			Assembly secretary and Vice Chair \$300; Chairs of Disabilities, Minority Affairs, GLBTQ \$300 each; Women's Committee co-chairs \$150 each		Faculty Assembly Women's Comm \$4,748 operating funds. Faculty Minority Affairs Committee \$5,208 operating funds.
Other		BFA has requested the addition of a \$3K-\$5K stipend to the base salary after the chair's term of office		Retired Faculty Assoc receives some staff support, \$1500 for parking and other costs.	President-Elect receives 1 course offload in spring semester.

Note 1: Assembly Chair Differentiated Workload: No written policy, but it is possible for Assembly Chair to negotiate a differentiated workload with her/his College dean.

Note 2: Administrative Assistant: Faculty Assembly does not receive a budget for administrative assistant support. A UCCS staff person is assigned to provide minimal support to Faculty Assembly as part of the regular unit workload.

Consolidated Faculty Assembly Compensation Issues

Discussion Points

Spring 2008

1. Proposed Compensation Principles

- a. Faculty should be rewarded only for faculty-governance service that exceeds normal expectations (e.g., 40-40-20 or what is expected of 12-month faculty) in terms of time allocations or responsibilities; differentiated workloads may be required for some positions and faculty
- b. Compensation should be "equal" for faculty from the two campuses; that is, if an assembly chair from Denver is "paid" (see below) or a committee chair compensated in some way, then AMC faculty should receive the same benefits
- c. Compensation should originate with the unit receiving the service (e.g., Chancellor's office, the Provost's office, a Vice Chancellor's office)
- d. Compensation for faculty-governance service warrants specified outcomes and annual 360° performance assessments
- e. In the case of 12-month faculty, compensation policies need to account for demands on 12-month faculty to generate their own income, grant-agency rules, and university additional-compensation policies

2. Types of Compensation at Denver

- a. "course" release
- b. payment to professional development fund
- c. salary addition
- d. salary

3. Possible Types of Compensation for AMC 12-Month Faculty

- a. "course" release
- b. payment to professional development fund
- c. salary addition
- d. salary
- e. special arrangements (e.g., visiting professor—funded by Chancellor's office—who "picks up" responsibilities for department member in significant governance service such as assembly chair)

4. Sources of Compensation Funds (avoids negative effects of deans or department chairs funding what is a university obligation)

- a. chancellor
- b. vice chancellors (& provost)

5. Issues to Consider

- a. because faculty-governance service is not highly regarded at AMC and "service" that is valued is compensated (e.g., IRB), AMC faculty tend to eschew non-departmental or non-compensated activities
- b. to be equal across campuses, equal pay for equal work is critical
- c. the probable reorganization of Faculty Assembly may take two years to accomplish; administrative support for faculty governance, in the form of financial commitments, is essential to facilitate the process

March 24, 2008

Leslie C. Jameson, M.D.

Salary Support for Institutional Administrative Functions

Structure from the School of Medicine for the Medical Student Education.

Developed by Rob Feinstein and administered by Amy Collins Davis
Provided by Dean Krugman.

Departmental Reimbursement.

SOM Role	FTE Support School/Department	Assembly Role
Associate Dean	0.4/ 0	President/President Elect
Block Director* Basic Science	0.2/0	Major Committee Chair e.g. Finance, Full Institutional committee
Block Director – Clinical**	0.1/0.1	Same
Local Course Manager***	0/0.1	Minor Committee Chair

*Block Director – Basic Science is in charge of organizing, developing knowledge requirements and executing the process for each course e.g. Cardiovascular system. This is didactic lecture/laboratory/seminar role.

**Block Director – Clinical is in charge of organizing knowledge requirement, distributing the students and assessing education sites and students performance over a major area of clinical education e.g. Pediatrics .

Local Course Manger is the individual who teaches the students on a daily basis usually at the clinical sites. This payment is variable and not supported by the SOM.

Determination of Dollar Amounts

FTE calculation: Use the NIH formula

- Actual salary up to a maximum of \$187,000 for a 1.0 FTE
- Independent of rank, degree, school

Distribution of Money

- Distributed to the Department
- Used at will
- Obligation to meet performance requirement of the position.