Lincoln D. Carr, Ph.D.
Professor, Humboldt Fellow, Honors Faculty Fellow
Department of Physics
Email: lcarr@mines.edu
Web: http://inside.mines.edu/~lcarr
Phone: 1 – 303 – 273 – 3759
Fax: 1 – 303 – 273 – 3919

COLORADOSCHOOL**OF** **MINES**

GOLDEN, CO 80401-1887 USA

To: Dr. Terence Parker, Provost and Executive VP
Dr. Thomas Boyd, Associate Provost
Cc: Dr. M. W. Scoggins, President
From: CSM Faculty Senate
About: Faculty Senate Proposal for Mentoring Pilot Program and Suggested Procedures Manual Modifications for Promotion Process, all for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty
Date: April 25, 2014

The 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Mentorship and Transparency in Promotion and Tenure Processes has put together a package of recommendations, approved by the Faculty Senate, which we would like to ask Academic Affairs adopt for the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty line. These recommendations come out of a town-hall style meeting with the CSM Faculty in Fall 2013 and dedicated weekly meetings of the subcommittee through the whole year, including regular discussions with many administration members such as all three CSM deans. The three recommendations are as follows:

1) **Pilot Faculty Mentorship Plan for Assistant and Associate Professors.** Please find below as Appendix A.

2) **A new Procedures Manual 6.5 with recommendations for candidates applying for Promotion and Tenure** (PT) and for Department Heads and Department PT Committees to meet and discuss this document with their faculty members early in their careers. Please find below as Appendix B.

3) **Additions to the Faculty Handbook** that include a description of the role of the Departmental PT and University PT committees and clarification that changes to the format of PT application package must be disseminated by Academic Affairs at the close of each Spring semester. These have already been transmitted directly to Academic Affairs via email.

We look forward to hearing from Academic Affairs soon concerning these three recommendations, and thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

Lincoln Carr, Physics (Faculty Senate President)
Joel Bach, Mechanical Engineering
Bernard Bialecki, Applied Mathematics and Statistics
Gerald Bourne, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering
Uwe Greife, Physics

MINES

Dan Knauss, Chemistry and Geochemistry
Thomas Monecke, Geology & Geological Engineering
Ken Osgood, Liberal Arts and International Studies, McBride
Steve Pankavich, Applied Mathematics and Statistics
Kamini Singha, Hydrologic Science and Engineering
John Spear, Civil & Environmental Engineering
Kim Williams, Chemistry & Geochemistry
Ray Zhang, Civil & Environmental Engineering

Appendix A: Faculty Mentoring Program (FM at Mines)[1]

Executive Summary (PILOT)

Colorado School of Mines success is due, in a large part, to quality faculty. We propose Mines invest in a formal Faculty Mentoring Program to help faculty be successful. The cost of losing a faculty member, due to a failed tenure-case or a desire to depart Mines for another opportunity, is enormous (estimated in the hundreds of thousands of dollars). We propose Mines invest in FM to mentor, retain, and develop top faculty.

Specific benefits to Mines include:
- Increases commitment, productivity, and satisfaction of the faculty
- Minimizes faculty attrition and promotes faculty retention
- Helps recruit and retain underrepresented faculty (women and racial/ethnic faculty)
- Benefits both the mentors and the mentees
- Encourages an environment of collegiality
- Develops faculty, enabling them to make full use of their knowledge and skills
- Increases collaboration within the faculty
- Facilitates the development of future academic leaders
- Advertises the university well (recruiting tool)
- Contributes to the stability of the institution

Several goals of the Strategic Plan Draft correspond to this proposed program, such as "Increase faculty membership in national academies and professional society fellows" (Goal 1), "Improve mentoring and other support of faculty" (Goal 2), "Increase the diversity and quality of Mines' faculty" (Goal 2), and "Produce faculty teaching and research guidelines that promote excellence and satisfaction" (Goal 4).

The proposed Faculty Mentoring Program includes four key components, which are based on a successful female faculty mentoring program at Mines.

1) **Individual Mentoring** matches will be organized to offer specific guidance for a more junior faculty member. Each faculty member wishing to participate will be matched with two faculty members who are more senior (one inside and one outside his/her unit). Mentors will be encouraged in their role, e.g., given possible topics that the mentors/mentees might want to discuss. Mentors will also be required to attend a "Mentor: Do's and Don'ts" training workshop.

2) **Group Mentoring** events will be organized to share best practices for succeeding as a faculty member. Group Mentoring will include appropriate professional development opportunities based on faculty rank. For example, Assistant Professors would be invited to a presentation on "Preparing for Tenure and Promotion", Associate Professors would be invited to a presentation on "Leading Initiatives", and everyone would be invited to a presentation on "Representing Yourself Outward". All Group Mentoring events will include several mentors, chosen to offer different perspectives, and will include plenty of time for Q&A.

3) **Social Events** will help facilitate a more positive, supportive, and collegial environment at Mines.

4) **Formal Administration Acknowledgement** that faculty mentoring at Mines is a valuable service to the community and will be given appropriate attention during the annual FDR evaluation. How best to implement this requires conversations.

Details on these four components are attached, as well as costs associated with the proposed program. With the large percent of new faculty at Mines, we encourage the adoption of this program immediately.

---

[1] Submitted by the 2013-14 Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Mentorship and P&T Processes. This pilot program is for T/TT faculty initially; the expectation is to extend the program to include teaching faculty within two years. Please contact Tracy Camp tcamp@mines.edu for questions/comments.

Faculty Mentoring Program (FM at Mines)

Details (PILOT)

Individual Mentoring:
1. Formal mentoring program (for those wishing to participate)
   a. Each junior faculty member is matched with a departmental mentor
   b. Each junior faculty member is matched with a non-departmental mentor
   c. Each Mentor/Mentee pair expected to meet 1-3 times/year
   d. Each Mentor/Mentee pair expected to attend training 'workshop'
2. Annual informal review of junior faculty member's progress by departmental committee (e.g., P&T committee, committee of senior members, etc.)
   a. Review meeting occurs in January each year, as part of the preparation for the annual FDR process
   b. Set specific goals for current year
   c. Evaluate progress made toward goals set previous year

Group Mentoring:
1. Two 'workshops'/semester on a topic geared toward Assistant Professor
2. One 'workshop'/semester on a topic geared toward Associate Professors
3. 1-2 'workshops'/semester on a topic of potential interest to all
   NOTE: from T/TT female faculty meetings, we have a list of topics that female faculty think would be of high interest to the Mines faculty community.

Social/Networking:
1. Informal gathering twice/semester for informal mentoring (inc. peer meeting events)
2. Informal gathering twice/semester for female faculty
3. Informal gathering once a year with former university P&T committee members (in last three years) for Q&A and informal mentoring

Program Evaluation/Improvement:
1. Survey Mentor/Mentee pairs on outcomes from connections
2. Survey attendees of Group Mentoring Workshops on content provided
3. Mechanism for assessing the value of the program and mentor/mentee pairs

Program Website:
1. Details on program components
2. Resources for mentors and mentees

The proposed program would also contain elements of interest to the underrepresented faculty on campus. For example, female faculty are typically asked to do more service than their male colleagues, as committee leaders typically desire a diverse membership (which is a good thing). But, when it comes to service, female faculty want to know "What is too little? What is too much?"

Resources and Budget: The resources needed for the proposed FM program (annual budget) follow:
- 12.5% academic year salary for each of three CSM faculty members to lead the program (i.e., course release for each Program Leader, one from each college)
- $7-12K for training (e.g., bringing an expert to campus, training of Program Leaders)
- $3-5K for F&B at group events
- $3-5K for materials and supplies

For program establishment, six weeks of summer salary (two weeks for each college leader) is requested. It is recommended that the Faculty Mentoring Program be administered by three faculty; having three leaders for the program (1) allows the possibility for brainstorming during program implementation and (2) ensures each college is well-represented. After establishment, periodic rotation of leaders will be healthy for the program. The proposed FM program will also involve several administrators on campus (e.g., DHDDs for mentor/mentee matching, Kay Schneider for assessment, Tom Boyd for faculty handbook/FDR updates, Deb Lasich for program implementation/content advice). The establishment of a location for faculty to meet socially is also desired.

Appendix B: Procedures Manual

6.5   ITEMS FOR CANDIDATE, DEPARTMENT HEAD/DIVISION DIRECTOR AND DEPARTMENT/DIVISION PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING APPLICATION PACKAGE

The following memorandum was submitted to the Associate Provost and Faculty Handbook Committee on April 30, 2014 and replaces the document created in 2002 by Tissa Illangasekare. These guidelines represent the recommendations of the 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Faculty Mentorship and Transparency in Promotion and Tenure Processes.

We strongly recommend that Department Heads/Division Directors meet and discuss the details of this memorandum with their Assistant and Associate Professors and the Departmental/Division Promotion and Tenure Committee early in the promotion and tenure process.

Faculty Senate Subcommittee: Robert Braun, Tracy Camp, Tina Gianquitto/Jon Leydens, Stephen Pankavich, Roelof Snieder, Kim Williams (Chair)

CANDIDATE

The purpose of this section is to provide the candidate with additional information that supplements the **Procedures Manual, Section 6.2 Guidelines for Submission of Promotion/Tenure Material**. These guidelines are intended to help the candidate prepare his/her dossier in a manner that best presents his/her accomplishments. Due to inherent differences among different fields, it is not expected that all recommendations apply to all candidates or that each candidate should rigidly follow every last recommendation herein. Furthermore, these guidelines may not be all-inclusive.

1. Candidate Statement
   Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 1 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Provide a summary - typically 1 to 3 pages - of important accomplishments (impacts and advances) related to scholarship, teaching, and service in such a way as to demonstrate a positive trajectory. Building upon facts, describe the unique strengths and circumstances of the application.
- Applications for promotion to Full Professor should provide specific examples of leadership and national/international recognition.

2. Teaching
   Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 13 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- For each course, list the number of students in the class and responses to Questions 901 (teaching methods are effective) and 911 (effectiveness of instructor) from student evaluations.
- Briefly describe innovative course development activities and practices.
- Provide information other than student course evaluations that will assist the committee to determine teaching effectiveness and student learning (e.g. class visits, course portfolios).
- Provide clear data on student advising (level of effort, co-advisors, outcomes). Differentiate undergraduate research advising from conventional advising. For undergraduate research advising, list student names, research period, graduation semester, project title, and outcomes,

such as conference presentations or publications. See Section 6.2 of Procedures Manual for details on graduate research advising.

- Include workshops and short courses, number of attendees, and your role (e.g., organizer, lecturer, one of two instructors for three day course, etc.).

3A. Scholarship - Publications

Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 14 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Provide separate lists of archival journal publications, book/book chapters, and conference proceedings. Clearly identify publications that are peer reviewed and those that are not.
- Provide information regarding the quality of journals in which the candidate has published his/her work. In particular, provide acceptance rates and/or impact factors (or any other published quality indicators or measures). This information may be listed in a table within the publications section. If acceptance rates are difficult to obtain from the Internet, candidates may consider contacting journal editors directly.
- If authors are listed alphabetically, define candidate's role and level of contribution. Clearly mark (1) the publications where the candidate is the corresponding author and (2) all co-authors who are CSM students and CSM post-doctorals. In the example below, CSM students are underlined and the corresponding author is denoted by *.

  J. R. Smith, A. Gables, P.T. Barnum*, "Interesting Research Advances", *J. Important Research*, **1**, 40-48 (2013). DOI or identifying link
- If appropriate, include metrics such as number of citations, h-index over entire career, and h-index while at CSM.

3B. Scholarship – Funding

Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 15 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

- Clearly state the *total* funding that the candidate has been involved in securing as well as the individual's *total* share.
- Clearly identify the amount of funding that is credited to the candidate in *each* multi-investigator grant.
- Clearly identify the candidates' role on *each* funding award, e.g. PI, co-PI, senior investigator, etc.
- In collaborative grants with outside institutions, identify the amount expended at CSM.
- Provide information on how the funds were utilized to support students, post-doctoral, and/or technicians.
- Identify products such as number of papers, software, workshops, book, patents, etc. that resulted from the funding generated.
- List non-funded proposals (same level of detail as funded proposals) to demonstrate track record for trying to obtain grant funding.

4. Service

Within the candidate's dossier, the information below should appear within Item 16 as listed in the Procedures Manual, Section 6.2.

For all of the items listed below, note that the candidate should state his/her level of effort and the impact of the contributions. In other words, a list of service does not provide sufficient information.

- National and international committees, editorial boards, panels, review teams, etc.
- Departmental and campus committees, graduate student committees, junior faculty mentoring, etc.
- Professional societies
- Outreach activities
- Organizing conferences, sessions, workshops, etc.

DEPARTMENT HEAD/DIVISION DIRECTOR AND DEPARTMENT/DIVISION PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE

The following recommendations incorporate aspects of Illangasekare's 2002 memorandum and may form the basis for a future expanded section.

- Provide information regarding context of candidates' accomplishments relative to peer departments and institutions.
- What are the expectations in terms of number of publications and research funds generated?
- How do you weigh writing a textbook as a teaching or/and research contribution?
- What is the average teaching load in your department for a research active faculty member by rank?
- What are the general expectations with respect to the teaching of number of undergraduate, graduate and advanced graduate level courses in your department?
- What are the expectations in your department in relation to the number of M.S. and Ph.D. students a candidate has helped to graduate before going for tenure and promotion?
- Do you count graduate student advising and supervision of special study courses towards teaching?
- Do you count advising undergraduate research towards teaching?
- Do you consider faculty mentoring as a valuable service and how do you assess outcome?
- Are there details unique to CSM that will assist external reviewers to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments?
- For the candidate's discipline, are other avenues used to disseminate scholarly work (e.g., writing a textbook, instructional software and videos, professional development workshops, etc.)?
- What are the expectations for service at the department, campus, and extramural levels?

Reference Letters

- Provide information on the process used to solicit references, e.g., how the list was prepared.
- Provide a copy of the generic letter of solicitation for external reviews.
- Provide a table listing the individuals from whom letters were requested (include name/affiliation/title and standing in the field), the response from each potential letter writer (or lack thereof), and whom suggested the letter writer.

Please see Section 8 of the Handbook for complete information:

http://inside.mines.edu/UserFiles/File/policies/FAC/HB_Sec8_Promotion_Tenure.pdf.