

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 8, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: **2015-2016 Senators:** Ken Osgood (President), Linda Battalora (PE), John Berger (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN), Graham Davis (EB), Tina Gianquitto (LAIS), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (GE), Roel Snieder (GP), Chuck Stone (PH), Chet Van Tyne (MME), **Representatives:** Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Colin Marshall (USG)

APOLOGIES: Jason Ganley (CBE)

GUESTS: Lisa Nickum (LB), Cyndi Rader (EECS), Shannon Sinclair (Internal Audit), Nicole Vilegi-Sandage (AMS), Mark Mondry (EB)

1. Visitors - There were no visitor updates.

2. Approvals

2.1. Past minutes (Singha)

Motion to approve minutes from December 1 meeting: Snieder, second: Brune. Vote to approve: Yes 11, No 0 Abstain 1.

3. Topics of discussion

3.1. Whistleblower policy (Shannon Sinclair) Internal Audit.

Sinclair explained her role as internal auditor. She is employed by Mines to audit the school and she reports to the Finance and Audit Committee. Part of her role is to administer the school's hotline which is designed for people to anonymously report issues of concern.

Currently the hotline is rarely used, many people don't know about it and the goal is to increase use. Sinclair and the committee have revamped the existing fraud policy and are turning it into a whistleblowing policy. There are four main changes from the original fraud policy. 1) The range of items constituting fraud has been expanded. 2) Channels of communication have been clarified. 3) Strong protections have been put in place for reporters. 4) Sanctions for violation of the policy have been created. Not listed in the policy are more detailed procedures outlined in a supporting document. Sinclair is seeking faculty feedback to the draft policy.

Sinclair explained messages left on the hotline are processed through a third party, she then receives an electronic transcription of the report, she does not hear anybody's voice.

Information about the hotline can be found on the internal audit page on the Mines website.

That information will move to another more prominent page in the future. Senators will review the draft of the revised policy and will provide Sinclair with feedback.

3.2. Teaching faculty committee update (Rader)

Cyndi Rader reported on the committee's work on teaching faculty rights and responsibilities. The focus has been on four primary items: 1) Branding – with the goal to expand the Mines brand to include world class stem education and research with a focus on the benefits of an innovative teaching faculty. An outstanding teaching faculty can free researchers to perform more research. The committee created a draft of talking points for prospective parents and students. Having faculty that focus on excellence in teaching allows research faculty to focus on research which results in a balanced faculty for the benefit of the school. Committee will finalize details then share the resulting documents with senate.

Item number 2) Professional development – lead by Linda Battalora. Regarding the request for extended professional development leave for Teaching Faculty, Academic Affairs offered summer support for this type of leave. Committee is looking into making course release available for TF when they are working on a very large innovation because it is difficult to implement significant innovation with a full teaching load.

Item 3) Promotion Path – determining the criteria for promotion path for TF. Last year the Handbook Committee made large revisions based on senate recommendations. The goal was to incorporate flexibility in determining P&T, but the Handbook Committee changed wording from "should be" to "must be" which made the process less flexible. Service is now required with the changes. The "must be met" criteria applies to service, but how can that happen when four classes are being taught by the faculty? Teaching four plus service is taking place in the LAIS department. Other departments do not have people doing service and teaching four classes. There are a few individuals here and there on campus that teach four or more plus service, but the majority of those are in LAIS. Next Rader will talk to DH and Assistant DHs, share the data from their departments and ask for their perspective.

There is a presumption on the TF side that service will lead to teaching load release, there is no presumption for T/TT that full service will lead to teaching release. Davis discussed the rationale for the Handbook decisions for the TF. Since TF don't do research they need to do service in addition to teaching their courses. Rader said her committee's top priority is to determine service loads and figure out what amount of service is equivalent to teaching a course.

Item 4: Multi-year contracts – these contracts were proposed in lieu of tenure. AA said we may be able to consider this but first the Handbook will be looked at regarding the non-renewal notice. University of Denver has just implemented multi-year contracts. Dr. Art Jones from DU spoke at the Teaching Faculty luncheon and gave his perspective on how the contracts were implemented at DU where TF can be hired for 5 years and at the sixth year, they are promoted to the next level or let go. Rader reported, in the past, Mines TF were not in favor of this type of contract, but today, this may be of interest. She also noted at Mines, faculty are often hired at the associate level, for just having taught one class, but the school would not promote our

assistants to associate for simply teaching one class. That practice could be reviewed. The committee plans to spend January through August working on the language. Next fall they will bring draft language to the senate, have a campus-wide discussion for feedback, and then provide a proposal to Handbook Committee for the 2016-2017 cycle.

Davis suggested the committee consider both options of TF being required to do service and have 3/3 vs. maintain 4/4 for those who want to teach and not be involved in service. Have an annual contract for 4/4 types and a 5 year evaluation for those with service. Senate supports this issue and agrees Osgood should communicate this inequity to campus before the holiday. Osgood will work with Rader to go over the data and prepare a communication.

3.3. DH response to Senate hiring recommendations (Osgood/Davis)

David Marr provided feedback on the hiring recommendations proposed by the senate reflecting the views of the Department Heads. They support most aspects of the Senate proposal, including the faculty vote provision. But they do not like the freedom for departments to create alternate hiring policies and they do not like requiring participation in the interview process as a prerequisite for voting. The DHs fear this will add levels of complexity to their administrative workloads. If it were an absolute requirement for participation prior to voting, that rule would be hard to enforce. If it were a suggested rule, some would violate it and the good guys would follow it. Marr sent Handbook Committee a proposed revision to paragraph 4.7.1.A.9 of the Handbook that reflects these views, which Osgood discussed with Marr. The DH proposal also states that there should be three recommendations coming from departments: the faculty vote, search committee recommendation, and DH recommendation. Osgood is generally comfortable going forward with this proposed revision, but prefers the original Senate document. If senate endorses Marr's revision, Osgood thinks we should include a statement about the expectations and value of faculty participation. Osgood asked the senate if they support the language recommended by the DHs. He noted that since the DH version sends three separate recommendations out of the department, this differs from the original senate intent to make the faculty vote the focal point of the departmental recommendation. Discussion followed. If the DH revision were implemented, Senators suggested clearly wording the proposal to clarify that there are three strands of recommendation going directly to the dean, rather than allowing the DH to take the other two strands into account and then making his or her recommendation to the dean if that is what is wanted. Snieder feels strongly that there should be faculty consensus and agreement on their recommendations to the dean. Osgood will modify the document based on this senate feedback, send the modifications around for final senate approval and then forward. This was done via email during the week following this meeting, and on December 16 the senate sent to Handbook another revision of paragraph 4.7.1.A.9 that seeks to address DH concerns.

3.4. Provost search (Osgood/Davis)

Davis feels the faculty should have involvement in the process of hiring a new Provost or discussing the future role of a Provost at Mines. President Johnson's memo to campus invited

input, therefore Davis suggested senate give feedback to Johnson. Discussion followed of how other schools handle the role of Provost and about empowering the deans with authority. Osgood suggested inviting the president to share his ideas and discuss the Provost topic at a meeting early in the spring. Osgood will invite Johnson to attend a senate meeting in January. Senators will draft a list of questions for him to address at the meeting, Singha will create the document to get the list started.

3.5. Senate's recommendation re teaching evaluation schedule (Osgood)

Regarding the electronic student evaluations of faculty, there was a complaint about the number of emails students receive reminding them to complete the evaluations. Students are too busy and stressed out to complete the evaluations during dead week. Also, students don't know if they are actually being heard. There was discussion of the low response rate and the validity of the results due to the low rate. Senators agree that the low response rate is a problem. Marshall suggested students may be more willing to complete the evaluations if they thought somebody would listen to their feedback. Senators agree to try keeping the evaluations open two weeks – during dead week and exam week.

3.6. Undergraduate council items (Battalora) Vilegi-Sandage

Battalora reported on the UGC Program changes, discussion of the role of Senate for small program changes was discussed.

BS Mechanical Engineering: Program change to add CHGN125 as an acceptable alternative to CHGN122. **Motion to approve the ME program change:** Van Tyne, second: Berger. **Vote to approve:** Yes 10, No 0, Abstain 2.

CEE Program Change:

CEE department conducted comprehensive review of BS programs for Civil Engineering (CE) and Environmental Engineering (EV) degrees due to: 1) the past merger between two former academic units into CEE, 2) the creation of two new degrees (and away from the legacy degree) and 3) back to back ABET visits in 2012 and 2013 for the old and new degrees. In addition, the dept. expects changes to the ABET Program Criteria that will be effective for the next ABET visit. Lastly, the Dept. would like to stabilize/increase enrollment in the CE program which has slowly declined over the past ~7 years.

Vilegi-Sandage explained there are 14 curricular changes in the proposal, along with the addition of three new courses and revisions to the courses used to determine the in-major GPA for the CE and EV programs. The most significant changes are the addition of new courses, revisions to existing requirements and course modifications to the in-major GPA calculation.

CE Program Changes:

The proposed new courses are: CEEN210 Intro to Civil Infrastructure, CEEN350 Civil and Construction Engineering Materials and CEEN360 Intro to Construction Engineering. CEEN210

is designed to enhance ABET compliance in the CE program criteria as well as the ability to meet the Student Learning Outcomes. CEEN350 will replace MEL I for the CE program and will enhance the new Construction Engineering breadth area to meet minimum ABET lab requirements. CEEN360 will expand CE breadth courses per recommendations from faculty, students, advisory board.

Other revisions include consolidating the list of technical electives and making MEGN424 an elective course (rather than required) since it is not necessary for ABET.

EV Program Change:

The main changes for the EV program are to remove MEL I and MEL II and make CEEN303 and CEEN482 required courses as these labs are more appropriate/relevant for EV majors than the MEL courses. The in-major course list was revised to include pertinent courses and CEEN470 and CEEN480 are required courses to strengthen our ABET compliance.

CE and EV Program Changes:

CEE is also proposing that common EPICS II courses are allowed to fulfill the EPICS251 requirement for both the CE and EV programs. This will dramatically reduce the number of Registrar forms. Lastly it is suggested that the Field Session prereq is revised from EPICS251 to CEEN course(s) to reduce the number of prereq override forms.

All program changes are outlined in memo from Susan Reynolds and outlined in CIM.

GPA Calculation Change for both the CE and EV BS degrees: Four years ago the courses for the GPA calculation were changed. This proposal moves the in-major GPA calculation closer to the standard outlined in the bulletin. There is desire to create a school-wide GPA policy, but until that happens, this GPA calculation is more aligned with the rest of the school. The department wants the new calculation to include all 300 and 400-level courses with a CEEN prefix. The proposal intentionally excludes 200-level courses. Davis asked if there was anyone opposed to this. (Note: The vote for approval in UGC on 11/11/2015 was: Yes 13, No 0, Abstain 1.)

3.7. P&T process: discussion of rough draft of Handbook revisions

Osgood distributed a document proposing criteria for promotion and tenure. He suggested it serve as a strawman document for submission to the P&T committee chaired by Tom Boyd. Senators discussed the document and Osgood's comments. In section 8.1.2 Osgood likes the gender paragraph written by Singha, which added that Provost should communicate issues of gender bias when forming the P&T committee. Davis suggested the P&T committee should not include faculty on sabbatical; Singha replied it is useful for small departments to allow members on sabbatical to choose whether they want to participate. Osgood does not want to rule out somebody on sabbatical from participating. Senators agreed to leave that as is.

Regarding letter writing, asking for criteria for letter writers will be good. Davis suggested the letters should have some consistency, therefore there should be expectations given to the

letter writer. The Procedures Manual contains suggested solicitation language for letter writers. Senators discussed whether this should remain. Some senators had concerns about giving letter writers too much direction. Senators discussed the differences in procedure for obtaining the external letters. Osgood will revise the comments in the document. Senators liked the EECS department process of using letter writers who were identified by the candidate, the DH and the P&T Chair. Osgood proposed wording indicating the DH will create the list of names and the candidate may submit a list of suggested names to the DH. Discussion of making sure “pre-screening” of the candidates prior to the letter solicitation is not done. It was agreed that the committee and the candidate should not contact the person in advance to get a sense of whether they are willing to write a strong recommendation. Martin’s committee (on P&T expectations) may propose that all UP&T members vote yes or no, they will not be able to abstain. If there is not a unanimous vote, then the minority group must write a letter explaining why they are not in favor of the person getting the promotion. There will not be secret votes within the committee, but the votes will not be divulged outside the committee.

Osgood asked senators to review the document and let him know if they have any concerns. If there are none he will forward it to the committee on P&T expectations, and then we will compare how Senate views mesh with those of this committee. Senators agreed.

3.8. GSG update (Aucoin) – No report.

Next meeting, Tuesday, January 12, 2:00-4:00 p.m. Hill Hall 300