

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 11, 2014 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
300 HILL HALL

ATTENDEES: Lincoln Carr (President, PH), Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Gerald Bourne (MT), Benjamin Goertz (GSG), Uwe Greife (PH), Dan Knauss (CH), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (LAIS), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Sydney Sullinger (USG), Kim Williams (CH), Ray Zhang (CEE)

APOLOGIES: Kamini Singha (HS), John Spear (CEE)

GUESTS: Jason Ganley (CBE), Tracy Gardner (CBE), Juan Lucena (HE), Dr. Terry Parker (Provost), President Bill Scoggins (President), Phil Romig (CCIT), Derek Wilson (CCIT)

1. Introductions: senators, guest faculty, undergrad/grad reps, administration members

2. Visitor Updates and Minutes

2.1. Provost Update – Terry Parker

Hiring season is taking place, CSM is currently interviewing for new faculty members. Regarding the new IT policies, the administration is in the process of integrating changes into the new policies based on feedback from the campus community. Parker will work with CCIT to finalize the policies and then communicate the updates and the reasons behind parts of the policies that have caused discomfort. The reasons for the change in policy include the responsibility the institution assumes when faculty and staff handle data that is not public and the issues surrounding appropriate use of state resources. The administration is starting up the activities list that is required by the strategic plan; they will be vetting the list with campus in the coming month. Carr requested faculty input for the activities plan. Osgood asked about the nature of the data that needs to be protected and about the use of Dropbox because the current file sharing system at CSM is less effective than Dropbox. Parker explained that the school has a responsibility to protect private data. Regarding use of the cloud, there is a bill in the legislature regarding protecting data, and CSM must keep up with that law if it is implemented. FERPA and financial data are the most important data that need to be protected. Carr reported that there is encryption software that costs \$125/laptop that needs to be purchased by computer users and there may be issues working with Linux systems. The cost of the encryption software is a concern for faculty members.

2.2. President Update - Bill Scoggins

Colorado higher education is being considered this legislative season. Senate Bill 1 is a higher education funding bill. CSM has agreed to the following with the Governor: the

state will increase higher education funding if schools hold tuition increases down to 6 percent or less. That is the most important bill, there are others under consideration such as re-funding the Colorado Energy Collaboratory and some containing other research funding that will require schools to match the funds. CSM stands in good stead with both sides of the aisle. Campus budget committee is working on the financial plan, and is looking at sensitivities that could impact the school. Applications, enrollment and retention are strong, all of which contribute to increased revenues, but expenses are also increasing, therefore the President is looking ahead to insure that CSM remains financially solid. Fundraising has been strong for the last two years and it looks good for this year. The endowment has increased to over 250 million; five years ago it was 130 million. CSM is continuing to get major gifts for capital projects, such as the Welcome Center and the Clear Creek facility. The administration is hopeful for a major gift that will enable the proposed new Meyer Hall/physical sciences building work to begin. Carr asked about research infrastructure in light of the expected budget surpluses. Scoggins reported that the surpluses are book surpluses, and that it is too early to know if they are real surpluses. Money is needed for unexpected emergency projects, such as the new boiler that had to be purchased recently to heat the school. Regarding new research space, the goal is to get the physical sciences area going first, then have a discussion of what to do after that. A GRL facility is a possibility, which is a fundraising goal. When asked about a regular fundraising mechanism for upgrades, Scoggins reported that we do have a regular account included in the annual budgeting process to cover ongoing upgrades and equipment replacement. Senators raised a need for infrastructure, including people, to support competitions for major cost shares and for going after center-type grants.

2.3. Approval of Past Minutes

Vote to approve minutes from January 28 meeting with the correction that Carr will report to the Board rather than Osgood: Yes: 10, No 0, Abstain: 1.

3. Major Topics of Discussion

3.1. Bio Minors

This is a serious issue for campus. The administration intends to grow biology for various reasons, including funding reasons. Senators reported the preferences of their departments. Chemistry is ready to move forward with a bio-chemistry minor and PH is ready to put together a bio-physics minor. Bach, representing ME, stated the concern that this is coming from the top down, however, if bio-minors move ahead, then ME will be ready with a bio minor called bio-mechanical engineering. Osgood raised the concern, that in the process of creating the bio-minors, the school should keep structure in place to continue collaboration. Carr suggested the creation of a biology program, similar to the Nuclear Science and Engineering program; Knauss suggested CSM should work toward creating a bio department.

Vote to approve CBE minors: Yes 10, No 0, Abstain 1.

Carr proposed preparing a memo suggesting CSM work toward creating a biology department. Bach and Speer have agreed to draft the memo.

3.2 Faculty Survey – Osgood

An updated survey was distributed to Senators prior to the meeting, discussion took place about some of the questions. Osgood explained that the survey items addressing workload were intended to benefit teaching faculty. Raw data will be confidential and will be reported out by department and in ways that allow the school to work on making improvements. Knauss suggested a question be drafted to gauge the success of the changes that have taken place over the last several years, since the school has created colleges. Also, shared governance is an area the Senate should address. Question suggestions: Do you think moving to colleges has improved your situation? Also, how has adding Deans to the process impacted your situation? Osgood will add a question about the new set-up of colleges and a question about shared governance.

Osgood suggested that Senators will need to promote the survey to colleagues so that accurate results can be obtained. Regarding confidentiality, there will be a “choose not to answer” choice offered on the survey. Personal diplomacy on the part of Senate members will be needed to push colleagues to complete the survey.

Data results will let Senators know which departments have a strong response and which do not. The survey will state that raw data will be analyzed only by the Faculty Senate executive committee, which should address confidentiality concerns. Administration is aware of this survey, Senate will inform the Board in March.

Vote to approve faculty survey, substantially as is, including items discussed by Senators: Unanimous.

Carr will draft an e-mail that will accompany the survey and will forward it to Senators for review before sending survey out to faculty. Discussion ensued regarding the distribution method and list of recipients. Carr asked Osgood to find out what categories are on Faculty Announce distribution group and to find out which groups are included. Bach suggested each Senator send survey out to their own department so as not to get extra, non-faculty members completing the survey; Senate agreed to distributing the survey in this method.

4. Campus Committees and Regular Responsibilities

4.1 Undergraduate Council – Singha (absent, no report)

Humanitarian Engineering Minor: Juan Lucena gave overview of humanitarian engineering minor. It includes a curricular revision and projects for students that involve communities, NGOs, and different social groups, which keeps the projects challenging and interesting for the students. Students get to work on projects that are bigger than themselves, such as assisted design for a disabled client. This kind of work

allows students to see another's perspective. Students and companies value this program. Humanitarian Engineering and McBride program are key draws for donors to CSM. UGC has recommended this minor as is.

Vote to approve the Humanitarian Engineering Minor: Unanimous.

Student mid-term evaluations of faculty issue - Carr explained the concerns of the administration, including whether evaluations will be used by the administration to evaluate faculty. Solution is to have the results go directly back to faculty members and not to department heads or administration. Carr will do a memo explaining the purpose of the evaluations to the Provost, which is just to give feedback to faculty for the purpose of letting them know if there are any student concerns with their instruction which ultimately, will benefit the students. Students will present their idea to UGC at their next meeting.

4.2 Graduate Council - Knauss

Meeting included the usual course approvals. There was also discussion of thesis deadlines and the feeling by graduate faculty that they are too early. Jeff King will work on a proposal for a solution and present it to the Graduate Council. Knauss will discuss other graduate office deadlines with Monecke.

4.3 Research Council - Greife

Research Excellence Awards: On February 6, Research Committee selected John Spear in MME for the senior faculty member award, and Michael Wakin in EECS for the junior faculty member award. Greife will inform Lisa Kinzel of the results.

Vote to approve Research Council's recommendation: Unanimous.

4.4 Leadership Nomination Committee – Bach

Data is coming in for the non-committee, committee work survey. Bach will report on results at next meeting.

4.5 Handbook - Zhang

No new report beyond Williams' comments above.

5. Key Committee Updates

5.1 Teaching Faculty Evaluation Process – Osgood

The suggestion was made that there needs to be a teaching portfolio as part of the evaluation process. The portfolio requirements should be defined in the procedures manual.

5.2 P&T Subcommittee - Williams

Subcommittee met with Handbook Committee two weeks ago. Issues: 1) subcommittee should not submit specific wording of items for the Handbook, simply their intent of what needs to be included and then let the Handbook Committee craft

the precise language, 2) mentorship plan needs to be implemented throughout CSM before it can be included in the Handbook and 3) regarding the procedures manual, the language needs to be legal and stated correctly. In the future, there may need to be a subcommittee of the procedural manual to work on this. Williams feels it is best to have the subcommittee give their intent to the Handbook Committee and then ask them to report back to the subcommittee what has been done to address the concerns raised. Williams and Pankavich will be travelling during the Feb 25th Senate meeting, Handbook submissions need to be done by March 1, therefore, the remaining P&T subcommittee discussions with Senators will take place via e-mail.

6. Other Standing Issues and One Time Issues

6.1 Final Exams Scheduling

Knauss explained how the exams are scheduled using a matrix. Next meeting Senate will discuss whether they want to pursue this item with the Provost.

6.2 CSM Scheduling of Classes on MLK Day and other holidays

How does holiday scheduling reflect CSM's commitment to diversity? Discuss at the next meeting.

6.3 Diminishing TA Budget There is a graduate student bottleneck. Knauss reported that the budget last year included an increase in the TA budget. Deans may be reducing it. Senate agreed that Carr should bring this up with the Provost.

6.4 On-Campus Day Care

Senate will discuss this issue later in the semester.

Next meeting: February 25, 2014 3:00 p.m. Hill Hall