

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 23, 2016 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: 2015-2016 Senators: Ken Osgood (President), John Berger (ME), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (HY), Chuck Stone (PH), Chet Van Tyne (MME). **Representative:** Hanna Aucoin (GSG).

APOLOGIES: Linda Battalora (PE), Jürgen Brune (MN), Samara Omar (USG), Jay Straker (LAIS).

GUESTS: Tom Boyd (AA), Lisa Nickum (LB).

1. Approvals and announcements

1.1. Past minutes – 1/26 and 2/9 (Singha)

Motion to approve minutes from 1/26/16 and 2/9/16: Davis, second: Martin. Vote to approve: Yes 8, No 0, Abstain 1.

2. Visitors

2.1. Provost Update (Tom Boyd)

Boyd reminded senators about the upcoming library town hall meetings. The first one is tomorrow at 1:00 p.m., the second will occur on Thursday at 10:00 a.m. in Ballroom D. A library renovation survey was distributed to campus, please encourage faculty and students to participate. Regarding demand based scheduling, Boyd held a meeting with the deans and the registrar, they made significant changes to the proposal. They looked at out of sequence courses, and discussed scheduling shadow sections. Students cannot see the shadow sections, but they are available if other sections fill up. If too many sections are offered, then many of them may be only partially full. Boyd presented the revised plan to President Johnson and he was supportive. Medley will implement the plan. Her office decided not to offer some of the courses in the off-cycle semesters. Mehta asked if it would be possible to allow the faculty to indicate when they don't want to teach. Boyd is not sure if that will be possible, he tried to provide flexibility. Medley will schedule the times for the courses, the departments will then be responsible for staffing. Berger noted it is difficult to teach multi-section courses that use a common syllabus but are offered both Tu/Th and M/W/F. Osgood noted that there was poor communication to faculty regarding these changes. Martin asked about the costs to provide courses in this manner. Boyd acknowledged there will be additional costs, and those are being addressed. The plan going forward is to keep the off-cycle courses. Van Tyne noted the memo from the registrar stated 70% of Mines' courses are not offered during prime times. In MME they like to offer their upper level courses back to back, such as at 8:00, 9:00 and then 10:00. He felt it is a disservice to MME students to not have the classes blocked together in that manner. Boyd listened to comments and acknowledged the concerns. Mehta asked if

assessment has been done to determine whether this will increase the four year graduation rate and asked if course scheduling is actually a problem with regard to the four year graduation rate. Boyd explained demand based scheduling was implemented for two reasons, 1) to help the four year graduation rate and 2) to provide incoming freshmen students with their schedules in June.

Regarding the meetings the senators are having with departments as a follow-up to the faculty forum, Davis explained a question was raised for which he did not have an answer. Faculty noted that there was the one incident reported at the forum, and now Mines has Speak Up. The question was asked, how big of a problem is this? Do we need to further discuss this or was this an isolated incident? Boyd answered, the item handled at the forum was an extreme case. However, in his role as graduate dean, he heard of numerous issues, such as micro-aggressions, that verged on a hostile work environment. From that standpoint, how we interface with our students is an issue for which we should have a broad discussion. Boyd relayed that Ranta-Curran has stated the reports that come to her are not insignificant. Mines expects the report numbers to rise now that we are welcoming people to come forward with concerns. Martin asked about the senate request to receive a summary report from Ranta-Curran or Sinclair, with the number of incidences, type, etc. Boyd said he does not know what the reporting requirements are for those offices.

Boyd asked for the timeline for the senate's revisions of the P&T process. He will present the requested revisions to the Handbook Committee. Osgood said they will be finished at the next senate meeting. Boyd asked how the senate would like the P&T revisions to apply to the other faculty categories. Nickum noted last year the library workload document was approved. Boyd agreed but noted that document did not involve P&T. Osgood will send Boyd a message about whether the senate wants the P&T changes to apply to other faculty categories.

3. P&T Process and Guidelines review

Osgood compiled the comments he received from Survey Monkey and faculty emails into one document. Senators received a copy of that document to review and discuss at today's meeting.

Osgood listed some of the issues: Role of service – what is the relative role of service at different levels? Should we shield junior faculty from too much service? Faculty responsibility for non-thesis vs. thesis students, more clarity is needed. Martin stated, non-thesis students take some work by faculty, but a thesis student takes more work. Berger noted the emphasis on non-thesis students may change with the new kick-back for non-thesis students going to departments. Conduct for P&T – should professional conduct expectations be included? Tenure clock stops – this may be more appropriate for the Handbook. At what levels should there be recusal options for departmental P&T votes? The new document provides a list of things candidates should do, but it is not clear if candidates should do all of the things included on the list or if any of them are weighted. Martin said they are examples of what can be done, not a list of requirements. Service is expected from junior faculty but perhaps that level should be moderate in order for them to focus on research and

teaching. This document may infer that one needs to do all of them. Also, regarding the mentoring of graduate students, some departments have a graduate program, but some faculty are not poised to contribute to advising graduate students due to the nature of their specialty. For example, LAIS has a graduate program, but a poet scholar would not have the expertise that contributes to the graduate work in the program. LAIS may be the only exception to this issue. Rather than using “where those programs exist” language indicating “as appropriate” may be a better choice of words. Davis noted the EB requirement to raise funds for graduate students. Senators discussed the expectation to generate external funding.

Senators agreed that holding behavior out as a denial for P&T will be hard in practice, but stating the school’s values in the guidelines is useful. Including the expectation of respectful and ethical interactions with others gives the committee and DHs the opportunity to raise these issues if needed during the P&T process.

Senators discussed publishing with students. Davis noted there is not a publishing requirement with students in the document, but the rule is being applied and used. In EB it is unethical to add your name to a student’s paper; in some fields everyone in the lab includes their name on the paper. Osgood will note this item for future consideration.

Senators discussed cases where people from research labs are hired into Mines as full professors who have never taught. Those hires would fail many of the bullet requirements for promotion to full. Davis suggested adding a sentence about professors who come in as tenured or full indicating how their packages should be evaluated when they do not meet the bullet criteria. Faculty hired in from other schools may need special consideration as well. Osgood noted the need to further discuss these situations.

Senators discussed the section containing examples of successful teaching. Stone noted that some of the items should be given as just doing your job, such as having a well-organized syllabi. Singha noted too much specificity could become dangerous because some subjectivity is important to the process. Osgood will work with the language regarding the overall creativity and quality of teaching pedagogy.

Regarding mentoring of graduate students, currently, successful mentorship equals the number of students graduated. Senators discussed how to amend the language to indicate quality of mentorship is important. The goal is to separate quality mentorship and successful completion. Also, Martin raised the concern that an assistant professor could be held back for not graduating a PhD student, which is hard to do in the short time frame between arrival and promotion. Perhaps the sentence should indicate that the candidate needs to be a good mentor, but doesn’t necessarily need to have graduated a PhD yet, rather, they could be on schedule to graduate PhD students and perhaps have graduated MS students. Osgood asked Aucoin to review the mentorship paragraph in detail in relation to the Graduate Student Bill of Rights. It was suggested that P&T guidelines refer to the Graduate Student Bill of Rights (officially named Statement of Values and Responsibilities).

Senators discussed whether academic citations should be included in the guidelines. Osgood noted the citation issue is difficult because some disciplines cite a lot and other disciplines have very low citation factors. Davis suggested the words “impactful scholarship” because there are many ways to measure “impactful.”

Senators discussed citizenship activities and agreed that service unrelated to Mines or professional work does not constitute grounds for P&T. They noted a difference between coaching a ski team at Mines vs. coaching a team at a ski resort. Osgood added, coaching a ski team at Mines should be acknowledged as service because it positively impacts the student population.

Regarding professional, discipline-related service, senators discussed whether the service has to be at or for Mines. Is it OK to be an editor of an outside journal, organize a huge workshop in France every year and advise thesis students in Hawaii while absent from campus because of this off-campus service – even though it is approved by the DH and dean? Martin noted one of the requirements is university service. Davis pointed out the Handbook may need to be changed to indicate that some service on campus is required. He would like to see something that indicates that the majority of one’s service should be on campus. Faculty with NREL joint appointments could have a problem in this area, many of them are not on campus very much. Kaufman recently drafted a memo on joint appointments and what they mean; that memo may need to be considered for these guidelines.

Senators agreed to move on to other items and continue the discussion at the next meeting.

4. Campus Culture Meetings update

4.1. Status of departmental meetings (Pilkington)

Two departments have held meetings with senators: GP and CEE. Four more are scheduled: ME, EPICS, GE and MN. The following departments have not scheduled: AMS, EECS, CBE, CH, MME, PH, EB, LAIS and PE. Pilkington will follow up with some of the departments that have indicated an interest in scheduling meetings. Thank you to Stone, Singha, Martin and Davis for volunteering to represent the senate at the meetings.

4.2. Senator Meetings with Departments update

See above under Provost update. Davis asked Boyd whether there are other instances of this behavior on campus beyond the case discussed at the Faculty Forum.

5. Other topics of discussion

5.1 Undergraduate Council Items (Ganley)

Ganley reported there are four items for the senate to discuss or approve. These items have been introduced but not approved at the UGC meeting. He suggested holding a senate vote provisional on approval by UGC.

EECS Major GPA calculation change: This proposal is similar to the CEE and EVE desire to clean up the in-major GPA calculation. **Motion to approve the EECS in-major GPA calculation proposal, contingent upon unanimous approval of the proposal by UGC at the March 9 meeting: Van Tyne, second: Martin. Vote for approval: there were no objections.** Also, it was noted that GPA calculation changes do not need to come to the senate for approval, but the vote happened for consistency with other previous votes in Senate over similar topics.

BS in Chemistry: This program has BIOL1 listed as a core and a technical requirement; department wants to free up the technical requirement and open up an option for a new technical requirement. **Motion to approve: Singha, second: Osgood. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

BS in Petroleum: Due to the poor economic climate the department has fewer options for field session. The department wants to cut the two credit field session to one credit and have students take one credit of free elective. Van Tyne is against the one credit free elective because it doesn't serve the students well. Senators agreed they have reservations about the one credit free elective. **Singha made a motion to disapprove, second: Van Tyne. Vote to disapprove: 8 (Eight senators voted against the proposal.) Abstain: 1.**

Mechanical Engineering department is cleaning up the A List and B List of electives. The courses came from various departments prior to forming colleges. Department wants to delete several of the classes that current students do not take, and add a few electives. The proposed list was provided to senators on the Google drive. Van Tyne explained senate does not need to vote on this because it is not a change in the curriculum, some senators interpreted the bylaws differently and assumed this constituted a curricular change. Osgood suggested senate approval should be conditional on unanimous UGC approval. **Motion to approve elective list changes contingent upon unanimous UGC approval: Singha, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

BS in EECS: Add CHGN125 as an acceptable substitute to CHGN122. **Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Berger. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

5.2 Research Council Update (Berger)

Berger reported the council is in the final stage of selecting the research award recipients. Similar to the Distinguished Faculty Lecturer, they would like to have an evening where current junior and senior award winners give a presentation on their research and then the new award recipients will be announced. Also, Research Council is supporting the new B.B. Rath award. Dr. Rath, a researcher from the Naval Research Lab (NRL), has donated funding for an award for the best dissertation. A subcommittee of the Research Council will review nominations and recommend a finalist to the council. Students who graduated in December or May are eligible to receive the award. Dr. Rath served at Mines as an adjunct faculty member.

5.3 Handbook Remedies (Davis)

No further discussion.

6. New Items

6.1 Library sub-committee (Van Tyne, Battalora, Martin)

Regarding the creation or reinstatement of a library advisory sub-committee, Martin reported that library Director Lerud-Heck is in favor of the committee and Van Tyne reported that Lisa Dunn is also in favor. The senator group will bring a report to the next senate meeting. The bylaws indicate that Graduate Council handles issues related to procurement of library materials. This senate sub-committee is focusing on the library advisory committee that was disbanded and not the library renovation. This committee seeks faculty and student input. The senate group will report back to the senate at the next meeting.

7. Executive Session – Senate did not go into executive session, the meeting was adjourned.

7.1. Replacement for Roel Snieder