

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 25, 2014 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
300 HILL HALL

ATTENDEES: Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Gerald Bourne (MT), Uwe Greife (PH), Dan Knauss (CH), Ken Osgood (LAIS), Kamini Singha (HS), John Spear (CEE), Sydney Sullinger (USG), Ray Zhang (CEE)

APOLOGIES: Lincoln Carr (President, PH), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Kim Williams (CH), Benjamin Goertz (GSG), Thomas Monecke (GE)

GUESTS: Dr. Terry Parker (Provost)

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost update – Terry Parker

AA has released another six hiring actions for teaching faculty. Congratulations to the Math Department for being the first department to complete hiring. Budget: administration is attempting to zero-base adjuncts, TAs, student labor and operating budgets. Parker is working with Volpi to close the start-up funding gap; this year it is over the line. To date, administration is still funding start-ups at a level that is competitive. Congratulations to the EECS and MECH departments, both have survived two consecutive years of ABET visits and have put significant work into curriculum reform to keep their curriculum competitive. Congratulations to the faculty in those units for working hard to produce a quality student experience and outcomes and alignment with national norms. Next week, the LAIS Reimagine committee will visit campus to look at LAIS, its mission, its focus and how LAIS can best align itself with Mines and support the institution.

Regarding IT issues, University of Maryland had a data breach in the amount of 16 million dollars. This is an example of why CSM administration needs to protect the school and still try to keep an open policy that works for users. Administration is continuing to work through IT policies to make them workable for all on campus.

Spear asked about the total start-up package pool, 3.1 million dollars annually is available; we generate 11 million dollars annually in overhead. Different departments have different start-up package needs for new faculty – start-up expenses for CH are higher than EB, for example. Because there is a range of needs across campus, administration tries to be competitive with other institutions.

Osgood asked Parker to talk about the LAIS Re-Imagine Committee (RIC) and explain why it is an important initiative. Parker explained that it is important to look at how LAIS can best support Mines. LAIS is a department that is organized to provide support classes for the degrees on campus; it also offers one degree, a Master's in Political Economy. There should be an upper level conversation so that we understand the playing field, with respect to other comparable schools, and so that we understand the LAIS mission. One skill LAIS should convey to students is critical thinking. One item that is missing in the Strategic Plan, from LAIS, is a focus on communication and writing skills. Parker feels those items should be addressed because a core component of that department is communication. LAIS is a valued department that has lots of aspirations in lots of directions; administration feels it will be useful to have outsiders come in and discuss how CSM might organize the department to best serve our students and the school. This is not a visiting committee, but it has a similar purpose; there is also a core internal committee looking at the overall department structure.

Minutes from January 26: Correction made regarding deadlines for final thesis submission for graduate students. Change will be reflected in January 26 minutes. Vote to approve corrected January 26 minutes: Unanimous. Minutes from February 12, were not discussed or approved.

3. Major topics of discussion

3.1. Teaching Faculty Subcommittee – Osgood

Committee met repeatedly this year and held two town hall meetings. The goal is to address problems in the Handbook relating to the promotion of non-tenure track faculty, and also, how to best institute a system that enables Mines to recruit and train great teachers and to treat them well. Osgood distributed a draft memo of recommendations that will come from Senate. Recommendations include: 1) the appropriate role between teaching, service, and professional development for teaching faculty. Committee discovery: there is a contradiction in practice and policy at CSM, that teaching faculty must engage in service to get promoted. In the Handbook, teaching faculty are expected only to teach a full load, but in order to get promoted faculty have to perform service. This disconnect leaves a potential legal and ethical vulnerability, also, faculty members want teaching faculty to be engaged in the campus through service, not just through teaching. The subcommittee offers two key recommendations. 1) CSM default policy should not be that 100% teaching is acceptable, but that some amount of service is expected, which will effectively result in reducing the normal teaching load. 2) Regarding job security, CSM needs to provide some element of job security, especially in order to retain good faculty. One suggestion is, upon promotion from assistant to associate professor one should become eligible for a multi-year contract, then on promotion from associate to full professor the multi-year contract should receive a longer term. Another approach to job security is to address the phrases in the Handbook stating teaching faculty are employees at will and are subject to termination any time with or without cause. Recommendation is to ask CSM to extend the rights offered to T/TT faculty to teaching faculty, including to give them notice of non-renewal of contract. Discussion of how long a probationary period/notice period

should be. Most Senators feel that in order to offer good teachers job security, and to demonstrate that they are valued members of the faculty, the T/TT faculty and Teaching Faculty should be treated they same. Proposed changes to the Handbook: in Section 6: need to change the language about the teaching assignments. The most substantive changes relate to Section 8 (page 6 of the Senate memo), relating to how the criteria for promotion are articulated. Excellence in teaching should be the first and foremost criteria, but it should also be coupled with evidence of engagement with the institution for the first level, from promotion to associate professor. Then, from promotion to full professor we would also expect to see curricular leadership and professional development. Discussion of external evaluations: teaching faculty want an additional reference point beside the results of the student evaluations; having external evaluators would improve teaching and would show that faculty members value good teaching. Regarding the issue of whether faculty members should be required to have a PhD to get promoted, most thought that this is not an issue the Senate should tackle right now. The next task for Senate members is to look at peer evaluations for teaching faculty, and then, discuss whether there should also be peer evaluations for T/TT faculty? Senators should consider this, including what a peer evaluation system should look like, and give feedback to Osgood.

Boyd asked subcommittee to consider language that explains the difference between the departmental P&T Committee and the University P&T Committee. See section 8.22 of draft memo.

Osgood asked Bourne come up with language that would be appropriate to address sabbatical for teaching faculty. Regarding time period for teaching faculty to get promotion, there is currently no time scale; discussion ensued regarding what an appropriate timeline would be for a teaching faculty member to be considered for promotion? Some think keeping the promotion timeline unstructured is a good idea, because the reward for being a good teacher would be promotion.

The Senate discussed the draft document and expressed its general approval. Osgood will let the subcommittee know that the Senate is supportive of this document. The draft will also be discussed at another town hall meeting, then revised, then submitted to the Senate for approval by email on 3/7/14, then transmitted to Academic Affairs and the Handbook Committee.

[Note: As planned, the memo was revised as planned and approved unanimously by email vote of all senators on 3/7/14. It was sent to Academic Affairs and the Handbook Committee on 3/11.]

3.2. Nominations for 2014 Faculty Senate Distinguished Lecturer

Three faculty members were nominated by the selection Committee (Paul Martin, Annette Bunge and Jim McNeil.) The Senate discussed the nominations. There was also a brief discussion about whether it is appropriate for Department Heads to receive the award and

whether it is appropriate for a DH to serve on the selection committee. It was later noted by email discussion that the award criteria specifically state that department heads are eligible. The Senate then confirmed its selection by email vote on 2/27/14, and sent its decision to Lincoln Carr to communicate with the recipient.

3.3. FACTIR Report – no discussion

4. Campus committees and regular responsibilities, part I

4.1. Undergrad council – Kamini Singha

4.1.1. Epics II update

See below under EECS curricular revision.

4.1.2. EECS curricular revision

EECS has asked for approval to eliminate EPICS II from their curriculum; Undergraduate Council approved the request. Singha shared results of departmental preferences for keeping or eliminating EPICS II. Results of survey of 400 students concluded that EPICS I was valuable but students didn't see value in the school-wide EPICS II, because they feel that it is repetitive. UGC decided that if departments want to opt out of EPICS II, it will be approved if they tell UGC what they plan to do to replace the instruction of the skills that were covered by EPICS II.

Motion to accept all EECS changes, including allowing option out of EPICS II as it was approved through Undergraduate Council. Vote in favor: 8, against 1, abstain 0.

4.1.3. Changes to how UGC is run

Singha proposed a restructuring of homework for UGC members: members should study proposals from their college so that a more thoughtful vote can occur when course changes and additions are proposed at the meeting. Significant, cross-departmental and major-curricular changes will need to be reviewed and considered by all members of UGC. Senate agrees that it is a good plan to approach UGC duties in the manner proposed.

Retention: FACTIR document discussion. Osgood distributed FACTIR document and asked Senators to share this document with their departments. FACTIR group also proposed a campus committee on retention.

4.2. Grad council – Dan Knauss – No report. No meeting has taken place since last Senate meeting.

4.3. Research Council – Uwe Greife

As part of the the process of getting the new computer system going to make things easier to get proposals submitted, ORA/Ralph Brown is rewriting certification forms. New forms listed the responsibilities of the Deans, department heads and center directors, including reimbursing costs to the university in the event that costs are determined to be unallowable. Greife believes that this is a concern and that some responsibilities need to be left with the school.

Greife suggested Brown discuss the legal issues of this at the next Research Council meeting.

- 4.4. Leadership nomination committee (former committee on committees) – Joel Bach
Will report at next meeting.
- 4.5. Faculty Handbook Committee – Ray Zhang
Received updated information from new Federal regulations, had minor clarifications regarding the University P&T committee. Meeting tomorrow, nothing else to report.
- 4.6. President’s Cabinet highlights – Kenneth Osgood – Nothing major to report
5. Key issue subcommittee updates
 - 5.1. Campus-wide faculty survey – Osgood reported that most departments have received the survey. A deadline has not been set to close the survey, Senators will send reminders to their departments to complete the survey. At the appropriate time, a closing deadline will be set in order to get the last faculty members to participate.
 - 5.2. Faculty mentorship and P&T transparency – Kim Williams – not at meeting.
 - 5.3. Revamp committee structure across whole campus – Joel Bach – no update.
 - 5.4. Revamp faculty senate bylaws – Dan Knauss – no update.
 - 5.5. Possibly removing Epics II campus requirement - Singha via UGC (reported under UGC above)
 - 5.6. Data gathering for good model for research faculty. Can CSM be a leader nationwide in this regard? – Monecke absent, no report.
 - 5.7. Data gathering for appeals process repair – Bourne - Has been working on this task, he has found some information on the appeals process, but needs to get more details. Bourne is seeking contacts at CU and CSU to try to get more information on their process.
6. Other standing issues and one-time issues
 - 6.1. MLK and other holidays not at CSM but at CU/CSU. Discussion of what kind of message we are sending about our support for diversity and discussion of why spring break falls where it does. Singha agreed to write a short draft about this issue for consideration by Senate at next meeting.
 - 6.2. Diminishing TA budget, graduate student bottleneck –
Senators would like to get data on this. More discussion next meeting.

6.3. Graduate admissions issues - discuss later.

6.4. Meeting on March 11 (spring break): 2pm, Hill Hall 300 May not have enough for a quorum. May have to have further discussion via e-mail for materials that need to be submitted to Handbook Committee.

6.5. Last minute additions, if any - None

7. Meeting Adjourned

Next regularly scheduled meeting March 11, 2014, 2 pm, Hill Hall 300. Due to spring break, a quorum may not be available, in that case, next meeting will be Tuesday, March 25.