

# COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 9, 2016 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), Jason Ganley (CBE), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (HY), Chuck Stone (PH), Jay Straker (LAIS), Chet Van Tyne (MME). **Representatives:** Wendy Harrison (BOT), Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Samara Omar (USG).

### APOLOGIES:

**GUESTS:** Tom Boyd (AA), Corby Anderson (MME), Lisa Nickum (LB), Jane Rosenthal (OCP)

---

### 1. Approvals and Announcements

#### 1.1. Past Minutes (Osgood)

Minutes from January 26, 2016 will be approved at the next meeting.

### 2. Visitors

#### 2.1. Provost Update (Tom Boyd, Interim Provost)

Boyd reported on the status of the library renovation. There will be two town hall meetings lead by an independent consultant at the end of February and open to the campus community to discuss the needs of campus constituents. Feedback will be provided to the library advisory committee. This is an additional opportunity for students and faculty to provide input for the renovation. After the town hall meetings a new building advisory committee will work with the architect to design the plans. Boyd encouraged all faculty to attend the meetings.

Boyd updated senators on the search for the next library director. Joni Lerud-Heck is retiring June 1. Lisa Dunn will serve as interim director. Boyd is now putting together a search committee, he anticipates candidates visiting campus in the fall.

#### 2.2. Ad-hoc Committee on Mining and Mineral Processing Report (Harrison)

Harrison reported on the work of the ad-hoc committee charged by Deans Kaufman and Graves last June to examine how Mines might reposition the Mining and MME Departments.

Committee members are Corby Anderson, John Spear, Priscilla Nelson, Chet Van Tyne and Wendy Harrison. The committee was asked to examine the student experience, determine improvements and suggest a viable path for Mines to become a global leader in mining and mineral processing. The charge does not include analyzing the curriculum. The committee's report is posted on the senate website and in the senate shared drive. The committee determined options going forward: leave metal processing in MME, move it to Mining and/or set up an institute that looks at the sustainability of resources use. Committee looked at advantages and disadvantages of each of the options. Results of the analysis were provided to

President Johnson and he will consider the information and determine the path forward. Anderson reported that President Johnson was encouraging regarding his views on hiring and promotion and tenure. He supports hiring year-round and if a person is noted in their field, they could be hired anytime. Brune asked Harrison to highlight the pros and cons of the three options. Harrison explained, for faculty to be successful when they reside in a small department and possess a diverse discipline, the nature of their situation needs to be recognized and that person may need to be judged differently. She reported, the committee is not looking at changing degrees, but is looking at enabling the faculty to be successful and making the school better for students. Resources should be provided to support making Mines a world-wide leader in this area.

2.3. Jane Rosenthal, Director of Compliance and Policy, reported on the status of the revisions to the Conflict of Interest Policy. In the fall the BOT adopted a slightly revised conflict of interest policy and a training requirement. It is posted on the BOT policy page. Rosenthal distributed copies of the policy and the conflict of interest form that faculty will need to complete. The form contains a link to the required on-line training site which is a third party vendor. Faculty will be required to complete the training once every four years. The program teaches the user what a conflict of interest is as well as discusses the meaning of conflict of commitment. This is important when faculty members have ownership in companies. Conflict of interest reports will be filed with Rosenthal, rather than departments, to ensure confidentiality. The policy is in place to ensure Mines is compliant with federal regulations. The form is on the web page currently. Rosenthal invited feedback and asked that faculty direct specific questions to her.

### 3. P&T Update (Osgood)

Osgood reported the P&T subcommittee sent draft language to President Johnson and Tom Boyd in late December, the president and deans gave feedback. Osgood shared the February 5 version of the P&T report Defining Expectations for Promotion and Tenure at CSM with senators. He asked senators to review the document in preparation for a discussion at the next senate meeting. He updated the group on the current state of the P&T revision process. Osgood asked senators to determine the best method for obtaining faculty feedback; senators agreed the document should be sent directly to faculty. Osgood will send the document to Boyd for distribution to academic faculty.

Boyd asked senators to consider whether there are any items in the proposed process for which faculty, who are up for P&T this year, need to be aware. Items that may be concerning or inconsistent with current practice need to be identified. These changes do not need to go through the Handbook Committee. Osgood asked for a senator to draft a memo to the faculty, Singha volunteered. The senate will focus on analyzing the Defining Expectations for P&T document at the next meeting and then will look at how to move forward with P&T procedures in the Handbook. Davis pointed out there may be conflict between this document and the Handbook regarding external service because the new P&T document encourages external service whereas the Handbook requires various approvals of external service. Boyd and Davis will review the Handbook for references to external service.

Osgood asked for three senators to thoroughly review the document. Straker, Singha and Berger agreed to review it carefully and meet to discuss their observations. Singha will invite Sitchler to participate in the review.

#### 4. Faculty Forum discussion & possible actions moving forward (Osgood)

##### 4.1. Senator Meetings with Departments

Senators are holding meetings with each department to discuss issues from the recent faculty forum. The GP department was quick to welcome senators to meet. Stone, Osgood and Martin attended the meeting with GE faculty and staff. The department took the forum issues very seriously. Challenges in upcoming department discussions may be the attitude that “somebody else is doing these things, not me” and “we see the problem but we are all busy and stressed so we can’t take action.” In those cases, Osgood suggested redirecting the conversation to “Yes you are stressed and busy but what can we do to prevent this and to fix the situation?” Osgood added faculty don’t understand why there should be a concern over student stress because at Mines, the programs are hard and faculty feel we all work hard and we are all stressed. He reiterated the need to focus on what faculty can do to reduce stress and still provide a strong program. An example: don’t give an exam that is designed for half the class to fail, instead, figure out how to create an atmosphere of support. Martin reported it was good that staff members were in attendance. It was noted that Mines helps perpetuate these problems because everything the school reports is measured by dollars (graduating student salaries, the dollar amount brought in by researchers, etc.). How can we focus on an education that provides benefits other than money? One goal of the meetings with departments is to ask faculty to look at what they inadvertently do that brings on more stress than is necessary. Osgood asked Pilkington to schedule meetings with the remaining departments.

##### 4.2. Senate letter re forum

Osgood shared some of the messages he received after the forum. There was a lot of positive feedback and support for openly discussing the issues of sexual violence, treatment of students and how those are linked to stress.

##### 4.3. Engaging students

Boyd reported another aspect of changing the campus climate is outreach to students. Boyd and Ranta-Curran will lead student sessions on sexual violence. Osgood suggested senators find additional methods to reach out to students such as attend student government meetings or set up an open meeting with them. Mehta suggested that department faculty set up a meeting with their students after the senators meet with the department. This would allow the faculty and their students to have a discussion. Ranta-Curran will do a survey of the student experience. Boyd’s is not interested in targeting individual employees, the goal is improving the Mines experience for all faculty, students and staff. He stated, as a school, we need to 1) have a set of expectations for all of us and 2) speak up when others’ behavior does not meet

those expectations. If we can change those two things then we've fundamentally changed the culture of the institution. Davis asked about the appropriate role for senior faculty when mentoring junior faculty. Senior faculty provide mentoring for publishing and academic items, but not for behavior. Collegiality and good behavior are not included or rewarded in the P&T package. Senators agreed the faculty senate has a vital role in changing the environment and making Mines better, therefore, the senate needs to lead this charge. Osgood took away from the GP department meeting the faculty need to hear from the president and provost a statement on where they stand on this. Osgood added, DHs also need training on what to do when questionable or concerning situations arise.

Straker pointed out question five on the electronic student evaluations of faculty questionnaire regarding whether the professor demonstrates a caring attitude. (Actual question is: [Instructor name] demonstrates a positive attitude toward helping students.) Straker suggested the school look at the faculty scores on that question and perhaps elevate the criteria to be added to the FDR.

## 5. Other topics of discussion

### 5.1. Undergraduate Council Items (Ganley)

Ganley reported there are six items needing senate approval, those items have been posted on the shared drive.

1) PA Proposal to remove prerequisites: students can take 200 level courses right away.

**Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Martin. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

2) BS in Geology: allow Math 225 or 222 and add GEGN330 Thermodynamics for Geoscientists.

**Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Osgood. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

3) LAIS Minor: remove one course requirement (Literature in Society) and replace with an additional elective. **Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Osgood. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

4) BS in EE: replace MEL lab II with SEED lab which is more electrical engineering based and less ME based. **Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Straker. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

5) BS in Economics: reduce credits to 124. **Motion to approve: Singha, second: Davis. Vote to approve: Yes 10, No 0, Abstain 1. (Stone arrived after this vote.)**

6) BS in Math: move Probability and Statistics into the core, change the field session course. **Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Martin. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

Osgood gave an update on the expansion of the honors program. A first-year honors program will begin next year. As part of that program, students will take the new combined EPICS and

NHV course. They are still determining whether the course will be 6 or 7 credits. Osgood will ask UGC to approve allowing the piloted EPICS/NHV combined course to count toward the degree.

#### 5.2. Graduate Council Items (Brune)

Brune reported on Graduate Council items for senate approval.

1) CEE MS/ PhD Program: changing out the environmental toxicology course, replacing it with a microbial processes course and taking out an area of emphasis

**Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Mehta. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

2) UCT program name change: proposal to change the name from UCT to UCT Engineering.

**Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Berger. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

3) UCT program change: course changes (additions, consolidations and changes to courses).

**Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Singha. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

4) MS/PhD in Mineral and Energy Economics: move an elective into the core, add economic evaluation workshop. **Motion to approve: Van Tyne, second: Berger. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

5) MS in Engineering and Technology Management: change course names. Van Tyne stated the senate does not need to vote on course name changes. There was no opposition to the changes presented.

6) MS/PhD in Hydrologic Science and Engineering: change in Bulletin language clarifying the requirements determining committee members. Van Tyne stated senate approval is not needed for this type of Bulletin language change. Brune will forward this to Boyd for Provost approval. There was no opposition to this Bulletin language change.

#### 5.3. Handbook Remedies (Davis)

Davis reported Osgood sent a paragraph for remedies when Handbook policies are not followed. Davis talked to internal auditor Sinclair, she thought the audit area would be a good place for this. Davis noted that faculty can file a grievance or report under the whistleblower policy. Davis suggested putting this in the Handbook and seeing how it works. **Senate agrees with the paragraph distributed by Osgood and moves to submit it to Handbook Committee. Motion to approve: Brune, second: Van Tyne. Vote to approve: Unanimous.** Senate discussed asking the audit office to report the number of instances of concern to the senate. **Motion to approve an amendment to the above motion, to include the request to have the auditor provide senate with numbers of reports: Mehta, second: Van Tyne. Vote: Unanimous.** Davis will present this to Handbook Committee.

## 6. New Items

### 6.1. Availability of Library Periodicals (Singha)

A faculty member reported they do not have needed periodicals in the library and there is not funding to order additional periodicals because the library budget has been fixed for many years. It was suggested that senate raise the concern of a need for more journals. There used to be a library committee that visited departments once a year to ask what journals are needed. The provost disbanded that committee. Senators agreed that reinstatement of the library committee should be considered; if reinstated, it should be a senate sub-committee.

Osgood reported creating a library senate sub-committee would require a change in the bylaws. Discussion of how a library sub-committee should be designed to be effective (large, small, include representatives from all departments). Aucoin reported that GSG helps fund the interlibrary loan fees to gain access to more periodicals for graduate student research. Nickum reported that each year journals increase in cost by 5-7%. 80% or more of the library's materials budget goes toward periodicals, most of which come bundled in large packages. When asked about ordering new periodicals, the library staff tell faculty, let us know which ones you want to drop in order to get new ones. Dropping individual journals and picking up new ones is often not possible because of the bundled journals. Davis suggested, because of the new dean and college structure, perhaps it is time to delegate the responsibility of selecting journals to the colleges. Osgood asked for senators to contact the library to discuss setting up a library committee; Van Tyne, Martin and Battalora agreed to work on forming a committee.

## 7. Executive Session

### 7.1. Replacement for Roel Snieder

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 - Hill Hall 300