COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 28, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.
300 Hill Hall

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Jurgen Brune (MN), Lincoln Carr (PH), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Kamini Singha (HY), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Patrick Marshall (USG)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Tom Boyd (AP), Lia Vella (Library)

---

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes
   2.1. Provost – Terry Parker
   Parker distributed an updated proposal for improving email communications; the intent is to implement a daily digest with the purpose of increasing efficiency. Senators know email communications changes are necessary and they approve of the administration implementing a policy. Meetings have been held to determine the next steps for implementing the strategic plan and working groups are being identified; administration is currently considering the best method to share the information with the campus community and Parker welcomes Faculty Senate feedback. The issues surrounding prior learning assessment have not been resolved with the state. Parker is trying to forge an alliance between Mines, CSU, CU and Ft. Lewis. The initiative, proposed by Lt. Governor Joe Garcia, will not be good for many schools. The regional schools do not want this imposed on them and their standards are very different than Mines standards. Parker is hoping to have a document soon showing the alliance between the four schools. If Mines has success in stopping this initiative, then the Faculty Senate won't notice or won't care; if the initiative goes forward, the Faculty Senate will care about this issue.

   2.2. Associate Provost Update – Tom Boyd
   Fifty-eight PhD graduates will participate in May Commencement, which is an increase from the 46 graduates from last year. To accommodate this number, Boyd has recommended significant changes to the hooding ceremony, such as a 7:15 a.m. start time, a move to Bunker Auditorium followed by the breakfast in Friedhoff Hall. Graduate students and administration are aware of the changes. Considerations for permanently changing the full commencement ceremonies are underway. Knauss would like to reduce the faculty commitment for participating each year. Boyd explained PhD advisors would participate in the graduate ceremony, remaining faculty could participate in the undergraduate commencement – possibly every other year.

   2.3. Approval of past minutes
   Motion to approve March 31, 2015 and April 14, 2015 minutes: No opposition to approving both sets of minutes, therefore, minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

3.1. Approval of graduation lists – Medley
Motion to approve the graduate student list of candidates for graduation: Osgood, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: unanimous.
Motion to approve the undergraduate student list of candidates for graduation: Bach, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: unanimous.

3.2. Graduate council – Jürgen Brune
Brune gave an overview of the Administration of Research Credits proposal. Goal is to tighten up rules surrounding loopholes of research credits. **Motion to approve the Administration of Research Credits proposal: Brune, second: Mehta. Vote to approve: Unanimous.** Brune reported the proposal to reduce credits/allow double counting for the EECS joint degree program will be presented at the May 6 meeting.

3.3. Undergraduate council – Jason Ganley
Three program changes will be approved next week, Senate will then need to approve them at the next meeting or in an on-line vote. Knauss reminded the group that the councils need to make sure program changes are submitted to them in a timley manner and then approved in time for the Faculty Senate to consider them for approval. Ganley proposed the Senate hold an email vote after the next and final Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council meetings on May 6. Senators agreed to hold an email vote.

3.4. Research Council – Corby Anderson
Anderson reported Corinne Packard ran the most recent Research Council meeting. The IDC vote has been tabled for further discussion. There was discussion at the Research Council meeting about the summer undergradaute research program and talk of the discrepancy in the fellowship distribution. Knauss stated that the summer undergraduate research program should continue and if maybe more useful to some departments than the program during the semesters. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of continuity on Councils due to Councils being chaired by senators. It was noted that chairing Graduate, Undergraduate or Research Council is a big commitment that used to be handled by an administrator. The need for consistency was raised as well as the importance of ensuring councils are run appropriately.

3.5. Faculty Handbook Committee – The period to comment on the proposed changes closed yesterday. Osgood provided feedback to Boyd regarding the work his Senate sub-committee did last year to make sure the proposals will be incorporated into the Handbook. Osgood suggested it would be helpful to have senators who worked on crafting significant proposals to serve on Handbook Committee to ensure the Senate proposals are seriously considered for incorporation into the Handbook. Osgood stated, much of the language proposed regarding the teaching faculty issues did not get into the Handbook. Knauss noted Handbook meetings are open to all faculty, and the Senate subcommittee members could attend the meetings, but ideally, the Senate representative should be advocating for the Senate position on those kind of proposals.

Osgood pointed out as an example, the multi-year contract suggestion was rejected by AA and not put into the Handbook. Knauss reminded the group, the Senate makes recommendations and not all recommendations will be accepted by the Handbook Committee. Mehta asked that the Senate receive a response explaining why certain items or language was not included. Knauss stated, one has to make the request to the committee to answer why something was not adopted. Osgood noted follow up needs to be done on issues that the Senate really cares about, rather than just sending a memo and letting it drop.

3.6. Budget Committee – Mehta

Budget committee passed the budget, it is now being discussed in the BOT Finance and Audit subcommittee meeting. The final budget will be voted on at the May 18 BOT meeting.

3.7. Brief report on any other committees/issues – No additional reports.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Senate Bylaws – Dan Knauss

Knauss will make the minor technical changes to the Faculty Senate bylaws: add CASA as a non-voting member to UGC (this was passed in UGC but the bylaws were never updated to reflect the addition); update student group name change from ASCSM to USG (Undergraduate Student Government); remove CCIT representative from Graduate and Undergraduate Council membership because CCIT representatives do not attend the meetings and Romig stated CCIT does not need to send representatives to the Council meetings. **Motion to approve the changes listed above: Osgood, second: Monecke**. Discussion of whether to keep CCIT representation on the councils. Senators decided CCIT does not need to have representation. **Vote to approve above changes: Unanimous**. Knauss will make the updates to the bylaws.

Substantial bylaws change: On April 15, 2015, via email to the full faculty, the Faculty Senate proposed changes to Article II Section B of the Faculty Senate Bylaws. Amending the bylaws requires a vote of the faculty as described in Article I, Section D:

8. Amending the Bylaws: After written notice of at least one week, the bylaws may be amended by a vote of two-thirds of the Academic Faculty present at a meeting of the Academic Faculty, a quorum being present, or by two-thirds of the ballots cast by the Academic Faculty.

The Senate proposed a vote on the amended bylaws at the April 22nd Faculty Forum. The proposed changes are described in the attached document. Approval of the changes will facilitate the Senate's ability to hold an election to fill the open Senate seats for next year's Faculty Senate. **Senate President Dan Knauss presented the vote to the attendees at the forum. Through a *viva voce* vote, the proposed bylaws changes were approved.**

4.2. Changes to committees – Joel Bach

Voting for senator positions for 2015-2016 school year closes on Friday, May 1 at 5:00 p.m. There has been a strong turnout to date, over 100 faculty members have voted.

Bach reported there are committees that are not utilized effectively. He is focusing on addressing the ad hoc committees. Bach proposed ad hoc committees operate for one year and must receive Senate approval each year if they continue to operate. The bylaws state the Faculty Senate approves all committees, however, that is not current practice.
Consideration of the items in Bach's proposal: Item 1: Committees that predominately affect faculty should be formed by the Faculty Senate. Regarding the faculty affairs and senate affairs committees, discussion of whether Senate should approve these committees. Senators noted, if committees don't exist, then the administration will make decisions without involving the faculty. It was acknowledged that ad hoc committees are important to get work done. Monecke commented, faculty don't receive information about the final decisions made by the Classroom Committee, however, the Tech Fee Committee is transparent and provides feedback. Item 2) Leadership Nominating Committee chair should meet with the Provost – discussion took place regarding how often. Item 3) Staffing of ad hoc committees should be approved by Faculty Senate, where that is not feasible then Senate should be informed of the staffing. The Common Exam Committee is an example of an ad hoc committee that is not documented anywhere. It would be good for the Senate to be aware of the committee and who is serving on it so that faculty overload can be determined. Item 4) Ad hoc committees should be disbanded at the end of each academic year, if they need to exist for a second year, Senate must give approval. Item 5) If an ad hoc committee needs to exist for more than two years, it should become a formalized committee and will be added to the bylaws or the Procedures Manual (if it is a university committee). Bach suggested increasing size of the Senate, Knauss suggested an equal distribution of workload across the Senate instead of increasing the size. Mehta suggested creating a spreadsheet with faculty assignments and the amount of work included in each assignment to determine service workloads. Bach stated, if implemented, the new FDR reporting software would make this easier.

Senators gave general agreement to the five items in the proposal. Bach will incorporate suggestions into the document. The Distinguished Lecturer Selection Committee will become the Distinguished Lecturer Recommendation Committee because they recommend, not select. Discussion ensued regarding placing the committee under the Faculty Awards Committee. Monecke thinks the committee should be under the control of the Senate. Knauss does not see a problem with the current operation of that committee and noted the awards are currently given by the Provost. Boyd does a lot of work to oversee that committee each year; it seems to operate as a university committee because it is in the Procedures Manual. Senators agreed, all of these committees need to be formalized. Bach reported the Medical Sciences Advisory Committee has operated the last ten years as an ad hoc committee, it used to be the pre-med committee and is comprised of faculty members who advise students interested in attending medical or other professional graduate schools. The group would like to become a formally recognized committee. There were no senator objections.
Bach will incorporate all of the changes discussed today and send a clean version to senators for an on-line vote of approval. Readmissions Committee is a standing Senate committee that is chaired by an administration member. Bach proposed the Readmissions Committee continue to operate as is and suggested removing the requirement to have a senator serve on the committee. Bach will ask Parker to present the committee issues to the Handbook Committee.

Bach suggested making both the Classroom Committee and the Tech Fee Committee official committees. Discussion of merging the Classroom Committee and the Tech Fee Committee together as well as combining the Architectural Committee with the Sustainability Committee. Knauss proposed Bach revise the document based on the discussion and distribute the proposal for on-line approval. Further changes and improvements to the committee structure can be taken up by the next Faculty Senate.

4.3. Meeting with Paul Johnson

Senators should attend lunch with presidential candidate Paul Johnson if available. Questions and topics to raise include his views of shared governance and the current operation of the Mines Faculty Senate. Osgood distributed a proposed summary of completed and current Senate initiatives. This list will be shared with Paul Johnson. Goal is to have Johnson come away with an impression of the work accomplished by Mines Faculty Senate. The Senate ensures the climate at Mines is beneficial for the faculty to conduct their work for the overall benefit of the university. Osgood will make the revisions as discussed, he suggested posting the list of accomplishments on the website. Knauss thanked the senators for their hard work and dedication to the Faculty Senate this year.

4.4. Email lists framework – discussed above with Parker.

4.5. Perceptions of Leadership Survey – Ken Osgood

Committee has not analyzed the data. The plan is to create separate reports by department and to transmit the departmental results to the DH and the appropriate Dean. Whether to provide the departmental results to the Provost will be determined. The report containing the perceptions of the Deans will be shared with the Provost; the Provost results will be given to the President. It has not been decided whether the results will be distributed to campus, at a minimum, the Senate Executive Committee will examine the data for overall trends. The Department Heads could report the results to their faculty members. There were 199 responses to the survey, which is a 71% participation rate.

4.6. Handbook comments – Discussed above.

4.7. Suggestions for next Senate – Mentioned above.

4.8. Other topics – Not discussed.

➔ **Next meeting May 12th, 2-4 pm? A meeting will be convened to welcome the new Senate members and to elect a new Senate President. Possible dates during finals week will be investigated.**

Attachment: Proposed Bylaws Change

Proposed changes in **bold** to Senate Bylaws Article II, Section B. The current bylaws are available at http://facultysenate.mines.edu/UserFiles/File/FacultySenate/Academic%20Faculty%20Bylaws%20Revisions%20Approved%20on%204-22-14.pdf The changes are to number 6, to remove number 8, and to renumber accordingly for the remaining item.

1. The Senate shall consist of thirteen members.

2. At least eight Senators must be tenured members of the Academic Faculty who are: full professors with a minimum of five years of experience as a member of an academic faculty, at least two years of which must be at CSM; or tenured associate professors with at least ten years at CSM. Members who meet these requirements shall be referred to as Senior Senators.

3. At least three Senators must be members of the Academic Faculty who do not meet the requirements to be Senior Senators, but have at least two years of experience as a member of an academic faculty. Members who meet these requirements shall be referred to as Senators.

4. Any remaining seats may be filled by either Senior Senators or Senators.

5. Senators shall serve three-year staggered terms.

6. If a Senator, while a member of the Senate, becomes qualified as a Senior Senator through promotion or other reason, that person shall ~~retain Senator status until the end of his/her term~~ *attain Senior Senator status at the start of the next academic year.*

- **Rationale: A faculty member who becomes a full professor and also meets all the requirements to be a Senior Senator should become so as soon as is practicable. Thus, upon promotion to professor, a faculty member serving on Senate would be recognized as a Senior Senator at the start of the next academic year. This change would also facilitate appropriate staffing of senate seats.**
- **It would only be fair to a Senator who qualifies for Senior Senator standing, to grant him/her such standing.**

7. No Senator may hold an administrative appointment at the level of department head or division director or above.

~~**8. Former senators are ineligible for service on the Senate for one year following completion of any Senate term of two or more years.**~~

- **Rationale: A faculty member who has developed expertise on the Senate and wishes to continue service for an additional term should be allowed to do so, provided he or she is again elected by the faculty.**

~~**9.**~~ **8.** No more than two Senators shall be from the same academic department, division, or locus of appointment. Persons holding joint appointments shall be considered to be members of all departments/divisions in which they hold appointments.