

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 22, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

GRL Conference Room

ATTENDEES: 2014-2015 Senators: Ken Osgood (President), Linda Battalora (PE), John Berger (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN). Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Tina Gianquitto (LAIS), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (GE), Roel Snieder (GP), Chuck Stone (PH), Chet Van Tyne (MME).
Representatives: Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Wendy Harrison (BOT) Colin Marshall (USG).

APOLOGIES:

GUESTS: Tom Boyd (Associate Provost), Paul Constantine (AMS), Bruce Honeyman (VPRTT), Lara Medley (RG), Terry Parker (Provost), Lisa Nickum (LB), Todd Ruskell (PH)

1. Consent Agenda:
 - 1.1. Vote to approve Minutes for 9-08-15
 - 1.2. Vote to change meeting schedule: 11/24 meeting to 12/1
Motion to approve consent agenda (minutes and meeting change above): Van Tyne, second: Davis. Vote to approve: Unanimous. (12/1 meeting will take place in GRL Conference Room)
2. Announcements:
 - 2.1. Welcome new senators: Linda Battalora and Chet Van Tyne
Osgood welcomed new senators Linda Battalora (PE) and Chet Van Tyne (MME).
 - 2.2. Faculty Senate will host a tailgater at Homecoming
Senate will host a tailgate party at the football game on October 3; the Alumni Association will provide a table and food. Osgood asked Sarah Hitt to help organize the event.
Emily Gonzales, Interim Director of the Alumni Association has invited faculty to lunch on Thursday, October 1 at Mines Market. Osgood encouraged senators to attend the event.
 - 2.3. Certain faculty in administrative roles (assistant DHs, program directors) may have salary reduced by 11%
Osgood reported that, like other program directors and assistant department heads, he has been receiving a 1/9 supplement to his salary for directing the McBride program. He recently received notice indicating the 1/9 supplement for various faculty roles will go away. He wanted to let senators know about this in the event that it also affects others in their departments. Ganley reported that he surveyed eight affected faculty and seven of those indicated they would step down from their positions if the increment is eliminated. Singha also noted two department heads would step down if they didn't have an assistant DH. Osgood asked Parker to address the supplement issue. Parker explained the upcoming change of the supplement was announced last February and that Osgood was aware of it. Two years ago, assistant department heads were added to departments that needed them but did not have them. The funds secured for this were not recurring and will run out at the end of FY16. As the faculty grew, the plan was to move away from a 1/9 model for extra duties to a course relief model for extra duties. Osgood stated this is an information item and it may be added to the agenda as a future discussion item.

3. Senate communications – Osgood

Osgood noted, in spite of his emails, department heads have indicated they are not always aware of what is going on in the senate. Osgood asked senators to be sure to inform departments of senate business and especially to flag important items that are contained in Osgood's emails. Davis suggested department heads could be encouraged to read the senate minutes once they are posted to the website or the minutes could be directly sent to them as well. Osgood asked senators to see if the department heads would welcome the minutes being sent to them.

Osgood noted anything discussed in the open meetings can be shared with others outside the senate. He indicated the documents on the shared Google drive are also public knowledge.

4. Major Topic of Discussion: P&T

4.1. Development of expanded guidance re P&T criteria (guideline): committee charge, timetable, and composition

Osgood explained the term criteria refers to the basic expectations in teaching and service for promotion and tenure. The other half of the P&T revision project will focus on the process or the mechanism through which it is determined if the criteria have been met.

President Johnson has recommended establishing a committee to work with AA to determine the criteria and then also to evaluate the process. Osgood said the senate should first focus on the charge to the committee that will work on the criteria. Snieder asked if the senate has an actual charge from the president. Osgood replied, the goal is that this charge document will be the charge to the committee, subject to the revisions made by senators today. The plan is to establish a committee comprised of one person from AA along with four respected faculty members from across campus. President Johnson shared the model used by Arizona State, the charge tells the committee what to do and suggests a timeline by when it should be done. Osgood stated, if the senate agrees with the charge document then there can be an executive session to discuss committee composition and recommendations.

Osgood reviewed the timeline. Senators discussed differences in P&T processes at various types of institutions. Parker noted that large comprehensive institutions may have differences from focused institutions but all of the constructs have similarities. Most have a legal bedrock like our Faculty Handbook which is fairly terse, and they have a more verbose description that fills in the blanks like our Procedures Manual. Osgood noted the ASU example seems to be more comprehensive with details about expectations, while our Handbook is the opposite. Osgood feels the ASU document is pretty good in terms of clarity, organization and establishing the baselines. Some of those parts may be transferable to Mines, but there are other pieces that do not capture the institutional reality of Mines. Boyd reminded the group that the recently revised P&T section of the Procedures Manual is a good working document from which to start. Osgood remarked the ASU document details service. Their service is focused toward the academic community and less inclined toward institutional service, however, there is a need for more institutional service at a smaller school like ours.

Snieder suggested including in the charge an explanation of why the P&T policy is being reviewed and reworked. It would be useful to explain whether it is because our current materials are inadequate or our standards and criteria are changing. Davis noted it is important because departmental P&T committees, department heads and the university P&T committee all interpret the Handbook differently. Senators discussed options for tackling the project including creating

small focus groups, involving the departments and keeping President Johnson apprised of the progress. Senators talked about whether criteria should be specific to colleges or departments since publication expectations are different for different departments.

4.2. Discussion of questions raised re P&T process

Osgood asked senators to review the P&T Process Questions document and suggested they decide whether each question needs to be considered by the committee. It was determined that all 21 questions need to be considered by the committee but that question eleven should be put on hold until it is determined what other issues arise surrounding the DHs.

Question 1: **Should there be a feedback mechanism while the process is on-going?** Discussion of whether there should be an opportunity for candidates to respond after the department head review is done. In a negative situation the committee and DH could give the candidate a letter and then the candidate could respond at that time. Boyd noted the intent of providing the candidate the opportunity to respond is to correct errors of fact.

Question 2: **Should the candidate or his/her department have some mechanism for discussing the case with the UPT?** Question 3: **Should UPT be enlarged to include all departments?**

Senators discussed the rationale for excluding the department representatives. Harrison explained, if the committee moves in this direction then it becomes more like a departmental committee. The departmental people could either advocate for or go against their department colleague. This is how it was set up years ago. Senators agreed questions two and three should be considered by the committee.

Question four: **Shall there be a mechanism for attempting to resolve disagreements between various review levels?** Singha feels communication between the groups would be good. Van Tyne raised the issue of whether conversations would be necessary if the guidelines for both committees were clarified and were the same. When there is disagreement between the UPT and DPT perhaps discussion could take place at that point. Parker noted a concern that a requirement to agreement might be interpreted as one where individuals are required to hold a specified opinion. If you don't allow for disagreement, then there is no room for judgement. The UPT is asked to apply their best judgement and therefore, they should not be told how to think. Senators agree this question should remain on the list.

Question five: **Should there be explicit guidance for expectations of UPT service?** Senators agreed having rules for the committee is a good idea. Especially whether somebody from the same department should be recused.

Question six: **Should composition of DPTs be changed?** Senators agreed this is an important question to be discussed.

Question seven: **Should there be mechanisms to address procedural issues?** Also:

Question eight: **Should any such process regarding procedure also include mechanism for addressing errors in fact?** Discussion of whether there should be a way to flag factual concerns early on so that the case is not prejudiced. Osgood gave an example from Ohio State where one committee member is tasked with making sure the process is being followed. At CU, if there are procedural problems the provost can send the case back to the department for further review. Currently Mines has no formal mechanism to address procedural errors. Davis stated it is his experience is that there are often factual errors in the packet, and when the UPT finds them, there

is no procedure to determine what to do. Additionally, the candidate has no chance to provide clarification. Parker explained the UPT has the authority to seek clarification. Senators agreed questions seven and eight should be considered.

Question nine: **What should be the respective roles of the deans/colleges in the process?** Also: Question ten: **What should be the role of the VPRTT?** Some think the VPRTT should not be involved in the process. Parker explained the letter from the VPRTT is focused exclusively on the research portion of the dossier and is used separately for input into the provost's decision. At times the VPRTT letter has shed light on the packet in one direction or another. Some noted including the VPRTT in the process may place too much emphasis on the research side. There is an element in the current structure that all deans give input into all candidates. Martin asked if it is usual for the DH and the DPT committee to act sequentially. The DH reviews the packet and comments without the DPT being involved in the DH process. Singha noted a letter from the deans would be as valuable as a letter from the VPRTT, if not more. Gianquitto feels having the letter go straight to the provost seems strange. Harrison gave her view that as the deans become included, the VPRTT letter at the high level may not be necessary. Osgood asked Parker if the letter helps determine the outcome, Parker stated there have been a couple of times where the letter from the VPRTT has been useful. Senators agreed questions nine and ten should be considered.

Question eleven: **Should there be amended role of DH in the process?** Discussion about the DH being involved with the DPT. Mehta noted that it is a problem in departments such as his (EECS) that contain different disciplines. Osgood said it would be bad if the DH tries to sway the DPT, therefore combining the DH with the DPT is not a good idea. Berger noted since the school has permanent DHs it should be separate, if chairs were rotated then it could be done collaboratively. Discussion of cases where the DH dissents from the DPT and of cases when there is dissent within the DPT. Senators decided to leave this question out of the discussion until it is determined what other issues arise.

Question twelve: **Should there be expanded guidance regarding solicitation of external reviewers?** Senate agreed to leave the question on the list to consider.

Question thirteen: **Should specific policies regarding sending letters to reviewers be enumerated/reviewed?** Senators agreed this question should remain on the list.

Question fourteen: **Under what conditions should the candidate be permitted to update his/her file?** Boyd stated we do not have guidelines addressing updating the file. This question should remain on the list for consideration.

Question fifteen: **Should there be additional guidance regarding gender?** Osgood noted a study on differences in letters of recommendation for men and women and reported that the MIT review committee includes guidance for reviewers to be aware of these gendered differences. He suggested perhaps the Mines UPT should also be apprised of these differences. If this is included in the Mines guidelines, it will send the message that the school is aware and that the committee should also be aware of the fact that language in women's letters is very different from the language used in men's letters. Further discussion of whether the nationality of the letter writer should also be considered and pointed out to the UPT. Senators agreed this question warrants further consideration as well as the question of guidance for international reviewers. Harrison asked if the guidance should be provided for letter writers as well as for the review committee.

Question sixteen: **Should there be guidance regarding voting procedures?** Davis stated this needs to be decided. A problem could arise if there were rogue DHs making rules requiring votes to be public, or other such varied procedures. Boyd stated the rationale against secret votes is transparency. Parker stated, if faculty don't have the trust of their colleagues to keep the vote confidential then that should be considered. This question will remain on the list.

Question 17: **Should there be additional protections for the candidate?** CU allows the candidate to submit any information he or she feels would be helpful in evaluating their performance; we have a similar ability in our new dossier format in the last section. Discussion of what to do in the case of submitting a book that is not published electronically, however. Davis explained, at the UPT level, a book will not be read; perhaps there should be different submission formats for the DPT and the UPT.

Question 18: **To whom may a candidate appeal and on what grounds?** President Johnson would like to have a possible role in the P&T process. If the president has a role, then to whom would the candidate appeal? Osgood answered, perhaps an appeal could go to a senate-related body.

Question 19: **Should there be some mechanism for UPT or CSM to communicate with the faculty and/or departments after the year's reviews have been completed?** When there is a failed candidate there is not further communication to the department? Should the department receive feedback in this situation for the department to take stock of the situation to help other candidates become better prepared? Parker noted currently there is a discussion with the dean and DH and they can provide feedback to their faculty for future reference. Boyd stated in terms of campus communications, even though transparency is good, because there are small numbers going through, it may be difficult for the unsuccessful candidates to have the results announced to campus. Davis noted that it would be good if UPT could give feedback to DHs so that there could be advice for future candidates.

Question 20: **What shall be the respective roles of the president/provost in the process?** Senators agreed this question should remain on the list.

5. Committee assignments (Martin)
Motion to go into executive session re committee composition: Van Tyne, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: Unanimous.
6. Other –
 - 6.1. Proposed parental leave policy – Not discussed.
 - 6.2. LAIS name change – Not discussed.
 - 6.2.1. Update from EB (Davis) – Not discussed.
 - 6.2.2. Possible Resolution: “Faculty Senate has not objections to the LAIS proposal to change its name to Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, provided Undergraduate Council also has no objections.” – Not discussed.

Next meeting: October 13, 2015 Hill Hall 300