

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 8, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

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

APOLOGIES: Corby Anderson (MME), Jürgen Brune (MN)

GUESTS: Linda Battalora (PE), Tom Boyd (Associate Provost), Paul Constantine (AMS), Bruce Honeyman (VPRTT), Linda Layne (LAIS DD), Lara Medley (RG), Mark Mondry (EB), Terry Parker (Provost), Allan Sellinger (CH), Chet Van Tyne (MME), Lia Vella (LB)

1. Reminder: next Senate meeting is in GRL.

2. Visitor updates

2.1. Provost – Terry Parker

2.1.1. Senate requested updates on status of past recommendations: Mentorship & P&T; teaching faculty rights and responsibilities; faculty appointment process; teaching faculty salary equity; family friendly proposal, if there is any new information since faculty conference. All these recommendations are posted on the documents page of the Senate website.

Parker gave an update on items of interest to senate. He distributed a table with items listed and their status. AA formally responded to senate regarding the mentorship program on September 16, 2014. Within that response there were proposed additions to the Faculty Handbook, those items were taken care of, as well as additions to the Procedures Manual. Regarding the pilot mentorship program, AA has adopted pieces of that but not all of it. The administration is now asking senior faculty to be involved as mentors and the FDR's have been revised to reflect this expectation of mentorship activities. Boyd has organized ongoing workshops to provide mentoring to faculty. Several of the workshops have focused on research but with the new faculty orientation workshops Boyd has designed, there is also an emphasis on other topics. Parker noted, from a mentorship perspective, the school is making significant strides. Additionally, AA has put in place a formal reporting procedure for the deans to annually assess P&T progress of untenured faculty to determine areas in which they can improve. Last year the deans sponsored social events for new faculty but they now feel the effectiveness of those events has run its course, therefore those events will not take place this year, but may be reinstated in the future if they could again be useful. Osgood noted, it is the faculty member's responsibility to know what the expectations are for their department and to live up to them, however, it is also important to provide support. Martin noted that P&T expectations should not be changed too quickly for those already in the system.

Regarding teaching rights and responsibilities, AA also responded to this in the September 16, 2014 memo. This was addressed by making changes in the Faculty Handbook. The

administration has looked at termination letters to match the notification language that is present for other faculty in the system. Regarding multi-year contracts, Parker explained, historically, it is very rare that teaching faculty are terminated; the last case was around 2006. The Handbook Committee and the Board of Trustees approved termination language that gives longer term faculty more notice for termination than recently hired faculty. Osgood said it would be valuable for senior teaching faculty to have multi-year contracts signify their seniority in addition to providing them security.

Parker reported the administration has floated the idea of a summer sabbatical for teaching faculty. The school could possibly provide a summer supported professional development opportunity. Parker has asked the deans to have the management of summer effort tied more directly to productive activity. This may provide a funding stream for teaching faculty sabbaticals. Parker explained the school provides support for teaching faculty to attend conferences and that support will continue. Osgood acknowledged the senate owes Parker language to move this forward.

Boyd outlined recent Handbook changes that allow full teaching professors to be nominated for university emeritus status. Osgood raised the concern of teaching faculty service in the context of teaching faculty instructional loads. He stated many TF are teaching 4/4 plus performing service which puts them over the expected limit. This practice does not follow Handbook guidelines. Parker reported, the deans assure him that they are following the guidelines in the Handbook and asked Osgood to provide specific occurrences offline.

Regarding the faculty appointment process memo from the senate, Parker explained the Handbook revision cycle is starting now and faculty appointment will be further evaluated by the Handbook Committee. Provost asked the deans last spring to always secure faculty input in hiring and searches, as a way of addressing senate concerns. The Handbook Committee meets Wednesday, September 16, Boyd will invite Osgood to share his agenda at that meeting.

Regarding teaching faculty salary equity, Parker explained the budgeting process. In the end, the president signs off on the total expenditure. This year, President Johnson has asked the deans to let him know how they would utilize extra salary money if they were given extra resources. The deans provided a few additional requests. The process starts with two pools, traditional merit/equity and then a general equity pool. The traditional raise pool is given to the colleges and then distributed to the departments. The first consideration is equity, and then merit. There is some leftover which the deans use to adjust where needed. That is how the 3% raise pool is divided. Additionally, there is a \$60,000 equity pool which was allocated by the deans.

Osgood asked about the family friendly campus initiative. Boyd pointed out the survey question distributed by Volpi this week that asked for faculty interest and their anticipated use of activities for children on an upcoming day in November when public school will not be in session. Boyd also reported that parental leave is being reviewed by the Handbook Committee. Stone asked about compensation for TF who are teaching in the summer but want to attend a conference which will require them to miss class (the traveling faculty member would like to be paid for their time at the conference but a substitute professor must also be paid to cover the class). Stone asked if the school can do anything to support faculty who want to promote educational innovations in these types of situations. Parker suggested, perhaps the pool of conference funds could be expanded to cover salary as well

as conference fees in these situations. Stone asked, regarding expected teaching, scholarship and service percentages, sometimes, depending on the faculty member's assigned teaching and service load, the numbers on the FDR may not match up with what a faculty has actually done that year. Parker answered, the faculty and department head need to discuss the management of their collective effort. They can then agree on the direction in which to go. Stone also raised the concern some faculty have no way of knowing how well they are performing compared to others. Parker acknowledged that evaluations are received in isolation and suggested the professor should be proactive and hold a conversation with their department head asking questions such as: "How do I compare with other faculty?" and "What quartile do I fall in?"

Van Tyne asked Parker about some courses becoming more entrepreneurial and about the 65/35 split. Van Tyne asked if having the large burden may discourage faculty from teaching in the summer. Parker explained, we started to address the issue of decoupling the summer budget and summer activity. Van Tyne feels some faculty may be reluctant to try teaching in the summer because it feels like a burden. Getting more students in the summer can be beneficial.

Regarding the proposed LAIS name change to Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Johnson asked Parker to look at processes for making the change. Parker explained that a division name needs to appropriately describe people and their skillset, and needs to enhance the school, the function and how it is perceived. That is more difficult for complex departments. Finally, the school needs to consider stakeholders on campus, figure out what they need and come to peace with how two units (LAIS and EB) can coexist comfortably with one unit having the new name. The name change will have to satisfy those criteria. It is important to ensure the department is positioned in way that enhances the mission of the school. Parker will continue to prepare this for a presidential decision. Linda Layne, LAIS Division Director, reported one of the steps in the approval process is to get senate input. Osgood proposes the senate vote to approve the name change today, pending the approval of UGC at their meeting tomorrow. Davis stated that his department, EB, has not discussed this as a department. Faculty members gave individual feedback to Department Head Walls, but Davis believes EB faculty need to discuss the proposal before the senate moves forward. The concern is that this may turn out to be more than simply a name change, it may be the beginning of a consolidation of the divisions. Osgood decided he will not call for a vote at this time on the LAIS name change. Layne offered to meet with EB faculty, it was suggested she also bring Dean Graves.

3. Consent agenda:

3.1. Vote to approve minutes from August 25, 2015 meeting - See below.

3.2. Acknowledgement of receipt of the following reports/communications:

3.2.1. Handbook: Board approved revisions – See below.

3.2.2. Campus communication: report from consultant – See below.

3.2.3. Calendar: Memo from Volpi to Calendar Committee asking for inquiry into MLK & Veterans days, as well as sync with JeffCo Schools

Motion to approve the minutes and acknowledge the receipt of the above documents: Singha, second: Davis. Vote to approve: Unanimous.

4. Committee assignments (Martin)

Martin reported, Graham Davis is the senate representative for the Faculty Handbook Committee.

Additionally the senate will provide two faculty nominations for the president to appoint one more to the Committee. Senate discussed and agreed on two nominations, Osgood will convey those names to Gitkind.

For membership on the University P&T Committee, faculty members must be full professors. Senators discussed potential nominees and agreed on names to submit to the president for consideration and appointment to the committee.

Osgood suggested Martin seek faculty volunteers with an email advertising open committee positions. Martin agreed to send an email.

5. Quick items (Osgood):

5.1. Homecoming – Not discussed.

5.2. Proposed Faculty Town Hall: on appointment process for 9/15 @ 3pm

Osgood suggested having an open faculty meeting to discuss the appointment process. Singha suggested waiting until September 29. Senators agreed to this plan. Davis brought up the March 3, 2015 memo from last year and suggested checking to see if the current senate is aligned with the proposal from last year. Osgood agreed but also acknowledged there will be revisions along the way in which the current senate can weigh in. He suggested senators continue this conversation offline.

5.3. LAIS name change. Possible resolution: “Faculty Senate has no objections to the LAIS proposal to change its name to Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences” – Discussed above.

Vote tabled until after both EB department and UGC have discussed the proposal.

5.4. Next Senate meeting agenda:

5.4.1. Teaching Faculty rights and responsibilities, including service & teaching loads and on-going violations of the Handbook

Eberhart came to Osgood with a proposal to improve the way UGC works with the goal of improving efficiency. Eberhart expressed interest in being involved with that procedure. Osgood will invite Eberhart to the next senate meeting to discuss.

There has been some confusion about how to use the shared Google drive folder. It may work better to change the folder from week to week, and in there create a separate file for FYI items. Snieder suggested urgent items need to be flagged because there are too many documents to review.

5.4.2. Other high---priority items? – Not discussed.

6. Major topics of discussion

6.1. Promotion and Tenure

Osgood reported on his conversation with President Johnson. There are three separate P&T threads: 1) Expectations: Johnson’s charge to faculty and AA is to develop a process to create new guidelines that communicate to faculty what the expectations are for P&T as they move up the ranks. Clear expectations will eliminate problems. 2) Review the mechanics of the actual P&T process. 3) Determine where these guidelines will be housed, Procedures Manual or Handbook. Osgood indicated, the goal for today is to discuss with Parker the creation of a process that allows buy-in from constituents. The desire is to make the process open as well as efficient. He reported Johnson feels this should be a faculty driven exercise along with AA. Parker and Osgood met on Friday to determine the process and Osgood passed out a document containing Parker’s bullet points. Parker suggested a joint AA/Senate committee comprised of Osgood, Parker, Boyd and

others. Osgood suggested a small micro committee identify key issues and develop a charge for the actual committee. Johnson wants a draft done by the end of the semester, therefore, the micro-committee needs to get started in the next two weeks. Snieder suggested senators use the P&T proposal the senate and his committee created last year. That proposal included goals and expectation recommendations in addition to process recommendations. The guidelines piece is important as is the process piece. Osgood suggested one micro-group start and then hand off the project to another larger group to make the specific P&T guidelines.

Singha and Davis met last week to review previous senate work. Most of the proposed items were incorporated into the Procedures Manual. Singha suggested the process may not be broken, but the communication of the process may need improving. The question was asked, where is the broad faculty leadership on campus to control the rumors and the communication? Mehta feels there is a disconnect between Departmental P&T Committees and the University P&T Committee. Parker clarified the current role of the deans in the process, they have heavy involvement at the end of the process, they do not contribute at the beginning. The president may want more involvement in the process rather than simply approve and pass to the BOT the candidates that have been approved by the UPT and provost. Gianquitto suggested the departmental faculty evaluation procedures should also be considered in this process. There should be a more collaborative process between the DHs and the P&T committee. Osgood suggested some senators will work with AA to create questions that will drive the second committee. Senators agreed.

6.1.1. Discussion of recommendations from Academic Affairs (Singha/Davis) - See above.

6.1.2. Discussion of recommendations from Paul Johnson and process for drafting improved guidance in P&T (Osgood) – See above.

6.2. Executive session

6.3. Adjourn to Bottles n Brews

→→ Next meeting September 22: GRL (not Hill Hall!)