COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
February 14, 2012 - 2:00pm
Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES:  Davis, Dean, Gardner, Greivel, Miller, Reimanis, Spear, Van Tyne, Zhang

APOLOGIES:  Braun, Scales, Steele, Williams

GUESTS:  Terry Parker, Provost; Lara Medley, Registrar; Tom Boyd, Graduate Studies

Dean, Senate President, called the meeting to order.

Provost Parker update items:
- There has been discussion on campus regarding the asymmetry created by the new Dean structure and how this might affect the P&T process. Some changes were considered, but It was felt that approaching the Handbook Committee with this was premature. The Provost is already provided the ability to request input from outside sources during the P&T review and it was felt that this could include the Dean if appropriate.
- The administration is currently in the process of building next year’s budget. The budget primarily affects hiring actions. Department Heads that deliver 100 and 200 level courses are being asked to review their current resource deployment in these courses and how these efforts are being supported. The goal is to find out how these departments are allocating their resources.
- Van Tyne asked for a status update on the potential modification of field session requirements that were approved by the Undergraduate Council and the Faculty Senate in the fall. A memo summarizing Senate actions for the fall term was submitted to Dr. Parker. Parker hasn’t yet responded to that memo, but hopes to have an update at the next Senate meeting.

Minutes of January 24, 2012 meeting were approved with one correction.

INFORMATION ITEMS:
A. Executive Committee meeting with the Provost
   The 3 members of the Executive Committee met with the Provost on Feb. 8th. Dr. Parker is interested in how the various departments staff the 100 and 200 level courses across campus. The provost is soliciting information from the department heads as to their resource allocations to those courses. The Senate attendees felt that this feeds into the retention initiative that has been initiated by the Senate.
   There has been discussion across campus regarding reorganization. The Senators pointed out that the importance of giving faculty an opportunity for input before things are set in stone. This was recommended not only in order to minimize backlash, but because faculty may be able to offer valuable suggestions. A question was raised as to the timing of the remaining departments forming a college structure. The “Blue” Strategic Board is still in information-gathering mode. There has been no formal endorsement of a “Blue College” movement. The “Green” Strategic Board is in the process of generating a white paper, but it is still in preliminary stages.

B. Faculty Senate Distinguished Lecture: Prof. Paul Martin, Feb. 22 at 4 pm
Brochures have been distributed. Dean encourages attendance.

C. Dean requested another Senior Senator volunteer to join the Executive Committee. The floor was opened for nominations, but none were forthcoming.

COUNCIL REPORTS:
A. Undergraduate Council:
   There was discussion regarding dual degree policies; if a student is enrolled in a dual degree program, how much distinction in the degree requirements should there be between the two? As new degrees emerge as a result of the reorg, this will need to be addressed. Registrar will be presenting data to the next council meeting.

   There was also discussion about a forgiveness policy for freshmen in certain courses, perhaps similar to one that had been in place in the past. There was little interest in reinstituting this policy.

B. Graduate Council:
   Proposed Institutional Objectives and Outcomes for Doctoral Education:
   Boyd had sent a trial plan for assessment activities for doctoral education out to departments early in the fall. He had assembled an ad hoc group during the summer which drafted a set of objectives that might be appropriate for all doctoral programs across campus. Grad council made minor clarification changes and endorsed the objectives and outcomes. The question was asked if departmental responses to the initial assessment were similar. Boyd responded that responses to the trial run of 5 assessment activities varied by department. This item will be an action item for the next Senate meeting. A similar effort for the Masters program will be coming next year.

   The Graduate Research Fair has been expanded to 2 days this year and recast as the Conference on Earth and Energy Research. The conference is soliciting external participants - targeting over 200 participants this year. This year's keynote speaker is a MacArthur award winner from CU Boulder. Senate participation is encouraged. Judges for the conference are still needed, and the Senators were asked to encourage students to participate and faculty to judge. Monetary awards are being offered.

   The Material Sciences program submitted a new core and required curriculum to the Grad Council. This is happening under Brian Gorman’s interim leadership in the program. Council will vote on these in March.

   A proposal was made that would reduce the number of PhD thesis committee members from 5 to 4. Boyd suggested looking at all the representatives on PhD thesis committees. The concern is for interdisciplinary programs like Material Sciences and Nuclear Engineering. The current rules are department-centric and don’t work well for interdisciplinary programs. This will be a continued discussion item in the Council.

   Chemistry also requested consideration of a pass/fail course option. This option died in Grad and Undergrad Councils 3 years ago. Chemistry asked that it be reconsidered not as a student choice option, but as a grading option associated with specific courses, e.g. their seminar course. No decisions have been made. Dahl was asked to talk within the registrar’s office. This is also a continued discussion item.

   Boyd proposed an increase in the minimum stipend for RAs and TAs. CSM’s current minimum full-time stipend is $1,250/month. He would like an increase to $1,400/month. The TA increase would generate minimal financial impact ($50-60k) whereas the RA increase would generate a
much larger impact. Boyd asked Research and Grad councils to confirm that his assessment of the impact is correct and for suggestions regarding implementation. This is an open discussion item.

Boyd discussed the initial results for PhD assessment activities with Research Council, Graduate Council and Academic Assessment. One area is the impact of CSM’s doctoral research. To assess how PhD graduates will advance the state of the art of their discipline, Boyd sent questionnaires to advisors of every PhD graduate in last 3 years within six departments. They were asked about publications resulting from the research, whether it led to external funding, etc. Of the 63 students involved, responses were received from 44. The responses varied greatly and data did not prove very useful. Boyd then gathered publication records for these students and generated a summary document. Only 65% of PhD grads in the six departments have published any archival literature. Boyd requested feedback on metrics and how the institution may be able to encourage students to publish in the future. Boyd was asked to compile results for the rest of the departments. He will present these data to the Research Council.

Boyd also compiled data concerning completion and retention rates for doctoral candidates. This will be released to Department Heads without department names listed. The data reflect the 2000-2005 incoming cohorts. 54% of PhD students entering PhD programs left with degrees (60% is the national average), some departments were in the 75% range and some department retentions were in the teens. Data is for completion regardless of full or part-time status or years to complete. Some departments have students who are taking as long to complete Master’s degree programs as others would take to complete a PhD. Boyd sent out a list of best practices to departments in order to draw a correlation between them and the PhD completion rates. However, the responses were not uniform enough to draw a satisfactory conclusion.

C. Research Council:
The Council is reviewing nominees for its Jr. and Sr. Research Awards. It currently has about 10 nominations under each category. Some of the nominees are executive committee members, so Spear is forming subset of the committee to avoid any conflict of interest. Attendance by the administration at Council meetings is up. Council has identified 4 or 5 topics as a focus, with plans to make recommendations in April. One is the need for a daycare facility to attract a better class of researchers. Another is that Mines trains grad students at a high level, but recruits at a relatively low level. The council is also looking at the best ways to mentor incoming faculty more about how to do research at CSM and in general. Also, it is addressing how to work with ORA to help streamline the flow of research across campus. Recommendations will be made by April. Research Lecture Series: Junko Munakata-Marr is speaking this Friday in the Library at noon. Attendance to the January lecture was low.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:
A. March Faculty Forum
It was suggested that the Senate request a “State of the University” discussion from the Provost. Dean will approach Dr. Parker.

B. Common Exam Schedule
Faculty feedback suggests that there is significant support for not having finals on Saturday so that students have more of a study break before exams start. The Registrar was told by administration that Commencement cannot be moved from Friday. Senate continued discussion in support of a possible schedule change. One suggestion was to consider Sunday exams; another was to have both Thursday and Friday as Dead Days. Dean requested the Registrar explore some of these possibilities.
The exam schedule for the current semester has been released. The schedule was changed so that freshmen would not have two intense finals on the same day.

The Senate moved to executive session. Regular meeting was adjourned.

The next Senate meeting will take place on February 28, 2012 @ 2:00pm in Hill Hall room 300.

Approved,
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Anthony Dean,
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