

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
December 14, 2010 - 2:00pm
Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: Eberhart, Dorgan, Hitzman, Gardner, Greivel, Griffiths, Miller, Reimanis, Sacks, Scales

APOLOGIES: Spear, Steel

GUESTS: Dendy Sloan—Chemical Engineering

Eberhart, Senate President, called the meeting to order and welcomed the guests.

COMMENTS FROM GUESTS:

- A. Dendy Sloan spoke in support of the proposed new curriculum, management, and assessment of the McBride program and urged Senate approval. His remarks are included with these minutes. Dorgan called the question but receive insufficient votes to terminate debate. Debate followed regarding the inconsistency in supporting a program of Public Affairs at an institution that does not endorse the most recent statements of academic freedom. Following animated debate the Senate adjourned to executive session.

The Senate returned from executive session and voted to reject the McBride program as submitted. In a subsequent vote, the Senate provided temporary approval for the program but requires yearly review and a full resubmission in the spring 2013. The Senate's stipulations are summarized in the attached memo. Further the Senate voted to urge the Handbook committee to move forward with the submission of a new statement of Academic Freedom to the President for approval by the Board of Trustees. That memo is also attached to these minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

The next Senate meeting will take place on January 11, 2011 in Hill Hall room 300.

Approved,

Mark Eberhart,
Faculty Senate President

Approved,

Tracy Gardner
Faculty Senate Secretary

Recorded,

Alice Jensen
Faculty Senate Recording Secretary

Message to the Faculty Senate on the Proposed McBride Honors Curriculum
Dendy Sloan December 14, 2010

I speak today to solicit your endorsement of the Revised McBride Honors Curriculum, which was passed unanimously by the Senate's Undergraduate Council on Tuesday December 7.

The McBride Honors Program in Public Affairs is a CSM institution created in 1978 through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and endowed in part by CSM's President McBride. The program consists of a series of seminars and off-campus activities that has as its primary goal to provide a select community students the enhanced opportunity to explore the interfaces between their areas of technical expertise and the humanities and social sciences.

On his retirement in 1984, the CSM Board of Trustees intended that the Honors Program be a living legacy, rather than one of bricks and mortar, for Guy T. McBride, Jr., who celebrated his 91st birthday on Sunday, December 12, 2010.

The curriculum has undergone almost a year of study, punctuated by:

1. the report of the McBride Futures Committee in June 2010 Jim McNeil, Chair
John Cuddington (EB), Elizabeth Davis (LAIS), Mark Eberhart (CH), Tina Gianquitto (LAIS), Willy Herman (MACS), David Muñoz (EG), Barbara Olds (Trefny Institute), Dendy Sloan (ChEng)
2. the McBride Curriculum Committee redesigned curriculum in October 2010 and an administrative structure that will bring the McBride Program under the auspices of LAIS. Members of the Faculty Senate were on both the Futures and Curriculum committees.
3. an ad-hoc committee of older McBride Faculty on October 25
4. A CSM Faculty Forum on October 27
5. A McBride-CSM Student meeting on November 18
6. A McBride Alumni meeting on December 2
7. Unanimous passage by the Undergraduate Council on December 7.

The current McBride students correctly say, that the administration drove the process so quickly that the students were brought into the discussion after the important decisions had been made. The concerns from the students, regarded (a) the trips to Washington and international travel, and (b) removal of the Freshman Seminar to start the program in the Sophomore year. However, discussions were held with the 2010 McBride Senior class regarding an overall program evaluation and student meetings on November 28 and December 2, were aimed at voicing those concerns.

No one is absolutely happy with the new curriculum, because it does represent change, and because the students were not intimately involved from the beginning with the revisions. However, we have to believe that the new curriculum is the best approximation from the available resources, with time being principal.

As the last faculty member of the original McBride founding committee, I can assure the Faculty Senate that the proposed curriculum is much better than the one we originally proposed in 1977. No doubt changes will have to be made as we learn and experience more, just as the original curriculum evolved over 32 years. However, there are mechanisms in place for those improvements.

Let me conclude by recommending your approval of the new Curriculum for the McBride Honors Program.

Memorandum

To: Steve Castillo, Provost
Copy: Wendy Harrison, Elizabeth Davis, Carl Mitcham, Arthur Sacks
From: Faculty Senate
Subject: McBride Program
Date: 20 December 2010

On 14 December 2010, the CSM Faculty Senate considered the proposed revision of the McBride program, the Undergraduate Council having approved the curriculum. The Senate heard from Professor Dendy Sloan (a founding faculty member of the McBride program), who urged approval of the program and from Professor Arthur Sacks, the current Director of McBride. Professor Sacks also spoke passionately for Senate approval.

The McBride Program is in its 33 year and offers the students who choose, and are selected to participate, a unique educational opportunity at CSM. The Senate is cognizant of the passions that this program stirs in the faculty, alumni and students who have been involved and takes note of the importance that alums place on this program and its affect on their professional and personal lives. The Senate wants nothing more than to guarantee that McBride remains a unique, viable and positive experience for its future participants. The Senate is concerned that the process of curriculum development moved far too quickly this past fall (2010) and under ordinary circumstances would suggest a more targeted effort at the development of this new curriculum. However, we are persuaded by Professor Sacks' comments in the assessment document included in the package submitted to the Faculty Senate:

At the outset, it must be understood that in accordance with the McBride Future's Committee recommendations... the McBride Program is scheduled to acquire three new faculty: a tenured LAIS faculty member who will serve full-time as McBride Director ... a second, regular LAIS faculty member who will devote 50% of their time to McBride, and a third, regular faculty member to be appointed in EB who will devote 50% of their time to McBride. ... Given that a new Director and the additional new faculty will play essential roles in the detailed design of course syllabi, in the management of the Program, and in the continuous improvement of the Program, it is important that any assessment plan enables flexibility for modification of the plan as it is implemented in due course.

We interpret these comments as indicating that the proposed program is but a starting point for a much richer program that will follow, an interpretation that is consistent with that expressed by some of the members of the McBride Curriculum Committee. Professor Sloan's independent comments also echo a similar message:

No one is absolutely happy with the new curriculum, because it does represent change, and because the students were not intimately involved from the beginning with the revisions. However, we have to believe that the new curriculum is the best approximation from the available resources, with time being principal.

As the last faculty member of the original McBride founding committee, I can assure the Faculty Senate that the proposed curriculum is much better than the one we originally

proposed in 1977. No doubt changes will have to be made as we learn and experience more, just as the original curriculum evolved over 32 years. However, there are mechanisms in place for those improvements.

Let me conclude by recommending your approval of the new Curriculum for the McBride Honors Program.

The Senate is placed in the position of approving a program that will and should change. However, the act of approval provides a disincentive to the very change required by minimizing the necessity that the Administration commits resources to the program and eliminating the established means of assessment—Undergraduate Council and Senate approval for the final curricula including detailed class syllabi.

As a consequence, and as a way of assuring that the McBride program evolves, the Senate voted with nine in favor and one abstention to approve the program as submitted through the 2013/2014 academic year. The Senate will expect a new and more complete program submission no later than spring of 2013. In the interim, the Administration should appoint a review panel, approved by the Senate, that will determine if the principal structural facets of the program are being achieved, i.e. that:

- Tangible financial and administrative support is being provided by the Administration;
- The interdisciplinary nature of the program is preserved through the participation of senior S&E faculty;
- Student assessments of the program remains high;
- The program alumni are actively involved; and
- A program budget proposal be prepared that can support the goals and aspirations of the McBride Program; this includes: 1) The existing CSM commitment to the hiring of an LAIS faculty member who will serve as the McBride Program Director; the hiring of an additional LAIS faculty member who will have 50% of their time committed to McBride; the hiring of an EB faculty member who will have 50% of their time committed to McBride; and 2) The need for raising CSM Foundational funding to support the needs of delivering the McBride curriculum to CSM's best and brightest students.

In the unlikely event that the UGC or Senate does not approve the program to be submitted in the spring of 2013, all students then participating in the McBride program will be allowed to complete the sequence.

We firmly believe that these recommendations will make for a better McBride program and invite representatives from Academic Affairs and/or LAIS to discuss our decision at the next Senate Meeting (11 January 2011).

Memo

To: Wendy Harrison, Chair Handbook Committee
Copy: M. W. Scoggins, Steve Castillo, Anne Stark Walker, Elizabeth Van Wie Davis, Carl Mitcham
From: Mark Eberhart, John Dorgan, Murray Hitzman, Tracy Gardner, Gerrald Greivel, Vaughan Griffiths, Hugh Miller, Ivar Reimanis, Arthur Sacks, John Scales, John Spear, John Steel, Kent Voorhees
Subject: Memorandum of Concern Regarding Academic Freedom
Date: 14 December 2010

During the Senate meeting of 14 December 2010, a number of potential concerns were raised regarding the proposed McBride program. One issue of note involved whether CSM's academic policies allowed faculty the ability to achieve the Program's proposed mission. The McBride Program's Mission and Goals statement calls for students "to explore the moral, social, and environmental implications of their future professional judgments and activities." The Senate noted that the exploration we are encouraging from our students has not be codified and granted as a right to the CSM faculty. Specifically, the Senate's request to amend the *Faculty Handbook* to guarantee the freedom to "discuss all relevant matters in the classroom, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or restraint on matters of public concern as well as on matters related to professional duties and the functioning of the university" has thus far been deemed unacceptable by the School's General Counsel.

While the McBride Program provides a particularly striking example of the importance of codifying academic freedom on campus, all programs and disciplines are affected. At a time when the public is seeking unbiased opinions on pressing issues dealing with the earth, energy, and environment, CSM students and the citizens of Colorado have a right to the unfettered opinions and judgment from the faculty of a State institution that is a world leader in these areas.

Though we are aware that the School is faced with pressing issues on all fronts, we are disappointed that progress on this issue, which affects all faculty, has been slow. We are gratified that the issue of Academic Freedom will be discussed at the next meeting of the Handbook Committee and stand ready to help in whatever way we can to bring a new statement on Academic Freedom to the Board. As the School continues to explore ways to devise appropriate policy initiatives that are in keeping with its stated mission, such a statement will provide the Senate on behalf of the faculty more freedom to approve programs that will enable CSM to compete with world's great technological universities.