

**COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**January 28, 2014 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.**  
**300 HILL HALL**

**ATTENDEES:** Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Gerald Bourne (MT), Lincoln Carr (President, PH), Uwe Greife (PH), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (LAIS), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Kamini Singha (HS), John Spear (CCE), Sydney Sullinger (USG), Kim Williams (CH), Ray Zhang (CEE)

**APOLOGIES:** Dan Knauss (CH – sabbatical), James Slyby (GSA)

**GUESTS:** Dr. Terry Parker (Provost), Jason Ganley (CBE), Tracy Gardner (CBE), Colin Marshall (Junior Class Rep)

---

1. Introductions:

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost update – Terry Parker

The new IT policy has been announced, administration is starting to receive feedback. Feedback will be incorporated and the final policy will be improved. Defining personal use vs. business use of devices is being discussed; encryption and defining where the lines will be drawn is also being clarified.

Regarding EPICS II, Parker met with Carr and discussed the administration's concerns; Parker will meet with Singha (UGC Chair) in the next few days and broaden the discussion. In a meeting with student leadership, concerns with EPICS II were also expressed to Parker.

Attrition report: attrition rate data is in for the spring. CSM lost 2.6% of the freshman class since last fall, the loss was 2.3% last year, those numbers are not statistically significant. Early retention metrics on the class of 2012/13 look very good. The big issue is second to third year retention, if the current rate holds, CSM will retain into the third year at the greater than 85% level. Carr asked about the goal for retention. Retention rate is an indicator for four-year graduation rate. We have a 40% graduation rate after four years, after 4.5 years it goes up. Goal is to get that percentage rate up to the 60's. [Rate per K. Schneider: 4 years = 44.1%, 4.5 years = 57.9%]

A test of the emergency alert system occurred today, Parker encouraged all to sign up for the system. If signed up, you get a text message when there is an emergency. To sign up go to Inside Mines, go to trailhead, select self-help option then enroll.

2.2. USG Update on midterm evaluations – Colin Marshall, Junior Class Representative, reported that the junior class is working on a mid-term faculty evaluation to be sent out through Blackboard. Sydney Sullinger, USG Representative, presented the draft of the questionnaire, which includes five multiple choice and two open ended questions. Osgood noted that the questions could be more mid-term oriented. To aid the professors, specific feedback is needed so that the professor can make immediate adjustments in their teaching. Senators made suggestions of questions that might be useful to put in the questionnaire, including asking what percent of the reading has the student completed. Carr proposed giving a very brief questionnaire after two weeks of class then having a more thorough questionnaire at mid-term. Williams reported that some departments want to know what questions will be asked in the mid-term survey, prior to distributing the survey. Carr recommended the students attend department meetings and present their plan directly to the faculty members. Senate strongly supports students meeting with faculty at the departmental meetings and presenting their plan at UGC. Students will contact department assistants to schedule their attendance at the meetings. Carr question to USG students, are you going to continue pushing the issue from last year of getting your work back from professors in two weeks? Getting work returned to students within two weeks has been put on the standard syllabus template. Carr recommended USG students get feedback from students to know that they still want this and to see how it is going. Senate wants to support the students on this issue. Carr suggested the students also bring this up at the UGC meeting.

2.3. Approval of past minutes

Vote to approve minutes from 11/26/13 and 1/15/14: 11 voted to approve, 1 abstention.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities, part I

3.1. Undergrad council – Kamini Singha

Minor approvals: Biomedical engineering minor in CBE approved by UGC. BELS committee proposed a series of bio minors, this is the first one to be approved. Second minor will need to come from the ground up. PH has interest in a physics bio minor. Singha asked Senate members to let her know if their department wants a bio-related minor. Gardner explained the list of courses needed for students interested in pre-med and courses needed for obtaining a bio minor. There is some overlap between bio minors and the list of courses needed to get into medical school. Bach suggested the Senate have a serious discussion about the big picture of bio-science before a lot of individual minors are approved by Senate. The BELS minor is no longer available to

students who started this fall. Bach posed the question, when was this officially eliminated as an option? Bach proposed offering one minor with multiple tracks, rather than multiple minors offered in different departments. Discussion ensued as to the pros and cons of having one vs. multiple minors. Originally, BELS was one minor with six tracks. Singha, feels having multiple minors on the books is good for the school, because it offers students options and will garner enthusiasm. Singha wants to make sure there is something in place for bio students to select since they can no longer sign up for the old BELS minor. Gardner reported that, there are good reasons for moving away from the BELS program, which didn't even have a home. Bio grew out of various areas, so it makes sense, in her opinion, to have a group of minors to offer and for them to have a home and a name that people recognize. If there is concern about overlap in the courses for the minors, when additional minors are offered, UGC can determine if there is too much overlap and handle those situations accordingly. This is a good framework to get started. A question was posed about departments getting credit for teaching these classes from other departments. Gardner explained that the departments that teach the course do get credit for teaching it, even though credit is earned in another department for the major. Spear raised the issue that maybe CSM needs a bio department, having the bio minors is a start in that direction. The success of these bio minors will help biology on campus. Singha brought forth a motion to approve adopting bio minor document as it stands with no changes. Vote to Approve: Yes: 4, No: 1, Abstain: 7.

There will be more discussion on this topic by the Senate at the next meeting. Carr asked that Singha report back to UGC and seek more feedback. In answer to the question, "Why did people abstain?" Williams said it was not discussed in her department and she didn't want to vote without knowing her department's choice on the minors. Several UGC reps didn't report back to and solicit an opinion from their departments. Senate wants to make sure UGC reps have discussed bio-minors with their departments. Gardner: if council members are not reporting back to their departments that is a problem. Osgood suggested, now that the Senate has heard the issue, Senators need to discuss this with their departments. Four Senators are liaisons to other departments, they will report back to those departments. February 25 must be the final vote in Senate on this issue. Bach question: if it is the Senate's job to approve minors, does the Senate also have the responsibility to approve disbanding minors?

Humanitarian Engineering minor was approved at UGC. It was proposed by Juan Lucena to have one minor with areas of special interest. Carr asked Singha to circulate the Humanitarian Engineering minor document. Senate will vote on 2/11.

3.1.1. Epics II, Bio minors update. EPICS II – There is a very mixed review as to what people want with EPICS. Singha is gathering data from UGC and then will report back to the Senate. Sullinger: Students think that EPICS I is good and has a purpose, students have problems with EPICS II. The students that took the department version of EPICS liked the course, the regular EPICS II was not useful because it was a repeat of EPICS I. Carr explained that 1) the cost of continuing and fixing the general EPICS II with regard to hiring adjuncts is \$300,000-\$500,000, which is a financial problem, and 2) CSM wants to reduce overall credit hours. Sullinger will write up the results of their student survey and will give the results to Singha for UGC and to the Provost. Thirty students in UGC provided this feedback. Carr suggested the students do a student poll about the usefulness of EPICS II and the students' desire to enroll in the class. Part of the purpose of EPICS is for students to get a feel for their major before they have to declare. Students like working with a mix of departments and students in EPICS I.

3.1.2. **Action item: Approve two new minors as recommended by UGC** - Vote will take place 2/11.

3.2. Grad council – Dan Knauss – Absent (on sabbatical) no report.

3.3. Research council – Uwe Greife

Next meeting is Feb 6, they will finalize Research in Excellence Award winners at that meeting.

3.4. Leadership nomination committee (former committee on committees) – Joel Bach  
Working on staffing the committees that need to be filled. Bach proposed sending a message to all faculty members asking them to volunteer for the committees. He will draft a memo for Carr to send out to faculty. Bach will e-mail committee chairs to find out how much time is required of members on each committee, those hours will be included in the message to faculty seeking their involvement. Carr reported that the administration is supportive of reducing the number of committees. Carr asked Bach to find out what committees are non-committees and should be eliminated. Carr asked Senators to go back to their departments and find out what committees or duties are recurring and what kind of time commitment is involved in that service work. Carr will ask Knauss, based on the bylaws, if administration can put people on committees whenever they desire without Senate approval. Senators agreed to report back with the data from their dept.

### 3.5. Faculty Handbook Committee –Ray Zhang

Last meeting was two weeks ago. Issues covered: 1) finalized change of locus of appointment for tenured faculty, 2) long discussion regarding P&T process communication issues. Committee invited Kim Williams to attend FHC meeting and clarify the Senate’s wishes. The subcommittee members, Kim Williams, Steve Pankavich, Tracy Camp and Rob Braun, plan to attend. Extra links of outdated versions of Handbook have been taken off website.

#### 3.5.1. Brief mention of post-doc maternity leave

Boyd told Carr they will not do away with post-doc maternity leave – all employees must be employed for one year to be eligible for maternity leave.

### 3.6. President’s Cabinet highlights, Report from meeting with Provost – Lincoln Carr

Carr’s notes were sent out directly to Senators via e-mail.

### 3.7. Brief report on any other committees senators are serving on

Williams reported she is convening another committee regarding a new student dismissal case.

## 4. Key issue subcommittee updates

### 4.1. Teaching and library faculty promotion, rights and duties – Ken Osgood

Committee is compiling feedback and will give report to Senate at next meeting.

### 4.2. Faculty mentorship and P&T transparency – Kim Williams

Subcommittee met last week, memo has been sent to FHC in preparation for meeting tomorrow. Subcommittee has received latest version of Handbook and many of the Senate’s requests have already been incorporated. For example, regarding the requirement for the university and departmental P&T committees to communicate, the subcommittee wanted the language changed from “may” get feedback to “shall” get feedback, and those words were changed. Memo may be at the point to post on BB. Next task to work on: Pankavich and Williams will start a draft of changes to Illangasekare’s memo. Williams will forward memo to Senators for their feedback. Williams is keeping notes for the continuation of this project so that tasks for the future are clear.

### 4.3. Revamp committee structure across whole campus – Joel Bach – discussed above.

- 4.4. Revamp faculty senate bylaws – Dan Knauss – Absent, no report.
- 4.5. Bio minor finalization across campus -- Singha, Spear (reported under UGC above)
- 4.6. Possibly removing Epics II campus requirement -- Singha (reported under UGC above)
- 4.7. Data gathering for good model for research faculty. Can CSM be a leader nationwide in this regard? – Monecke  
Monecke agreed to begin gathering data. Carr suggested he look at University of Washington. Monecke will report back in the future.
- 4.8. Data gathering for appeals process repair – Bourne  
Bourne agreed to gather the data. He will start with a list of peer institutions to begin research.
- 4.9. Campus-wide faculty survey – Osgood  
The goal is that the faculty survey will shed light on mentoring and other issues that have been discussed in Senate. Osgood presented the proposed survey. He included strong language about confidentiality and letting faculty know how it would be used. Discussion ensued as to revisions/changes needed to the questions. Survey was patterned after survey used at Boston University. Osgood asked Senate members to read it thoroughly and give specific feedback. Monecke suggested that faculty be informed that results will be published to insure a high level of participation. Carr will report to the Board that a faculty survey is being created.
- 4.10. Assorted other matters including midterm course evaluations, interspersing all academic faculty in marching order at graduation – Senate
- 4.10.1. **Action item: Vote on interspersing commencement marching order of all academic faculty** (note: presently all teaching faculty go behind all T/TT faculty. Proposal is to do away with this tradition.)  
Mid-term course evaluations request from students – discussed earlier  
Motion for teaching faculty be interspersed with other faculty in the graduation walking order: Vote: Unanimous to approve. Carr will verbally report this to the Provost.

5. Other standing issues and one-time issues

**5.1. Action item: Finalize decision on faculty senate e-mail list and link on senate.mines.edu vs. helpdesk**

Senators agreed to keep system as is at last meeting.

5.2. Graduate applications and thesis deadlines – Monecke

Two issues for graduate school 1) moving the applications for admission to graduate school on-line then graduate office can easily and quickly send them to the departments for consideration; and 2) the deadline when students need to submit their final thesis for formal review. After speaking to Boyd, Monecke feels that the deadline can be changed to allow students to submit final thesis until census day. Under the new system, if students have everything in by census day in January, for example, they don't have to pay for summer tuition. Monecke reported that the Office of graduate studies will look into this suggestion and attempt to implement changes for next semester.

5.3. Clarification of dependent audit from CHEIBA trust (not actually Anthem, no relation to our insurance company) – Lincoln Carr

Carr reported on meeting with Dougherty. CHEIBA trust is designed to protect schools from raids on pensions by the government. It is not related to insurance companies. Having this trust is required and is used to protect pensions at higher education institutions.

5.4. FACTIR – No discussion today.

**Next meeting February 11, 2014, 2 pm, Hill Hall 300**