

# COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

January 13, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

**ATTENDEES:** Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Lincoln Carr (PH), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSA), Patrick Marshall (USG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

**APOLOGIES:** Jurgen Brune (MN), Uwe Greife (PH), Kamini Singha (HS)

**GUESTS:** Terry Parker (Provost), Ed Balistreri (EB), Lisa Dunn (LB), Wendy Harrison (Board Trustee), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Lara Medley (RG), Chuck Stone (PH), Lia Vella (LB)

---

1. Introductions: senators, guest faculty, undergrad/grad reps, administration members

2. Visitor Updates and Minutes

2.1. Provost – Terry Parker

Three CSM faculty members have recently passed away, Dick Bursyck, Art Kidnay, and Mike Batzle. Memos regarding on-line student evaluations of faculty and the departmental annual faculty evaluation system have been provided to Knauss for Senate review. Regarding faculty teaching load distributions, the data is not as accurately kept as it should be, the data is accessed via the class list created by the Registrar and the instructors of record. AA is currently researching some instances to confirm that the teaching load reported is appropriate. At this time, there are eight individuals that appear to be below the minimum teaching threshold set by the Handbook. Parker and Knauss are in the process of regularizing meetings between the administration and the Senate Executive Committee. Gus Greivel and Pat Kohl are serving as co-interim directors of the new Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. The search for the LAIS Division Director is underway, one candidate out of three finalists has already interviewed. Interviews for the three college webmaster positions are taking place this week.

2.2. Approval of Past Minutes

Senators did not want to approve the minutes taken by a substitute recording secretary at the November 25 meeting. Knauss suggested recreating a record of the meeting by taking the agenda and the Proposed Senate Action Plan handout that was distributed then making a summary of the actions that were approved based on memory of the senators. Senators will create a new set of minutes to vote on at the next meeting.

3. Faculty Trustee – Wendy Harrison

Wendy Harrison was elected to serve as the faculty member to the Board of Trustees. Harrison thanked the Senate and the faculty for selecting her. Her intent is to meet with Illangasekare to discuss and plan a smooth transition and noted this is an important time for the school. Faculty and senators should reach out to her with their concerns. Harrison plans to visit all departments in the

next two months. Osgood noted the reluctance of faculty to share their concerns and suggested Harrison find ways to encourage faculty to reach out to her. Harrison acknowledged that reluctance and stated that she is open to suggestions. Knauss thanked Harrison for serving in this role and noted the Senate looks forward to working with her.

#### 4. Senator Replacement

Uwe Greife needs to step down from the Senate immediately for personal reasons. Faculty Senate therefore needs to send a new representative to serve on the Budget Committee and to chair Research Council. Greife also served on the Parking Committee. Natalie Van Tyne is already on that committee, therefore Senate will not send an additional senator. Dinesh Mehta volunteered to cover the Budget Committee. Corby Anderson offered to take over as chair of Research Council. Honeyman gave an overview of recent Research Council business and noted that Greife has done a good job disseminating information to the faculty. It will be important for the new chair to continue to represent the research needs of faculty and balance the research goals of the school. Knauss informed Anderson that chairing the meetings is important but understanding the various research issues is also a very important part of the chair's responsibilities. The Senate approved Anderson as chair of Research Council. Greife's Senate term expires May of 2016; senators will discuss filling his position at the next meeting.

#### 5. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

##### 5.1. Undergraduate Council – Jason Ganley

Ganley introduced four program changes for Senate approval. Two changes involve bachelor's programs in Environmental and Civil Engineering. CEE proposes reducing credit hours for the BS degree in Environmental Engineering to 134.5 hours and Civil Engineering to 135.5 hours. The CBE Department proposes a small change of eliminating a co-listed class in their Chemical Engineering degree. The EECS Department is proposing a four credit-hour reduction to their Electrical Engineering degree resulting in 129.5 credit hours. Ganley reported that these program changes have already been discussed in departments and approved by UGC. Knauss asked for the results of the UGC votes, Ganley reported the votes were unanimous except for one abstention in one of the programs. **Monecke made a motion to vote in one block, to approve the four undergraduate program changes as listed in the memo provided by Ganley. Second: Mehta. Vote to approve: Yes 7, No 0, Abstain 1 (Vote took place prior to the arrival of Carr and Davis.)**

##### 5.2. Graduate Council – no report, Brune absent.

Ed Balistreri from EB reported on the proposed program change in Economics and Business. Proposal will streamline the Bulletin, build depth into the program by moving a survey course out and adding an econometrics course, add a requirement for master's students to take two 600 level courses and change some 500 level courses to 600 level. Goal is to provide an introduction to the basic materials and then have in-depth 600 level courses. Department also proposes requiring students to attend lecture series and removing areas of specialization from Bulletin. **Motion to approve the EB MS and PhD program changes: Osgood, second:**

**Monecke. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

Monecke suggested streamlining Senate meetings with respect to approving program changes already approved by Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. Knauss offered to meet with UGC and Grad Council to let them know what items Senate wants to see and what items they do not need to see. Medley reported the CIM workflow is set up for the Faculty Senate to approve all program changes. Knauss explained that senators will be informed of all program changes approved by UGC and GC but they would not need to discuss and vote on the smaller issues.

5.3. Research Council – no report

5.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – see report below.

6. Major topics of discussion

6.1. Shared Governance – Thomas Monecke

Monecke distributed a handout of proposed changes to the Handbook that are intended to increase shared governance. The changes involve the faculty appointment process and the goal is to ensure that search committees have sufficient representation and that the process is rigorous and comprehensive. Present Handbook focuses on provost, proposed changes incorporate deans into the document. Extensive discussion took place about requiring each search committee for tenure/tenure track and library positions to interview a minimum of three candidates. This requirement could impact small departments, and especially would impact minority hires and department head positions. Discussion of allowing the provost to change the search procedure if the candidate(s) are not deemed appropriate. Provost could alter the search rather than declare it failed. The purpose is to prevent a pool of one candidate. Vella noted library faculty report to the provost rather than the deans. Endowed chairs report to provost also, language was suggested that reflects the appropriate approver for each type of faculty, either the dean or the provost.

Honeyman raised the issue of opportunity hires and the difficulty of requiring three candidates, others agreed that opportunity hires should not require three candidates because that would make the process much more difficult. Knauss noted the opportunity hire process needs to be fixed because there have been situations where people were hired and faculty members in the department did not have the opportunity to meet the candidate. Honeyman noted the problem of being boxed in with too many requirements which could lead to losing a prime candidate, including the situation where a spouse is also looking for a position. Area hires and part-time positions were discussed.

Osgood suggested modifying point three regarding type of advertising or adding a section on opportunity hires to codify the process. Monecke will continue to revise the proposal by incorporating these suggestions.

Knauss identified that the language does not define the makeup of a search committee. Bach pointed out a big concern is when a dean or department head goes against the search committee recommendation with no explanation. Also, the search process for administrative faculty on campus who serve in the roles of provost, associate provost, VPRTT, deans and department heads should be a Senate focus.

Senators concluded that opportunity hires are an increasingly good method of hiring exceptional faculty, however this method can also be used by the deans and provost to make exceptions. Further discussion ensued including whether departments should vote on hires and opportunity hires.

For adjunct faculty and visiting faculty, Monecke suggests making it simple, let the DH appoint researchers, with contingency approval of the dean, requiring a search is too complicated.

Administrative Faculty – Monecke suggested mimicing the language from the T/TT faculty section. Honeyman noted problems with hires include mentorship and the issue of resource allocation and lab space. If search committees look at the cost and benefits of a hire, they make better hiring decisions, perhaps that should be part of the search process. Monecke noted those are good ideas, but that is not the intent of the proposal. The process should include requiring a search first and not allowing the provost or deans to waive a search in the beginning. After the search takes place, the provost or deans could be allowed to make the exception if the search does not go well if the hire is in the best interest of the school. Bach prefers having departments vote on candidates instead.

Knauss stated the real concern is with higher level administrators such as the provost, deans and department heads, not every member of the administrative faculty. Knauss suggested specifically identifying the positions that need searches including provost, deans, and department heads.

Discussion of the definition of adjunct vs. temporary positions. Carr noted, some schools such as the Univeristy of Washington have adjunct and affiliate positions, and do not have temporary faculty. At CSM the tendency is to appoint as research faculty, when some should be called affiliate faculty. Monecke proposes that temporary employees should not be allowed to transition into a regular faculty position without an open search. Osgood suggested naming the section Internal/Temporary Faculty.

Research Faculty - Last year Carr found there were 80 research faculty listed on the website, AA said there were 50, and departments gave a different number; most research faculty are concentrated in a few departments. CSM does not have a well thought out definition of the research faculty position. Carr stated that Boyd and Parker agree that this should be fixed. Carr suggested looking at how other large research universities are structured. The issue of research faculty who are no longer working or contributing was raised. Honeyman reported on Romig's research and the analysis determined we need a dedicated, highly regarded research

faculty to help the school reach the 100K goal in the strategic plan. The question was posed, how can research faculty be appointed and yet be allowed to advise graduate students.

Osgood summarized the next steps should include: explore departmental voting, explore opportunity hires, consider separating the section for dean, provost, and department heads, figure out how to deal with research faculty and focus on the makeup of the search committee.

Davis talked to Dougherty in HR regarding searches, Dougherty is not opposed to changing the current process. Each department now has their own procedure for hiring. Davis feels faculty must give input on who gets hired, having DHs simply announce new faculty hires is not acceptable. Discussion of the makeup of the search committee; currently those details are in procedures manuals and HR hiring guidelines. Senators felt that hires in a department should have a search committee made up of members of that department. The process could be the search committee chair makes a recommendation to DH, then faculty in that department vote on the candidate. Monecke will modify the document based on discussion today.

#### 6.2. Handbook Report - Davis

Handbook Committee is discussing the grievance process. Davis reported Dougherty wants to make it a two-stage process, beginning with an initial informal stage that may resolve most problems. A formal stage would follow if the informal stage does not resolve the issue. Davis noted the informal step is currently optional, both Dougherty and Davis feel the informal step should be required because many disputes can be resolved at that level. Carr suggested inserting language about the ombuds person into the informal grievance step.

#### 6.3. Evaluation of Academic Leaders

Osgood and Singha are working on this. Discussion of whether this should be a survey or an evaluation of the administration, what the instrument should be called and who will see the results of the instrument. Knauss suggested the department head evaluation results should be shared with the department. There can be other confidential evaluation processes for administrators, this would be a public piece. Senators agree that evaluation results should be open.

Knauss suggested senators finish the revisions online and also work to revise and recreate the November 25, meeting minutes. Meeting adjourned.

#### 6.4. Senate Agenda for Spring – not discussed

➔ **Next meeting January 27, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300**