

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

January 27, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Jurgen Brune (MN), Lincoln Carr (PH), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSA), Patrick Marshall (USG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Ken Osgood (MB), Kamini Singha (HS), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Thomas Monecke (GE)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Lia Vella, Abby Hickman, Undergraduate Admissions, Wendy Harrison (BOT), Tyrell Jacobsen (USG Secretary), Lauren Jacobsen (USG President)

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost – Terry Parker

Parker distributed a plot chart showing the average teaching loads and noted the reporting of low distributions is finished, nobody has an inappropriate load, one person is overloaded. Some faculty are under the load outlined in the Handbook, those individuals will be handled on a case by case basis. In looking at average loads, teaching faculty contributions are somewhere in the range of 460 credit hours this spring, tenure-line faculty are around 130 credit hours. The statistics include all of the senior design courses but do not include 700 level courses. One can look at how many faculty it takes to deliver the bottom 15% and the top 15% of the credit hours. For teaching faculty the numbers are symmetrical for the top and bottom, 12 instructors on the top and 12 on the bottom. For tenure-line faculty the picture is very different, there are 2 on the top and 126 on bottom.

The CoorsTek building executive committee has been meeting to discuss the spirit of the building and managing the relationship between campus and the donor. The committee is currently in the process planning stage; plans may be ready for public viewing in approximately six weeks. Anderson, Mason, Dale is the architect on the ground, they also designed Brown, CTLM and co-designed Marquez Hall.

Regarding capital, the process is underway for the build-out of the GRL RAD lab. The contractor starts in a week and a half. It is a significant, \$900,000 development project for campus. On a smaller scale, the new TEM that came out of the CoorsTek gift is also going into the GRL until the new physics building is completed. Carr reported the Physics faculty is very impressed with the architect and happy that they have been able to give input into the design of the building. Many PH faculty members have been consulted and involved.

Walter Isaacson, CEO of the Aspen Institute and author of *The Innovators* delivered a very

successful, well-received lecture last night to the campus community as part of the President's Lecture Series.

Knauss noted that it has been a long time since the teaching load section of the Handbook has been revised and asked if the current loads listed are appropriate. Parker explained the language requires charge out, but it does not allow charge out below one course without a specific exemption. Parker explained, there are different variations on how this works, for example, at MIT, faculty must teach at least one class. Knauss asked if the research productive faculty members are the ones that are not teaching in the statistics Parker reported. Parker has not yet analyzed those tails in the stats to see who or what type of faculty member is not teaching. The broader policy question is, if faculty have some opportunity that is appropriate in terms of what it brings to the school, then that situation can be considered carefully. Parker reported that questions about class size came out of the lunch meetings he held with faculty last semester.

2.2. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve minutes from November 25, 2015: Wait until next meeting. Knauss will draft a new set and distribute for review.

Motion to approve minutes from January 13, 2015: Mehta, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: Yes 7, No 0, Abstain 2. (Anderson and Davis had not arrived.)

3. Senator replacement

Uwe Greife can no longer serve on Senate. Carr suggested getting someone from PH and noted Chuck Stone has expressed interest. Senate can appoint a replacement for this semester or hold an election. Greife is a senior Senator, therefore he will need to be replaced by a senior Senator. Various faculty members were recommended and discussed. Singha suggested sending out an e-mail seeking a replacement and asking for self-nominations for the position along with a reminder that in March the Senate will be seeking nominations for three-year terms to begin in the fall. Bach and Knauss will send out the e-mail.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Senate response to Procedures Manual changes

Knauss stated that the Senate response to Tom Boyd regarding the proposed Procedures Manual changes is overdue. Knauss will work with Anderson and Davis to craft a memo outlining the Senate response. Carr suggested Knauss draft the memo then send it to Senators for review before it is sent to Boyd. Knauss noted that much of the search language is in the Procedures Manual and needs to be addressed separate from the Handbook issues. Knauss will distribute a memo before the end of the week.

4.2. Procedures Manual addition for Library faculty promotion

Knauss distributed the memo from the library staff to Senators. Osgood noted it is difficult for academic faculty to judge what is to be expected from the library faculty. Osgood suggested

the memo include a baseline of performance expectations. Vella said that they could come up with a baseline of duties, but many of the library faculty positions are very different which makes creating a standard position description difficult. Osgood suggested including the expectations for service and teaching. Vella reported that librarians are involved in service opportunities on campus. This will provide guidance to the P&T Committee for library faculty tenure consideration, therefore it may help librarians in the P&T process if the expectations are clear, especially for those not versed in library staff duties. In the past, the expectations were 80% professional, 10% scholarship and 10% service, unlike faculty who have expectations of 60%, 20%, 20%. Vella reported that the Handbook Committee has asked for more clarity on what professional responsibilities include, she is working to provide the information. Senate needs to support and endorse this then send to Handbook, which is why Senate is discussing this. There is a slight indication that publication and service have a larger role, therefore library faculty should clarify. Osgood asked the library to revise the language as he suggested. Vella agreed and will send revisions to Knauss to incorporate language in the Senate recommendations for the Procedures Manual.

4.3. Shared governance – Thomas Monecke (absent), Jürgen Brune

If Senate wants changes in Handbook language, the proposed changes need to be submitted to the Handbook Committee in the spring in order to be added to their agenda for the next year. Procedures Manual revisions that are given to AA this spring will be considered for revision this summer for publication in the fall. Carr discussed a search in PH that did not work well to illustrate the need for revisions in the search process. Requiring a research statement, a teaching statement, etc. should be required and outlined in the Procedures Manual. Senators feel there are problems with opportunity hires and problems with representation on search committees. Knauss feels there is a problem with search committees having all of the power and the fact that the hiring recommendations do not come back to the faculty for a vote. The Procedures Manual does not dictate that faculty have a say in the recommendation decision, the decision is up to the search committee. Knauss suggested identifying the Handbook issues the Senate wants corrected, decide which ones to pursue, then figure out how to fix them, rather than discuss major changes. Carr asked if Knauss will discuss this with administration, Knauss said he will bring this up at the Senate Executive Committee meeting with Parker and Boyd on Tuesday.

Brune noted situations where only one candidate was involved in a search. Senators want the requirement of a proper search to go into the Handbook. Osgood suggested setting the opportunity hire piece aside for now and focusing on the process for regular searches. Mehta noted a badly conducted search impacts morale which is why this needs to be fixed. Senate tabled the discussion and moved on to other items.

Osgood added comments to the suggested revisions made by Monecke and Brune to section 4.7 of the Handbook which outlines the faculty appointment process. Senators reviewed the comments and proposed revisions. Discussion about mandating the creation of a search committee and whether the committee members should be from the department or program

for which the search is being conducted. Osgood suggested adding a paragraph for joint hires. Senators agreed there should be a mechanism for joint hires that will protect the department's prerogative to hire but will also maintain flexibility. Senators agreed that language should be added allowing exceptions to be made by the department.

Discussion of whether three candidates should be required in every search and how to make exceptions allowing the department to vote to continue the search if there are less than three candidates. Senators discussed having faculty in the department vote on candidates and whether that is realistic given the desirable time frame for responding to candidates. If faculty would vote on candidates, they would have to have been involved in the interview process. If a tie ensues, the department head could make the decision. It would be ideal to allow the departments to create their own process. Senators deliberated about split votes within departments and situations where different departments don't agree on joint appointments. In split situations, department heads could outline the candidates' strengths and weaknesses then allow the Dean to decide. Senate agreed with the proposed language as revised by Osgood.

Discussion of the language allowing the Provost to make exceptions if the exception is in the best interest of CSM. The exception language could void the entire process, however the language is what enables the school to make targeted opportunity hires that are in the best interest of CSM. Carr suggested giving the departments the power to approve the Provost's decision to make the exception.

Regarding section D, Academic Leadership and Administration, Senators weighed whether to add language requiring Senate to vote to approve search committee members or language requiring Senate to recommend search committee members. Senators agreed that the search for department heads should follow the process for faculty, the search for Provost and Deans should follow the process for administrators, and the Associate/Assistant Provost positions can be appointed and do not require a search. Knowing that it is too late in the year to add items to the Handbook Committee agenda, Senators suggested submitting a memo of understanding to AA asking for these items to be incorporated into the Procedures Manual until they can be added into the Handbook.

Osgood proposed having these Procedures Manual/faculty hiring recommendations completed along with a proposed questionnaire for evaluating administrators, then presenting both at a faculty forum. Osgood will make the revisions as discussed by Senators then prepare document for submission to AA.

4.4. Future surveys/evaluations – Ken Osgood, Kamini Singha

Group will meet Thursday to work on the evaluation of administrators. At the last Senate meeting, Senators felt they should administer the evaluation and share the results with faculty.

5. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

- 5.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley – Nothing new to report, after the next meeting there will be a block of items for Senate to approve.
- 5.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune
At the last meeting, the council finalized changes dealing with the Newman move from EB to ME. The council approved the Hydrologic MS & PhD Program credit hours reduction from 36 to 30 to align with their non-thesis program requirements. **No senate opposition, therefore program change is approved.**
- 5.3. Research Council - no report.
- 5.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Davis
Committee is working on the grievance process, Jane Rosenthal has been helping identify gaps in current policies, including disclosure of conflicts of interest. Knauss suggested a Senate working group be formed to identify issues and work to push items through Handbook that help faculty.
- 5.5. Brief report on any other committees – No reports.
- 5.6. GSG Request for CEER Faculty Volunteers Judges – Goertz
Goertz asked Senators to let their colleagues know that GSG is looking for volunteer judges for the Conference on Earth and Energy Research on February 26 and 27. Interested faculty members should contact Goertz at bgoertz@mymail.mines.edu. A solicitation will be going out shortly; the GSG website has a place for faculty to register to serve as judges.

➔ **Next meeting February 10th, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300**