

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 10, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

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

APOLOGIES: Corby Anderson (MME)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Lia Vella (Library), Faculty from Caspian University: Aliya Bekbauliyeva, Askar Seidaliyev, Maksat Tabylganov, Tursinbay Turymbetov, Akkenzhe Bussurmanova

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost – Terry Parker

Kaufman, Graves, Boyd and Parker met with the Senate executive committee last week. Parker feels positive about the results of the meetings. They are working together to revise the faculty hiring process. Overall, Parker is pleased with the construct. Knauss told Parker the feedback from the Senate regarding Parker's memo was positive. Last week, two strong candidates interviewed for the Director position for the new Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. Parker is waiting for feedback from faculty and a recommendation from the search committee. The visiting committee for the Geology Department completed their visit; they made some suggestions to improve the program. It was a small committee of high quality people. They were very complimentary of the program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Budget presentations will take place February 24 and 25, they will include discussion of where the school is going and how it will get there. The meetings are public, anybody who wants to attend is welcome. Parker raised the issue of differential tuition and explained that fundamentally Mines is a full tuition-system. Graduate students pay tuition based on their residency status. Using money from the differential tuition account is how the school buys down contracts of out-of-state students so that their tuition is similar to in-state students' tuition rates. Due to changes in our student demographic, the differential tuition account is in the negative. This happened because the school has had an enormous amount of success graduating PhD students. As they have graduated and the school has filled in new students, the swing in the type of student admitted has caused that change. In the future, departments may be asked to forecast the numbers and demographics of their incoming students to allow administration to incorporate those projections into forecasts. In the past, when that account had a positive balance, the extra money was directed to TA budgets. The differential budget has been flat over the last several years. Parker believes differential tuition is an important part of the Mines program. Knauss agreed with Parker and feels this has been the single most

important factor in getting and retaining effective graduate students. Finally, Parker reported there is a CoorsTek building meeting tomorrow with the Coors family and others. A mock-up of the building plans will be presented.

2.2. Associate Provost update – Tom Boyd – No report.

2.3. Kazakhstan Faculty Fellows visiting

Faculty visiting from Caspian University through the SPACE program attended the Senate meeting. They are at Mines studying pedagogy and teaching methods in order to implement new practices in Kazakhstan.

2.4. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve reconstructed minutes from November 25, 2014, and the minutes from January 27, 2015: Singha, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: Unanimous.

2.5 Senator replacement

Knauss sent an email to faculty seeking candidates to replace Uwe Greife. Bach explained, according to the Senate bylaws, vacancies longer than three months should be filled with a candidate. Greife's term runs through May of 2016.

3. Major topics of discussion

3.1. Computer users advisory group to CCIT – Natalie Van Tyne

Van Tyne explained she has experienced a decrease in the quality and timeliness of service from CCIT. She asked if others have experienced these issues and raised the idea of forming an advisory group. Carr noted there is a priority list in CCIT and suggested Van Tyne check with Michael Erickson to see if there is a work-order back-log before a new committee is formed. Mehta also voiced the same concern because he had difficulty getting help from CCIT. Singha stated CCIT has provided her with excellent support. CCIT announced they are working to provide service via phone. Many issues can be resolved in a short phone call rather than many e-mails back and forth. Knauss suggested Van Tyne contact Michael Erickson as a representative from Senate and start a conversation. Mehta will join her in that discussion. There were no objections among Senators to pursuing this path.

3.2. Senate response to Procedures Manual changes – Dan Knauss

Knauss distributed the draft Senate response to the proposed Procedures Manual changes to senators and received little additional feedback. Knauss will therefore send the Senate response to Boyd. The communication will contain a response to last year's Procedures Manual changes as well as recommend items for Handbook Committee to pursue next year. Knauss asked senators if minutes are recorded at their faculty department meetings and discovered that, with the exception of LAIS, most departments take minutes. The Procedures Manual used to require faculty department meetings to record minutes and stated that the minutes must be sent to the Provost. Those requirements have been taken out of the Manual. Knauss feels that department meetings must have minutes as this is the forum for many curriculum issues that

ultimately come to Senate; Senators agreed having a record of decisions made is important and that minutes should remain a part of department meetings as stated in the current Procedures Manual. Knauss will include retaining minutes requirements as part of the Senate's Procedures Manual suggestions.

3.3. Shared governance (searches) – Thomas Monecke, Jürgen Brune, Ken Osgood

A revised document was sent out to Senators last week. Brune explained the goal was to formalize the search process that is based on the principle of shared governance. Senators discussed various aspects of the proposed changes and fine-tuned the language in several areas.

In the document, most of the decision authority now lies with the deans rather than the provost. The language regarding voting on searches is very detailed and describes who is eligible to vote. A search committee will be comprised of three to five faculty members with at least half coming from the hiring department and one from outside the hiring department. Interdisciplinary hires involving more than one department were addressed; if one department does not approve of the hire, then the candidate cannot be appointed in that department.

There was an extensive discussion regarding whom should be eligible to vote on faculty hires within departments. Regarding the participation of research faculty, discussion ensued whether to allow active research faculty to vote on candidates or not allow any research faculty to participate. Senators expressed concerns as to who would determine which research faculty can vote and the idea of research faculty driving the direction of departments. The different roles of research faculty were outlined. Some are active but many are not and in those cases it would not be appropriate for them to be involved in voting. Senators discussed whether there is a fair procedure that could be put in place that would allow those faculty members to participate. Another option for the moment would be to pull the issue out of the document and ask AA to work with next year's Senate on an effort to improve the research faculty track. Senate supports including all academic faculty participating in the vote if they have participated actively in the search process. The language takes people on transitional contracts out of the process, which Senators feel is appropriate.

Osgood proposed language allowing faculty in a given department to expand the pool of eligible voters within that department. This would provide a mechanism for active research faculty who are engaging in the department to contribute to the decision making process for faculty hires. As the language in the proposed document notes, departments may change the voting process assuming the process is codified in writing and 2/3 of the faculty in the department vote to approve. Regarding opportunity hires, senators also agreed the process may be altered, but there must be a departmental vote. Discussion of the department head's role in the process and whether he or she has more of a role than just one vote. Senators also agreed to give the DH a say in the decisions; DH needs to retain some power or influence in the search process; otherwise, all decision-making could move out of departments and up to the deans. Senators agreed to change language to give the DH a recommendation role in the

process.

Regarding administrative faculty, the search process for key administrators who affect the academic life of the university were clarified (provost, VPRTT, deans). Osgood outlined the recommended process which is similar to previous language. A slight change was made to indicate the provost can change the outcome of a search, but not the process by which the search is conducted, which will be codified in the Handbook. For provost and president, the search committee shall be recommended by the Faculty Senate. For dean searches, the search committee shall include at least one faculty member from each department from the affected college. Senators agreed on the language requiring the majority of the search committee to be tenured faculty.

Regarding research faculty, direct appointment may be made by DH depending on approval of dean and departmental vote. Non-remunerative appointments should be renewed every year and should include a vote from faculty, not just approval by DH. This will eliminate faculty who are on the books and are not contributing. CH already does this. Carr supports this procedure and thinks it will a good way for department heads to clean house.

Osgood will make revisions as discussed and will add a memo stating these are guidelines to be considered for inclusion in Procedures Manual and Handbook. **Motion to approve document with the changes as discussed: Monecke, second: and Brune. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

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

A pilot survey of administrators has been created with the assistance of Mike Kaufman and Tom Boyd. The next step is to talk to Ann Walker regarding legal issues. The group agreed that a small subcommittee (e.g. 2 people) from the Senate will administer the survey, collect results, remove personally identifiable data (that might tie responses to individuals), and report the results to administration and to Senate. This set-up provides a mechanism for reporting feedback to the faculty while still providing anonymity to respondents. Osgood and Singha are happy with the progress that they have made with the administration. This preserves the process of oversight for the Senate while providing feedback to the administration. Knauss noted the senate executive committee also had a productive meeting with Boyd and Parker. Singha added: it is important to call this a survey of perception for feedback purposes and not an “evaluation” of the administrators. If an instrument serves as an evaluation it must be placed in the employee’s file.

Mines student government has asked Faculty Senate to keep the student evaluation process open through finals week. Knauss and other senators prefer to have evaluations open for a short period of time, such as one week but feel the evaluation period should close before grades go out. Knauss will respond to the students letting them know that the Senate supports their desire to have evaluations open through finals week. He will also let the students know the Senate prefers the evaluation period to be a week shorter than it is now.

3.5. Distinguished Faculty Lecturer for 2015-2016

The Distinguished Faculty Lecture committee unanimously recommended Tracy Camp.

Motion to approve Tracy Camp. Vote to approve: Unanimous (9 remaining senators voted).

4. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

4.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Next meeting is tomorrow.

4.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune

Council is gathering information on electronic student evaluations of faculty including whether it is technically possible to send evaluations to classes with less than five students.

4.3. Research Council – No report

4.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Graham Davis

Handbook Committee is continuing to work on grievance and conflict of interest issues.

4.5. Brief report on any other committees/issues

4.5.1. Extended leave – Knauss

Knauss met with Dougherty, Volpi, and others to discuss Mines' fringe benefits. Knauss explained, for everyone on campus, fringe rates only cover health insurance, PERA, etc, the money in those funds does not cover sick leave. If an employee is sick, they still get paid. For post docs, researchers and others working under grants, their payment on sick days comes out of the grant. This adds up and becomes an issue when an employee is on extended leave, specifically an extended leave for having a baby. Mines does not have a maternity leave, instead the school offers parental leave. Currently, grants have to pay for extended leave for employees working under grants. Knauss asked the Senate to discuss whether this is appropriate and raised the concern that faculty may not want to hire young women because of this situation. Should maternity leave be treated the same as extended leave for a knee surgery or for elective surgery? According to the administration CU charges extended leave to grants also. Senate will discuss this further at the next meeting to develop a recommendation.

4.5.2. CFAC – Knauss reported that Paul Ogg, Mines representative to the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council, cannot attend the meetings. On February 13 there will be a CCHE (Colorado Commission on Higher Education) meeting where discussion will include the topic of requiring schools to accept AP credit for certain classes. Davis suggested there may be somebody on UGC that would be interested in representing the school. Ganley will announce this opportunity at the Undergraduate Council meeting tomorrow.

5. Agenda items for next meeting

➔ **Next meeting February 24th, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300**