

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 24, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

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

APOLOGIES: Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Graham Davis (EB), Dinesh Mehta (EECS)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Lia Vella (Library)

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

1.1. Visitor updates and minutes

Provost – Terry Parker – (Report moved to 3:00 p.m.)

Sam Spiegel has been hired to serve as the Director of the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning and will begin April 1. He was the choice of the search committee; Parker agreed with the committee. Knauss agreed that Spiegel is an excellent choice and will do a good job in the position. Staff training space has been found in Alderson and will be up and running by fall, there is discussion of whether the room should be set up as a studio classroom.

There is an issue coming out of the Colorado Department of Higher Education regarding prior learning assessment. The DHE believes, if they grant credit to all students who are taking AP courses then there will be an increase in completion rates of degrees, and it will make state statistics show improvement. Mines does not want an external body setting the school's standard, such as requiring Mines to grant credit to students for an AP score of 3 or above. Parker has gone on record opposing this and the school is working with the politics. The CCHE meets in ten days and they want to vote and pass this measure. Mines is working to get language included in the proposal to exempt the school from the rule, but even that would cause trouble eventually when students get credit for materials they have not mastered.

Regarding the ongoing budget meetings, Parker shared a print out of his presentation to the Budget Committee. Parker will forward it to Knauss to share with senators.

1.2. Associate Provost update – Tom Boyd – No report

1.3. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve with revisions made by Monecke and Osgood: Monecke, second: Brune.

Vote to approve: no objection, minutes approved by acclamation.

2. Major topics of discussion

2.1. Leadership survey – Kamini Singha

Boyd, Kaufman, Osgood, and Singha are working on a leadership survey. The purpose is to give feedback to deans and Provost. The instrument is called POLs - Perception of Leadership Survey. Senators discussed when the survey should be distributed, after spring break was suggested. Department Heads have received a draft version of the questionnaire, Singha has received positive feedback from them.

Knauss suggested the Senate have a meeting with DHs and work to find common ground to ensure that DHs are hearing all of the items that are relevant to faculty. Also, Senate should hear if there are any issues from the DH perspective. DH group has not met since the formation of colleges. Knauss suggested inviting DHs to attend a Senate meeting. Knauss will schedule a meeting.

2.2. Promotion and Tenure Dossier – Kamini Singha

Boyd and Singha are working to create dossier guidelines for faculty. The goal is to find something that would be easier to put together. Osgood ran the proposed dossier by LAIS, they gave feedback and changes will be made. Colin Wolden, from University P&T Committee gave lots of feedback including the suggestion to eliminate the FDRs but include the summary. In the past, including the FDRs has caused confusion and all of that information should be included in the CV. He suggested leaving in the evaluation. Wolden told the group working on the dossier revisions the University P&T Committee ignores FDRs but looks at the CV. Carr pointed out that the narratives are in the FDR. In the dossier there are now four places for narratives: the teaching, research, service and introduction sections. Senate feels that FDRs may not need to be included, but want a phrase included that states information from the FDRs should be used to create dossiers. Singha will take Senate feedback to Boyd. Knauss said the changes are a definite improvement. Regarding the table of funding of graduate students, Monecke agreed the table is difficult to produce and in the end, it doesn't matter. Regarding section six and the external evaluation of teaching faculty, Van Tyne suggested the language, "External letters are not required, but may be included." Singha agreed to make that change.

2.3. Senator replacement/elections – Dan Knauss

Knauss has not heard of any interest in a replacement for Greife's position, therefore, he will not be replaced mid-year. Knauss feels it may be difficult to find enough replacements for next year. Knauss asked all senators to start talking to colleagues and begin soliciting candidates.

2.4. Extended Leave – Knauss

There is an issue with the fact that the fringe pool does not cover any leave for anybody. Leave during the year for faculty is not a problem because faculty are getting paid by the school. For a post doc, or somebody who is paid on a grant, extended leave can become an issue. If a grant is paying a post doc who has a major medical issue, a great deal of the grant would be used for the fringe when no work is actually getting done. One idea is for the school to fund extended leaves, but then the money would have to be taken from elsewhere in the school budget.

Some faculty think parental leave should be paid. During the fall and spring, if faculty are on a Mines contract then they get paid for leave. If leave is taken during the summer, while not on a contract, then faculty member does not get paid. If a post doc is on leave the grant pays for their time off. A compromise was suggested, for faculty on extended leave, the grant could pay four weeks and the school could pay the remainder. Discussion of women who get pregnant and their rights for parental leave. HR gives mixed messages to women on what their rights are. The benefits must be clarified in the Handbook to reduce confusion. Singha noted several cases of women who have been very confused about their benefits. Some of this comes down to budget and what the school prioritizes for finances. According to the administration, Mines' policy is the same as CU's policy and Mines follows federal guidelines which allow for 12 weeks off. Singha noted that Princeton changed to an opt-in program rather than an opt-out. At Princeton, if faculty have a family, the tenure clock will automatically stop. If the person doesn't want it to stop, then they can petition to keep it going and therefore opt-in. Carr reported the WISEM site is the only place with parental leave information.

Carr raised the idea of a family benefits package and noted something should be done to retain young families and to enable the school to become more family friendly. NSF grants can provide more money for parental leave. Knauss explained ORA does not allow putting leave into fringe rates, if leave would be included then the fringe rates would go way up. Knauss noted that if faculty want these benefits, they need to be incorporated into budget talks. Carr feels next year the Senate should work to make this a family oriented campus. Administration reports that Mines follows all federal guidelines and laws and also has similar policies to other CO schools. Carr stated the Mines parental leave policy should be stated somewhere else other than just the women's rights page, and he added, the Gen Y group won't tolerate taking just one day off when their kids are born. Knauss asked Carr to draft an outline of important items that are major issues that should be considered by Senate next year. Carr agreed to do this and suggested his memo will be titled: Family Benefits and Creating a Family Friendly Campus. Also, campus daycare is an issue. Senators thought it would be an attraction for new faculty.

2.5. Faculty Senate Distinguished Lecturer – Knauss

Knauss sent out the announcement regarding Reuben Collins' Distinguished Lecture, which will take place at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 25 in the Student Center Ballrooms. Knauss, Carr, and Singha will be out of town that week. Knauss will find somebody to introduce Reuben Collins at the lecture; Osgood may be able to run the March 24 Senate meeting.

2.6. Senate Leadership Compensation – Knauss

Discussion of compensation for future Senate Presidents or other heavily-involved senators, one idea is teaching relief. School does not want a president that is too busy to do a good job serving the faculty and the school. At one point, there was some discretionary money that went to compensate senators. When Wendy Harrison was the Provost, she pushed for class relief but that fell by the wayside. Carr reported his publishing went down during his term as Senate President. Knauss suggested writing a memo, Carr stated the Senate Executive Committee has saved the administration time and energy assisting them with policy issues.

Handbook states, if faculty are working over the summer they need to be compensated. Knauss will put a proposal together presenting the argument that future Senate Presidents should be compensated for their time. Senators agreed.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

3.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Program Changes: Ganley distributed a memo outlining the changes to the CEE and ME programs. (Three total programs, both Civil and Environmental for CEE department and Mechanical for ME department.) Reynolds (CEE) and Karaivanov (ME) were available to answer questions. Brune asked about the petroleum course and the difference between the different fluids courses. Carr commented that fluids has become very specialized and there are several different versions these days. Reynolds confirmed there are not changes to the petroleum fluids course and explained the fluids courses are more specialized and each department will teach their students their version. Karaivanov explained, the focus of the proposal is to better distribute the teaching loads to match existing faculty and to match student needs and interests.

Motion to approve the joint CEE (CE and EV) and ME programs proposal: Ganley, second: Brune. Vote to approve: Unanimous (7).

BS in Computer Science: Motion to approve: Ganley, second: Carr. Vote to approve: Unanimous (7).

3.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune

Council has almost finished the transfer of courses from EB to ME due to Alexandra Newman's transfer of departments. Other standard course change approvals have been taking place.

3.3. Research Council – Corby Anderson – Absent. Knauss gave Anderson's written report: Campus research awards are in good shape and a summer research program is being pursued pending funding from Guggenheim. IDC policy return rate discussions are continuing.

Honeyman reported the ONR-set overhead rate went up in 2014 from 45% to 50% for federal grants; non-federal rates went from 51.49% to 59.66%. Starting in 2013, the Office of the VPRTT began negotiations with the Provost and CFO to capture some of the overhead increase in order to put it back into research. In the end: 1) 4% of indirect cost (IDC) is to go to the deans; 2) 4% is to go to Office for Research and Development, and 3) 5.53% to go to the VPRTT's major equipment fund. A large part of the increased overhead rate is to compensate for depreciation of instrumentation which is now explicitly accounted for by ONR.

The fraction of IDC returned to Centers (or Departments) decreased for federal grants, from 21.09 to 14.61; the non-federal decrease was 23.03 to 16.45. One issue is how Centers use the IDC return: some keep all of the money; some return 80% to faculty; many are on the order of 50/50. In the new administrative structure, the deans are supposed to talk to center directors and DHs about structuring the overhead return to Centers, PIs and departments. Honeyman's office is trying to have a thoughtful conversation with the deans and departments to work this

out. Brune asked about the 22 million dollars sitting in faculty accounts. Bruce noted the school spends ~\$29 million on research each year (including tuition buy down) in addition to the direct research expenditures made by faculty. There was a discussion concerning the roughly \$22 million that faculty have in professional development accounts while, at the same time, the VPRTT only has ½ million dollars/year for equipment. Honeyman noted, there needs to be a discussion about how the faculty and administration can work together to move forward to enhance the research agenda. The leadership needs to be able to articulate a vision for the school, and there may need to be some individual sacrifice for the good of the group. Monecke raised the concern of losing research if the CSM rate is higher than other schools. Honeyman stated that the 'industrial rate' (which is the non-federal rate, not just industry) is the ONR-determined full cost of doing research. Federal rates are less because the Federal Government demands a preferred rate. Furthermore, there are CO state laws prohibiting state agencies from subsidizing private companies. Giving a discounted rate to industry would be breaking the law. Monecke and Honeyman discussed the constraints with the overhead rate and the pros and cons. Knauss noted, we don't have a real unified vision on this campus regarding research. Honeyman explained the situation: One issue is faculty time on non-federal projects. In some instances, faculty have contracts that support students and research expenses but are paid as consultants by the granting industry to oversee the research. The amounts to a state subsidy of non-federal research and needs to cease. Knauss noted the unpaid supervision in the summer of faculty who oversee paid summer researchers. Honeyman replied, it is possible to come up with money for summer salaries for faculty work, but there needs to be a movement and interest in doing this.

Honeyman and Kinzel plan to speak to faculty this summer about the complications involved with this system.

- 3.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – No report (Graham traveling)
- 3.5. Brief report on any other committees/issues – no report
4. Agenda items for next meeting – No new items discussed.