

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 22, 2014 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

300 HILL HALL

ATTENDEES: Lincoln Carr (President, PH), Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Benjamin Goertz (GSG), Uwe Greife (PH), Dan Knauss (CH), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (LAIS), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Kamini Singha (HS), John Spear (CEE), Sydney Sullinger (USG), Kim Williams (CH), Ray Zhang (CEE)

APOLOGIES: Jerry Bourne (MME)

GUESTS: Dr. Terry Parker (Provost)

-
1. Introductions: senators, guest faculty, undergrad/grad reps, administration members
 2. Visitor updates and minutes
 - 2.1. Provost update – Terry Parker

This year the budget is very constrained. Items the administration is trying to protect include: 1) improving the TA budget by pulling the TA function out of units that don't use TAs and then funding six new TAs, 2) providing for a range of instructional support actions that have been created by changes in the institution, by trying to backfill some of those positions with student labor, 3) providing for The Center for Teaching and Learning, the intent is to put additional budget behind what used to be the Center for Engineering Education and turn that into a more formal enterprise, 4) maintenance of library materials, 5) student health and safety needs, 6) IT campus service needs (the campus has grown resulting in some service gaps that hit the academic units), 6) Enterprise system service needs fixing, 7) Registrar's office (acquired responsibility for transfer students from Admissions resulting in a need for funding), and 8) web support, which is moving to the colleges, allowing them to create content on a regular basis.

Parker thanked the Senate for providing lots of great feedback and material in the teaching faculty memo. The administration will continue to analyze the suggestions and see what can be done to incorporate the Senate's recommendations. The time frame for considering and implementing teaching faculty recommendations depends on the item, items that fall outside the Handbook will be handled over the summer, those that fall into the Handbook category will be looked at next year. A Senator noted that the teaching faculty want information on how to put together their packages over the summer.

Parker discussed the CU Boulder strategic plan (double their enrollment in engineering and increase the number of faculty members by 125 by 2020), the Colorado Department of Education and changes taking place in other Colorado institutions.

2.2. Approval of past minutes

Minutes were not distributed, Carr will distribute and Senators will approve by e-mail.

3. Major topics of discussion

3.1. Approval of Graduation List

Action item: Vote. Motion to approve: Greife, Vote to approve: Unanimous.

3.2. Biophysics minor, Biomechanical minor – Kamini Singha

3.2.1. Action item: Vote

Biomedical engineering minor from CBE has already been approved by the Senate. Today two additional minors from ME (biomechanical engineering) and Physics (biophysics) are up for Senate consideration. **Motion to approve: Greife. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

3.3. Revamp committee structure across whole campus – Joel Bach

Regarding Senate elections, there are 7 openings, we currently have five candidates. Discussion of how to proceed. Bach will send one more e-mail to faculty soliciting additional candidates; candidates need to reply by Friday, April 25, 2014, an election will be held Friday, March 2.

Committee structure: Bach presented his document outlining faculty assignments and highlighting open positions for next year. Bach will meet with Kay Schneider and they will send out survey on BB for faculty to fill positions for various committees. Some committees exist but are not operating; some groups or ad hoc committees want to become full Senate committees.

Discussion of service assignments resulting from faculty survey and discussion of next steps. Bach stated the Senate needs to have a handle on the faculty workload and assignments. Bach's list does not include President's committees. Carr made the recommendation to eliminate every committee that is not staffed and to combine committees where possible (i.e. put Biosafety Committee under the Safety Committee). Also combine all awards committees under one committee. Knauss pointed out that the bylaws state, "The Senate shall approve the appointments of all persons who represent the Academic Faculty on institutional committees and councils." Senators proposed merging committees where that makes sense. Faculty survey points out that many faculty are feeling overworked over the past three years, therefore eliminating committees will help with the overall faculty workload. The University Committees are in the Handbook, therefore they cannot be eliminated by the Senate. A memo needs to be created, recommending which committees should be merged.

Williams was asked about the workload for the Academic Standards and Faculty Affairs Committee; the workload depends on how many student dismissals occur in a semester. That committee requires members who have sensitivity to students. Singha proposed Bach put the document on Dropbox so that Senators can fill in the blanks. Osgood proposed categories for each of the committees so that faculty can be aware of the level of work involved in each committee. Discussion of making ad hoc committees formal or not; ad hoc committees are

similar to a special topics course, if the ad hoc committee meets a couple of times, then it can become a real committee. Knauss noted that if an ad hoc committee has to be approved by the Senate then it may limit the number of committees that are created.

In the past, chair positions for UGC, GC and Research Council were performed by the Associate Provost, which is a paid position, now, that work is done by Senators on a volunteer basis. Senate should determine which committees are Senate committees and which are University Committees. The only standing committees that are official are those stated in the bylaws. Knauss suggested this become an ongoing agenda topic for next semester. A service streamlining and reduction charge was suggested for next year that would also consider faculty workloads and rewards. A proposal can be made to administration to compensate professors who are taking on the larger workloads. Senators agreed to recommend to next year's Senate that this should be a major issue to pursue.

3.4. Finalize biosciences department memo

Discussion of memo to Provost recommending a bio-sciences department. Chemistry does not feel now is the time for a biosciences department. PH is supportive of it, AMS does not have objections, CEE was Ok with it a year ago, and Geology will probably not have issues with a new department. Carr offered to send a preliminary memo seeking feedback from faculty regarding forming a biosciences department. Knauss raised the question, why is the Senate weighing in on this now? A memo from the Senate would force the discussion about having a department. Greife noted this should be looked at by Research Council, Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council. Senators agreed that they are not ready to make a recommendation to the administration; Carr will let Parker know that Senate will continue to consider this item.

3.5. Finalize Faculty senate bylaws revision – Dan Knauss

Knauss sent out revised version of bylaws. Major change includes that Senators are now chairing the Councils. Regarding the four-year term to the Readmissions Committee, Monecke suggested changing that to a three year term. Senators agreed then discussed changing all appointments to renewable one-year terms. Motion to approve revisions: Singha. **Vote to approve bylaws with the following amendment: the name Committee on Committees will be changed to Leadership Nomination Committee and Senate service on Senate committees should be for renewable, one-year terms. Vote to approve: 9, Against: 1.** (One senator departed the meeting prior to the vote.)

Procedures Manual recommendations – Kim Williams and Steve Pankavich

Subcommittee (Pankavich, Williams, Braun, Camp, Snieder, Gianquitto and Leydens) moved on to the mentoring portion of their task. Promotion and Tenure memo went out this afternoon. Procedures Manual issues are wrapping up. Committee will draft a message to all faculty regarding the results of the town hall meetings; memo will be sent out by Carr letting professors know they were heard and that changes are in the works. Committee revised Illangasekare's memo and sent it out to Senate as a supplementary document to the

Procedures Manual. It was suggested that the Department Heads sit with their P&T Committee to go over the guidelines included in the document and Osgood suggested the memo state that at the beginning. It was suggested to include instructions to the DHs, requiring them to include a copy of their solicitation of external letters. Knauss will e-mail Pankavich with the recommended language, "A copy of the letter from the DH to the external reviewer should be included in the packet." This would provide consistency across Departments and across Departmental P&T Committees. Carr thanked Pankavich and sub-committee for their work.

3.6. Budget and parking issues – Uwe Greife

Budget Committee will vote on the budget on 4/24 before it goes to the Board. Administration is still hashing out the last half million dollars. Costly items in the budget include: five new positions in CCIT which will cost half a million dollars; three web content managers, one in each college; there are 9.75 positions in Academic Affairs this year, none of them are faculty. All of the departments have requested very little, the big pieces have been in Academic Affairs. The budget is so tight this year because we have been used to tuition increases of 8% or 9%; this year tuition increase will likely be 2.75%, most of that goes into raises for people, some of which is for people who received promotions. There will be a 2.5% to 3.5% mandated raise for classified employees. The raise pool for faculty will probably be on the order of 3.5%; from a 3.5% raise pool, some of that is taken by promotions, only about 2.75% to 3% will remain for the existing faculty that were not promoted. Greife suggested to Budget Committee that the faculty can live with poor website content in exchange for a greater salary pool; he also does not see a need for five additional CCIT people. The result is there are no additional lines in the budget for additional faculty members. Last year 15 faculty lines were new and 11 administrative lines were new, this year it has gone back to just administrative lines, there will be no new faculty lines in the budget. What is approved in the budget is only the operating budget, once something is put into reserves it is spent, spending out of reserves is not controlled by budget committee. Concern was raised with how the implementation of the strategic plan will take place with this budget. The next Faculty Senate should keep an eye on the implementation of the strategic plan. Greife received justification for parking fee increases. Budget Committee voted parking fee increases down last year but it still passed, with some revisions. This is an example of one office using pricing power and comparing CSM to other schools to justify fee increases. When asked if an increase in students is budgeted, Spear reported that there are 1,050 students currently, and the school is aiming for 1,100 students in the freshman class. That is a small increase but fewer students compared to years past.

4. Major topics of discussion - continued

4.1 Faculty survey discussion – Ken Osgood

Osgood gave preliminary results of faculty survey. There were 189 complete responses which resulted in 70% participation; there were eleven pages of written comments. The data need to be analyzed carefully for lessons to be learned, but a few overarching trends jump out from the numbers. Osgood summarized some of those trends, but stressed that greater analysis of the data is needed before a formal report could be made. Of greatest concern is the high percentage of

faculty who indicate that they are likely to leave, or try to leave, CSM in the next few years. 38% of respondents indicated that they are likely to try to leave CSM, with 15% of them saying it is “very likely.” Most of those indicating a desire to leave CSM are tenure-line faculty. The data can be very helpful in improving the climate for faculty retention. The survey speaks to many more issues than just this, and the senate should analyze the results carefully. Senators discussed how to share information with faculty, put raw data on BB for people to review OR put this on the agenda at the August faculty conference. Options include posting all data as a whole, posting data organized by departments, and/or posting data split by teaching faculty and T/TT faculty. If data is presented at August conference, Senate could present three main points to focus on next year. Dividing the data by department would allow departments to see how many hours they are working and how much service they are doing as a department.

5. Carr will circulate minutes from last meeting for Senate approval and will distribute MLK memo. Carr will let administration know that the results of the faculty survey will be distributed. Osgood will help with this data and can do a presentation in August if needed.

Carr thanked the Senate members for their hard work this year. Additional items were not discussed due to time constraints. Meeting adjourned 4:10 p.m.

➔ Today is the last meeting of this year’s Faculty Senate. The first meeting of the new Faculty Senate will be Friday, May 2, 4:30 pm in Golden City Brewery.