

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

August 25, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: 2014-2015 Senators: Ken Osgood (President), Corby Anderson (MME), John Berger (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Tina Gianquitto (LAIS), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (GE), Roel Snieder (GP), Chuck Stone (PH). Representatives: Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Colin Marshall (USG).

GUESTS: Tom Boyd (Associate Provost), Lincoln Carr (PH), Tracy Gardner (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSG), Paul Johnson (President), Lara Medley (RG), Terry Parker (Provost), John Spear (CEE), Chet Van Tyne (MME).

-
1. Introductions: Senators, guest faculty, student reps, and administration members were introduced.
 2. Visitor updates

2.1. President – Paul Johnson

President Johnson noted his office is always accessible to senators and faculty members. President Johnson stated he supports faculty governance, looks forward to working with the senate and hopes senators can spend time working on aspirational issues to move campus forward. He asked the senate to start with two pressing issues, P&T and differentiated workloads. President Johnson wants to ensure the P&T guidelines are aligned with the values and aspirations of the institution. He noted, the current document is generic, and does not reflect the school's core values or the direction in which the school wants to go. Johnson asked the senate to provide him with guidance on differentiated workloads and noted if faculty set the right expectations for themselves, the campus will run smoothly. He acknowledged the benefit of metrics but also noted the need for flexibility in recognizing varied contributions to the school. An institution's P&T guidelines reflect the organization's values as do the differentiated work load guidelines. Mines has a bubble of new faculty; to ensure their success, Johnson explained, it is important to address these issues soon. Osgood asked Johnson to elaborate on shared governance. Johnson explained if we can develop a culture that works well, the administration can be productive, but it requires the faculty to really own their part of it. Carr would like to see the uneven service component across campus fixed. Regarding P&T, he suggested the prior work of the senate be taken into consideration. Johnson asked the senate to please reply quickly on these issues. He suggested departments report what they do, and give some guidelines and examples of what will work for 80% of the people in the department. Regarding P&T, Johnson stated the root foundation is the set of expectations and making sure they are very clearly related to Mines' aspirations. Then, the school can determine how to communicate the expectations and work with faculty to meet them.

Stone noted the need for synergy with other faculty, Johnson suggested selecting a group of faculty who everybody highly regards to take this on, and then share their recommendation with everybody. Osgood then asked about faculty control over the curriculum, Johnson stated he believes the faculty should own the curriculum but that people have to fully own it. He went on to note that there is a way to figure out which part the faculty want to own and which part the administration should handle; it gets back to the aspirations of the institution.

2.2. Undergraduate Council and curriculum – Van Tyne/Gardner/Ganley

Ganley reported he will serve as chair of UGC again this year, the council will meet on September 9. An issue that came up over the summer raises the question of who has the ultimate responsibility for the undergraduate curriculum. Gardner explained that items passed through UGC and Senate were vetoed over the summer and asked if there is a precedent of this happening in the past. She stated, the specifics were trivial in the eyes of most of campus but a lot of time and effort went into deciding what should be changed. Gardner questioned the role of UGC and Graduate Council when approved items get overturned. She raised the issue of CBE deciding they want to calculate the major GPA based only on the core CBE courses. The change was approved in Undergraduate Council and Faculty Senate but got overturned by the administration. Parker shared his decisions with Osgood prior to sending the memo. Osgood stated the faculty bylaws indicate that faculty are in charge of the curriculum. Gardner asked if vetoing has ever been done and Parker reported every year there is review of campus actions. In the past, regarding the core, review has occurred, in the past five years a lot of this has occurred with EPICS II. Parker explained that curriculum comes about through degree approval and degree approval comes from the Board. The provost handles the interplay between faculty requests and BOT approval. Parker gave Gardner examples of when items were not approved or were revised at the administrative level. Van Tyne raised the fact that historically, UGC was run by the associate provost or other members of the administration which ensured that changes were appropriate as they progressed through the system. He stated that maybe the problem is not having an administrator attend or chair the meetings. Van Tyne has looked at state statute, court findings and the senate bylaws. He stated that faculty clearly have control of the curriculum. He pointed out administrators are also members of the faculty. Boyd agrees with Van Tyne that an administrator should be involved in the meetings; Boyd will begin attending UGC and Graduate Council monthly meetings. Parker reported there are years that the councils have been less active; he commended the current council members who have been highly involved and have worked to revitalize the departments. The enormous amount of activity coming through the councils has contributed to this. In the future, Parker has arranged to meet with Medley each month to review curricular changes as they are approved by the appropriate group. He stated that curricular reform effort is very important and very much appreciated. Osgood asked the key council chairs to touch base with Boyd and Parker to determine best path forward.

3. Organization of Senate and routine business

- 3.1. Ken's leadership style & need for senators' support
Osgood plans to run the senate with the goal of keeping things on track and maximizing efficiency. He will cut off extensive debate and make things into action items if needed. Osgood asked senators to object if he is moving things along too quickly and indicated his need for their significant involvement and contributions.
- 3.2. Minutes 5-5-15: **Motion to approve the minutes: Brune, second: Ganley. Vote to approve: Yes 9, No 0, Abstain 2.**
- 3.3. Senate leadership: Secretary and Executive Committee
Osgood suggested Singha serve as secretary and asked for senate endorsement. **Motion to approve Singha for secretary: Brune, second: Anderson. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**
Executive Committee: Osgood suggested Mehta and Sneider serve on executive committee along with Singha in her role as secretary. He also invited others to express their interest in serving and explained the role of the executive committee. Stone volunteered to join executive committee. **Motion to approve Mehta, Singha, Sneider and Stone to serve as the executive committee along with Osgood: Ganley, second: Ginaquitto. Vote to approve: Unanimous**
- 3.4. Departmental liaisons: PE, Library, Chemistry
The purpose of a departmental liaison is to communicate senate information to unrepresented departments and report information and ideas from the departments to the senate to ensure strong communication. Gianquitto will serve as library liaison, Berger will serve as EPICS liaison, Brune will represent petroleum, Anderson will cover chemistry. Singha has a joint appointment in GE and CEE, therefore, she will represent both departments.
- 3.5. Senate vacancy
According to the bylaws, replacing Natalie Van Tyne will be done through an appointment. The executive committee collects nominations then puts forward their choice for subsequent senate approval. Osgood would like this to happen via email and hopes to have somebody in place by the next meeting. He noted Lia Vella is interested in serving and asked senators to let executive committee members know if they have any other recommendations. Any faculty rank is eligible, however the candidate cannot come from LAIS because two senators from LAIS are currently serving (Osgood and Gianquitto).
- 3.6. Review of committee appointments; need to make sure all positions are filled
Paul Martin will serve as chair of the leadership nominating committee. The assessment committee and the calendar committee need senate representation. Mehta agreed to serve on the calendar committee, Brune agreed to serve on assessment committee. Martin will handle other committee appointments. Boyd reported on the newly formed grievance committee and indicated a need for senate to nominate 12 faculty members for consideration; other members will come from administrative faculty and other employee classes. Committee will meet once or twice for initial training but then will only meet if there is an employee grievance. This is for

any employee who is not otherwise covered under another grievance process. Osgood asked each senator to give Paul Martin one or two names from their department to put forward for grievance committee nominations. Parker reported the need to repopulate the two vacant positions on the seven member university P&T committee. There can be no duplication of departments, it is preferred to have at least two members from each college and the members must be full, tenured professors. Current departments represented are CH, GE, MN, LAIS, and CBE, therefore CASE and CERSE already have 2 representatives, CECS has one. Members must be nominated, then the administration will make the selection. CECS includes AMS, CEE, EECS and ME.

Parker asked for a faculty member to serve on the ad hoc committee to review and critique the plans for the redevelopment of the library. The plan is to make it more of a student services area. Parker wants the review committee to determine if these plans will meet the school's needs in five and ten years down the road. Parker is seeking faculty input and needs at least one faculty member, however, more are welcome. Parker explained the vision has a student services focus and will include the AMS learning center, the testing center, writing center, and the Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning. Osgood suggested Gianquitto accept this role and also seek other faculty for this committee. Gianquitto agreed to serve and stated she is quite interested in participating. Parker and Boyd indicated other schools are making similar changes as libraries are becoming less a repository for books and more a place to serve students. DU and Georgia Tech were cited as excellent examples of schools making similar changes. Aucoin and Marshall asked if students are represented on the committee, Parker said he welcomes graduate and undergraduate representation.

3.7. (Tentative) meeting on 9-29 (none on 10-6, fall break)

Disregard this issue, there is not a senate meeting scheduled during fall break.

3.8. Email and Meeting Efficiency (meetings, documentation, and communication for AY15-16)

Osgood discussed methods for creating efficiency. He created a shared drive for managing the documents and ongoing conversations. Senators discussed the issue surrounding having a private area for senate documents. Davis reported that senate cannot make decisions off-line in between meetings; rather, issues need to be formally introduced and ratified in person, at public meetings. Voting on-line is only acceptable for appointments. Gianquitto is opposed to voting on-line for regular senate issues and feels it is troublesome. Brune raised questions about keeping documents on a private Google drive. Osgood explained the drive is just for working documents, all actual documents will be public.

3.8.1. Proposal: routine updates electronically; focus meetings on substantive discussions

Discussed above.

3.8.2. Proposal: Updates on shared drive Thursday prior to meeting by 3pm; Senators review documents and note items that warrant further discussion by 3pm on Friday; president

compiles agenda by 5pm

Osgood requested council chairs to post council updates on the Google drive on Thursdays the week prior to senate meetings. Senators should plan to submit and review reports prior to each meeting. Osgood's goal is to post the agenda on the Google drive by 5:00 on Fridays before the meeting. Singha explained the benefit of using the "senate conversations" document on the drive rather than using "reply all" emails for senate on-line discussions.

3.8.3.Proposal: minimize "reply all," email is primarily for brief announcements; discussions on shared drive - Discussed above.

3.8.4.Proposal: schedule tentative deadlines and town halls

Osgood asked senators to identify key issues for town hall topics. Goals of town hall meetings include 1) involve faculty to assist senators and 2) build support for senate issues and goals. Osgood suggested holding town hall meetings on Tuesday afternoons on off-senate weeks. Proposed topics: shared governance and P&T.

3.8.5.Proposal: two-person teams tasked to review items & "own" key issues

Osgood suggested, as issues arise, he will ask pairs of senators to review these items in detail, flag the main issues before senate meetings, so that issues of note or concern can be efficiently discussed and handled at meetings. Mehta asked if the pairs of two people tasked with reviewing particular issues will talk to administration about those issues.

Osgood expressed support for that and said it could be determined on a case by case basis.

3.8.6.Proposal: secretary to review minutes

Osgood proposed Pilkington send minutes to senate secretary Singha, or a designee, for a detailed review, prior to distribution. Completed minutes and update reports from committee chairs (graduate, research and undergraduate councils) will be posted in the Google drive by 3:00 on Thursdays prior to each Tuesday meeting. Student representatives indicated an interest in having access to the drive. Senators approved the request, Osgood will give students access to the drive.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Improving Senate communication

4.1.1. Mechanisms to improve communication w/ administration: reduction of formal reports, more regular periodic suggestions/recommendations; administration participation on councils

Past methods of communication have led to reduced effectiveness. The senate works hard in isolation then presents a final document to faculty and sometimes gets no response.

Osgood suggested a new operating procedure: rather than create formal memos, he will raise smaller items with the administration as they come up. Singha told senators about the spreadsheet on the drive containing ongoing initiatives. It identifies the status of initiatives (ongoing, completed) and contains red and green flags to indicate which items are sitting with AA and which are sitting with the senate and need further action. Singha asked senators to review the document, add items of which they are aware and provide status updates as needed.

4.1.2. Mechanisms to improve communication w faculty: circulation of reports, agenda, minutes, brief updates; town halls – Not discussed.

4.1.3. Communicating Senate recommendation from Sp15: Faculty Appointment Process
Not discussed.

4.2. Issues and priorities for AY 15-16

4.2.1. Follow-up on past Senate proposals: mentorship, teaching faculty, shared governance in appointment process, salary equity (evaluations?)

Add priority issue: P&T. Osgood suggested a mini-committee look at Boyd's proposal/recommendations; Davis and Singha agreed to work on this. Martin noted the Boyd document has a procedural focus. Martin and Snieder agreed there are larger issues beyond the procedures.

Osgood reported that he suggested the Provost not attend each senate meeting, instead he prefers to have Parker come to the senate meetings, when needed, for longer discussion sessions. Osgood has asked Parker to report on the status of all initiatives and to provide a report on campus working groups.

4.2.2. Participation in campus working groups

Osgood asked Parker to give a report of the working groups at his next senate appearance.

4.2.3. Internationalization – Not Discussed.

4.2.4. Building a Community – Not discussed.

4.3. Faculty evaluations: service on Senate – Not discussed.

4.4. Next Senate meeting agenda:

4.4.1. Discussion with Provost regarding past Senate initiatives; campus working groups, communication/collaboration with Senate

4.4.2. Senate Bylaws revision proposal

Van Tyne pointed out that the senate bylaws state, with regard to UGC and Graduate Council that the council will make “recommendations” to the administration. Regarding research council, the bylaws state that “final decisions will be communicated” to administration. His view is that the wording for UGC and graduate council should be revised to read more like the research council phrase. Van Tyne reported on state statute and court cases regarding the faculty’s authority to control the curriculum. Van Tyne expressed an interest in helping revise the bylaws in this regard. Osgood posted a draft of proposed bylaws changes in the Google drive.

4.4.3. Promotion and Tenure changes: process for review; interdisciplinary hires
Singha will touch base with Terri Hogue regarding interdisciplinary issues.

4.4.4. Working group issues – Discussed above.

4.4.5. Leadership survey – Not discussed.

4.4.6. Executive session

**Motion to end regular meeting and convene executive session: Singha, second: Davis.
Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

4.4.7. Adjourn to Bottles n Brews

➔ **Next meeting September 8**



Board of Trustees
c/o Office of the President
Colorado School of Mines
1500 Illinois St.
Golden, CO 80401

August 28, 2015

Dear Members of the Board,

The Faculty Senate congratulates you on the successful conclusion of the search for the 17th President of the Colorado School of Mines. We thank you for your efforts to conduct the search in accordance with the principles of shared governance, for your inclusion of a broad array of faculty in the search, and for your communication with the campus during the process. We look forward to working with you and with President Paul Johnson during the upcoming academic year.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Osgood

for the CSM Faculty Senate

Corby Anderson, Metallurgical & Materials Engineering
Jurgen Brune, Mining Engineering
John Berger, Mechanical Engineering
Graham Davis, Economics & Business
Jason Ganley, Chemical & Biological Engineering
Tina Gianquitto, Liberal Arts & International Studies
Paul Martin, Applied Mathematics and Statistics
Dinesh Mehta, Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Kamini Singha, Geology & Geological Engineering
Roel Snieder, Geophysics
Chuck Stone, Physics

Kenneth Osgood
President, CSM Faculty Senate
Director, McBride Honors Program
Professor of History

Division of Liberal Arts and International Studies
Golden, Colorado 80401-1887
Telephone: 303.273.3990
Telefax: 303.384.2129
mcbride.mines.edu
kennethosgood.net