

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 23, 2014 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), Uwe Greife (PH), Patrick Marshall (USG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Kamini Singha (HS)

GUESTS: Tom Boyd (AP), Lara Medley (RG)

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost Update – Terry Parker

Architecture Review Committee is meeting with prospective architects for the Meyer Hall rebuild. It is a repeat of the process that was done for selecting the Brown Hall architect. Thus far, the group presentations are very professional, which shows the increase in stature of CSM. Recipients for the CoorsTek fellowships are almost finalized, we anticipate awarding three proposals. We have scheduled meetings with the junior faculty for late October regarding the tenure process and we are meeting with DHs to discuss how to best support the pre-tenure faculty. The issue of scheduling common exams may arise for Senate consideration this year. With the growth of campus and the limited times available for common exams, it is becoming more difficult to schedule all of the exams. There is no action required by the Senate at this time, but exam scheduling may become an issue in the future. The administration wonders if faculty perceive this as a problem and if so, the administration welcomes ideas for solutions. Regarding the faculty forum discussion of the climate survey results scheduled for tomorrow, Parker invited faculty to meet with him to discuss any issues or concerns they have at any time.

2.2. Associate Provost Update - Tom Boyd

The next junior faculty workshop will take place on October 21 at 2:00 p.m. in the GRL Conference room and will include the topics of research expectations and tenure. The panel will include faculty members who have gone through the tenure process recently, some who have served on the P&T Committee and the Provost. 25 junior faculty members attended the last session which featured John Poate. Handbook Committee is up and running, October 15th is the next meeting; Committee will discuss the Senate memos on teaching faculty. P&T appeal issues will be discussed as well as anonymity of the University P&T Committee. Knauss asked for an extension for the Senate to give feedback to the Associate Provost on the proposed changes to the Procedures Manual. Boyd consented to an extension of time, however, he would like to get feedback settled before the Committee works on the faculty evaluation section. Knauss noted discrepancies between the academic calendar, the Procedures Manual

and the Handbook. For example, the academic calendar states that in the evaluation process, the DH does an evaluation of the faculty member, then the evaluation goes to the Dean before a meeting with the faculty member ever occurs. Boyd reported the intent of the new Faculty Data Report Narrative procedure is to streamline it from the faculty perspective and then have the colleges and the departmental assistants collect data and then vet that with the faculty. Once agreement occurs, then faculty simply provide narrative. Carr stated that last year the Senate looked at the appeal procedures at CU and CSU and found CSM is not aligned. Carr wants to insure that the Senate does research into how other schools handle their appeals and then incorporate that knowledge into the Senate feedback to the Handbook Committee.

2.3. Registrar Report – Lara Medley

Medley has created a description of the Classroom Committee to send to the Handbook Committee. New scheduling software for students will be implemented soon, the software is similar to Schedule Miner but it does much more. CSM is going to call it Geode. Students can enter preferred breaks and unavailable time periods, then request classes, and then the program will create many iterations of potential schedules. When it is the student's time to register, they can hit submit and a schedule will be created. Geode will be in place for the November advising period; students can use the program any time before registration.

2.4. Approval of past minutes

Minutes from the September 9 meeting will be voted on at October 14 meeting.

3. Major topics of discussion

3.1. Leadership nomination committee – Joel Bach

3.1.1. Update on committee nominations and remaining appointments

Knauss reported that all committee nominations were submitted to the President and the Provost to fill all committee assignments. Knauss has the names of the people who were selected by the administration. The budget committee rep is going to be John Speer from MME. For the Board of Student Publications, Manika Prasad and Rebecca Swanson were submitted. Senate wants to make sure spring elections are held for the Councils rather than members being assigned or elected by their departments in August.

3.1.2. University Promotion and Tenure Committees

Regarding the anonymity of the members on the University P&T Committee, Davis reported the Handbook does not say anything about that committee being treated any differently from other committees. Boyd surveyed the members of the University P&T Committee from the last six years and the majority responded that they wanted open notification in the interest of transparency. Mehta asked how other schools select their P&T Committees and suggested the Senate select half of the members of the committee and the Provost select the other half. The new members of the University P&T Committee are: Cristian Ciobanu, Juan Lucena, and Carolyn Koh. The Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee members are selected by the Provost and include: Vibhuti Dave, Gus Greivel, Toni Lefton, Cindy Rader, Todd Ruskell, Chris Shorey, and Sandy Woodson.

4. Update to Senate regarding Senate Executive Committee meetings

A number of executive committee meetings have occurred over the last two weeks. First, Knauss

met with the BOT Executive Committee, then the Senate Executive Committee met with the BOT, Knauss then met with the President, then the Senate Executive Committee met with the President. Joel Bach met with Dean Kevin Moore, and Lincoln Carr met with Dean Tony Dean (Dean Ramona Graves was out of town). Knauss also met briefly with Provost Parker. In these meetings, Senators spoke about the survey results and their concerns about CSM. They addressed these items candidly to the President and the Board, and they spoke about the anonymous letter distributed to faculty members and the concerns listed in that letter. Senators feel they have made an impact, they know of five letters sent by faculty members to the BOT about current issues, some of the letters and comments were negative and some were positive. In conversation with President Scoggins, the Senate Executive Committee requested that the full Senate have the opportunity to meet with the full Board, preferably at the October 31 BOT meeting. The Senate will put the request in writing and indicate that they want to meet with the BOT without the administration. In meetings with some administrators, the validity of the survey was questioned. President Scoggins and the BOT have taken the survey seriously and have not expressed concern to the Senate over the validity. Osgood invited comments from the rest of the Senate about this process. Davis commented that one would think the leadership of the school would want to have a feel for the pulse of the faculty and staff and wondered if there is discussion of needing to do this on an ongoing basis. Carr reported that this was not perceived as something the BOT and administration wanted to do. The Senate can try to let the administration know that they should be concerned with keeping track of the contentment of faculty and staff. Carr stated that departments that are doing well (ME, PH) are supportive of the school environment. Of the 64 respondents who have served as Division Directors, Administrators, Department Heads or Assistant Department Heads, only 9% agreed that decision making at CSM is collaborative and transparent. Greife raised the issue of the new appointment of the VPRTT and questioned the lack of involvement of faculty in making that decision. Greife feels that more faculty need to be involved in all areas of campus.

5. Faculty survey discussion/Faculty Forum planning – Ken Osgood, Dinesh Mehta

The Senate will collect feedback from the forum and then will give the President a short list of issues for him to consider. To get changes made in the Handbook, the Senate is often a year behind. Last year, the Provost's responses to Senate memos come back too late, Carr thinks there needs to be a different process to get things into the Handbook. Davis explained that the Handbook Committee does not set policy, rather it turns AA policy into language. Parker does not plan to attend the Faculty Forum; the President said that he had discouraged VPs from attending. Osgood stated that Senators should keep control of the meeting, should speak openly by way of example, and should remain positive with comments. Discussion ensued regarding the approach to take at the forum, including how to emphasize the most salient issues. Knauss will give the introduction and will explain that the results from the forum will give the Senate direction going forward. Davis suggested the moderator should cut people off who are there to complain, and suggested Knauss and Osgood emphasize that the purpose of the forum is not to vent but to propose solutions to improve the climate at CSM. Discussion ensued regarding what slides to include in the presentation. Osgood suggested Mehta stand on stage to assist with the interpretation and explanation of statistics. The goal of the survey and the forum is to insure that CSM is a school where faculty and staff are happy and working to their full potential. Discussion of whether the Senate should present

any suggestions for going forward; Knauss said the forum should be a blank slate. Knauss reported on research done by another faculty member on the vote of no confidence at CSM in 1988 or 1989 involving Dr. Ansell. Knauss stated, that situation mirrors the current climate on campus. Osgood drafted an e-mail for Senators to send to their departments encouraging attendance. Discussion took place regarding whether the Senate should give the audience categories in which to provide feedback and whether this is an information gathering exercise or a decision making activity; Senators decided the purpose is for gathering information. A handout will be provided to all participants asking for "Suggestions for the Senate to consider" and "Additional data the Senate should be aware of."

6. Senate response to procedures manual changes – Not discussed, Knauss asked Senators to take time to look at the proposed revisions and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting.

7. Campus committees and regular responsibilities
If there are urgent issues, send Knauss an e-mail
 - 7.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley – Not discussed.
 - 7.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune – Not discussed.
 - 7.3. Research council – Uwe Greife – Not discussed.
 - 7.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Graham Davis
Davis reported that the grievance process for exempt employees will be revised this year and suggested anybody interested in the grievance process contact him for further information.
 - 7.5. President's Cabinet highlights – Dan Knauss
No major news other than announcements and updates has come from the President's Cabinet.
 - 7.6. Brief report on any other committees – Not discussed.

Next meeting: October 14, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300