

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

October 7, 2014 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Jurgen Brune (MN), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSA), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Lincoln Carr (PH), Uwe Greife (Arrived for Executive Session) (PH), Patrick Marshall (USG), Kamini Singha (HS)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), 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

The administration is working through the appointment process for the Interim Dean for CASE, the process includes meeting with each department impacted and consulting with faculty members in these departments. Parker received a query from the *Oredigger* asking about cuts he made to the CSM budget last year. Parker reported we are not in a “cutting” environment at this time. Parker gave a handout to Senators outlining the budget process from last year, the document outlined some of the priority items and issues that have been identified by the Deans, Associate Provost and Provost. Parker and Boyd are reaching out to each faculty member at small group lunches to talk about what is right and what is wrong at CSM. Parker is receiving interesting viewpoints and feedback. Thus far, common themes from the meetings include a significant desire by faculty to have more information and desires for deeper support staff. Parker is looking at how to provide more information. The CoorsTek \$27M donation has been announced; the result will be a new Meyer Hall, which will require a full evacuation of the building. The plan is to create a low cost GRL 2 to create swing space to allow CSM to evacuate Meyer, it will be on-line by the end of next summer. The cost will be in the \$5-6M range. Because of ongoing need for laboratory space, CSM needs to plan well for this and make sure the building will work for the next 50 years. Parker noted the e-mail sent from President Scoggins to Senate President Dan Knauss asking the Senate to prioritize items that they wish to see addressed by the administration; Parker offered to help with this list or any other items the Senate wants addressed by the Provost’s office. Parker noted that his door is always open and he welcomes working with faculty on any concerns they have. Graham Davis inquired about the status of the items in the memo the Provost sent to the Senate dated September 16, 2014 in response to the March 2014 memo from the Senate regarding Teaching Faculty Rights and Responsibilities and Handbook revisions for teaching faculty. Parker will create a chart of action items to keep the Senate apprised of the status of the issues. Boyd stated the Handbook

items in that memo will be discussed at next week's Handbook Committee meeting.

2.2. Associate Provost Update – Tom Boyd

Boyd reported on three informational items. Walker and Boyd have reached out to legal counsel from CU, CSU and DU to obtain information on P&T processes. Boyd will compile that information, touch base with the Senate and then have a discussion about what items to address. Boyd gave examples of some of the procedures at other schools and noted there are radical differences in the appeals processes. The CSM process is more open than some others. Boyd stated it was helpful talking to counsel because there is a lot they do that is not necessarily written in the policies. Mehta asked for statistics on appeals. Boyd reported that CSU had two appeals last year, while CU had one going to a formal process; Boyd did not have information on DU. Statistically CSM is on the higher end of appeals, possibly because there are more opportunities to identify problems in the review process along the way at other schools. Problems are identified early on and along the way, therefore, when it is time for promotion, there are fewer surprises, therefore, possibly fewer appeals. The CSM graduate school is growing and getting to a stage where the Ph.D. hooding ceremony will need to be significantly changed because there are too many students participating. In response to the Senate's request for mentoring for faculty, Boyd has implemented a series of workshops for new faculty. Boyd asked the Senate to let him know of topics they want included in the mentoring workshops.

2.3. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve minutes from September 9 and September 23: Brune, second: Anderson.

Vote: Unanimous to Approve.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

3.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Next meeting will take place on October 8. Last month's meeting included course changes and additions.

3.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune

Council has met twice, courses have been approved. Also, Mining Engineering wants to change their graduate program by providing two tracks, one for mining engineering students who have an undergraduate degree in mining, and a second track called Earth Systems for graduate students who do not have an undergraduate degree in mining. There are problems requiring all graduate students to have certain qualifications before coming into the program. This new track will allow people without a mining background to apply to the program. A second issue discussed is that some graduate students have found ways to bypass unsatisfactory progress for research credits. If a student has not met the requirements they change advisors, then they get to graduate even though they did not perform some of their research. Davis reported there is some question, in EB, with whom students can sign up for thesis credits. The Bulletin says students have to sign up with their thesis advisor, but in reality, that is not the case. Students may be signing up to do research with faculty they think will be best for their work, but their

advisor may not be happy if the student has not spent enough time working with the advisor.

3.3. Research council – Uwe Greife

No report (Greife absent).

3.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Graham Davis

Davis reported the Handbook Committee will be reviewing the grievance procedure, which is an issue brought up by Mike Dougherty in HR. The idea is to make the grievance procedure more like a mediation and less like a legal proceeding. Knauss noted that the grievance process assumes that a grievance is against the direct supervisor, now that CSM has more layers of administration, a person could have a grievance against a Dean or the Provost, and that should be addressed. Regarding the proposed Procedures Manual changes, Boyd is waiting for the Senate to get back to him with feedback. Senate is working on a response.

3.5. Library Liaison report – Graham Davis

Davis met with Joni Lerud-Heck to discuss library issues. Lerud-Heck thought the Senate might want to discuss resurrecting the Library Advisory Committee. The purpose of that committee is for the faculty to advise the library as to what items they need and want in the library. Lerud-Heck feels the library should have the materials the faculty need to be successful in their work and ultimately to be successful in obtaining promotion and tenure. If the faculty want this committee, then the Senate should write up a proposal. The library does not know what is essential to the faculty and what is not when they make purchasing and cutting decisions. The Senate needs to decide if it is interested in this. The library receives funds from AA, if departments need items, then having them request funds may help the library. The question was raised, is the library the right conduit for requests for money for library materials? Davis reported that Lerud-Heck does not feel she has support for purchasing items. Discussion of whether there should be procedures in place for departments to request materials; much of the need may come from a research perspective, rather than from a teaching perspective. The library is not given guidance as to what they should keep and what they should cut. Subscription costs increase at a rate that is not supported by the library's budget. Can the library track electronic usage to help determine which items are used most? Osgood suggested, if the library is going to cut something they could tell campus and then get feedback. Davis said Deans should be channeling information from the departments up, this is a resource allocation issue. Davis will report Senate thoughts to Lerud-Heck. The process for library faculty promotion is not clearly outlined in the Handbook, promotion goes through the University P&T Committee and they don't know how to handle library faculty. Davis told Lerud-Heck to come up with proposed Handbook language for library faculty promotion and give to Senate to discuss. CSM librarians perform less research than other campus librarians, 10% vs. 50% at other schools. Bach reported this issue was discussed last year, but it was decided that research and library faculty promotion issues would be put on hold while the Senate worked on teaching faculty promotion.

3.6. President's Cabinet highlights – Dan Knauss

Knauss distributed the meeting notes to Senators via e-mail.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Senate response to procedures manual changes

Osgood suggested a subcommittee work on this, Davis and Anderson agreed to serve. They will look at Boyd's proposed changes. Knauss wanted the calendar issues addressed. For example, he felt the Dean's should not see the evaluations done by the DH's before the faculty member ever gets to see the evaluation. In some cases, evaluations never take place, but the Handbook says evaluations determine raises. Mehta pointed out that existing rules and procedures should be followed. Davis suggested inserting language into the Handbook stating that the Handbook is binding. He also suggested there should be a reconciliation process if one side or the other does not follow the Handbook. Knauss noted, in the grievance process, certain issues are grievable, some issues are not grievable.

Anderson noted his department's inability to charge lab fees, MME labs need to be supported from other budgets. Knauss said that is a budget and an AA issue, some departments can charge lab fees.

Knauss reported on the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council. Paul Ogg is the CSM representative. The main topic on their agenda is the House Bill 14-1319 which looks at how money is allocated to universities. In the past, Mines has done pretty well per student FTE in how well the school uses COF and fee for service funds. If the bill changes, then it could hurt Mines. The administration is waiting on the recommendations from the Advisory Council working groups. Peter Han has been in touch with Knauss to keep him informed. Other small schools are looking into bringing in underrepresented students and they would like to receive funds for supporting these students, research universities prefer a different method of distributing the money. Mines does not know if they will side with the research universities or side with the smaller schools. The good news is that CSM only receives 7% funding from the state, so changes to the distribution will not be significant.

4.2. Faculty forum follow-up

President Scoggins invited the Senate to follow up on the faculty forum with a document. The Senate is invited to attend the BOT meeting on October 31st.

5. Executive Session

- 5.1.** Motion to go into executive session: Bach, second: Brune. Vote: Unanimous.
Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting: October 28, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300