

**COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**OCTOBER 22, 2013 2:00 p.m.**  
**300 HILL HALL**

**ATTENDEES:** Lincoln Carr (PH), Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Gerald Bourne (MT), Uwe Greife (PH), Dan Knauss (CH), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (LAIS), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Kamini Singha (Hydrologic Science), John Spear (CCE), Kim Williams (CH), Ray Zhang (CEE), Sydney Sullinger (USG)

**APOLOGIES:** James Slyby (GSA)

**GUESTS:** Dr. Terry Parker (Provost), Patricia Anderson (Library), Tissa Illangasekare (CEE)

---

## **Introductions**

### **Preliminary Matters**

**Provost Update** – T. Parker: thanked the Senate for submitting nominations. Regarding strategic planning, shared current version of MVV statement. Strategic plan has been presented to grad and undergrad students. Undergrad students' comments: make certain that you preserve the current climate that allows for great student to student interaction. Undergrad students value the venues, both inside class and outside class, which allow them to interact as students. Graduate students' comments: what about the tension between the teaching and research areas of the university? Students feel that conflict, are aware that there is a balance needed between the teaching and research sides of the school, they don't have any ideas on what to do to fix it, but they want that addressed by the administration. 110 people attended strategic planning open forums. Administration will put that feedback on blackboard when it is compiled and will present that information to the Board of Trustees this Friday. After Board weighs in, then administration will integrate their input into Strategic Plan and report back to campus.

**Past minutes:** Minutes from 10/8/13 were not discussed or approved.

### **Key Issue Subcommittee Updates:**

#### **Teaching Research and Library Faculty Promotion, Rights and Duties - J. Bach**

Faculty interested in joining committee: Vince Kuo and Adele Tamboli. B. Bialecki suggested Lee Landkammer from CCE, but CCE already has representation. U. Greife: raised concern with having research faculty on committee, because he felt they are not committed to school. Osgood: last meeting Senate decided to focus on teaching faculty, trying to address both research faculty and teaching faculty at the same time may derail the teaching faculty issues Carr: Yes, but we need input from research folks to insure the valued research faculty don't leave. T. Monecke: we should determine difference between adjunct, affiliate faculty and research faculty. Solution: create a sub, sub-committee to focus on research faculty, so that

teaching faculty issues can move forward. Senate agreed by acclamation to form a sub (research), sub-committee.

**Help Desk Committee** - R. Zhang: Nothing new to report since last Senate meeting. CCIT is working on their end of the task. Senate agreed by acclamation that there does not need to be a big Help Desk committee. R. Zhang will work with CCIT, L. Carr will work with T. Parker.

**Faculty Mentorship and P&T Transparency** – K. Williams

Committee met over fall break. Decisions: 1) Town hall-style meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 30 at 4:00 -5:00 pm, Hill Hall 300. 2) Prioritized goals and determined that both parts are intertwined and need to be addressed together. Committee will start from T. Illangasekare's memo. Young faculty members are not looking at what is required for P&T, by the time they start applying, it is way too late. We need to determine how we can we let faculty know that earlier. Committee has a plan on how to run town hall meeting, how to address mentorship and P&T concerns and still provide anonymity. If Senate members have any leading questions to include, especially regarding P&T and Transparency, please send them to K. Williams. S. Pankavich will lead mentorship section of meeting; K. Williams will lead P&T. Committee will compile and process feedback. Once committee has outcomes/responses, what should committee do to transmit results to faculty? Carr: suggested opening a blackboard folder to post information. S. Pankavich: When Carr sends out announcement for this meeting, let faculty know there are other options for giving feedback if they are unable to attend or do not want to speak at meeting. K. Williams is currently collecting faculty feedback. L. Carr will draft memo, let faculty know that it is a faculty-only meeting and will run memo by S. Pankavich and K. Williams.

**Strategic Plan** – No need to discuss today since T. Parker will get Senate feedback after administration's version is firmed up. K. Osgood: if we have large issues we know about, we should be ready to discuss them now. D. Knauss agreed.

Feedback from departments: K. Osgood: 1) the plan didn't seem to emphasize what we want students to become, it is not a student-centered plan. In looking at the profile of a CSM student: Where are we successful and where do we face challenges, such as broadening students, communication skills, preparing them for lifelong learning? Student focus is great, but community interaction and role of faculty seems to be missing. Regarding diversity: diversity also means an intellectual climate that supports diverse opinions. What kind of strategies promote that kind of environment? Also missing is how to increase diversity. L. Carr: metrics/numbers in plan are hard numbers, but seem to be coming out of nowhere.

Department feedback from T. Monecke: Regarding the guiding principles, there could be some re-wording because it talks about customers not students. Concerned about the statement, "We are a public institution but really we should be guided by entrepreneurship." That should be reformulated because otherwise we would have to do a cost-benefit analysis for everything we do, academic programs, departments, etc. Department feedback from J. Spear: people wondered about the peppering of research throughout the plan, there wasn't enough research. The call out of bio made folks sore. Still seems to be a conflict of science vs. engineering. (basic science vs. applied science). Graduate students not mentioned. Department feedback from K. Singha: Questions about metrics and where numbers came from. Senate action: L. Carr will

produce a memo to T. Parker with broad general issues and then let him know Senate plans to provide him with a memo with detailed concerns after Board firms up their version. K. Singha and J. Spear will help produce the memo. Senate agreed to that idea.

**Action Item: Prepare final Senate version of MVV statement for Provost** - L. Carr Senate members proposed and discussed changes to each paragraph of document. Document will be posted to Blackboard. Senate agreed that L. Carr should take suggested changes to Provost as the result of today's meeting for his consideration.

**Leadership Nomination Committee** J. Bach – Continuing to identify committees and their members. Senate agreed to put this off until Spring and focus on Strategic Plan and other issues.

**Faculty Handbook Committee** R. Zhang – Committee is in the process of reorganizing Section 8, Promotion for Research and Teaching Faculty. Group is also talking about the rights and responsibilities of faculty. FHC is waiting to hear from Senate with their input. T. Boyd wants information reported through R. Zhang. T. Boyd agreed to wait to get feedback from K. Williams' committee in spring.

#### **Council Reports:**

**Undergraduate Council** K. Singha – UGC had discussion about providing enough time for issues to be discussed by departments, Senate and Provost's office before issues were brought to a vote. M. Seger has idea for undergraduate advising manual. UGC asking Senate to look into having school provide a scanning service rather than having faculty scan exams themselves. Idea was that Copy Services could take on this task. L. Carr agreed to raise this with T. Parker.

**Grad Council** D. Knauss – Has not met since last Senate meeting.

**Research Council** - U. Greife Undergraduate Research Fellowships: changing wording of the solicitation because non-resident students can now apply. Changes relating to the future: 1) we should have money flexible through the semester and maybe extend the money to fund some research. 2) We are starting up Excellence in Research Awards, we will change a few small things in the solicitation. Other items committee has identified: centralized outreach efforts in the university, so that some individual faculty member who some agency has required to think about outreach can have a partner to easily get this done. We also discussed looking at having a support person for proposal and management of large projects since we will have to go after larger things. Also, look to see if there would be any infrastructure pieces that would be beneficial for a large chunk of the faculty that could be pushed by the Research Council.

**Board of Trustees Update** T. Illangasekare (Faculty Representative to Board)

Update of strategic planning: He is trying to meet with all of the faculty members before the Board meeting on Friday to get faculty feedback. Some issues have been governance, how the Board operates, how decisions are made, and communication issues. The faculty decided to meet with the Board without administration present, having direct communication. Board

agreed to meet with Senate, date to be determined. CSM has a reputation of getting top students, but they don't have low-income top students. He mentioned the NY Times article regarding low-income students and the fact that students without money will impact the school. Illangasekare invited Senators to send him their feedback and bring him any issues and concerns of which they are aware.

**Appeal Process** – L. Carr attended appeal event and stated the procedure needs fixing. The panel of professors sitting above the faculty member had lawyers, the Provost had lawyers. L. Carr feels that the appealing faculty member should have access to a lawyer during the process and that Senate should take this on next year. Parker and Boyd both want to fix process. Appeals only occur every so often, two in one year is very rare.

Other agenda items will be pushed back to next meeting:

- Faculty forum suggestion: pedagogy

- FACTIR correspondence, discussion

- New faculty bio and campus-wide announcement

Meeting Adjourned 4:00 p.m.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 12, 2013  
2:00 in 300 Hill Hall