

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

October 28, 2014 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN), Lincoln Carr (PH), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSA), Uwe Greife (PH), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Kamini Singha (HS), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Patrick Marshall (USG)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Tom Boyd (AP), Corey Wahl (RG), Mike Dougherty (HR), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Lucy Orsi (*Oredigger*), John Heilbrunn (LAIS)

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost update – Terry Parker

Parker reported an Ombudsman's Office is being formed at CSM. Deans, DHs and Senate will discuss how this office should work. This office will have two goals, to provide confidential communications from employees to the administration and to perform conflict resolution campus-wide. If Senators have any concerns or suggestions, please let Parker know. Parker noted the memo he sent to campus outlining the authority given to the Deans, the intent is for decision-making to take place closer to faculty members. Academic Affairs recently reorganized significant portions of the website in an effort to increase access to information. Website contains a repository for announcements made by the administration, as well as information about procedures and committees. At the request of Graham Davis, Parker created a table outlining the responses to Senate requests, Parker thanked Davis and noted that the table will be a useful tool to keep the Senate informed. The Geode scheduler program is on-line, this software allows students to pre-plan many versions of their class schedule. Davis asked about the Deans' authority and whether the Deans will push some of their authority down to their DHs. Parker said, it depends on the issue in question. Hiring authority, for example, would not go down to DHs, because there is a framework and a budgetary process that needs to be upheld. Other items could be delegated to DHs. Davis asked about delegation of budgetary authority, Parker stated, there is intention to pass some of that authority down. Monecke asked about space allocation and how it will be handled in the future between the Provost and the Deans. Parker explained that we have had a soft model thus far, areas that are clearly within a college and are for research space alone, are handled by the Dean. Areas that have classroom functions and areas where there is cooperation across colleges, then those Deans have to work together and the Provost gets involved. Parker gave an example of a situation in Chauvenet that has to be resolved by two colleges. Bach asked about Parker's reference to the Deans as Chief Academic Officers and asked when the Deans will have academic authority for program changes and those type of issues. Parker replied that program

changes run through the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils and on to the Senate. Singha asked about authority over DHs if they are not functioning. Parker explained the supervisory chain is that DHs report to the Deans. The Deans would consult with the Provost in a case like that but Deans have the authority.

2.2. Associate Provost update – Tom Boyd

A second new faculty workshop was held last week, the topic was P&T expectations, there were 24 engaged participants and an excellent panel. In November, Early Career Awards will be the topic.

CSM is at capacity for the Ph.D. hooding ceremony, last year 49 participated, this December 64 are expected. Ceremony has been held in Friedhoff Hall, but last year it was too small with 49 graduates. The backup plan this year is to hold the ceremony in Bunker Hall, which will completely change the feel of the event. Depending on the final number of participants, the Graduate Office will decide on November 15 whether to move the ceremony to Bunker or stay in Friedhoff. If faculty members have ideas on how to change the ceremony, please contact Boyd. Greife suggested having a graduate ceremony separate from the traditional grad/undergrad ceremony, possibly the night before. Boyd discussed options and pros and cons of different types of ceremonies.

Corey Wahl from the Registrar's Office reported on Geode, the new course scheduling software. The promotional campaign includes posters around campus and a booth at registration. Students will have the ability to use the web-based tool to generate every potential class schedule. They can input preferred breaks, activities, and sports practices then select the schedule they like best. When it is their turn to register, they submit their choice for their best available schedule. The schedule is laid out visually. Major benefits: 1) CSM has the ability to get data from this program ahead of time regarding the students' preferred courses and course times. The Registrar will be able to identify the most requested classes to gauge demand and will be able to adjust the course offerings prior to registration to accommodate students. 2) RG can also track what time the students request breaks (many students prefer to sleep in the morning), RG can look at student activities and the times they are scheduled in order to plan course offerings for the benefit of the students. Geode is integrated into Banner. Geode does not stand for an acronym, students selected the name. This has been tested multiple times. Carr suggested a dedicated hotline to help people with questions and concerns. Wahl reported on the measures they have taken and will continue to take to inform students about using the system. The rollout has been solid. Wahl recommended, to faculty who are advisors, to use some of the useful tools, especially: the Geode schedule planner, the bulletin and the degree evaluator piece. Wahl stated flowcharts are not helpful to students, especially when they get off track. In the degree evaluation piece you can look at what a student's schedule should be in the future to ensure they take the courses they need to graduate. Over the next few months, CSM will work on implementing added features.

2.3. Graduate student health care and contracts - Mike Dougherty

Boyd asked Dougherty to attend Senate meeting to explain the current health insurance issue affecting graduate student employees. Due to PPACA, CSM is required to provide health insurance to employees that work 25 hours or more per week. CU recently announced they are limiting the number of hours graduate students can work so that the University does not have to provide health insurance. Boyd reported there are 677 Research Assistants and Teaching Assistants under contract, of the 677, 65 were not offered insurance and did not opt out of insurance. Of the 65, 45 are TAs and only 20 are RAs. Boyd believes that CSM should require offering insurance as part of the TA and RA contracts. The cost is about \$1000/semester. That would cover the 20 RAs, the remaining 45 are TAs, primarily working in LAIS, PE and EB. Boyd supports backfilling the TA accounts with a permanent budget adjustment to cover the cost. Boyd feels CSM should offer health insurance because it is the right thing to do for students, it fosters goodwill, and it sets CSM apart from other institutions. Boyd would rather provide insurance than limit hours. Boyd can provide some money to help cover budgets for next spring. Dougherty reported there are additional IRS requirements, which affect student/faculty insurance. The question to the students will be a) do you want free student insurance, or do you want to pay a small amount for the employer coverage. Most students will choose the free student coverage. Boyd is seeking feedback from Senate. Greife moved for a vote supporting providing health insurance to graduate students, Carr seconded. An official vote was not taken, however, no senators disagreed with the proposal. Boyd will roll this out in January.

2.4. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve: Anderson, Second: Brune. Minutes approved by acclamation.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities (15 min)

3.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Two items: Kay Schneider is working on a statewide articulation agreement, Mines will now have its own agreement, not a joint agreement as in the past. This will not affect individual departments from making their own decisions on what to accept and not accept. Ganley reported on course approvals as well as the discussion around the chemistry course CHGN198. CHGN 198 is a different flavor of Chemistry II, the department is asking for the opportunity to offer a third pilot, testing it on a larger class size. If a third pilot is approved by Council, they also want approval to allow the course to count as Chem II for all of the students who have taken the pilot and for future students if the course becomes permanently approved.

3.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune

Registrar is getting ready to roll out the new Course Information Management (CIM) system, which is a workflow system. Brune gave an overview of the system. Regarding the changes that may take place in the graduate student hooding and possibly the graduation ceremonies, Davis would like faculty to give feedback regarding the changes. Brune will add this discussion item to the Graduate Council agenda.

3.3. Research council – Uwe Greife

Two meetings have taken place this year. At the first, the agenda for the year was discussed along with Undergraduate Research Awards. At the second meeting, Faculty Research Awards were discussed, Council decided to repeat last year's process. The solicitation for the spring Undergraduate Research Awards will begin in the next few days. Tony Dean, the new VPRTT attended the meeting. Council discussed IDC rates because some are unhappy that industry pays a higher rate than federally funded research. It is a difficult situation that needs continued discussion. There was also an NSF MRI selection which was done without faculty involvement, Research Council expressed dissatisfaction. CSM will negotiate IDC rates with the Office of Naval Research in January. Greife asked Ralph Brown to give a presentation in February outlining the procedure for calculating the rates and explaining how CSM decides what the centers get back. Greife stated, the school has not been able to explain how the return rates are calculated. The Deans and the VPRTT are receiving a portion of the returns. Monecke noted, if we raise our rates, we may be awarded fewer projects. Greife suggested Monecke talk to Dean because there are ways to lower the rates for certain projects. Monecke asked about the overhead rate on student stipends, because student labor is one of his larger costs, he stated it would help if they could avoid charging overhead on student stipends. Greife reported the IDC rate is based on two components, one is administrative and the other is space and infrastructure. The federal rate is capped at 26%. Bruce Honeyman explained, the federal government insists on a preferred rate and some programs only allow a certain overhead rate, therefore, CSM tries to conform to those rates if possible. Honeyman gave examples of different rate options. By accepting projects with the lower rates, it puts CSM at a deficit, therefore, some support must come out of the general fund. Honeyman is trying to establish line items that have come from the overhead and have those items specified for replacing equipment in the future. Honeyman posed the question: How can schools do a better job talking about this to industry?

3.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Graham Davis

Davis reported that Boyd asked for clarification from the Senate whether they want the chairs of the University P&T Committees publicized on the website or whether they want all of the members listed? Davis said the reason all P&T members should not be publicized is that those members may be subjected to lobbying on behalf of faculty members under consideration. Carr suggested a motion to put all information on campus operations out to the public in an accessible way. **Carr made the motion that all P&T members be publicly identified. Singha seconded. Vote: Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 1.** Davis identified two issues Handbook Committee is currently reviewing: 1) the grievance policy, which covers any type of faculty member (academic, administrative, athletic) and 2) the appeals process for P&T. Boyd gave Handbook Committee policies from other schools and invited feedback. Senate will discuss this at another meeting. A third issue is revising items on teaching service loads for Teaching Faculty. Davis asked, does the Senate want service to be required from the first level to the second or only for promotion to the second level. Osgood noted that service should be required for promotion so that faculty are engaged in the school. Davis asked for suggestions of what could be put in the Handbook to prevent violations of assigning faculty 12 hours of teaching plus service. That kind

of a workload is bad for the faculty member and for the school. Davis reported the revised language will say that teaching faculty are expected to teach and serve. To clarify what that means, the Handbook will refer back to the table. Davis would prefer a new section in the Handbook that includes accountability and the process for violation.

3.5. President's Cabinet highlights – Dan Knauss

Knauss sent out his notes from the Cabinet meeting.

3.6. Brief report on any other committees

Brune raised the Calendar Committee's consideration of MLK Day. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Senate response to procedures manual changes – Not discussed.

4.2. Regarding Senate recommendations from last year – Not discussed.

4.3. Board of Trustees Meeting Friday October 31

Knauss noted the board meeting is on Friday, October 31; Senate is on the agenda to meet with the Board at 9:00. Knauss expects this to be a conversation with the Board, Knauss suggested Senate offer to help Board by asking what they need from the Senate to help them do their job. President has provided a response to Senate concerns, President is taking the issues seriously. The recent memo regarding Deans' authority, is an example of the response from administration. Singha stated that administration is responding to Senate concerns. Discussion of past meetings with the Senate and BOT and what those presentations looked like. Knauss suggested, and Senators agreed, rather than having a formal presentation, have a discussion. Honeyman talked about the history of faculty governance and suggested it is important to decide what the Senate and faculty want. The faculty should empower the administration to do the things they don't want to do. In any endeavor, for the organization to work well, people have to give up things and also have to provide things. The hard part is deciding what you want to keep and to give up. Knauss said they are coming up with some shared governance ideas. Senate will discuss possible questions for the BOT via Google docs.

5. Ombuds office

5.1. John Heilbrunn, LAIS faculty, presented on the topic of ombuds offices. These offices tend to be advisory and generally work on behalf of the administration. It seems that CSM needs somebody to mediate between the faculty and administration. At Harvard, the ombuds office is working to prevent bullying. The most crucial aspect of this office is that the person be independent. They can advise grieved parties on what they can do, however, ombuds don't have authority. Most university ombudsman offices are toothless. UC Berkeley and MIT's offices are proactive and they are working to prevent bullying by the administration.

Information is supposed to be confidential and not disclosed to anyone, they advise on how to resolve conflict. Mike Dougherty has had this function on campus, but he is an at will employee who reports to the Provost. The issue is to create an independent office that does not report to the Provost or President. Senators asked, would this job be under the BOT? It would be similar to the internal auditor position. Heilbrunn says the creation of this office should not be rushed, there needs to be an external search. One option is to have an ombudsperson and a committee to vet complaints. Davis noted Parker's two goals for the office, stated today in the Provost update, first goal is conflict resolution and second goal is safe and confidential communications upward to the administration. Heilbrunn said most ombuds offices do not have the power to mediate the conflict, they do not pass along communication rather, the ombudsman listens to and advises the complainant. There has to be a certain degree of buy-in on the part of the faculty for this to work. If bullying is taking place, there has to be impunity. The ombudsman could report to a body like the Senate.

5.2. Adjourn to attend Ombuds office meeting – Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Next meeting November 11, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300