

# COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 10, 2015 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

**ATTENDEES: 2015-2016 Senators:** Ken Osgood (President), Linda Battalora (PE), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Tina Gianquitto (LAIS), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (GE), Roel Snieder (GP), Chuck Stone (PH), Chet Van Tyne (MME), **Representatives:** Wendy Harrison (BOT), Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Colin Marshall (USG)

**APOLOGIES:** John Berger (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN)

**GUESTS:** Lisa Nickum (LB)

---

### 1. Visitors

Harrison gave an update on the October BOT meeting. Due to a long executive session she did not get the opportunity to present.

### 2. Consent agenda (5mins):

2.1. Vote to approve Minutes for 10-27-15: Senate will approve minutes at the next meeting.

Snieder shared an article authored by Singha; Snieder shared two quotes and asked, "What is the song we are singing as a Faculty Senate?"

### 3. Topics of discussion

3.1. Organization of Senate issues for rest of academic year (Snieder)

Snieder shared the table that resulted from the brainstorming activity held at the last meeting. Prior to the meeting Snieder and Osgood discussed some of the issues and added to the table.

1) Mental health on campus was discussed but it was agreed senators do not have enough time to tackle mental health issues at this time. Derek Morgan in Student Life announced a mental health workshop that faculty can attend. Marshall suggested the senate work with existing campus groups focused on mental health such as the Be Well initiative and the Active Minds group when ready to take action.

2) Diversity and inclusion is a topic with significant senate interest. One goal would be to revitalize the existing President's Committee on Diversity and make it become more than an event scheduling group. Snieder recommends the senate let President Johnson know how important this is and possibly suggest ideas. Singha ran a diversity program at Penn State and thinks Mines has opportunities to increase diversity, especially because of Mines' proximity to Denver Public Schools. Aucoin is going to meet with Lasich next week to share graduate student thoughts on diversity. Osgood suggested the senate identify areas where the school can improve and make those recommendations to the diversity committee rather than tackle diversity issues directly at this time. Senators agreed to send ideas to Battalora and Singha.

3) Excellence in administrative performance, a.k.a. Administrative Effectiveness - Chet Van Tyne suggested this topic could focus on the amount of paperwork, hoops and approvals people have to jump through to get work done. How can the faculty help advise the departments in these administrative areas? Osgood asked Aucoin and Marshall what the students feel about this. Aucoin agrees that there is too much paperwork to get everything approved. She gave an example of the hassles she had to go through to get a procurement/purchase order done. Marshall stated sometimes CCIT responses are slow, and reported that students are meeting with the CIO tomorrow (Erickson) to discuss these issues. Marshall agrees that some of the paperwork is difficult. Snieder explained, senate can either ask the administration to streamline the processes or senators can provide specific suggestions. Osgood feels specific suggestions would be welcomed by the administration. One option is to gather information about where the bottlenecks and frustration levels are for administrative problems. Davis identified two issues: 1) the administrative processes and 2) the people who are supposed to be doing the work. Osgood suggested the focus should be on processes rather than personnel. An example was given: students have to spend an hour wandering around campus to get signatures to complete a minor form. Snieder explained, if this topic is going to be pursued, then somebody needs to be the champion. Osgood asked the students if they would be willing to take this on with the senate. Aucoin said GSG would be willing to support this. Davis suggested a half step, if senators and students see processes that are cumbersome then they can point them out to the responsible administrator. Because nobody is available at this time to take this on as champion, and because Brune was absent (and interested), it was tabled until the next meeting. Senators agreed to wait until somebody steps forward.

4) The university climate issue had the most interest. Singha and Snieder agreed to champion this topic, Aucoin and Battalora agreed to help. Senators agreed classified staff and administrative faculty could help with this work and would also have concerns that need to be addressed. Snieder commented the faculty do not talk about their research. Senators agreed to name this topic: Campus Culture. Osgood suggested a two question survey monkey to solicit feedback about the campus culture.

5) Graduate student experience and the expectations of RAs and TAs - Snieder has talked about the Mines Graduate Student experience. The president is interested in this; Snieder asked Mehta to contact the president about this. Osgood suggested a combined faculty/grad student committee. Marshall offered to give a regular student government update at the senate meetings, it was decided that Marshall and Aucoin can provide a brief written update in the Google Drive instead with the other senate groups: UGC, GC, and RC. Davis asked the students if it would be useful to have a faculty member attend the student meetings. Marshall pointed out that all student meetings are open meetings and said faculty are welcome. Harrison suggested students contact senate when there is an issue in which faculty may be interested, and then faculty can choose whether or not to attend.

### 3.2. Faculty Forum (Osgood)

Osgood invited Johnson to speak at a faculty forum, he is interested in speaking in January. Davis suggested the senate play a communication role in the closure of the provost departure and noted there are 27 people up for P&T with no provost to make the P&T decisions. Osgood reported there will be an email coming out this week from President Johnson and there may be a new role for the Office of the Provost. Johnson indicated there may be too many levels of administration and perhaps deans will have a greater role. Davis said all the more reason to have a forum because the faculty are interested in seeing who will be in charge. Senators agreed to wait until President Johnson makes an announcement before suggesting an earlier forum. Once the announcement happens, if faculty have concerns they can share them with Osgood.

### 3.3. Calendar Committee (Mehta)

Committee met three weeks ago to come up with proposals that took last year's senate suggestions into consideration. The main idea is to delay the start of spring semester by a week. This addresses MLK Day, because school will not have started, and pushes back spring break which may better align with Jeffco. This plan would shorten summer which would impact the eight week physics classes. Mehta will meet with the PH department on Friday, the Calendar Committee will meet Monday for a vote.

Marshall reported the students will vote no for this proposal because they will miss one week of summer internships. Being unavailable to work until a week later is concerning to students because they feel they may not be hired as a result. They also have the concern of earning less money in a summer if they do get hired. Snieder reported that the GP department also has concerns with the issue of students obtaining internships and he noted the GP field session would be impacted. Stone has received pushback from faculty who want a full summer to research and participate in other activities. One suggestion was to make a Wednesday a Tuesday or vice versa (i.e. have a MWF class schedule on a Tuesday or Thursday). Osgood suggested students contact the Career Center regarding the summer internship issue to get facts about whether the late start is really a problem. Osgood said that maybe students are concerned about an issue they need not be concerned about. Marshall reiterated, the big concern is that students could lose a whole week of earnings.

Van Tyne noted, from a student's perspective, if the school has a longer winter intersession then it provides opportunities for students to travel, study or hold internships. The question was raised, do all departments really need to have field sessions? Perhaps some departments may not need to continue requiring field sessions. Davis said the senate needs to look at things from an educational perspective because we are here for the educational benefit of the students. Davis added the best we can do for our students is to attract the best faculty, therefore we could look at these issues from a faculty recruiting perspective. Gianquitto stated if the school had an extended winter break students could do some really interesting things. Mehta asked senators how they want him to vote on the proposal. Gianquitto noted LAIS has

not had a discussion about the proposal. Osgood will send out the proposal and will seek input from the faculty.

3.4. Evaluations: length of time for them to remain open (Osgood)

Osgood explained Boyd asked the senate to reconsider the length of time faculty evaluations are open to students. AA changed the time period from three weeks to one week at the request of the senate. Senators did not recall why they wanted it open for only one week. Marshall recalled that in the past, senators said they did not want to annoy students with a long evaluation period and lots of reminder emails and as a result get negative feedback. Marshall said the students are too busy to complete the electronic evaluations when they are studying for finals, but if the evaluations are open after finals then they have time to complete them. Osgood suggested having evaluations open the last week of classes and through the end of finals. Davis feels it is important for evaluations to take place at the very end of the semester when capstone projects and final exams have been completed because students then realize how much they have learned. Singha pointed out if students want it open longer, then the response rate may go up. Osgood suggested testing to see if the response rate goes up with a two week window, if it does, then keep it at two weeks, if not, then go back to one week. Senators agreed to hold evaluations during dead week and finals week as a trial period and then compare the response rate to the one week period before making a final decision. Gianquitto noted there was a gender issue with negative comments reported in the evaluations of female faculty, more negative comments were submitted on the electronic evaluations as compared to the paper comments. Gianquitto asked if this can be looked at to see if gender based negative comments have occurred.

3.5. P&T process update and discussion (Osgood)

The following senators met to go over the list of P&T questions: Davis, Singha, Martin, and Osgood (Van Tyne was not available). Osgood distributed a handout outlining the recommendations and briefly reviewed each item. They agreed that deans should write a letter, but the VPRTT does not need to write a letter. Also, the president should provide the BOT with recommendations both positive and negative. Davis noted December 16 is the last official date to provide the Handbook Committee with new items to consider, but added, Boyd may be able to accept new items in January. Osgood asked if the document should be sent to faculty for feedback at this time, senators thought it would be a good idea to talk about it first, but that the document should be considered public.

3.6. Proposal for expanding Honors program (Osgood)

Not discussed.

3.7. Other items TBA

Regarding the library renovation committee, Snieder distributed a letter he drafted that would come from the senate noting the faculty would like to see more of a vision incorporated into the project. He feels it is important to redesign the space to create a building that inspires the

people who use it. Gianquitto served on the committee, they were not asked to provide a vision, they were asked to take a space and see how many chairs can be added to the space. The renovation was not discussed from a philosophical point of view, it was a nuts and bolts exercise. Gianquitto feels the senate should make a suggestion to approach the project from a philosophical point of view and to include an outside architect in the planning. Marshall stated, in the area available, they want a student learning space, not a space that is used for collaboration between faculty members. She feels the items outlined in the committee report do represent the desires of the students. Marshall said the philosophical purpose was addressed by the committee since it is for students' use. Their priority is to have spaces to study. Osgood noted the library also needs to serve other key functions, it is a place for research, and there needs to be more of a vision for everybody. It should be more welcoming for all people. Osgood asked Gianquitto to revise Snieder's proposed letter. Stone noted the library is not a faculty club and it is not a "make your own space" environment. Stone asked what percentage of faculty actually use the library for research or physically spend time there. Nickum noted the library was built in 1954, and space was added on in 1978. The numbers of students using it are up. Nickum added the committee recommendations are much better than the original plan put forth by the administration's architects. She also reported the committee had no library representation on it whatsoever. Osgood asked if there is consensus among the library staff about the current plans, the librarians did not support the first plan because all student seat spaces were planned for other groups which took space away from student seating. Librarians now think the committee did a good job, given the constraints within which they had to work. Gianquitto will revise the Snieder document and share it with senators in a few days.

Next meeting, Tuesday, December 1, 2:00-4:00 p.m. GRL Conference Room