

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

November 11, 2014 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Hill Hall 300

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Joel Bach (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Ben Goertz (GSA), Uwe Greife (PH), Patrick Marshall (USG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Kamini Singha (HS)

APOLOGIES: Corby Anderson (MME), Lincoln Carr (PH), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

GUESTS: Terry Parker (Provost), Tom Boyd (AP), Bruce Honeyman (RTT), Brian Winkelbauer (Foundation), Lara Medley (RG), Chuck Stone (PH)

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

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost update – Terry Parker

Parker thanked Osgood and Knauss for meeting with him, Kauffman and Boyd. Meetings between Senate and administration will continue, Parker welcomes continued conversations to discuss campus issues. Parker and Boyd have held small group lunches with over 160 faculty members in an effort to listen to faculty concerns and improve the campus climate. A common theme that is emerging is the desire for more communication between faculty and administration in both directions.

Regarding space and location, Environmental Health and Safety Office is moving out of Chauvenet and into the trailers formerly occupied by Capital Planning and Construction. CPC has moved to the Moly building. Deans Moore and Kauffman are working with CPC to solve their congestion problems in Coolbaugh and Chauvenet. Parker plans to find space in the library for The Writing Center, The Math Learning Center, The Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, The Testing Center, and possibly a classroom; the formalized tutoring programs will remain in the library as well.

Registration is underway, the new Geode scheduler program is working well. It is allowing the Registrar to better manage student schedule demand and actively open and close sections of classes, making the entire registration system more efficient. Goertz asked about undergraduate students looking for expanded computer use. Parker stated that AA is fairly aware of computer seat demand. Next year, in CH 215, there may be potential for additional computer lab/teaching lab seats and in Brown 136 there may be an opportunity to add seats.

2.2. Associate Provost update – Tom Boyd

Handbook Committee meets next week, nothing new to report. Committee is reviewing the Teaching Faculty recommendations made by the Senate. Committee will be looking at first

reading of conflict of interest language from Jane Rosenthal. Boyd is also working on commencement planning. There are 49 Ph.D. graduates this December, therefore the ceremony will remain in Friedhoff. The OGS is continuing to look into long term solutions for the growing number of graduate students. Last year there were 45 or 46 Ph.D. graduates. Osgood asked about the status of the P&T issues for Handbook. Boyd is happy to meet with the Senate to discuss that anytime. He is looking at CU, CSU and DU P&T and Appeal policies. He has learned that if a school is more proactive in the P&T process, then there may be fewer appeals. Other schools' appeals are more like grievance processes, which are closed. In these other policies, there is greater communication at each step, and correction of problems along the way, so there are fewer surprises in the end. Boyd is working to move in that direction within our current guidelines. Regarding the integrity of the documents, at CSU if there is a negative recommendation along the way, from DH for example, it is shared with the candidate right away. The candidate can provide a response that stays with the packet. The DU model is more extreme, if anybody says no along the way, the promotion dies right there. They use a brutal four year review, if a candidate passes the four year review, then he or she will most likely pass the six year review. Another model includes greater involvement and intervention by the Provost; Boyd and Parker do not like that model.

- 2.3. Brian Winkelbauer, President and COO of CSM Foundation, reported on the Foundation's goals and activities. He distributed an update sheet for the current campaign goal of 350 million dollars, \$220 million of which is philanthropic gifts with the remaining amount non-governmental sponsored research. He is expecting to reach that goal in the next 1.5 years. The campaign has achieved 71% (\$157M) of the goal. The CoorsTek gift helped a great deal with those numbers. Winkelbauer explained the campaign is not just about money, it is about marketing our school and selling the faculty and the students. Foundation needs everybody to get involved and help achieve the goals. Goal of 350 million, was set based on the needs of CSM. In calculating our fundraising, CSM does not include non-governmental research, although that is a critical stream of revenue for the school. Private partnerships are very important, the corporate partnership with Halliburton has led to useful collaborations. Funding priorities for the school include faculty support, financial aid, centers and initiatives, departmental support, capital projects, campus initiatives (like student tutoring) and the Mines Fund. Current activities include CASE College Statement, departmental liaison meetings, Provost/Deans campaign final re-prioritization meeting, and event planning (parent/family weekend, athletics events, Mines on the Move, and receptions). Winkelbauer feels the Foundation's job is to be the broker between the university's needs and the donor's interests and passions.
- 2.4. Medley reported that she will bring a graduation list for Senate approval to the next meeting. With regard to registration, there have been some issues with pre-requisites, but those have been ironed out.
- 2.5. Approval of past minutes: **Motion to approve with amendments (include additional Provost's remarks) and replace "Graham" with "Davis": Monecke, second: Greife. Vote: Yes: 9 No: 0**

Abstain: 1. Minutes from 10/28/14 are approved.

3. Major topics of discussion

3.1. Campus Climate meetings with administration

Tom Boyd, Mike Kaufmann, Ken Osgood, and Dan Knauss met as a result of the ombuds meeting. Another meeting will be set up with Parker, Boyd, Deans and Senate Executive Committee. Davis asked if the summary notes from Kevin Moore accurately reflected the meeting, Knauss reported that the notes did accurately reflect the meeting.

3.2. Discussion of Search for next President

President Scoggins' retirement was announced. Board Chairman, Spaanstra announced that a search firm has been hired to oversee the process. Scoggins expects to have a new President in place by July 1, 2015. There will be no interim President, Scoggins will stay beyond July 1 if needed. Knauss stated Senators need to be engaged in shaping the search process. Brune asked if criteria on what they are looking for in a president has been set. If they do have criteria, Brune noted that faculty were not consulted. Graham suggested the Senate be ready in case they are asked to give input into the process. Knauss said he would serve on a search committee if asked. Suggestion to request appointing T/TT Faculty, Teaching Faculty and Research Faculty to search committee. Osgood pointed out the need to have a faculty member who is a strong and independent voice serve on the search committee. Knauss will talk with Spaanstra to find out about the process, Singha will look at processes in the recent CalTech search and other successful searches. Davis will also research. It was suggested to request a vote in the process not just input. Knauss noted the important issue is to determine what the criteria are for selecting the candidate. If Senate can give input on the criteria, then that will be valuable.

3.3. Shared governance – Thomas Monecke, Jürgen Brune

Monecke shared nine recommendations that came out of the Faculty Forum and other feedback from faculty. The Senate prefers to present their suggestions directly to AA rather than try to accomplish this through Handbook Committee. Some of the issues need additional discovery, some of them are ready for action. 1) Voting rights for faculty and student trustee. Why is the faculty member on the BOT not a voting member? Answer: The position was made by statute and does not include a vote. To change this, the next step would be to go back to the CO legislature to work to change the law to include a vote. 2) How to get more significant representation on the Budget Committee at both the college and university levels? Greife suggested the Senate ask to establish budget committees in the colleges with strong faculty representation. He noted, it is hard to have an impact because nobody understands the budgets. 3) Investigate make-up of faculty representation on searches, make sure faculty involvement is specified to ensure senior administrative positions are filled with searches, not appointments. This may need to go into the Faculty Handbook. 4) Move to a rotating Department Chair system, consider changing name from Department Head to Chair. Allow faculty to select their chair with a vote, give faculty the sole ability to also vote them out. 5) Provide compensation for significant leadership roles, either additional salary or course

reduction. This idea needs discovery because it becomes a budget issue. Start by giving the Faculty Senate President additional compensation or course release, then work to get compensation for other service roles. Other schools compensate their Senate President. 6) Look at the way decisions are made at the department, college and school levels. Invite Provost to come and explain how this works. Senate would like an understanding of who decides what. 7) Creation of Ombuds Office, it would need to have teeth. Ombudsman would need to report to the BOT. The person selected could be a faculty member, the position should be in the Handbook. 8) Role of the Senate in decision making. Is the Senate a suggestion making body? Can they have veto power? Greife noted the Senate has control of the Curriculum. 9) Change Senate bylaws to implement regular faculty survey and administration review. This used to be handled by the Senate, it can be an easy fix to change Senate bylaws. Knauss asked Senators, what do we really want from shared governance? Senate needs buy-in from the administration. Also, if there is more input into the budget, then that gives faculty some control. It was noted that Boyd offered today that he is open to any agenda items for the Handbook and Procedures Manual. The suggestion was made to sit down with Boyd to go over these ideas to see what can be done from the list. Bach suggested the need to have a philosophical view first, rather than focus on the details. Monecke will continue the discussion of the list via e-mail.

3.4. Senate response to procedures manual changes – not discussed.

3.5. Regarding Senate recommendations from last year – not discussed.

4. Faculty Trustee election - Joel Bach – not discussed.

5. Committee assignments – Joel Bach – not discussed.

6. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

6.1. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Ganley reported issues relayed to him involving the Blackboard electronic student evaluations of faculty, including: electronic evaluations were imposed on the faculty without their input, problems have been identified but not fixed. A member of the teaching faculty told Ganley that the old scantron evaluations were only for their section, now with the electronic evaluations, all students can evaluate the course coordinator. Students that don't have the course coordinator as an instructor but go to the effort to enter an evaluation will most likely enter a negative evaluation, which will result in useless data. For example, if there are 16 sections of Calc 1, but the coordinator teaches only two sections then the coordinator may get more criticism. The electronic system may affect teaching faculty more negatively than other faculty. Faculty can actually see who has and who has not completed the survey. Teachers can delete a student from participating if they feel that student will give a bad evaluation. This system is not connected to actual numbers in Trailhead. Evaluations start too early in the semester, they need to be given out later. Davis chaired the committee, in the past, which changed the long scantron form to the shorter form with eleven questions. His group looked at

electronic forms and decided they were a bad idea, due to security and some of the problems faculty are seeing today. Greife moved that CSM return to using the paper version. Different suggestions were made to Ganley, including 1) turn off the electronic format until faculty are satisfied with the format, then turn it back on, 2) give faculty the choice of using paper or electronic evaluations, and 3) give faculty the freedom to administer their own evaluations. Greife doesn't think third idea is good, because it is too much work for faculty. Bach noted there is contradiction in how this is set up, students can do this outside of class, but then faculty are asked to take time during class for students to complete the evaluations. Another problem was reported, a course or field session had multiple instructors, the student evaluated one instructor, then wanted to evaluate the other instructor, but the student could not do that in the system. Ganley stated that comments have been going to Provost's office and they have been unresponsive. Faculty can go in and delete students from Blackboard. Students that have dropped the class are left in the system and could evaluate the instructor. If a student has dropped the class then they should not be evaluating the professor. People's careers hang in the balance with these evaluations. If the system is flawed, it should be turned off. The question was posed, can the electronic evaluations be turned off now and have the school go back to paper? Knauss will prepare a memo with Ganley's help suggesting AA turn off the system immediately. Stone suggested there be more peer evaluation and encouragement. Greife commented that mentoring was suggested and it was turned down by administration because they are not interested. Greife referred to Provost's memo to the Senate. Discussion of assessing teaching effectiveness continued. Davis mentioned the dossiers that are being discussed in Handbook Committee regarding Teaching Faculty evaluations. **Ganley made a motion proposing he work with Knauss to prepare communication to AA offering to work with them on this. Motion seconded. Vote: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 1.**

Bach proposed Senate add a meeting next week on November 18 and meet as scheduled on November 25. No change yet to December, but may move the meeting up to December 2.

6.2. Grad council – Jürgen Brune – No report.

6.3. Research council – Uwe Greife – No report.

6.4. Faculty Handbook Committee – Graham Davis – Next meeting will be next Wednesday.

6.5. President's Cabinet highlights – Dan Knauss – Notes posted to BlackBoard.

6.6. Calendar Committee (MLK day discussion) – Jürgen Brune

The Calendar Committee reviewed the Senate memo regarding recognizing MLK Day. The Committee started with seven options for changing the calendar and eliminated several options that were not appealing to the majority of the groups represented. The viable options remaining include: swap MLK day with President's day for a non-class day but not an employee holiday. This would be an easy change, unless the option turns into making MLK day a holiday. Students did not like that option because they don't want a day off three days after the

semester starts. Students objected to that. The other viable option was to start classes two days earlier (Monday) to gain a Monday off for MLK and to gain an extra day which could be added to President's weekend. Knauss noted that, in the past, if we started on a Tuesday, that first day followed a Monday schedule. Medley explained that CU has only one week off in the fall and one week off in spring. They don't have fall break and a short Thanksgiving break like CSM. In spring they only have spring break, no President's day. Our students have a day off for E-days. Singha pointed out that the school is sending a negative signal by not closing school on MLK day and wondered how the school will be able to attract a diverse student body if CSM doesn't observe the holiday. Goertz reported that student government had a great deal of discussion about how best to celebrate the diversity of the holiday. He noted they want to celebrate the significance of the day but also balance that with available funds for activities and events. Students have mixed views at this time. Singha has concerns about the way we are perceived from the outside. Majority of Senate prefers option three to start two days earlier, however, one senator has concern for international students who travel home, noting it would be hard for them to cut overseas visits short to return to CSM earlier. Knauss expressed concern whether we are accurately representing faculty on the issue. Medley noted the main issue with this is making it a holiday or not. Making this into a holiday will be difficult because of the other employee groups that will object to moving MLK Day to the day after Thanksgiving or to one of the holiday days during Christmas Break. Brune summarized the on-line feedback he received, 8 voted for option three to start early, one voted for option two. Others did not respond (abstained). Senate agreed to have Brune vote for option three at the Calendar Committee vote.

6.7. Brief report on any other committees - None

7. Senate schedule for remainder of semester

➔ **Next meeting November 18, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300**