

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES
FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 24, 2013 2:00 p.m.
GRL CONFERENCE ROOM

ATTENDEES: Lincoln Carr (PH), Joel Bach (ME), Bernard Bialecki (AMS), Dan Knauss (CH), Ken Osgood (Secretary and LAIS), Steve Pankavich (AMS), Kamina Singha (Hydrologic Science), John Spear (CCE), Chet Van Tyne (MT), Ray Zhang (CEE), Sydney Sullinger (USG), Annette Pilkington (AA)

APOLOGIES: Uwe Greife (PH), Thomas Monecke (GE), Kim Williams (CH)

GUESTS: Dr. Terry Parker (Provost), Joanne Lerud-Heck (Library Administrator)

Introductions

Senators, guest faculty, undergrad rep, Grad rep – TBD, administration member.

Preliminary Matters

Provost Update – Terry Parker 1) Tenure line hiring is fully released, have 26 searches across three colleges, still holding on the tenured faculty searches. The 26 include old and new tenure applicants.

2) Teaching faculty promotion process: Kevin Moore developed draft language for the handbook last year. Senate should consider asking Kevin Moore for that language.

3) Strategic planning: AA took draft plan to Board last week. Plan is laid out as five large aspirations, meant to be quantifiable long term goals. Under those aspirations are four goals, each with a set of strategies. We are still getting feedback from Board, but so far, members have said to bridge gap between long term goals and short term goals so that there is an appropriate sense of urgency. In terms of next steps 1) (MVV) Mission vision values: AA will take Board feedback and campus feedback and bring back to campus for comment. 2) For draft plan – will post when schedule is set for next set of forums. 8th and 9th of October dates for forums and should be announced today. Will get draft plan posted on blackboard site for review by community. Oct 25 Board will consider the document (plan?) in more detail. Questions: from L. Carr – Will faculty forum take place during senate meeting on 8th/9th? T. Parker said they are working to get it scheduled in but there may be some overlap with the senate meeting. There will be several sessions on the 8th and 9th so that the Senate will be able to attend some of the sessions.

Vote for Senate Secretary and for Recording Secretary

Secretary Candidate: K. Osgood. L. Carr and D. Knauss agreed the Senate needs to have a secretary. Secretary will run the meeting if L. Carr is unavailable. **L. Carr and D. Knauss nominated K. Osgood as Secretary. R. Zhang seconded. Vote: 9 voted yes, 0 voted no, 1 abstention (K. Osgood).**

Recording Secretary: A. Pilkington, Administrative Assistant in Academic Affairs, was nominated by L. Carr as recording secretary. K. Osgood seconded. **Elected by acclamation to make A. Pilkington Recording Secretary.** Her duties include: taking minutes and follow up on minutes, managing all electronic content associated with councils, updating website, and posting minutes and other information.

Approval of Past Minutes: Corrections: J. Bach noted in the August 27 minutes, under item six, campus committees, the minutes should read “now heading” rather than “no longer heading”. D. Knaus moves to approve last three sets of minutes (March 26, August 27, and September 10) with the change. Seconded K.Osgood. Vote: **Unanimous (10) voted to approve.**

Introducing the Library Faculty – J. Lerud-Heck L. Carr wanted to have a library administrator attend a meeting since Senate represents library faculty. J. Lerud-Heck: Library faculty is not tenured, but we have a promotion process which is very parallel to professors. It goes through the promotion/tenure committee but often that committee doesn’t know what librarians do. Librarians suffer because they are not protected, they don’t have tenure. Regarding revision of T&R faculty promotional process, the librarians interested in promotion are glad to have a process. Request: please don’t put anything in the revisions that will all of a sudden affect us and we won’t know about it. Librarians would be very interested in multi-year contracts if that ever becomes an option. Some librarians who are reaching the end of their career may want to be considered for emeritus status. There is interest among librarians in sabbaticals, there is not an option for sabbaticals for people who are not tenured, but offering sabbaticals to librarians may be of value to CSM. L. Carr said librarians should meet and propose language to the Senate; that language can be folded into the subcommittee to discuss. J. Bach said it makes sense to consider emeritus status for librarians, and everybody else that is not on a tenure track.

Key Issues Subcommittee Updates

Teaching and research faculty promotion, rights and duties – J. Bach Update: 20 people attended previous committee meeting. There are big issues to deal with. Need to do a survey of teaching faculty, some think a parallel plan for tenure track process to other faculty would be good, but some don’t think that would be a good idea. There is a very large difference of opinion on this. Research faculty have their own issues which are different. Next step: committee will keep all groups together initially

to work on common issues, emeritus, long-term contracts, and then at some point split into smaller differentiated groups to come up with specific language.

D. Knauss: wording should be submitted to handbook committee by the end of fall. Senate may need to tell committees that the language proposed may not be perfect, but there is a need to get the process going and get something into the handbook. Handbook can always be revised in future. K. Osgood: complexities from the teaching faculty issues are greater than the research faculty issues. Research faculty may not be in a position to decide what they need/want. Perhaps the research faculty language should model the teaching faculty revisions. CSM has: 200 tenure track professors, 70 teaching professors, 33 research faculty, 10 library faculty, about 60 post-doctorates.

K. Osgood observation: With regard to the uniformity of promotion and rights and responsibilities, the divide between departments is extraordinary. Have there ever been conversations about creating departmental bylaws on this?

T. Illangasekare's memo addresses the above question. L. Carr: Board and T. Illangasekare said the memo needs to be updated. It explains that each department needs to explain why they do things the way they do. P&T committee: Originally, P&T was evaluated by the department (their boss only), then evaluations went university wide, now pendulum is swinging back to center.

D. Knauss and K. Osgood said we should focus on teaching faculty promotions for handbook. L. Carr: Concrete goal: Get handbook language in place by end of fall and if necessary get a majority vote among teaching faculty. L. Carr said there needs to be more discussion for research faculty and he gave examples of research faculty and how they were under-utilized and how one was treated with regard to office space.

K. Osgood: encourage library faculty and research faculty to create within themselves a working group to pull together their issues. J. Bach: Yes, but there are some common issues between teaching, research, and library faculty. L. Carr to J. Bach: contact top five prominent teaching faculty and get their views on this. J. Lerud-Heck will have librarians come up with language that would work for them and will get it to J. Bach. K. Singha: Does it matter if a teaching faculty does not have a PhD? J. Speer: It needs to be streamlined due to liability alone. This is important to solve now because it will affect people 5 years from now.

Dialog via a feedback/helpdesk type system for campus – R. Zhang

R. Zhang: We want IT personnel to set up help desk. Responses: work is broad based. We will have meeting October 1 and will report back. L. Carr reported that D. Wilson said help desk was originally supposed to be campus-wide for all feedback. Now, it will not be hard to implement that campus-wide feedback option again. L. Carr wants to be offered anonymous and non-anonymous feedback options. G. Boyce will probably attend the next subcommittee meeting to help move this along. K. Osgood: Where does

this feedback mechanism go? Feedback for each department will be sent to the assigned person in that area so questions/suggestions can be handled. K. Osgood: Should there be a Senate person to receive, handle or oversee the information? An ombudsman type person(s) to make sure faculty are informed about faculty issues or concerns. Perhaps a stats report: numbers of inquiries made to help desk and number of issues solved.

Faculty Mentorship and P&T Transparency – S. Pankavich (K. Williams out)

S. Pankavich: Oct 29 is the Town Hall meeting. Trying to pull together 6 person committee comprised of 3 full professors and 3 assistant professors. Currently have half of the committee lined up. They are gathering materials, reviewing handbook, reviewing T. Illangasekare's memo, etc. Feedback or questions for S. Pankavich? L. Carr: T. Illangasekare, admin and Board all want memo re-written. Who will do it? We need people who have been on committee in the past. Concrete goal: Try to get this done by end of fall. T. Parker directed deans to meet with all untenured faculty and work on mentorship. Some departments are good and some are not good at mentorship. Mentorship may be moved to colleges, your committee should discuss this. Also, K. Moore has some good ideas: his old university had an interesting model, the committee should talk to K. Moore and get ideas. Committee needs to clarify mentoring standards. Faculty should not be afraid to help on the committee. Senate agreed that it is not part of their role to take on appeals.

Faculty members need feedback about what they need to do to make tenure. Define what the bars are. Need to deal with how to dole out credit for high collaboration science. Committee should come up with a straw man.

T. Illangasekare's memo is in the procedural handbook. Therefore, this is not as urgent and can be revised. L. Carr: Action item: By February or March lets have something in place regarding faculty mentorship and P&T transparency by this committee. Action Item: S. Pankavick will send T. Illangasekare's memo to Senate members. .

BREAK

Campus Committees and Regular Responsibilities Part 1

Leadership Nomination Committee (formerly Committee on Committees) Joel

Bach: Still working to fill committees. J. Bach will send names out via e-mail to Senate so that at next meeting Senate can vote on people for committees. He will talk to K. Gitkind to get names for President's committees.

Needed: another senator, officers of academic faculty, grand marshal of academic processions, senators to serve as liaison to athletics, geophysics, petroleum and mining engineering because senator liaisons for those areas have left. D. Knauss is liaison for library, J. Bach for EECS, C. Sulzbach is for EB. L. Carr: Can Thomas represent MN? K.

Singha offered to do GP. J. Speer said he would do PE. B. Bialecki will be liaison for PA. Grad Council: need a list of folks on committee. L. Carr: we need to better manage and organize these lists of members; make sure which terms folks are staffed. Need somebody for readmissions committee, PERA rep, CO Faculty Advisory Council, Academic Assessment committee. Action item: J. Bach will finish up committee lists and circulate to the Senate within a week.

What about ad hoc committees? How do they pop up? What is the process for establishing them? There should be an official record/list of ad hoc committees. Tell T. Parker that Senate will provide more candidates for committees and ask him to provide a list of all ad hoc committees to the Senate (for the purposes of promotion). Those lists could be put on the website as a service to faculty members. Action item: L. Carr to send response memo to T. Parker.

Campus Committees and Regular Responsibilities Part 2

Undergrad Council – K. Singha

K. Singha – last meeting was short. K. Osgood gave overview of the minor issue. J. Kenney collecting agenda items for next meeting. J. Kenney will write agendas and send out to members of UGC; K. Singha will facilitate meetings. K. Singha can add “other items” and address agenda items as needed.

Minors issue: some faculty are angry at Senate for rejecting faculty proposal. Senate and registrar may have dropped the ball in not letting faculty know that senate overturned the proposal. It affected some students because people didn't know the new policy. L. Carr: UGC and GC are advisory groups and they will be improved now that they are chaired by Senate members. Problem was that it was done last minute. L. Carr: Proposal: have a rule that committees need to present info two meetings prior to end of year otherwise issue will be put off until next year. Consider this for a change to the bylaws. K. Osgood: maybe putting it into bylaws is too rigid and will tie us up. Hindsight: we should have held off voting on minors until the fall. L. Carr: put forward motion that we require the councils to present to the Senate any business, voting issue, at least two meetings before a decision needs to have a vote taken. Clarified J. Bach: Any business brought to the Senate for vote must be on the agenda at the meeting prior and at least one meeting before graduation. **D. Knauss motion for vote, second J. Bach. Unanimous vote – 10 in favor.** K. Singha will report to UGC that Senate has made this rule to solve this type of problem in the future.

Graduate Student Council – D. Knauss

Second meeting will be next Wednesday, agenda items are building regarding program course changes. Information is now being sent to both T. Boyd and D. Knauss. Issues: ME wants to have a zero credit seminar course that is graded, or a required seminar in a pass/fail situation. Action: L. Carr will send Physics' solution to the seminar to D. Knauss and J. Bach.

Faculty Handbook Committee – Ray Zhang

New committee started up, new chair, T. Boyd. Looking for two more members. Identified goals to focus on. Teaching and research faculty promotion is the most urgent task and there was discussion about post doc classification and benefits status. Group planned timetable for the year. L. Carr asked R. Zhang to share timetables with J. Bach and K. Osgood so that they can know when to have their work done.

Faculty Distinguished Lecturer Process – J. Speer

Committee is made up of past three distinguished lecturers. They work on their own with speaker. It will be R. Wendlandt in spring. J. Speer will follow up on getting the committee members identified for getting them credit for their service. In spring, the Senate will need to select distinguished speaker.

L. Carr reported on meeting with Board: Wanted Board member to speak at lecture on campus. Board was receptive to L. Carr's suggestions. Question: should Senate have Board of Trustees remain involved in Senate activities? K. Singha reported T. Illangasekare wants to be a regular representative/guest at the Senate meetings. L. Carr will add him to the e-mail list and will summarize notes from the President's cabinet meeting and send them out to Senate.

Other Standing Issues and One-Time Issues – L. Carr

L. Carr: Memo regarding daycare on campus – D. Lasich will work with L. Carr. He will try to build up goodwill with admin before distributing a memo.

Faculty conference format and content – L. Carr

Options for presenting new faculty and improving conference. K. Singha: roster and new photos should come from administration. How to promote collaboration? AA needs to update new faculty bios on website from last year. L. Carr will suggest this idea to T. Parker.

Admin Faculty Council – L. Carr will invite them to speak in November. J. Haight, President of AFC, will be the invited speaker. J. Bach suggested Senate have new athletic director come in and talk about new faculty. L. Carr will invite him to come later in the fall.

FACTIR Correspondence – Admin is worried because retention affects school rankings. Should this be a real campus committee rather than just a Senate initiative? FACTIR: faculty administration committee to improve retention. Action item: L. Carr will discuss this with Administration and see what needs to be done to make this a committee.

Faculty Forum Suggestion - Pedagogy – suggested by D. Sloan. Is this a forum that might want to be supported by Senate? Possibly build on studio bio and studio chem.

Meeting finished at 4:13 p.m. Next Meeting, October 8, 2:00 p.m. Hill Hall 300