

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 7, 2000 - 2:00 PM

Coolbaugh House

ATTENDEES: Ely, Klusman, Lu, Nickum, Ohno, E. Pang, Readey, Romberger, Underwood, and VanTyne

APOLOGIES: Griffiths, Kidnay and Wendlandt

VISITOR: John Trefny, VPAA

COMMENTS FROM GUEST:

A. Trefny

1. If a degree program fails to meet the demand quotas set by CCHE for 3 years running then the program can be eliminated. CSM programs that have not met this quota are MS Chemistry, ME in Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, PE in Geophysics, PE in Geology, ME in Mining, ME in Geophysics, PE in Petroleum and PE in Chemical Engineering.
2. Governor Owens announced the Colorado Institute of Technology on March 6, 2000.
3. A preliminary budget was presented to the department/division heads on March 6, 2000 and Trefny will be happy to make the same presentation to the Senate if they are interested. Academic Affairs is responsible for distributing funds for (1) operating budgets for the academic departments; (2) student health; (3) most classified salaries; (4) adjunct salaries; and (5) capital. Trefny prefers that no new programs be started with funds generated from the new capital campaign. He would like to see these monies used for existing programs that are not adequately funded.
4. Nominations are still being accepted for the 1999-2000 Teaching Awards. Very few nominations have been received.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the February 15, 2000 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

A. CCHE performance indicators were distributed (Available in Academic Affairs Office in Guggenheim)

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A. Executive Committee (Ely) – Two main items discussed were adjunct faculty and charge out policies. This is really a department heads issue. Also discussed was the payment of 12-month exempt employees who perform other duties over a period of time. This is being resolved by policy and is being handled by the Handbook Committee. The Executive Committee is encouraging the Calendar Committee to meet before it is formally announced by the President to address issues for the coming year.
- B. BOT Meeting, March 3, 2000 (Romberger) – Four agenda items were discussed: (1) the Joint Budget Committee recommendation of a 5.4% increase; (2) the CCHE Quality Indicator System for the next fiscal year (Attachment A); (3) the proposed professional masters or non-thesis programs; and, (4) the proposed tuition policy for graduate students

was presented to the Board of Trustees.

C. Councils of the Senate

1. Graduate Council (Klusman) – Four PE courses were presented – a microbiology course was tabled and 3 were approved. An engineering technology report was given by R. Eggert. G. Woolsey made a presentation on doctoral interdisciplinary programs similar to those available in the 1970s. The request to increase the number of 400 level courses from 9 hours to 12 hours was withdrawn because there was no support for it. The Graduate Council will meet March 7, 2000 to continue its discussion of the proposed professional degrees and proposed tuition policy. The next regular scheduled meeting will be April 5, 2000.

2. Undergraduate Council, February 9, 2000 (Nickum provided the following written report):

The Oredigger/Prospector task force has been appointed and will include Frost (Chair), Nelson, and L. Pang from the UG Council. Other representatives, such as students and student life advisors will also be invited to participate. The task force will report back to the UG Council at the March meeting.

Middleton informed the Council of the institutional preparations for ABET accreditation. The three issues his office is working on are (1) compiling a comprehensive report of actions since 1994; (2) creating a glossary of terms so all departments will be using the same terminology and making appointments for an institutional editorial panel to ensure this consistency; and (3) creating the appendix of the study which includes financials, list of faculty, and CSM "boiler-plate" information. His office is also working on a extensive executive summary to be included with each degree-granting department's self-study. This executive study will discuss the institutional progress. The final materials need to be ready by the early part of summer.

A question was raised as to what is appropriate in terms of classes counted towards an ASI. The question regards a MCS major who wishes to take MCS graduate courses for his/her ASI. The Council thought this was going against school policy and although the student should be encouraged to take the MCS graduate courses, others need to be chosen for the ASI.

A **motion** was made by VanTyne and seconded by Ely requesting the Undergraduate Council take a critical review of the Environmental Specialty that was passed February 1998 as it appears not to have enough required chemistry courses. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Research Council (Ohno) – The Research Council approved the function of this Council so that it has the same format as the Undergraduate Council. It will be presented to the Senate as a proposal to be put into the Faculty By-Laws. If approved by the Senate then the change would have to be voted on by the entire Faculty in August.

There are five centers or institutes that were requested to present additional information before being reviewed for approval.

There was discussion on the new process for graduate student payroll.

D. Faculty Senate Committees

1. Committees on Committees (VanTyne) – This committee will meet March 8, 2000 to make recommendations for University and Senate committees for the upcoming year. Nomination forms for the four Senate positions – 2 at the senior Senator level and 2 at either the Senior or regular level - that will need to be filled for the 2000-01 academic year will also be made available.

A question came from Academic Affairs asking who is officially on the committees during

the summer especially as it concerns the annual Board of Trustees Conference and who should attend from the Faculty Senate. VanTyne suggested that both the outgoing and incoming president be invited. The Senators agreed with this suggestion.

2. Faculty Affairs (Griffiths) – No report.

3. Academic Standards and Policies (Kidnay provided the following written report):

At the request of Vice President Trefny, the Academic Standards Committee (Arthur Kidnay (Chair), Harold Cheuvront, Gerard Martins, Suzanne Northcote, Craig Simmons, Susan Smith) met on Tuesday, February 1, 2000 to discuss the following items.

1. *Consider a time limit for the BS degree.*

The Academic Standards Committee recommends the following policy:

A student who fails to complete all requirements for the B.S. degree within ten years after first admission to CSM will be placed on special academic hold and must apply for readmission through the Readmissions Committee. A condition for readmission will be the approval by the student's major department of a plan for timely completion of all degree requirements

2. *Limit the choice of Undergraduate Bulletins to the entry Bulletin or the current one.*

The Academic Standards Committee does not regard this as a problem and recommends no change in the existing policy

At the request of the Faculty Senate, the Academic Standards Committee (Arthur Kidnay (Chair), Harold Cheuvront, Gerard Martins, Suzanne Northcote, Craig Simmons, Susan Smith) met on Tuesday, February 15, 2000 to discuss the policy regarding a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 in a student's major department. Specifically, the following points were discussed:

- 1) What constitutes a course in a student's major? For example, could it include chemistry courses for a chemical engineering major?*
- 2) How is a student notified if his or her GPA is below 2.00?*
- 3) After a student is notified of a GPA problem what action is taken?*

After discussion the Committee unanimously decided that there should be no changes in the current policy or procedures. The policy is (CSM Undergraduate Bulletin, 1999 - 2000, page 32):

A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 for courses comprising the department course sequence in the candidate's major.

The committee agreed that courses outside the student's major should not be included in the department course sequence. Courses that are cross-listed apply to all departments in the cross-listing.

With the new Web based system under development in the Registrar's Office students and their advisors will be able, at any time, to obtain a degree audit that clearly shows the student's cumulative GPA for all courses and for courses in the department major. It is the responsibility of the student, the advisor, and the major department to insure that the appropriate corrective action is taken if the student is deficient academically.

Ely will draft a statement and present it at the next Senate meeting expressing the Senate's concern that when a student's grade point average falls below 2.00 in his/her major, that student must be notified as a GPA of 2.00 must be maintained in a student's major to graduate.

4. Evaluation (Klusman) – In the interest of time, the following written reports will be discussed at a future Senate meeting.

The Evaluation Committee of the Faculty Senate met on January 14 and February 18, 2000 to consider the process for the student evaluation of faculty. This continued the effort of the Committee under Chet Van Tyne to consider possible changes in the process. In the time period between these meetings, a survey was taken of Department Heads about their use of optional

questions beyond the 14 in the core, and their use of the results in the evaluation of the teaching performance of their faculty(form attached)

The results of the survey do not suggest unanimity in support of use of the current system. Some doubt the validity of the entire process, others feel that it does provide useful data. Department heads appear to weight the summary results of the faculty/course forms at 20-70% in their evaluation of teaching performance.

Estimated costs for the current system are (\$0.10 for blank forms + 0.05 for printing of questions on the form) x16000 forms/semester \$2400. In addition there is about \$200/semester of student hourly help, plus about 50hours of Dave LaRue's time. The total annual costs are then about \$5200 + Dave LaRue's time and some departmental secretarial time. The rumored estimate of the cost was \$50,000/year, but cannot be substantiated.

There are mixed opinions among the Evaluation Committee that favor two possible options;

- 1) continue the current system, with no changes in process and no changes in questions,
- 2) give the Kansas State University (IDEAS) system another opportunity, considering it may have matured in the approximately 20 years since it was last used at CSM.

Arguments for the KSU system, include;

- 1) more complete information about the scientific validity of the questions and the process,
- 2) flexibility in questions is still there,
- 3) the question order is carefully determined in order to reduce bias on following questions,
- 4) a comparison is possible for similar courses at other institutions; for example, harder courses such as calculus or statics may receive lower evaluations than easier courses. This observation can be compared for similar courses at other institutions.

Arguments against the KSU system include;

- 1) a first pass estimate of the cost is \$20,000/yr.
- 2) a CSM coordinator will still be needed,
- 3) a request would likely have to be made to the Budget Committee.

5. Sports and Athletics (Wendlandt) – No report.

6. Readmissions (VanTyne): – No report.

E. University Committees

1. Budget (Romberger) – It is proposed that the student technology fee be increase from \$35 to \$60. This proposed increase came from ASCSM.
2. Hille Dias did an analysis of the impact on the budget of the proposed graduate student tuition plan. Her findings indicated that if the plan had been in effect in September 1999, there would have been \$165,000 deficit.
3. Handbook (Readey provided the following written report) –

The Handbook Committee is attempting to get all of the proposed changes in the Handbook completed by this Thursday, March 10, 2000 that the changes can get promulgated to solicit comments within the 60-day period prior to submission to the Board of Trustees. It might prove useful at a future Senate meeting to discuss all of the changes that are being proposed. Presumably, the revised handbook will be posted on the CSM web site and members of the Handbook Committee will get a complete version with proposed revisions.

1. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee proposal was passed by the Handbook Committee on February 24 by a 3 to 1 vote; one faculty member voted against and two voting members were not present. The revised wording (attached) has been included into the handbook revisions for comment. In additions, changes were made in the other sections of the Handbook to reflect the new committee

2. Inappropriate Conduct

Because of Senate objections, the wording of section 6.3.1 has been revised (2/24/00 and 3/9/00 revisions attached). However, the paragraph has not been eliminated. It is still felt strongly by the VPAA and the CSM attorney that some wording is required to address an increasingly frequent occurrence. The details of handling this are now left to the Procedures Manual rather than being put into the handbook. Ed Liberatore said that he would be happy to come to the Senate to discuss why this paragraph is needed in the Handbook.

3. Medical Leave Policies

There were several changes made in Section 5 regarding medical leave and use of sick-leave that is intended to provide protection for faculty members who are forced to take leave for medical reasons.

12.8 PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

12.8.1 Function

The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be responsible for evaluating the qualifications of all candidates for promotion and/or tenure and all candidates for tenured employment and providing advice and recommendations thereon to the VPAA.

12.8.2 Membership

The membership of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall consist of six full-time, tenured, full professors or full librarians. Neither multiple representatives from the same academic department/division nor department heads/division directors shall be permitted to serve on the committee. The membership, of the committee should equitably represent the diverse range of faculty disciplines at CSM.

12.8.3 Method of Operation

The VPAA shall appoint the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee A committee member who is a member of the same department as a tenure and/or promotion candidate under consideration shall be excluded from all participation in the deliberations of the committee with regard to that candidate. The committee shall meet at least once during the spring semester and at any other time deemed necessary by the VPAA. All non-recused voting members must be present at a meeting to constitute a quorum sufficient to permit the committee to conduct its business. All disputed procedural issues that arise regarding the conduct of the meetings of the committee shall be resolved according to Robert's Rules of Order.

12.8.4 Method of Appointment

Promotion and Tenure Committee members shall be appointed by the VPAA from a list of candidates provided by the Faculty Senate. The list shall include at least twice as many names as there are vacancies on the committee.

12.8.5 Terms of Appointment

All Promotion and Tenure Committee members shall serve staggered three-year terms. A minimum of three years must elapse before a former member may be re-appointed to the committee

6.2.3 Workplace Standards of Conduct

A. Behavioral Standards for Colorado State Government Employees

CSM hereby adopts the following standards of workplace behavior for its employees, which have been adapted from Integrity in Government for Colorado State Executive Branch Employees, an Executive Order signed by Governor Roy Romer on February 10, 1987.

1. CSM employees shall serve the public with respect, courtesy, and responsiveness;

2. CSM employees shall demonstrate the highest standards of personal integrity and honesty; and
3. CSM employees shall expose corruption in State government wherever discovered.

B. Sexual Harassment

The subject of sexual harassment at CSM is governed by the CSM Sexual Harassment Policy, which has been promulgated by the Board and is set forth in subsection 10.7 below.

C. Workplace Violence

CSM supports the prohibition of workplace violence enunciated in Workplace Violence, an Executive Order signed by Governor Roy Romer on August 13, 1996, which is available for examination in departmental offices and the Office of Human Resources.

6.3.1 FACULTY MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE BEHAVIORAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST FACULTY MEMBERS

6.3.1 Inappropriate Behavior

Upon receipt by the CSM administration of a complaint alleging inappropriate behavior on the part of a faculty member which does not appear to rise to the level of serious misconduct, the appropriate vice president shall notify the accused party and conduct an investigation to determine whether the allegation has merit. If the allegation concerns an individual who does not report to a vice president, the president shall appoint a vice president to handle the complaint. The vice president may conduct the investigation personally or delegate this task to a qualified subordinate. In conducting the investigation, the investigator shall review relevant documents and interview all individuals directly involved in the matter. The investigator should also interview other witnesses to any of the alleged behavior that is disputed by the parties. Additionally, the investigator may consult with any individual possessing expertise in the subject matter of the complaint or any member of the CSM community whose assistance is deemed by the investigator to be helpful to an equitable resolution of the complaint. If academic or instructional issues comprise a prominent part of the complaint, the investigator should consult with the President of the Faculty Senate regarding the proposed resolution. Within a reasonable time after the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator shall provide the parties with a written decision containing a resolution of the complaint. If the faculty member disagrees with the findings of the investigation or the resolution imposed, he or she may file a grievance pursuant to the Exempt Employee Grievance Procedure set forth in subsection 6.6 below. If a student complainant is aggrieved by the resolution of his or her complaint, he or she may appeal in writing to the immediate supervisor of the investigator within a reasonable time after the issuance of the decision.

6.3 FACULTY MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE BEHAVIORAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST FACULTY MEMBERS

6.3.1 Inappropriate Behavior

Upon receipt by the CSM administration of a complaint alleging inappropriate behavior on the part of a faculty member which does not appear to rise to the level of serious misconduct, the administration shall first refer the complaint to the immediate supervisor of the faculty member at the department/division level for informal resolution. If informal resolution of the complaint at the department/division level is unsuccessful, the complaint will be handled by the appropriate vice president according to the applicable policy set forth in the Academic Affairs Procedures Manual.

6.3.2 Misconduct

6.3.1 A. Preliminary Complaint Investigation

Upon receipt by the CSM administration of a report or complaint alleging faculty misconduct which is deemed to be serious, the appropriate vice president shall notify all accused parties and conduct a preliminary investigation to determine whether the allegation has merit. If a vice president is an accused party, the President shall perform the duties assigned to the vice president in this subsection. If the President is an accused party, the President of the Board of Trustees shall

perform the duties assigned to the vice president in this subsection. The vice president may conduct the preliminary investigation personally or delegate this task to another qualified administrator. In conducting the preliminary investigation, the investigator ~~may~~ shall review ~~any~~ relevant documents and discuss the matter with ~~any~~ all individuals directly involved in the matter. Additionally, the investigator may consult with ~~other~~ any individuals possessing expertise in the subject matter of the complaint or any member of the CSM community whose assistance is deemed by the investigator to be helpful to an equitable resolution of the complaint. Under normal circumstances, it is expected that the preliminary investigation will be concluded within thirty days.

(draft - 3/9/00) 64 (6/10/99)

The Faculty Handbook wording on emeritus faculty will be changed to include emeritus positions at various levels. There will be a University Emeritus position added that will be decided by the Board of Trustees.

It was **moved** by VanTyne, seconded by E. Pang and passed unanimously to formally recognize Dennis Readey for his efforts over the last 3-years on the Promotion and Tenure Committee revision.

- F. Ad Hoc Committee
 - 1. Academic Salary Advisory Committee (Griffiths) – No report.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Emeritus Faculty -see Handbook Committee report.
- B. New Research Initiatives - see Research Council report.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM