

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 5, 1999 - 2:00 PM

Coolbaugh House

ATTENDEES: Ely, Griffiths, Kidnay, Lu, Nickum, Ohno, E. Pang, Readey, Romberger, and Wendlandt

APOLOGIES: Klusman, Underwood and VanTyne

VISITOR: John Trefny, VPAA

COMMENTS FROM GUEST:

A. Trefny

1. The University Club is working on a proposal to eliminate individual membership and have only departmental memberships. Employees of a department would then automatically be members of the University Club. The fee structure is still being worked out.
2. The Academic Planning Council has been restructured. This has been an ad-hoc council for the last four years and has never had a formal structure or membership. This restructured committee will take the individual department/division plans and evolve them into an institutional plan that will be incorporated into the next capital campaign. The committee membership will be the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Graduate Students, President of the Faculty Senate and five department/division heads.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the November 16, 1999 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- A. Dr. Bob Weimer will give the Senate Distinguished Lecture on December 8, 1999.
- B. Elections for Faculty Senate will take place during spring semester 2000. Names of individuals wanting to serve on the Faculty Senate should be given to VanTyne.
- C. This is the last Faculty Senate meeting of the semester. The next meeting will be in January 2000.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A. **Executive Committee** (Romberger) –Discussed the proposed change of the chairperson of the Graduate Council. (This will be discussed under the Graduate Council report.) Formalized the membership of the Academic Planning Council as announced by John Trefny earlier. Discussed the possibility of an engineering and technology management master's degree in Business and Economics and a proposal by Gene Woolsey to have an interdisciplinary PhD.
- B. **Councils of the Senate**
 1. Graduate Council (Underwood presented the following report in an e-mail to Romberger)

Romig did not chair the meeting. Phil Romig is moving forward with plans to revamp the way graduate students pay tuition. A representative from the business office will attend a later meeting to present the financial repercussions of the Romig plan. There has been

discussion regarding a proposal by Gene Woolsey to have an interdisciplinary PhD. It would set up a structure for allowing a student to get a degree where the program is done jointly and equally with two departments. It would not be the same as a major in one and a minor in another.

The Graduate Council approved for credit, a distance learning graduate course that will be offered by LAIS. E. Pang will teach the course and is working with SPACE. The approval is for one semester.

If the Dean of Graduate Studies cannot be present to chair the Graduate Council meetings, the consensus of the Faculty Senate is to have a Senator or Faculty Senate representative on the Graduate Council chair that particular meeting. Romberger was instructed to convey this to Dean Romig.

2. Undergraduate Council (Nickum provided this written report)

ASCSM will select a student to be the student representative for the Council soon. This representative will be non-voting, but not ex-officio. Geophysics would like to reduce the summer field session from six to four weeks. A formal proposal will be distributed before the next Council meeting. Cheuvront and several students were present to express their views on credit and venue issues for the *Oredigger* and *Prospector*. The students would like to receive academic credit for these courses. L. Pang delivered the view from LAIS and indicated that LAIS is working on a more focused curriculum that does not include journalism. There was discussion of offering activities credit for these courses, although the students were not in favor of this. This issue is still in the beginning stages of discussion so no official vote was taken on how to handle these courses.

3. Research Council (Ohno) – The Council decided that research centers may spend the overhead that is returned to them anyway they desire. A discussion on that portion of the research policy that states how graduate students are to be compensated (stipends, health insurance, fees, etc.) concluded that there was not enough flexibility in this part. Romig will rewrite this portion and present at the next Research Council meeting.

C. Faculty Senate Committees

1. Committees on Committees (VanTyne provided the following written report)

The Committee has not met or been contacted during the last month. Outstanding items include:
1) By-law change for undergraduate representative on Undergraduate Council and 2) faculty representative to PERA to replace Professor Imad A. Elhaj.

2. Faculty Affairs (Griffiths) – Faculty salaries were discussed. A copy of faculty and administrative salaries is available in the library. Several Senators noted that once again the administration, except for the President, received higher pay increases than the faculty.

3. Academic Standards and Policies (Kidnay) - The Committee is still waiting for the Registrar to complete a report on reactions from other institutions who have switched to a plus/minus grading system.

3. Evaluation (VanTyne provided the following written report)

Committee on Evaluation Minutes from meeting on November 12,1999

Present: Baldwin, Nelson, Van Tyne (interim chair), and D. Larue (invited guest)
Apologies: Ochs, Moskal, Middleton (invited guest)

The meeting began at 4:00pm. The purpose of the meeting was to identify issues that the committee should be addressing primarily in the realm of student evaluations.

The function of the committee as stated in the Faculty By-laws is: "To review and propose changes in the processes, instruments and forms used for evaluating faculty, department heads and administrators. This shall include the student evaluation of teaching, the overall evaluation of faculty and the faculty evaluation of department heads and administrators."

A listing of issues that were identified either by email or at the meeting include:

1. Evaluation of summer teaching, especially field session.
2. Simplification of student evaluation process (to reduce cost, paper handling etc. Is there an electronic evaluation process for evaluation?)
3. Distinction between evaluating a course for continuous course improvement and evaluating an instructor for annual merit reviews. Is it appropriate to use the same broad instrument?
4. Any changes to the existing method may face some legal quandaries - many individuals approaching tenure/promotion have a track record in the existing system. "Changing the rules" could expose the school to legal challenges if individuals can claim that they are "hurt" by that change.
5. A concern for the validity of the student evaluation system was expressed.
6. Required core questions may not always be appropriate. Who changes the number of core questions and content of the core questions?
7. Where should the implementation of the student evaluation process reside -- computing center, information services, elsewhere? Who would do the best job?
8. What are the past decisions of the committee on student evaluations? Do previous minutes exist?
9. Presently three copies of the results are printed. One goes to academic affairs, one to the library and one to individual departments. ASCSM through Scott Strong is posting the results on the web. The students were concerned about the low rated faculty being annoyed with this posting so they only posted the top third rated classes. The data went directly from Larue to the company hired to create the web page. Several members of the committee recommended that all the data be posted not just the top third classes.
10. Cross year analyses should be done.
11. Is what we are doing now, what should be done? Should electronic evaluation be explored? Should other forms be explored?
12. Presently, the multiple-choice results are considered public information. The written comments are given to the faculty member and not distributed publicly. A clear policy in this area is needed either to confirm this mode of operation or to change it.
13. Does the committee have any authority over the evaluation of faculty for the annual review process?
14. Is there a way to separate the faculty and the course evaluations?
15. An observation was made that the CSM method of student evaluations is unique due to the quantity and flexibility of the questions asked.

For the record, each semester the VPAA sends out a memo with the schedule for the evaluations. The following statement is contained in that memo: "Evaluations are mandatory for tenured and tenure-track professors. Only "professors of record," those who actually have responsibility for the class, should be evaluated." The origin or force of this statement is unknown. We in fact evaluate recitation leaders, part timers, adjuncts and graduate students (and indeed some departments are so anxious to do this they do it twice, first in an unofficial early evaluation, so they can get feedback to them while the semester is still young). On the other extreme, there are many professors not evaluated in the field session and summer months.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:37pm.

1. Sports and Athletics (Wendlandt) - The Committee is in the process of interviewing 30 students who have completed their eligibility. They will also interview some undergraduates who have not completed their eligibility and students who participate in club sports.
2. Readmissions (VanTyne): – No report.

D. University Committees

1. Budget (Romberger) – Committee did not meet.
2. Handbook (Readey) – The following issues are being discussed:
 - a. Calendar Committee – several feel that the Director of Human Resources should be a member of this committee. Liberatore is rewriting the membership structure for this committee. This restructuring of committee membership will be revisited.
 - b. Board of Student Publications – having faculty serve on this board appears to be a non-issue.
 - c. Non discrimination clause in Faculty Handbook will include sexual orientation.
 - d. Emeritus Faculty – The Committee would like the Senate to discuss this issue as there are no procedures in the Faculty Handbook or criteria as to how a faculty member obtains this rank.
 - e. Promotion and Tenure Committee is still being discussed

E. Ad Hoc Committee

1. Academic Salary Advisory Committee (Griffiths) - The committee is still gathering data from 12 peer institutions.

F. November 18, 1999 CUFLA Meeting Report (Romberger) – CSM is in pretty good shape with regards to the CCHE performance indicators. These indicators are constantly changing. CUFLA will meet with Tim Foster and give him their input on the performance indicators.

G. Report on Joint Meeting Between BOT and CCHE with Tim Foster (Romberger) – CSM will probably not be able to be exempt from the entering junior exam. CSM may also lose some funding because of our graduate rate.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. **Approval of Graduation List for December Commencement** - A motion was made by Kidnay and seconded by Ely to approve the list of graduates subject to the completion of all requirements. The motion passed unanimously. Ely will present the Faculty Senate at the December Board of Trustees meeting in Romberger's absence.
- B. **Proposed tuition structure** for graduate students will be discussed at a future Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM