

Notes from Faculty Conference – Tom and Kirsten’s section

1. Who gets credit for PhDs graduated in the interdisciplinary programs? Departments or programs?
2. Willie – what about overload issues? (not sure I recall the context)
3. Can faculty provide input on weighting factors?
4. Use rolling 3 year average for research expenditures?
5. Address co-advising situations that we want to encourage.
6. Counting other types of funds that impact the campus but may not be research.
7. Consider putting teaching faculty in the upper bucket categories – to accommodate those doing research. Put TF and TTT faculty (zero research) with the same SCH expectations.
8. Questions about quality – related to teaching really large sections in order to get total SCH’s required.
9. Non-thesis MS students – how are SCH’s generated counted – any difference?
10. Need to somehow factor in number of sections
11. SCH’s in Field session are in the calculations (I think we should treat field session like the rest of summer with same incentives and penalties – it could be win-win...)
12. How we count labs? Capture contact hours?
13. In efforts to make UG distinct, do we hurt the intern program?
 - a. Consider using winter break?

Productivity Guidelines

Mines’ mission is to prepare students for successful careers, generate impactful output from our research and creative activities (i.e., discoveries, innovations, inventions, graduates), and to contribute through service to society and our professions. We aspire to be the top STEM university in the nation and to be recognized for the uniqueness of our graduates, the strength of our interactions with industry, and the impact of our research and creative activities.

We must accomplish this mission collectively, while recognizing that there is a wide spectrum of individual abilities, strengths, and interests among our faculty. Thus, there is a need for differentiated productivity expectations that provide opportunities for all faculty members to be successful and to make equally valued contributions to Mines’ mission. In making these differentiated assignments, we must recognize practical resource generation needs and the external metrics by which we are judged relative to our aspirational peers. For example, tuition and external grant funding are primary sources of Mines’ financial resources, and research expenditures and graduate student mentoring are metrics used when ranking graduate programs.

Our mission, aspirations, and university finances were considered in preparing the productivity guidelines table below. The table reflects practical needs for revenue generation and metrics that are important to our reputation as a STEM-focused institution. It is important to recognize that the different combinations of instructional load, graduate student mentoring, and research funding in the table below all represent equally valued contributions to Mines mission.

Instructional Load Target (Student Credit Hours per AY)

Tenured Faculty		Thesis and Dissertation Advisees (as primary advisor)			
		≤ 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	>5
Annual Research Expenditures	<\$25k	720	660	600	540
	\$25k - \$100k	675	540	440	440
	\$100k - \$200k	630	500	360	340
	\$200k - \$400k	585	460	330	240
	> \$400k	540	420	300	180

Tenure-Track Faculty	
0 - 2 Years in Position	180
3 - 5 Years in Position	240

Teaching Faculty	
	840

Implementation notes and considerations:

Student Credit Hour Calculations: Student credit hour targets include:

- all instruction completed during the academic year, and
- all courses from the 100 to the 600 levels inclusive.

Research Expenditure Targets: These are external funds that faculty members are engaged in securing and use to support research programs – including students. This includes:

- all expenditures (direct and indirect) from externally funded research grants (all 4- indices),
- some gift funds, if these funds were raised by faculty to support research-based students (6- indices with program codes of 1200).

Other General Considerations: In addition to the details provided above, other considerations in implementing these expectations include:

- After discussions between the Provost, Dean and Department Heads, each college and department will be assigned aggregate productivity targets (instruction, research, mentoring) that reflect the current status and aspirations of each unit and their expected contributions to Mines' overall mission and aspirations.
- Resource allocation (faculty hires, discretionary funds, etc.) will be linked to these targets and the success of each unit in meeting them.
- Department leaders will use the guidelines to set expectations for faculty members' contributions to their unit's aggregate targets, but unit leaders have discretion to deviate from specific values in the table, based on practical and strategic considerations (e.g., key new program development, authoring ERC proposal, etc.).
- Annual performance assessments will consider the quantity of contributions (SCH, funding, mentoring) and their impact to Mines' mission (e.g., quality of instruction, impact and visibility of publications and other output from the research).
- Promotion and tenure expectations are outlined in other University documents. Faculty are responsible for working with department leadership to have a range of assignments that build the portfolio of instruction and research activity needed for P&T evaluation.
- Charge-out is 12.5% a faculty member's AY salary per course. The Department Head and Dean must approve all charge-outs. One course charge-out is equivalent to 120 SCH in the table above, independent of the actual course enrollment.
- Internal buy-out is at adjunct replacement cost. Buy-out for course release purposes is the equivalent of 120 SCH. Buy-out for teaching reassignment generates SCH for the faculty member based on enrollment in the reassigned course.
- Faculty, university, and unit leadership should teach at least one course per year, unless there is a compelling reason for a waiver from this requirement (i.e., strategic major proposal development or other special assignments).
- Directors of recognized centers with >\$5M in cumulative annual expenditures, and department leadership with significant responsibilities (especially leading to accreditation review) should be treated as if they have 50% appointments, so the instructional productivity target in the table above should be divided by 2.

Campus Conference Feedback for Budget/Productivity model

1. Consider a three-year rolling average on the productivity model
2. Review the incentives of Non-thesis master's and confirm where the funding goes and how it will go to interdisciplinary programs
 - a. Currently, the credit hours follow the home dept for faculty in the budget model for base budget. We do a calc to show the % of interdisciplinary headcount by dept, but only to show their % - not to allocate
 - b. The incentive goes to the program and we need to determine how to actually do that procedurally – how the \$'s are gonna flow....
3. Review how to allocate co-advising situations for thesis (or the research grads)
4. Consider giving credit for outside work – i.e. Continuing Ed
5. Confirm that research includes foundation funds
 - a. it doesn't currently give credit for it in our model, but revisions to the model will add these expenditures
6. Determine how to “count” or include research generated by teaching faculty – do they get credit etc.
7. Confirm how we handle field sessions
 - a. they are currently in the budget model, but we are looking at pulling them out separately because the cost structure is different than the normal academic year
8. Make sure we account for or understand the impact of summer incentives on internships while trying to improve the time to graduation. There was also the suggestion of moving field to winter break to allow for more flexibility with internships.
9. Consider using contact hours for some allocations
 - a. when we looked at this, we determined that \$ are generated from SCH, not contact hours so it did not work well with the budget model – but may work better with the productivity model...
10. Consider looking at PhD admissions, not graduation and benchmark against national stats to measure productivity
11. They want a copy of the Power Point
12. Productivity min/max – management? I think this was related to deans/dept heads having the ability to individually make exceptions based on the structure of each department/faculty strengths.