

# Faculty Handbook Open Forum

**Welcome!**

**Academic Affairs and the Faculty Handbook Committee would like to take this opportunity to informally share the major suggested revisions to get initial input from Campus.**

**We will be polling the audience on their opinion. This is informational and non-binding.**

**Thank you for those that attended and participated in the Open Forum today.**

# Faculty Handbook – How the Handbook Process Works

- Fall – Informational and begin reviewing suggested changes that have been submitted via the form found on Academic Affairs website:

## [Faculty Handbook Revision Request Form](#)

- Spring – Word smithing, agreement and vote
- “Drop Dead” date to review suggested changes – mid March
- Comment period dates – end of March for 30 days
- Final recommendations to the President’s Office for the BOT– mid-May
- BoT decision date – end of May
- Publish - July/August

# 2023-2024 Faculty Handbook Committee

- Andy Herring (Chair and Provost Rep)
- Vaughan Griffiths (Faculty Senate Rep)
- Megan Rose (AFC Rep)
- Carl Frick
- Junko Munakata Marr
- Alina Handorean
- Paul Martin
- Ilya Tsvankin
- Christine Homer (HR Rep, non-voting)
- Jessica Salazar (General Counsel Rep, non-voting)

# RTT



## Scot Allen

### Director, Research Integrity & Security

Handbook Sections 10.3

# Policy for Research Integrity – Key issues

- 1) Policy for Research Integrity applies to all researchers on campus, but current version inadequately addresses potential misconduct by students, RF, postdocs, research associates;
- 2) No language on interplay between academic misconduct and research misconduct;
- 3) Mines is true to our own research values but if we accept federal \$\$ must also follow changing federal requirements (NSF, 2023; NIH, anticipated 2024)
- 4) Detailed Procedures for Addressing Research Misconduct (starting p. 3; lists #'d to 13; sub-lists run from “a” to “m”) need faculty voice for procedures but need not trouble the Faculty HB Committee.

# Recommended corrections to problems

- Keep Policy for Research Integrity in HB, but
- Remove detailed Procedures for Addressing Research Misconduct from HB
  - Put these procedures in the Policy Library
  - In conversation with Research Council to ensure input from faculty and other stakeholders
- Allow membership on inquiry or investigation committee representing status of respondent (student, RF, postdoc...). Require a tenured faculty member as chair.
- Cite Policy for Academic Integrity/ Misconduct in Policy for Research Integrity
- Update Definitions: Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research; Procedures, Roles and Responsibilities, Research Integrity Officer

I support this recommendation

**A** – agree

**B** – disagree

**C** – undecided

# RTT



## Will Vaughan

### Director, Technology Transfer

Handbook Sections 10.1

# Changes to the Intellectual Property Policy

## Why and why now?

- Mines Intellectual Property (IP) policy was written 34 years ago, only 10 years after Bayh Dole act and 18 years before Mines had a Technology Transfer Office. There was a minor update in 2010
- Does not reflect current or best practices (dispute resolution, for example)
- Necessary to provide clarity on and address recent issues
- Reduce duplicative language
- Procedural sections that apply to all employees moved to procedure repository to provide ability to respond quickly to Federal and State mandates and future best practices. Changes will still require campus input.
- Simplified the revenue distribution model to retain the generous share that is distributed to the inventors personally but allowing for more flexibility for the distribution of licensing revenue to the university.
- Created a separate Copyright and Works of Authorship policy - this policy is to be fleshed out and submitted for campus comment before implementation
- A list of specific changes is available to those who are interested



# Creation of New Policy on Copyrights & Works of Authorship

## Purpose:

Reaffirm academic faculty authorship rights in traditional scholarly, aesthetic, or literary works, and in academic instruction materials

- Specifically delineate the situations in which Mines will assert ownership in works of authorship, including:
  - Traditional work-made-for-hire doctrine (such as those works created by nonacademic employees within the scope of their employment)
  - Works created as contracted-for-deliverables under an agreement with a third-party
  - Works that are created at the direction of Mines or with the substantial use of Mines' Resources
- Clearly define the university's ownership and rights in its online courses.
- Provide flexibility in determining whether the creators will share in the commercialization revenues of any such works, dependent on the circumstances giving rise to the work, the participating parties and the nature of the work.

I support this recommendation

A – agree

B – disagree

C – undecided

# Research Faculty

**Kamini Singha**

**Professor and Associate Dean of Earth and Society Programs**

**Mike Kaufman**

**Director of Materials and Energy Initiatives, RTT**

Handbook Sections 4.1, 4.4, 4.5, 7.1

# Key issues

## Discrepancies:

- we do not hire Research Faculty as Admin Faculty (HB 4.5.2C)
- we don't have MOUs with anyone but a few National Labs (HB 4.1.2.8)

## Issues:

- 50% of Research Faculty on campus do not have expenditures, which implies that they are under the incorrect title, some of this is (previous) limitations on who could submit grants
- there is no language on expectations of Research Faculty for success
- Research Faculty should not be required to do service as they are paying themselves (HB 4.4.2)
- exceedingly poor language around affiliate faculty: *“An Affiliate Faculty member must possess the qualifications for the position to which they are selected”* (also HB 4.4.2)

# Suggested revisions to discrepancies

## Section 4.1.2

- ORA has agreed to allow research associates and postdocs to PI grants with approval

## Section 4.1.2.8

- remove list of (incorrect) institutions

## Section 4.4.2

- remove service as a requirement for hiring, since it is not (necessarily) part of their job going forward unless we plan to offer \$

I support this recommendation

**A** – agree

**B** – disagree

**C** – undecided

# Suggested corrections to problems

## Section 4.4.2

- add *any* language to affiliate faculty so we couldn't hire literally anyone

## Section 4.5.2

- update hiring language to match other academic faculty hires, since Research Faculty are academic faculty—go through department, DH, Dean, Provost...which is what we already do in practice

## Section 7.1

- set some (low) bar for Research Faculty to retain their title (also, HB 6.9)

# Human Resources

**Christine Homer**

**Chief Human Resources Officer**

Handbook Sections 5, 7, 9, Preface

# Section 5 – Rights, Privileges, and Benefits

- **Section 5.4: Leave Benefits**  
Federal and State leaves and the laws that govern change throughout the calendar year, resulting in the Handbook being out of date  
Ex. CO State Expanded Sick Leave (Aug 2023), CO FAMLI Leave (Jan 2024)
- **Recommendation:** Remove the details of the leave benefits from the Handbook, and refer to the HR Leave Benefit Policies Webpage



## LEAVE BENEFIT POLICIES

Below is the leave information for benefits eligible Academic Faculty and Administrative Faculty, "Employees" referenced below. Please review this information and contact [Benefits@mines.edu](mailto:Benefits@mines.edu) with additional questions. If you are a classified employee, please reference the [Classified Employee Handbook](#) for information. The Sabbatical Leave Policy is set forth in [Section 10.2](#). This leave is available only to Academic Faculty.

### LEAVE POLICIES (ALPHABETICAL)

- ANNUAL LEAVE +
- ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE +
- BEREAVEMENT LEAVE +
- ELECTION LEAVE +
- FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE +
- VE +
- VE +

I support this recommendation

**A** – agree      **B** – disagree      **C** – undecided

# Professional Conduct

- Respectful communications
- Personal accountability
- Collaboration with colleagues

I support this recommendation

**A** – agree      **B** – disagree      **C** – undecided



# Disciplinary Path

Termination (DH, Dean, Legal and HR)

Non-renewal (DH, Dean, Legal and HR)

Final Written Warning (DH, Dean, Legal and HR)

Letter of Reprimand (DH, Dean, HR)

Letter of Coaching (DH, Dean, HR)

Performance Improvement Plan (DH, Dean, HR)

Verbal with email confirmation (DH, HR)

Learning and Development (DH, HR)

# Section 7 – Performance and Evaluation

- Section 7.3: Performance Improvement Plans
  - Align policy with practice
    - Section 7.3: Clarify what is a Performance Improvement Plan
    - Section 7.3.1: Expand the timing to issue a Performance Improvement Plan and the ability to close a Performance Improvement plan earlier than the set term
    - Section 7.3.2: Clarify Performance Improvement Plan timing and leader signoff for Teaching Faculty and Administrative Faculty

I support this recommendation

**A** – agree      **B** – disagree      **C** – undecided

# Section 9 – Termination of Employment

- Section 9.3: Termination for Job Abandonment
  - Currently allows for a Mines employee to not report to work for 30 days, before considering them having resigned
    - Colorado is an at-will state
    - CO Personnel rule: 3 days of absence without communications to Mines
    - **Recommendation:** 5 days of absence without communications to their supervisor or Human Resources, is considered constructive resignation
  - Mines leadership and HR will make efforts to contact the employee within this timeframe

I support this recommendation

A – agree

B – disagree

C – undecided

# Handbook Preface

# Preface

- Currently defines all exempt employees as “faculty” for both academic and administrative positions
  - Remove this section to provide clarity
    - The Board, which defines all exempt Mines employees as “faculty,” regardless of whether their primary role is academic or administrative, has set forth the personnel policies, procedures and statements in this edition of the Mines Faculty Handbook, hereinafter the “Handbook,” for the convenience of members of the university community.
  - Provides clarity for academic and administrative employees
    - Reduces confusion regarding which handbook provisions apply
    - Enables policy and handbook development for administrative faculty

I support this recommendation

A – agree

B – disagree

C – undecided



**THANK YOU!**

**IT'S  
UP TO  
YOU**