

Colorado School of Mines
Faculty Senate Minutes
February 13 2:00-4:00 p.m.
Hill Hall 300

Attendees: Reed Maxwell (President), Linda Battalora (PE), Tzahi Cath (CEE), Paula Farca (HASS), Vaughan Griffiths (CEE), Jon Leydens (HASS), Paul Martin (AMS), Mark Seger (CH), Chuck Stone (PH), Jeff King (MME)

Representatives:

Lisa Nickum (Library), Bo Sinkler (USG), Tommy Fuerst (GSG)

Apologies:

Marcelo Simoes (EE), Sumit Agarwal (CBE), Neal Sullivan (ME), Terri Hogue (BOT)

Guests:

Tom Boyd (Interim Provost), Aurea Tolnay (AA), Carol Smith (Library), Ye Li (Library)
Chris Cocallas (ODC)

1. Minutes Approval

Approval of the minutes postponed until the next meeting on February 28th.

2. AA/Campus Update (Tom Boyd)

A part time program assistant position has been posted to the state website. This position will support Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, Calendar Committee, and helping the Registrar with loading information into the Course Inventory Management (CIM).

Board of Trustees met on Friday, February 9th. Three graduate degree programs presented to the Board were approved: certificate and non-thesis masters in advanced manufacturing, degree program in quantitative biosciences and engineering, and mining engineering and management. The next step for these programs is DHE. Mining engineering and management is a fully online program. We need accredited for fully online degree programs by the HLC before we can formally offer the program, more specifically before the first student completes 50% of the program.

Jennifer Velloff, new hire online manager in Sam Spiegel's group will be leading the effort to seek HLC approval. We will probably have an HLC visit in early fall which is the same time as our ABET visit. The space resources program is fully online as well. You can either accredit individual online programs or you can accredit multiple online programs at the same time. We will try to do both at the same time. Higher Learning Commission (HLC) is our regional accreditation authority whose approval we need to receive federal assistance which includes sponsored research contracts and federal

financial aid. HLC comes to campus every 10 years and was last on campus 5 years ago.

The BOT meeting continued in the afternoon with all department heads present, for a series of presentations on Pathways of Distinction documents that departments and programs put together. A variety of programs and initiatives were presented not only from the academic departments but also Student Life and the Library. Only a few of the departments presented so a follow-up department head retreat will be scheduled where all the department heads will present their department Pathways of Distinction to build more synergistic activities across campus.

3. Handbook Committee Proposed Language on Academic Faculty (Paul Martin)

Faculty Handbook Committee has built a proposal for the definition of the term academic faculty, to align the definition in the faculty by-laws with the handbook. The first change is to move professors of practice into the academic faculty category. When the bylaws were introduced that position did not exist. The second change is to move faculty on transition out into a kind of subclass where they could vote on faculty matters if they request, and that would be approved by Senate. The definition of academic faculty does include library faculty. If the proposal is approved it will need to go out to the faculty for a vote as it is a substantive change. Martin will check to see if it takes two-thirds of the faculty to approve, or just the majority of those who vote.

Boyd mentioned that faculty handbook committee is winding down with several substantive issues. The changes will be published and presented to campus the end of March for a 30 day comment period.

Motion to approve: Martin, second; Seger. Approved - Unanimous.

4. Campus Master Plan (Chris Cocallas)

A new master plan is being undertaken on campus. Presentations have been made to campus, small focus groups, and posters available to students for cognitive mapping. Maps, structure, procedure and timeline, was discussed. Architects for the project chosen using state procedure, based on qualifications not price. The plan is a wish list based on President's strategic plan and input from campus. In April more campus presentations will be given as well as with the City of Golden. Decision will be made on priority and funding by the steering committee. As a state agency we don't have to follow municipal zoning so may build taller buildings to maximize limited space. Residential master plan could not wait for the campus master plan to be complete. We will be building more housing on campus including graduate and visiting faculty housing in Mines Park. USGS proposed building is in addition to the master plan. Mines will occupy some of that space as well.

Transportation is a component being discussed such as walkability, shuttles, pedestrian walkways, bike paths, etc. Cocallas will send a copy of the presentation to be posted on the Faculty Senate Canvas site.

5. Teaching and Library Faculty Advancement Committee (Chuck Stone and committee)

This committee was charged with looking at a number of issues including multi-year contracts, possible sabbatical opportunities and tenure-like options for teaching and library faculty. After meeting for several months the committee came back to the Senate and decided to do a survey to gauge the larger campus atmosphere. The survey was done in the fall and based on the results, the committee put together a one page memo (blue version) presented to the Provost for review. Stone and Li met with the Executive Committee in January and they focused on multi-year contracts. There are two memos. The blue memo represents the views of the larger community based on the survey. The yellow memo is based on feedback from the Executive Committee. The Faculty Senate needs to decide a path forward with the results of the committee.

Discussion followed regarding the differences in the two memos. Conversations in smaller meetings not captured in the memos indicate the campus would like to offer multi-year contracts. Smith states the committee would like to see the blue memo go forward as it more accurately reflects the charge and survey results of the full faculty.

Discussion on the blue memo ensued. Does the blue memo hit the administration with too many items at the same time? Should we just deal with multi-year contracts now and deal with other benefits later? The blue memo does not imply all or nothing. Maybe it's best to present in total and the administration can decide which ones to address. Reformat to separate the multi-year contracts data from the other survey results, research leave, academic freedom protections and grievance procedures? What type of academic freedom are we looking at beyond what everyone already has? Faculty Handbook spells out academic freedoms although the perception is that it doesn't exist, and this memo addresses academic freedom protection. Grievance procedures and academic freedom protection are clearly delineated for tenure/tenure track faculty but not for teaching and library faculty.

Smith mentioned the white paper related to the memos was written over a year ago. To clarify, the entire proposal and memorandum is about contracts, not the faculty handbook. The blue memo advocating for multi-year contracts states: This contract option should incorporate research leave, academic freedom protections, and grievance procedures for TF and LF. This sentence relates to the faculty handbook section 9.2.1 addressing termination of teaching and library faculty: Mines may decide to not renew the appointment of a teaching faculty member without cause. The committee did research on multi-year contracts and found the contract needs to include grievance procedures and academic protection.

Many teaching faculty don't feel comfortable speaking frankly because of the termination clause which limits their freedom to speak and sometimes alters their academic behavior to ensure job security.

Path forward for the memorandum is to put a little more work into it for the Senate to get fully behind it. It was decided to wait two weeks, refine the memo, not so much content, but restructuring, and bring back to the Senate. Leydens, King and Griffiths will work on it with the committee, provide an online review, and bring to a vote at the next meeting.

6. Graduate Council (Marcelo Simoes)

Simoes could not attend the Faculty Senate meeting so Maxwell and Tolnay will cover his agenda items. A document outlining the double counting proposal as well as the four program revisions up for vote was distributed. All items have been approved by Graduate Council unanimously and do not require Board of Trustees approval.

1. Double Counting

Combined degree changes the rule on double counting. Originally thesis masters students could double count 6 credits for both undergraduate and graduate degree. Then campus as a whole provided the option for double counting non-thesis masters 4 plus 1 programs. Maxwell takes this proposal as saying every program will allow double counting unless they opt out. If a department opts in, does it have to adhere strictly to the requirements as written or have flexibility? Maxwell's understanding is that programs are allowed to apply program specific rules, but isn't implicit in the language, and that students should check with their program for any department specific requirements. For double counting it has to be a combined program. Departments do not need to go to Graduate Council to opt in or out.

King would like to see this reworded to be more explicit as discussed. The proposal needs approval at next Faculty Senate meeting to make it to the catalog. King will work with Simoes on rewording, loop the Senate in by email so it can be voted on at the next meeting.

2. New Degrees, Certificates, ASI's etc.

- a. Certificate in Natural Resources & Energy Policy (HASS)

3. Changes to programs

- a. MSPHD-EE: MS & PhD - Electrical Engineering (EE)
- b. MSPHD-CS: MS & PhD - Computer Science (CS)
- c. MSPHD-MECH: MS & PhD - Mechanical Engineering (ME)

No discussion on items 2 and 3.

Motion to approve: Seger, second; Martin. Approved with one abstain.

7. Undergraduate Council (Mark Seger)

A lot of changes to programs and courses were made during the January Undergraduate Council meeting. Seger proposes that since none of the following were contentious and unanimously approved, that the Senate does block voting by department instead of voting individually. See below for department new degrees and changes.

1. New Degrees, Certificates, ASI's etc.
 - a. ASI, Minor – Advanced Manufacturing (ME)
 - b. Culture, Creativity, Communication Minor (HASS)
 - c. Minor in Environment and Sustainability Studies (HASS)
 - d. Minor in Global Politics & Society (HASS)
 - e. Minor in Business and Entrepreneurship (EB)
2. Changes to programs
 - a. BS-MECH: BS in Mechanical Engineering (ME)
 - b. BS-CS: BS in Computer Science (CS)
 - c. MINASI-CS: Minor/ASI in Computer Science (CS)
 - d. BS-ECO: BS in Economics (EB)
 - e. MIN-ECO: Minor in Economics (EB)
 - f. ASI-ECO: ASI in Economics (EB)
 - g. ASI-ENT: ASI in Entrepreneurship (EB)
 - h. MIN-ENGY: Minor in Energy (CERSE)
 - i. BS-CE: BS in Civil Engineering (CEE)
 - j. BS-EVE: BS in Environmental Engineering (CEE)
 - k. BS-CHE: BS in Chemical Engineering (CBE)
 - l. MINASI-IPE: International Political Economy (HASS)
 - m. MINASI-LSE: Minor and ASI in Literature, Society, and Environment (HASS)
 - n. MINASI-STEP: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Policy (HASS)

ME - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Battalora. Approved - Unanimous.

HASS - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Leydens. Approved - Unanimous.

EB - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Martin. Approved - Unanimous.

CS and EE - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Griffiths. Approved - Unanimous.

CERSE - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Griffiths. Approved - Unanimous.

CEE - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Griffiths. Approved - Unanimous.

CBE - Motion to approve: Seger, second; Farca. Approved - Unanimous.

8. Survey Committee (Mark Seger, Jon Leydens, Tzahi Cath)

Survey committee would like to add six new questions on mentoring and students who are stressed and need counseling service. Everything else is the same as the prior survey. No questions have been removed. Proposed time to administer survey is March 22nd – April 8th. The survey will be open for two weeks including spring break. Senators should give Seger feedback offline. Voting on approving the additional

questions administering the survey will be on the agenda for next Faculty Senate meeting.

9. Climate Change Subcommittee (Jon Leydens, Tzahi Cath)

Tabled until next meeting.

10. Faculty Coffee Hour and Faculty Happy Hour (Reed Maxwell, Aurea Tolnay)

Faculty Senate Coffee Hour will be held every other Thursday 10 – 11 am, Library 266B, starting on February 15th. Faculty Senate will pay for coffee. Tolnay will put an announcement in Daily Blast.

11. Other Business

Stone provided a student-athlete exit interview summary document from the oversight committee on sports and athletics. There is some concern that coaches don't appreciate academics as much as they should. Progress has been made in past three years. Students are very candid in their responses to the survey. No action item is required from Senate.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 pm.

Next meeting February 27, 2 – 4 pm, Hill Hall 300