

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 14, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

300 Hill Hall

ATTENDEES: Dan Knauss (President), Corby Anderson (MME), Joel Bach (ME), Jurgen Brune (MN), Lincoln Carr (PH), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Patrick Marshall (USG), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Thomas Monecke (GE), Ken Osgood (MB), Natalie Van Tyne (EPICS)

APOLOGIES: Ben Goertz (GSG), Terry Parker (Provost), Kamini Singha (HY)

GUESTS: Hanna Aucoin (GSG for Ben Goertz), Tom Boyd (AP), Lia Vella (Library), Tyrone Vincent (EECS), Mike Wakin (EECS)

1. Introductions: senators, guest faculty, undergrad/grad reps, administration members

2. Visitor updates and minutes

2.1. Provost – Terry Parker - Not present.

2.2. Associate Provost Update – Tom Boyd

Boyd has published the revised P&T dossier format along with submission deadlines to department heads. Handbook revisions have been pushed out to campus for comments, April 27 is the deadline to submit feedback to Boyd. Handbook Committee meets April 29 to review comments, make final revisions, vote and then distribute the proposed revisions to President Scoggins and the BOT for final approval. Administration is meeting with Faculty Senators and other faculty groups seeking feedback regarding the implementation of the strategic plan.

Boyd gave an update on the PhD hooding ceremony, 59 students plan to attend. Last year at this time there were 33 PhD students expected to attend. This year the ceremony will be changed to accommodate the larger group. The administration is looking at modifying all commencement ceremonies. Having a separate graduate student ceremony the night before commencement is one option under consideration. Knauss proposed faculty should not have to attend both ceremonies, and noted, the school is getting to a size that all faculty should not need to walk every year, they could start rotating on a 2-3 year basis. Holding the ceremonies by colleges was suggested, but the problem is the need for three different venues or different time slots and different speakers. Carr noted that having a separate graduate ceremony and adding the graduate student speakers back into the program would increase school spirit. Boyd explained, if there is a separate ceremony, student speakers would be added. Also, a separate hooding ceremony would be eliminated and the hooding would take place during the main graduate student commencement. On another matter, Carr thanked Boyd for his hard work and for the excellent communication regarding his revamping of the promotion process. In September, Boyd will bring a proposal to the Senate for changes to the P&T process.

2.3. Approval of past minutes

Motion to approve minutes from February 24: No objections, approved by acclamation.

Minutes from March 31 will be approved at the next meeting.

3. Campus committees and regular responsibilities

3.1. Grad council – Jürgen Brune

Brune reported on the proposal to tighten up the administration of research credits. Graduate Council discussed recommendations made by faculty to treat graduate research credits more seriously. There are cases where graduate students have signed up with a professor for research credits and the faculty member was unaware. There were also cases where students received successful credit even if they didn't do work for the faculty member. Also, students have been funded for research approved under an advisor then changed advisors mid-stream, the faculty member who funded that research did not get any results from the student's work. This proposal was approved by the Graduate Council on April 1. The change in policy includes: if a student changes their research advisor, the advisor needs to be informed. Also, once the graduate committee is formed, changes to the committee need to be agreed to by the advisor. If there are disagreements, the Graduate Dean has the authority to make and approve changes of advisors and committee members. A second proposal was put forward, but not approved by Graduate Council, regarding grades for research credits. The proposal suggested not allowing successful progress grades to be pre-entered into the system. Current practice will stand where passing grades are pre-entered. If students fail, faculty need to enter the system and change the grade to unsatisfactory. Senators will vote on this proposal at the next meeting.

Brune presented graduate program changes for Senate approval:

MS & PHD-AMS – Applied Math & Statistics: Math program is changing some of their required courses, Graduate Council approved the program changes.

ME, MS & PhD – Nuclear Engineering: The nuclear engineering program requirements were proposed, there is no change in the total credit hours of 36.

MS & PhD – Electrical Engineering and Computer Science: Proposed changes have been approved by Graduate Council.

There is an additional issue forthcoming, EECS wants to allow double counting of six additional hours out of the 30 credits that are required for the non-thesis master's degree when the student is in a combined BS/MS program. This will fundamentally allow 24 hours of course work beyond the bachelor's degree. The Senate approved the previous reduction in credits a few years ago when credits went from 36 to 30 hours. Vincent explained the motivation for this change is to get more undergraduates to enroll in the graduate program. Currently, to complete the masters in the fifth year, it requires students to take 15 credits per semester, students attempt that load but it is very difficult. EECS Department feels one benefit is the increase in earning potential for Mines graduates. Some faculty are worried about affecting the quality of all of the graduate programs. Vincent explained, the EECS MS program requirements have not changed, this just allows undergraduate students to get started early and take courses

that count toward both the undergraduate and graduate degrees. One could consider it as reducing the number of credits in the undergraduate program rather than reducing the number of credits required for the MS. If a student comes from outside Mines they still have to take all 30 credits, this proposal only benefits Mines undergraduate students.

The financial aspect of the proposal was discussed. When income is decreased due to reduced credits, an increase in students is needed. The EECS Department feels, if these changes were made, the number of students would increase for the program and the income would increase. Carr is in favor of the change, he believes physics students will want to enroll in this program. He asked if the department has looked at whether this will work with the physics course flowchart. Knauss noted this would be a significant change to the graduate program, once one department does it, then it starts to become a rule for the full university. Vincent explained it would be up to each department to choose how many credits to require. Wakin reported they looked at requirements for peer schools and most of them allow double counting and all of those programs' credit requirements are well below Mines' requirements. Boyd raised the concern of transportability of double counting across departments and programs. He gave the example, if there is an outstanding student in the MS program, and the department convinces her to stay for a PhD, then will the double counting transport across programs? The second issue to consider is that many students complete graduate work while they are undergraduate students and they don't pay extra tuition for graduate courses. Third, in the past, when one department reduced requirements from 36 to 30, the other departments followed suit, if this is approved for EECS it will most likely spread across campus. If the proposal is accepted, how will it affect transfer credit? Boyd suggested the Senate take those points into consideration. Monecke pointed out this would benefit Mines students but would hurt graduate students who came from other schools. Vincent noted, at Mines, there are many specialized courses that other schools do not have, students from those schools have to take the specialized courses when they arrive, to learn the necessary information. He continued, we are devaluing our own program if the students from inside take applicable courses as an undergraduate and then have to still take 30 additional credits. Mehta pointed out Mines already has double counting that has different standards for internal and external students. Knauss asked Senators to discuss this with their departments and noted that this has not passed through Graduate Council. Further discussion will take place in the future if the proposal is approved by Graduate Council.

3.2. Possible New Committee (study abroad) – Rachel Osgood

R. Osgood is the McBride practicum advisor, she posed the question of whether the school can make it easier for students in certain programs to study abroad. Her goal is to find a way for all students to study abroad and still graduate on time. Other schools require students to go abroad to enhance the student experience. Experiencing international travel and receiving exposure to other cultures is important for students today in the globalized world. Because this is an important experience for students, R. Osgood has volunteered to chair an ad hoc committee to promote study abroad at Mines and to work to make it easier for students to fit the travel into their schedule and still graduate in four years. Brune stated he benefitted from being an exchange student and reported that he currently sends students on exchange

programs. Brune has had difficulties making study abroad work for his students and he would like to see the process improve. Brune will co-chair the committee with R. Osgood. Carr suggested the committee create a preferred semester list recommending which semester students from each department should go abroad to have the least negative impact on the student's course of study. **Motion to create an ad hoc committee to examine and improve the study abroad program: K. Osgood, second: Brune. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

3.3. Undergrad council – Jason Ganley

Minor/ASI in Electrical Engineering. Ganley distributed handout outlining the program changes and stated the program passed unanimously in Undergraduate Council. Carr stated the program looks great and indicated many physics students would be interested. **Vote to approve: Minor/ASI in Electrical Engineering: Ganley, second: Bach. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

Readmissions Committee Proposal for Semester Progress Reports: The proposal will require instructors for the courses listed to identify all students who may foreseeably fail the course using the mid-term grading system. The Undergraduate Council vote was: 11 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstention. Mehta noted, this will require more work for faculty members who teach those courses, and therefore, additional resources should be solicited for their support. Carr's concern is that students will say a faculty member didn't inform them that they were having trouble and therefore students will argue for a better grade. Carr asked if the proposal had been checked by Anne Walker in the Office of Legal Services? Ganley, thought so. Knauss suggested adding language to the policy indicating that failure to report poor mid-term performance is not grounds for appeal. That type of phrase would protect the faculty. **Motion to approve readmissions document requiring failing mid-term grade reporting: Ganley, second: Monecke. Vote to approve: Yes 6 , No 2, Abstain 2.**

3.4. Research Council – Corby Anderson

The recipients for junior and senior research awards have been selected. IDC issues are still brewing. Carr suggested sending a memo asking that administration not decide this over the summer. Anderson reported that VPRTT Tony Dean plans to show a summary of the history of IDC at the next Research Council meeting. Knauss suggested Anderson ask Research Council to send a memo to administration asking them to wait on making a final decision until after the summer. Carr asked that Research Council form a subcommittee to analyze the proposal and report back to campus. Senators agree the process needs to slow down and be carefully considered.

3.5. Faculty Handbook Committee - No report.

3.6. Assessment Committee – Natalie Van Tyne

Committee is publishing year end reports to BOT, Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate. Committee discussed how to get faculty to fill out graduate assessment plans. The following departments received rewards for submitting exemplary reports: CBE, Physics and MME.

3.7. Brief report on any other committees/issues – No reports.

4. Major topics of discussion

4.1. Perceptions of Leadership Survey – Ken Osgood – No report.

4.2. Senator elections – Joel Bach

There are six positions open for senior senators next year and no positions open for senators. There are five candidates for senior senator and two candidates for senator, therefore, there are not enough candidates available to fill the positions, and two interested faculty do not have the opportunity to serve because they do not satisfy the senior senator requirement. Discussion took place regarding strategies for filling the positions. Bach recommended suspending number six of the bylaws regarding senior status, for the current meeting, and then having Anderson resign as senator and then appoint Anderson to fulfill Greife's unfilled senior senator position. Anderson became a tenured professor this year which qualifies him for senior senator status. Senators agreed to Bach's suggestion. Anderson then resigned his position effective immediately. **Joel Bach made a motion to suspend section B, number 6 from the bylaws for the current vote and then to appoint Anderson to fulfill Greife's position, second: Carr. Vote to appoint Anderson: Unanimous.** Anderson will now complete Greife's term, which will last through May of 2016. Due to Anderson's resignation, one senator position is now open for next year along with five senior senator positions. **Motion to authorize Bach to conduct election for five senior senators and one senator: No opposition, motion approved.**

4.3. LAIS issues – Ken Osgood – Osgood distributed memo. Due to time constraints, discussion will take place on-line.

4.4. List of Senate Accomplishments – Dan Knauss – Not discussed.

4.5. Family Friendly Campus – Lincoln Carr

Carr gave a history of the initiative. In the past, there have been many different family friendly proposals. Lately there has been a lot done to improve life on campus for students, including new dorms, stadiums, etc. Carr feels now is the time to work to make campus friendlier to faculty and families. Certain issues involve parental leave, day care, the timing of spring break, family programs, and the creation of a website to provide information and resources of interest to Mines' families. Senators highly support Carr's ideas and suggestions. Carr has spoken to Mike Dougherty, Deb Lasich, and Stephanie Berry, they were all supportive. Dougherty pointed out that implementing the proposal will take a great deal of time. Faculty Senate will need to form working groups to get the proposals implemented. Carr supports asking administration to work on this over the summer and to make it a major Faculty Senate issue to pursue next year. Many of the items are very inexpensive, such as study hour in library. This will be a good initiative for Senate to put forward for faculty, it will be positive to let faculty know this is being done for them. Carr asked for feedback because this will be visible across campus. **Motion to approve the memo with minor edits: Osgood, second: Bach. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**

4.6. Senate Bylaws – Dan Knauss

Knauss noted an issue for next year is determining who will serve as Faculty Senate President. Carr is interested in having Davis serve as president. Carr reported the budget line item for class relief for Senate President has been approved by Parker. Knauss stated Osgood would be willing to run for another term if bylaws were changed to allow for a second term. Davis suggested holding a vote at the April 22 faculty forum to change the bylaws by removing number eight which prohibits senators from serving for one year following the completion of any term. Davis also suggested amending number six indicating that if a member of the Senate becomes qualified as a senior senator, that person shall attain senior senator status at the start of the next academic year. Senate can email the proposed bylaws changes to faculty prior to the April 22 faculty awards forum and hold the vote at the meeting. Proposal is to strike number 8 in bylaws which currently limits senators from serving in back-to-back terms and amend number six to state that when a senator earns senior senator status during their term as senator they can become a senior senator at the beginning of the next academic year. All senators support this plan. Knauss will send out an e-mail to faculty. The first meeting of the new Senate will take place on May 12. Nominations for senators will be accepted until 9:00 a.m. April 17. The election will open at 9:00 on April 24 and will run until Friday, May 1 at 5:00 p.m. The first meeting of the new Faculty Senate will take place on Tuesday, May 12. Knauss has been asked to make a small technical change to the bylaws that does not require a vote: change Distinguished Faculty Lecturer Selection Committee to Recommendation Committee because the group makes a recommendation to the Senate, it does not select the lecturer.

4.7. Other topics – None.

5. Agenda items for next meeting - None

➔ **Next meeting April 28th, 2-4 pm, Hill Hall 300**