

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
 September 25, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, Hill Hall 300

**Attendees:**

P	Tzahi Cath (CEE), Chair
---	-------------------------

**Voting Members:** 12 total (7 needed for quorum). Quorum was present

A	Linda Battalora (PE)	P	Jeff King (MME)	P	Alexis Sitchler (GE)
P	Paula Farca (HASS)	P	Jon Leydens (HASS)	P	Angie Sower (CH)
P	Gus Greivel (AMS)	P	Lisa Nickum (LB)	P	Neal Sullivan (ME)
P	Alina Handorean (EDS)	A	Marcelo Simoes (EE)	P	Steve Thompson (MME)

**Other Attendees and Guests:**

P	Joe Bourgeois (GSG)	A	Colin Terry (Student Life)	P	Sridhar Seetharaman (IN)
A	Michaela Serpas (USG)	P	Cathy Timm (RO)	P	Jeremy Zimmerman (PH)
A	Tom Boyd (AA)	P	Jacob Feldman (proxy USG)	P	Michael Barankin (CBE)
A	Lara Medley (RO)	P	Gongguo Tang (EE)		

1) **Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Tzahi Cath

▪ HLC Update

Boyd not able to attend. Cath provided update on HLC visit; he and the Council chairs had 30 minutes on the agenda with the committee. Overall, meeting seemed to go well and results are TBD.

2) **Registrar Update**

Cathy Timm

Lara not able to attend. Timm shared that notification was sent to all Council members announcing a deadline for all departments to submit new courses for Spring 2019. Additionally, if courses are online, conversations should be ongoing with Trefny Center.

3) **Approval of Minutes – September 11, 2018**

Tzahi Cath

**MOTION:** To approve minutes of September 11, 2018.

Motion: Greivel, Seconded: Farca. Approved: unanimously.

4) **Committee Seats to be Filled**

Alina Handorean

▪ P&T Committee Nominations

Alina received nominations, need to send 2 names to Provost. Per Cath's conversation with Boyd, he'd like to have distribution of people represented from campus; decision made to send all 3 Chemistry nominees to Provost.

Colorado Faculty Advisory Council is another committee that needs representation. No volunteers have come forward; two nominations have been received and will be forwarded to Provost.

5) **Nomination of Faculty**

Tzahi Cath / Alina Handorean

▪ Faculty Trustee – 2 year term ends Dec 2018 – (current representative is Terri Hogue)

Email was distributed and only one response was received with questions. Deadline is Monday, Dec 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Cath suggested that this be brought to attention of department heads.

▪ Distinguished Lecturer Series

The Senate has to select a lecturer for 2020. Question raised about who is leading the nomination committee. According to the bylaws, the committee should be formed out of the past 3 recipients of this award; the bylaws are silent on who chairs the committee. Process involves nominations being put forward in December, with list submitted by March 1<sup>st</sup>. Handorean agreed to be the relationship manager with this committee. Past year lecturers are Craig Taylor, Carl Mitcham, and Tracy Camp.

6) **Grad Council Updates**

6.1 Electrical Engineering (EE)

Gongguo Tang

[status: Approved Grad Council 9/19/18]

3 new programs: -MS | MS-NT Smart-Grid, Power Electronics, and Electrical Power Systems  
-Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Renewable Energy, Utility Integration, and Smart Grid Technology

Tang shared overview of the programs being proposed. Question raised about an undergraduate level course being required for a Graduate program; it is allowable. Question raised about having a combined degree program; it is not part of this proposal. As it relates to student interest, motivation is to attract non-traditional students from industry.

**MOTION:** To approve programs as submitted.

Motion: Greivel, Seconded: Leydens. Approved: 10 in favor, 1 abstained.

6.2 Interdisciplinary (IN)

Sridhar Seetharaman

[status: Approved Grad Council 9/19/18]

2 new programs: MS-NT and PhD in Advanced Energy Systems

Seetharaman shared a presentation; the objective is to create a distinct program that has an alliance with NREL. One unique piece is a rotation at NREL to get broad experience; analogous to medical school rotation. It's an Interdisciplinary Program designed to attract top talent. Faculty at Mines will engage with NREL. Significant economic advantage is that NREL will pick up costs after first year. NREL will pay tuition and stipend through Mines and student will spend time at NREL as staff; yet they will still be a student.

NREL has budgeted for 10 new students per year. Understanding is that it's an educational program; and will not cut funding in the middle of a program. Mines is also partnering to bring funds to the table and working with foundations to secure fellowships.

Question raised about joint appointments of faculty; they will be affiliate appointments from NREL. There will be a mix of adjuncts and affiliated faculty. NREL is willing to build incentive program for staff at NREL; many of whom are already adjunct faculty. As it relates to the Masters program, the NREL rotation will not be included for this program.

Typically, PhD recruitment is handled more on a personal level; this model will be a bit different. They will not exclude recruitment by advisor, but Seetharaman has had success with a pool model at a prior school bringing in quality students. Right now the challenge is to attract top students and has requested funding to accomplish this goal; they will start as soon as BOT approves the program. Seetharaman would welcome any assistance from Faculty Senate to recruit students and funding.

**MOTION:** To approve programs as submitted.

Motion: Sullivan, Seconded: Nickum. Approved: unanimously.

### 6.3 Physics (PH)

Jeremy Zimmerman

[status: Approved Grad Council 9/19/18]

2 program chgs: FROM: Master of Science in Physics TO: Master of Science in Applied Physics  
FROM: Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Physics TO: Doctor of Philosophy in Physics

Physics department is looking to change the name of Masters; nothing else will change about the program. Historically, people take applied programs and this is a follow on with thesis to follow up on senior design. The PhD is currently in Applied Physics and research direction has shifted over the years. No new courses or other changes are needed.

**MOTION:** To approve programs as submitted.

Motion: Sitchler, Seconded: Sullivan. Approved: unanimously.

7) **UnderGrad Council Updates** – no update to report Gus Greivel

8) **Miscellaneous Business** Tzahi Cath

▪ Voting Privileges for USG (and potentially GSG) Committee Members

Joe Bourgeois, Graduate Student Government rep, and Jacob Feldman, Undergraduate Student Government rep, were in attendance for the discussion. Greivel shared that there was a UG vote in April to approve the change. Bylaws would need to be amended. Tied to this discussion is who deserves a voting seat at the council. Currently, there are 16 votes (primarily departments) on undergraduate council.

As it relates to the nature of the discussion in prior year, Greivel indicated that he was not part of Council, but has received comments. Discussion items presented with the vote were largely not supportive of student government representatives having a vote. Greivel asked the undergrad student rep for supporting documents from the other schools that were cited as having voting students. There is something from MIT, yet not sure if this is an apples to apples comparison as it relates to the governance structure at Mines.

Question before the Senate is whether to de-couple this discussion with a larger one to give voting privileges to other members that currently sit on council; they include athletics, military science, CASA, registrar (they administer decisions), administrators from colleges (subset of departments), and student services. Cath is having a meeting later in the week with Kaufman as it relates to other programs having representation. Additionally, while the current topic is related to undergraduate student representation; it brings up the issue of having a parallel structure of voting for graduate student rep.

Question was raised about the feedback process to gather information from students to ensure vote is representative of entire student body. Feldman indicated that information would be gathered on a case-by-case basis depending on the particular department or issue to represent constituents.

A concern raised is that faculty members on Council have specific set of training and background to speak to curriculum and changes and students don't necessarily have similar skill to contribute on equal standing. Students have always been welcomed and encouraged to raise concerns. Faculty are responsible to deliver curriculum that serve needs of students, meet accreditation standards, and maintain viability within constraints of programs and institutions. While the student does not have similar level of expertise, the value of a students' input is different and important.

It was also stated that the student perspective is not always represented and brings a valuable voice. One vote will not sway a decision but could be powerful opportunity for student to express support or dissent. It would likely be a different viewpoint. Question was raised as to whether students have concern that their voice is not heard. And, it is not clear, based on information received so far, that the voice or concern is noted and taken into consideration.

Argument could also be made for anybody, at all tables on campus, to have a vote. It opens a pathway for people to be included at all tables. Key difference with this particular issue is that faculty have a different charge. And argument can be made the students are “paying customers” and yet they are also the product.

Also, this decision does not need to be a permanent one. If this goes through, it can be undone in the future. There is an opportunity for a greater potential upside. Question was raised around faculty having voting rights on student councils; they do not have a vote or representation according to Terry. He indicated that there are 4 professional advisors, but no formal representation. Faculty are welcome to attend and share within the parliamentary rules.

Terry suggested that it would be appropriate to allow a student vote and not others on campus that have requested a vote and clear rationale would need to be presented for this exception. It could be granted with some solid guidelines and uniqueness of request; as an example, rationale could be made that this vote is representative of a large body on campus (vs. smaller groups); it’s not just about numbers but what faculty does and who they serve. Terry feels that having a formal opportunity to vote would go a long way in students’ minds that their opinion matters and they have a say in where the institution is going.

From historical perspective, question about whether it’s a long-standing concern or not. It appears that this is a recent item that has come up in last year or two.

Bourgeois agreed to take the issue to the student executive council to gather their thoughts at the graduate level and Senators agreed this was an appropriate next step.

Senate determined that they should wait to vote and hear opinion from graduate student rep so item can be voted on together and additional thought should be given to the topic. Yet, concern is that there has been much discussion and voting should be done soon. Topic and discussion will be continued.

- Faculty Evaluation Task Force Update Alexis Sitchler  
Sitchler shared document she prepared with some feedback from some Senators. It outlines Justifications, specific tasks, potential membership, and outcomes. Recommendation is that task force doesn’t necessarily have to be chaired by someone on Senate, but should have member on committee so it can be shepherded through Faculty Senate.

Suggestion that Senate seek opinion outside of the institution; someone that has best practices; this would require budget and argument would need to be shepherded and presented to Provost to consider. In light of having expertise on campus in the Trefny Center, this step might not be necessary. Trefny will be technical advisor on the matter. As well, among faculty group that would be on the task force, they would bring perspective from their past experience.

Sitchler will send to Timm to post on Canvas and distribute to Senators.

- Student Grade Appeal Tzahi Cath  
 A student has come forward to appeal their grade that involved extra credit for class that was not explicitly posted. King chairs the standing Academic Standards Committee; Cath will send all material to him. The issue has gone to Academic Affairs, the Dean, Department head, and now it is in front of Faculty Senate. Cath has read the information presented and shared that there are many students with same grade around 90. The committee has a procedure on this and has a pool of people to form a committee to look at everything, then inform Provost and Dean whether they agree or disagree.
  
- Visiting days of Prospective Grad Students Alexis Sitchler  
 Plan is to have two days to bring recruits on campus at the end of January and end of February. The timing is a substantial change to past practice. It's unclear whether faculty will have information from admissions to make decisions by end of January. Faculty has to have full admissions information to get students to campus. Application deadline is December and some in January.

Faculty would like to have an earlier time to recruit, yet there is an admissions processing timeline to be considered. While all potential recruits on campus at the same time can be a challenge, a larger crowd creates chatter and can be a good thing.

Sitchler will continue her follow up and report back to Senate.
  
- Add'l Representatives from Programs Tzahi Cath  
 Cath is meeting with Mike Kaufman on this topic later in the week. King will attend with Cath and topic will be discussed at next meeting.
  
- Research Council Updates Tzahi Cath  
 Email sent to campus seeking feedback; received only one response with some pushback. Stefanie Tompkins will be available at next meeting to discuss and determine if bylaws will be changed.
  
- Tech fees and CCIT Tzahi Cath  
 Cath has had initial discussion with Erickson; he's preparing data to discuss with Senators.
  
- New topic introduced – Support Student Groups on Suicide and Mental Health Neal Sullivan  
 Sullivan asked Faculty Senate to support groups that are doing activities around suicide prevention and mental health issues, specifically Alpha Phi Omega and Active Minds that have events planned. They are looking for approximately \$6,000 in funding. Student Services has provided some funding. Big date is Nov 4 thru Nov 10; Alpha Phi Omega service week; they are planning on several events.

Cath asked for data to support decision; Sullivan will provide information. As well, want to incorporate with other events on campus related to this topic.
  
- Additional topics to Discuss – tabled Tzahi Cath

  - Climate survey
  - Consistently of MS, MS-NT across campus
  - FS Coffee Hour and/or Happy Hour

**Meeting adjourned** at 3:45 pm. Senate went into executive session.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, October 9, 2018, 2 – 4 pm, Hill Hall 300. Please send all items for agenda to Cathy Timm ([cgtimm@mines.edu](mailto:cgtimm@mines.edu)) one week prior to the meeting.