

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
 May 14, 2019, 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)	A	John Heilbrunn (HASS)	P	Marcelo Simoes (EE)
P	Paula Farca (HASS)	P	Andy Herring (CBE)	P	Alexis Sitchler (GE)
P	Gus Greivel (AMS)	A	Jeff King (MME)	P	Angie Sower (CH)
P	Alina Handorean (EDS)	A	Lisa Nickum (LB)	P	Neal Sullivan (ME)

Other Attendees and Guests:

A	Joe Bourgeois (GSG)	P	Paul Myskiw (RO)	A	Colin Terry (Student Life)
P	Tom Boyd (AA)	A	Michaela Serpas (USG)	A	Cathy Timm (RO)
P	Sam Spiegel (Trefny)	P	Megan Sanders (Trefny)	P	Julie Lambert (AA)
P	Sebnem Duzgun (MN)	P	Yvette Kuiper (GE)	P	Paul Santi (GGE)
P	Justin Shaffer	P	Roel Snider	P	Stefanie Tompkins (Rsch)

1) **Greet New Senators**

Tzahi Cath

Tzahi introduced two of the four new senators for the next academic year, Duzgun and Kuiper. The other new senators, Bullock and McCray, were not able to attend.

2) **Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Tom Boyd

- Boyd shared that Holz, the new provost, will be here permanently in two weeks.
- Boyd also referenced his email announcement about Simbai leaving; he has been a colleague for more than 15 years, and he will be missed. His new position at NREL is a great opportunity for him and our relationship with NREL. The graduate studies personnel will be moving to Starzer, and the admission's staff will move in with undergraduate admissions where both grad and undergrad admissions will report up to Kim Medina. Other personnel from the former graduate students group are now in Registrar's Office and supporting the graduate registration function. Boyd will be putting together responsibilities and functions for a graduate dean position that will be posted in the fall. He'll work with Holz and collaborate with department heads on the final description.
- Question raised about combining the Graduate Dean's office with Research office. Boyd thought that this was a good suggestion. There are some functions that coordinate and interface with research. He will coordinate with Tompkins.
- The Grad office will likely move back to the Green Center in November. The Geophysics department will move out of the trailers and into the Green Center in August. The trailers may be used for office space but eventually, they'll be eliminated after the Innovation Hub is designed and operational.
- There was a question raised about a faculty Conference on August 16th; Boyd clarified that this is the date of the Conference and he will let Holz know of this schedule and also send a reminder to all faculty. Boyd will also determine if the academic council will meet over summer.

3) **Registrar Update**

Paul Myskiw

Myskiw indicated that summer classroom scheduling is complete, Fall and common exam schedule should be loaded by July 1st. The office is working on transfer credit backlog which should be caught up by the end of the week.

Myskiw talked about a new workflow process software called OnBase, which is used to help automate processes; it identifies holes and discrepancies as you step through the workflow. Upon review of the grade change and incomplete grade policies, he has found that three places reference policy, and they are all different. An example was shared where a student that had been gone for seven years came back to address an incomplete grade; the policy should be cleared up and be consistent so that this type of situation does not leave it open for various interpretation.

Myskiw would like to have one policy. He has obtained information from other institutions as reference. Senators asked for a policy proposal to be prepared for Councils to review in the fall. This is a policy change that should be pursued for the academic year 2020-2021.

4) **Approval of Minutes – April 23, 2019**

Tzahi Cath

MOTION: To approve minutes of April 23, 2019.

Motion: Sitchler, Seconded: Herring. No abstentions. Approved.

5) **Committee Updates**

Alina Handorean

Handorean indicated that she had completed the senate elections. She'll be sending an email in coming weeks with all the vacancies on the Senate and university committees. The plan is to share recommendations and nominees in early August.

6) **Other Committee Updates**

▪ Taskforce for Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness

Alina Handorean / Justin Shaffer

Handorean shared a presentation and thanked the entire ad-hoc committee. She reminded the senators of the three objectives from the taskforce. They were to define effective instruction, determine what can and should be evaluated, and to identify tools for assessment of instructional effectiveness.

Shaffer indicated that end-of-class evaluations were not enough, there is a need to think temporally, before, during, and at the end of a course with evaluations by students, peers, and self. The other aspect that is recommended is to have a mid-term evaluation so that there is an opportunity to do some course correction.

There are three aspects of the evaluation. For the student evaluation, a definition of the Mines Effective Instruction will assist them in completing evaluations within context. Questions would be geared toward the specific goals of the Mines model. For peer observation, this would be accomplished inside the classroom, typically through an ad-hoc committee. The Trefny Center would assist with peer to peer observations and protocols. The goal would be to complete this evaluation every two or three years. For the self- reflection survey, this could be a simple Canvas survey that could be incorporated in the FDR teaching data. The mid-term evaluation might be something to apply to new faculty and newer courses. It would be pre-built in Canvas and would permit faculty to get feedback early. This allows the faculty to make changes or adjustments in mid-semester, before it is too late to change.

Handorean discussed the next steps which include sharing at the Learning Conference at the beginning of Fall 2019, as well as putting together a pilot group to work with the Trefny Center to create the protocol for peer evaluations and the processes associated with it. The task force members have agreed to be the testers and participate in the peer evaluation pilot.

Question raised about the original scope of evaluations and the online evaluation; Spiegel indicated that this is a separate project for the end-of-course online survey. The work presented from this committee would apply to all teaching modalities.

The comment that campus feedback could be gathered at the faculty conference in addition to the engineering learning conference; there is potentially an opportunity for this to be handled in a workshop format. Boyd will defer to Holz.

Question concerning how the team will ensure that the required assessment techniques map to effective teaching and how the core components will be assessed. This is necessary and the goal is to be in alignment; all questions will be designed to illustrate effectiveness.

A recent email from Prather talked about the Evaluation Kit software and senators had questions about how this fits with the discussion and recommendations. Spiegel shared that this is a software that generates and collects the data for the student evaluation tool. This company has been bought out by another organization and it is still TBD if Mines will retain this vendor. It appears that the school hasn't been billed for this package for the last couple of years; Spiegel suggests that we secure a one-year extension and have the Senate determine if this contract should be extended after a review of capabilities and connection to other software. There are a couple of other software packages being explored, and the goal is to ensure they communicate with each other. Prather is managing the administration of the survey and Evaluation Kit.

Concern expressed that the tool can determine any bias and adjust for anomalies like the engagement of students in the class or a small set of respondents. These are items that can be considered when the evaluations are being put together so the context can be better defined. If there are specific needs and requirements, the Senate can define these as components of the tool that is to be used.

Senators discussed timing to share the findings with faculty; the suggestion that a pilot is put together and data collected and vetted by the Senate before sharing broadly. Potentially information can be shared at a few campus workshops to gather faculty input. And, putting together a standing University committee.

In addition to faculty time in the rollout of the evaluation process, ultimately, there will need to be someone to manage the process. As an example, there should be a process around who chooses the courses to be evaluated. Boyd indicated that the work to date is a big step forward.

MOTION: To approve the extension of the committee and to pilot the program, which will include the peer evaluations, mid- and end-of-term evaluations and options presented. And, to report back to faculty senate early in 2020.

Motion: Sitchler, Seconded: Greivel. No abstentions. Approved.

▪ Campus Surveys – update

There was no discussion at this meeting.

Neal Sullivan

7) Briefings and Information Items

▪ Research Committee – update

Stefanie Tompkins

Tompkins presented an update regarding the activities from the Research Advisory Board. She reminded senators that this is an advisory body with a representative from each area on campus. The group has begun work with five sub committees which are recapped below.

In terms of research space, the committee has worked with department heads and others that are tasked with managing space; this is a challenging topic as there are many competing factors. Mines will likely be moving to a university space management model which will help with this project.

Related to bridge funding, this is funding for grad students if there is a cut or more time is needed on a project. It's a very relevant and important topic. The sub-committee interviewed department heads, and finding was that this was not a problem, and it was managed with teaching assistantships. There seems to be a gap in that faculty members indicate that this is an issue. A comment that came from the interviews was that departments could make it work by juggling resources; yet, this robs newer students of possible opportunities. The team is looking at drafting a guideline and looking at a funding pool with a management team to oversee it. There appears to be a mistrust regarding funding. A report is being drafted, with the exception of IDC.

Incentivizing collaborative research topic is to determine if Mines can get better at responding to large funding opportunities. The group agreed to use seed funding for planning grants. \$30-50k would be set aside to prepare to respond to a grant in the next grant cycle from a large funder. Funds would be used for potential travel, buy out of a class, creating workshops, and other items to assist in the proposal process.

In terms of grad student stipends and fellowships, Tompkins indicated that this is a popular topic and driven heavily by the idea of trying to create independent funding. There is work on the idea to have outreach scholars working through schools, societal organizations and industry. There is concern about not having as much industry funding as the federal funding overshadows it. She suggests building better connections and collaborations.

Regarding the topic of IDC return distribution, Tompkins indicated there is zero intention of changing the funding going to the individual PIs or departments. She believes it has to be constrained so that each party is working on an even playing field. Items to consider could be a pool of funding for shared research equipment or large proposal support. Also, restrictions to consider include not having more than 18 months of backlog and unused funding. The committee has looked at numbers, not recommendations.

A comment was raised that the Research Council was suspended based on the outcome of the IDC return distribution. There is potential for some of these ideas to can come back to the Council for continued work. Tompkins agrees and feels that she would continue to maintain an advisory board. Discussion followed regarding the information flowing from the research office, management of the funds from the research office, and whether there is a need for a separate governing body. Tompkins has absolved the committee of any decisions or recommendations. Over the summer, the committee will do financial modeling to determine if any of the ideas make sense and are worth the effort to hand back to Council.

In response to the question raised about terms; Tompkins indicated that members committed to a two-year term.

The topic of faculty mentoring came up and was not addressed in this first review. Tompkins indicated that this was not included as there wasn't enough interest and people to pursue. She will put it back on the list and review all of the other initial topics. The discussion will continue in the new academic year.

- Graduate Student Bill of Rights Tzahi Cath / Roel Snieder
Unfortunately, Snieder was unable to stay for the entire meeting. The Bill of Rights and information on the Signature Graduate Student Experience was posted on Canvas for all to review. Zhou has presented this document; it's a long document, and Cath feels that the vision/mission statement is not very clear. Snieder has additional information posted on his website.

Cath feels that the Senate should be involved in the coming year.

8) **Grad Council Updates** Marcelo Simoes
Nothing to report.

9) **UnderGrad Council Updates** Gus Greivel
Nothing to report.

10) **Miscellaneous Business**
▪ Best Practices Discussion Gus Greivel
There was no discussion at this meeting.

- Topics for next Academic Year Tzahi Cath
 - Foundation and Faculty Relationship
 - Tech Fees
 - Academic MisconductCath asked for potential topics for next year.

Sullivan suggested looking at improved stipends for post docs and adjuncts as there is no consistency. Potentially could have guidelines on minimum salary, benefits, and potentially change the role to research appointment. Suggestion that there be a holistic review of post doc position.

Faculty Mentoring is another topic. There is no consistency from department to department.

Cath indicated that he met with the president regarding the protection of faculty regarding complaints from students, much like what the AAUP might handle. He indicated faculty has zero protection; Mines' lawyers represent the school and the student, not the faculty. Mines will represent faculty if the dispute is between the faculty and an outside party. Senate may want to address next year.

- Election of New FS President Tzahi Cath
One person eligible to be president is Simoes and he is willing to serve. A second Senator who has recently become eligible is not interested in serving at this time. Cath asked senators to vote yes, no, or abstain.

MOTION: To approve the appointment of Marcelo Simoes as the Faculty Senate President for the academic year 2019-2020.

Motion: passed with six yes votes, one no vote, and two abstentions. Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm. Meetings of the Faculty Senate for academic year 2018-2019 are complete.