

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
 September 10, 2019, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, Hill Hall 300

**Attendees:**

**Voting Members:** 13 total (7 needed for quorum). Quorum was present

P	Marcelo Simoes (Chair)	P	Robin Bullock (EDS)	P	Sebnem Duzgun (MN)	A	Gus Greivel (AMS)
P	Alina Handorean (EDS)	P	Andy Herring (CBE)	P	Yvette Kuiper (GE)	P	Jon Leydens (HASS)
A	John McCray (CEE)	P	Lisa Nickum (LB)	P	Alexis Sitchler (GE)	P	Angie Sower (CH)
P	Neal Sullivan (ME)						

**Other Regular Attendees and Guests**

P	Linda Battalora (Trustee)	P	Rick Holz (AA)	P	Paul Myskiw (RO)	A	Colin Terry (Student Life)
P	Cathy Timm (AA/RO)	A	Jennifer Velloff (Trefny)	A	Brock Gagna(USG)	P	Muthu Thyagarajan (GSG)
P	Vibhuti Dave (CS)						

**Welcome**

Marcelo Simoes

**Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Rick Holz

At the previous meeting, Senators were asked to send questions to the Provost in advance; Holz provided written responses via email and asked if there were additional thoughts or comments. One Senator thanked Holz for calling out a negative comment that was shared; Holz appreciated the feedback and reiterated that his intent was to be polite and understanding and he would like to dispel any misunderstanding. The ultimate goal is for all to be on the same team, have a collegial interaction between faculty and administration, and most importantly, to put students first. Historically there may have been an “us versus them” attitude and this is not constructive.

As it relates to online courses, Holz would like to see a more robust online course offering in summer to enable students to take classes at Mines and reduce any bottleneck classes that might be slowing down their progress towards graduation. Intent is to look out for best interest of students. Misnomer is that school wants to offer online courses during the academic year; this is not the case; there is not a big push for massive numbers of courses. There are several being offered now to enable HLC accreditation for some programs. He reiterated that if more sections are added, more faculty will be added.

An additional question was raised: What would Holz hope to see from Faculty Senate in helping to achieve Mines@150 goals? Holz is glad that there is a subcommittee looking at the core; he believes it is the right time to take a look at this and, maybe, some of it can be reformulated. There is a need to review what we want students to know, from a general sense, upon graduating from Mines, in addition to their major. He would like to determine the foundation, or depth and breadth, of the student experience at Mines. For example, the school may want students to have some business curriculum to include finance and accounting, or have the ability to write and communicate well. Perhaps, all students should have a design course, which is not required at this time. Holz believes that the review should start with learning outcomes. The academic senate can play a major role in this effort. This will take time yet would like to get feedback and open dialogue around the core. The chair of Undergrad Council, Greivel, is spearheading this effort.

Another item to address is having all students take the same curriculum in their first year which is a Mines tradition. Some departments want to offer more department-specific courses in first year; Holz has said no to this request at this time. Before making any changes, he’d like to get additional feedback and get a recommendation from the faculty and determine if this model is working or not.

Holz asked if there are items that the Senate would like him to address that he might not be aware of. Senator suggested that perhaps ideas can be generated through a brainstorming session. Holz agreed that this would be a great idea. In addition to providing the priority items, sharing the context behind the request can provide valuable information so that planning can be coordinated as necessary. One item that the Board of Trustees is not ready to revisit at this time is the non-tenure track, faculty status for library faculty; he has discussed with Smith. Continued work through an ad-hoc committee is fine, it's just not the right time to present to the Board again.

Holz is currently working with the Deans on a new funding model for academic affairs which will include all types of metrics, including credit hours taught, number of faculty, professor of practice and non-tenure track faculty, graduate credit hours taught, and grant dollars per department, to name a few. Goal is to develop a weighting based on the strategic plan. This will be forthcoming and would like feedback. He is interested in having more transparency, clarity and incentive around budget decisions.

### **Registrar Update**

Paul Myskiw

Myskiw shared that the Spring schedule should be complete on Thursday and will send data that shows course and headcount for Fall. Regarding the Calendar committee, he indicated that there is an open position for someone from the Senate; Simoes indicated that the appointment will be discussed today.

Holz brought up an additional topic related to the common exam process. The amount of work that the Registrar's office has to perform in building schedules is debilitating. This is a subject that the Senate could explore to determine if there is a more efficient way to manage this process in the coming years. It probably worked well when the numbers weren't so large; it has become more of a challenge with our growth. The common exam model is not mandatory. Holz' experience and knowledge, based on peer schools, indicates that common exams are not a popular model. Some larger schools use weekends for this type of testing which presents a diversity and inclusion issue for students, faculty and staff in changing up schedules and finding day care, for example.

The question and analysis, if the Senate elects to explore, should be centered around how it benefits students. Putting together all the pluses and minuses would be helpful in creating some dialogue. Holz is not wedded to the process, just pointing out that there are issues that are bubbling up and perception is that students don't particularly like common exams. One Senator shared that she has moved away from a common exam citing some key benefits to a regular test schedule.

### **Approval of Minutes – August 27, 2019**

Marcelo Simoes

**MOTION:** To approve minutes of August 27, 2019 by Sitchler; seconded by Nickum. No abstentions.  
**APPROVED.**

### **Briefings and Information Items**

- **Research Council** – continued

Yvette Kuiper/Senators

Kuiper shared a document outlining a proposal to revive the Research Council from the 2018-2019 suspension which included several options for work to be accomplished. Goal is to have a smaller committee to determine the mission, vision, and goals with the possibility to bring it back in the following year. She has had discussions with other faculty and with Tompkins from the Research Advisory Board (RAB). Communication appears to be a concern and the work around research needs to be coordinated. Comment raised that Senate representation is a challenge as they have set up several sub-committees. Suggestion raised that Tompkins should be a regular attendee at Senate to improve communications. There is agreement among Senators that this is an important subject and the Research Advisory Board and the Faculty Senate Research Council can do complementary work.

The operation of the Research Council is defined in the bylaws; this proposal would be in conflict with them. Simoes indicated that he does not want to remove the Council from the bylaws, unless a campus wide survey with all Mines faculty has a majority recommendation to do so. Suggestion raised that the current committee be suspended for another year and set up an ad-hoc committee based on the proposal from Kuiper. The committee will deliver proposed changes to the bylaws to include recommendations and vision for the Research Council in March 2020.

**MOTION:** To suspend the Research Council for academic year 2019-2010. Motion by Herring; seconded by Kuiper. No abstentions. APPROVED.

**MOTION:** To have Senate approve Kuiper, Herring and McCray to work on a draft charge for ad-hoc committee to determine what Research Council will look like. Motion by Sitchler; seconded by Nickum. No abstentions. APPROVED.

#### **Committee and Council Nominations – cont'd**

Alina Handorean

- **University and Senate Committees**

Handorean shared a document outlining the various university and other committee nominations. She indicated that University committees are defined in the Faculty handbook. A vote was conducted electronically with the following results: 12 Senators voted, 11 voted yes to all, one Senator voted yes to all except abstained from the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee. The results were forwarded on September 9, 2019 to Baichi, Holz and Boyd.

Question raised about creating a new committee. A Faculty Senate committee can be proposed and can be included in the bylaws. Or, an ad-hoc one can be created as a separate initiative. For a University committee, this needs to go through the President and defined in the Handbook.

**MOTION:** To certify the electronic vote and the recommendations for the university and other committees. Motion by Handorean; seconded by Sitchler. No abstentions. APPROVED.

- **Committees Requesting a Senator to Serve**

Handorean shared the list of nominations for the Senate committees, and is included below. Comment was raised that the SSF-BAC committee isn't a Senate committee; this is true, the list represents committees that have a request for a Senator to serve. There was discussion about the amount of time required for Readmissions committee.

President of Faculty Senate: Marcelo Simoes  
Academic Standards: John McCray  
Assessment: Robin Bullock  
Budget: Alexis Sitchler  
Calendar: Angie Sower  
Executive: Alexis Sitchler, Marcelo Simoes, Alina Handorean  
Grad Council: Neal Sullivan  
Handbook: Lisa Nickum  
Faculty Oversight Committee on Sports and Athletics: Robin Bullock  
Leadership Committee: Alina Handorean  
Library: Sebnem Duzgun  
Readmissions: Yvette Kuiper  
Survey Committee: Jon Leydens  
Undergrad Council: Gus Greivel

Research Advisory Board: Sebnem Duzgun  
SSF- BAC (Subsurface Frontiers Building Advisory Committee): John McCray  
Research Council (if active next year. TBD in our first Senate meeting): Andrew Herring

Based on the discussion and decision related to the Research Council, the information originally submitted on this committee has been amended. There will be no Senator assigned to the Research Council; rather a new ad-hoc committee will be established as noted above.

**MOTION:** To approve the appointment of Senators serving in various Committees as outlined above, excluding the Research Council. Motion by Handorean; seconded by Sitchler. No Abstentions.

APPROVED.

### **Briefings and Information Items**

- **New Ad-Hoc Committee on Shared Governance – cont'd** Marcelo Simoes  
Simoes continued the discussion with a new document for all to review. In particular, he provided an article that gives a definition of shared governance in accordance to an article by the Chronicle of Higher Education, as well as a justification for the ad-hoc committee. A self-study is being proposed.

Concern shared that Senate should tread carefully with the term shared governance and how to communicate the intentions and justifications. The idea of shared governance seems to be a good idea, yet it could lead to alienating the people with whom faculty wants to work with and foster a relationship with. Simoes suggested that we invite the administration to participate; there is disagreement that this would be perceived in a positive way. The intention is not to provoke any dysfunctional relationship with administration.

Discussion about how to proceed was shared by Senators. Ideally, the Senate should decide how they want to proceed, which would include the formation, justification and motivation for such a committee and then proceed with a conversation with administration.

A question was raised about the specific nature and scope of the key shared governance issues. These issues have not been written down and it's too vague at the moment. One item that is relevant at the moment is the number of committees and the level of commitment requested of faculty; this could be a topic to address and viewed through the lens of shared governance.

Comment raised that this committee might be a committee on committees. Perhaps renaming it and confining the scope around a particular set of concerns could be explored now, with the concept of shared governance evolving. Suggestion raised that the committee could focus on an impact assessment – maybe start with something like “Assess the Impact of Committees on Campus” and part of the charge would be to determine how it affects the Mines@150 objectives. There is a sense that there are so many committees and some overlap and compete with others. There doesn't appear to be a document that outlines and maps the various committees and objectives of each of them.

There are different visions among Senators about shared governance and the primary issues to resolve. Simoes indicated that there was a very creative dialogue among Senators and asked all to send additional ideas and comments for continued discussion.

- **Library and Teaching Faculty Committee – cont'd**

Lisa Nickum

Nickum continued the discussion with a document outlining the proposal for this ad-hoc committee. Nickum is willing to serve as chair. Recommendation to change the title to an “ad-hoc committee” was raised. As well, the term “task force” should be used to avoid confusion; task force is typically charged with an outcome and recommendation. Nickum indicated that she understands the comment from Holz as it relates to a presentation to the Board of Trustees, yet will continue to explore the dialogue around the decision related to Library and non-tenure track issues, as well as other topics. Additional question raised about including the Research Faculty in the group. Nickum is in agreement.

**MOTION:** To approve the Library and Teaching Faculty Committee to include “ad-hoc” in the title of the committee, to include “research faculty”, and to change the term of appointment to one year. The committee will provide recommendations by March 2020 for potential change to bylaws. Motion by Sitchler; seconded by Nickum. No abstentions. APPROVED.

### **Grad and Undergraduate Council Reports**

- **New Program Presentations**

Marcelo Simoes

(10/22/19, 12/10/19, 01/14/20)

Simoes indicated that new programs will only be presented at these times to free up time at Senate meetings. Timelines have been shared for all Council members so they can plan accordingly.

- **Undergrad Update**

Gus Greivel

No update; Greivel was traveling.

- **Grad Update**

Neal Sullivan

Council has had two meetings to date with close to 40 people in attendance. Primarily, the discussion has centered around several courses to be made permanent. There was a healthy discussion about more important topics that Council could address, yet having to coordinate course conversations will likely take up all the time allotted for Council meetings. Suggestion raised to have sub-committees review curriculum to streamline some of the work. Additionally, perhaps the Council is operating within a model that is outdated. Simoes suggested that this could, also, be a topic discussed in a shared governance committee. Myskiw offered to perform research of peer schools to look at how they manage curriculum. At his previous school, only programs were processed through Council; courses were not subject to Council approval. He asked for a list of institutions they would like to compare.

### **Miscellaneous Business**

Marcelo Simoes

- **Distinguished Lecture, John Speer, April 1, 2020**

Simoes asked people to hold the date for this Senate event.

### **Questions / Comments**

Guests

Simoes asked guests for questions and comments; none were raised. Senator suggested that time be allocated towards a brainstorming session. It was agreed that 20 minutes would be devoted at next meeting with the suggested topic of “Pressing concerns for campus moving towards Mines@150”.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Next Meeting: September 24, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00 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.