

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
 October 22, 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)	P	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)	P	Colin Terry (Student Life)
P	Cathy Timm (AA/RO)	A	Jennifer Veloff (Trefny)	A	Brock Gagna(USG)	P	Muthu Thyagarajan (GSG)
P	Dinesh Mehta (CS)	P	Carol Smith (LB)	P	Sam Spiegel (Trefny)	P	Lori Kester (Admissions)

**Welcome**

Marcelo Simoes

**Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Rick Holz

Holz asked if there were questions regarding the annual review document. There are a few items from Senators, suggestions from the prior minutes, and brainstorm items related to FDR's that Timm will forward to Holz. Sullivan had an impromptu discussion with Boyd about the FDR's and provided a brief update. As it relates to scholarships that are funded vs. unfunded; this is already in place on the FDR with a spot to include all items. P&T guidelines should address the interdisciplinary research. Including post-doc and research faculty is the only item where there appears to be a gap. The new form has no relevant changes, just a different format.

Another concern was expressed about providing guidance to faculty around the weighting of the various portions of the assessment. The narrative is not part of the data summary, and oftentimes is overlooked. The narrative is not included on the cover page that recaps all activity.

**Registrar Update**

Paul Myskiw

The Registrar's office is advising and approving the graduate petitions. Currently working on residency, collecting all items in the first year and hopefully will be an automatic process for the 2<sup>nd</sup> year to be complete.

Regarding the grade change and incomplete policy; it will be brought up to Senate. The proposals are in front of undergrad and grad council for vote in next two weeks. Question raised about the grade change policy proposal; there is a concern from one faculty that has been brought to the attention of Simoes. At Undergrad Council, there will be a discussion and possibly a vote. Both the UG and GC will be voting as an advisory item to go to Senate.

On another subject, the academic standing proposal was presented and will be looking for a vote in another two weeks.

Question raised about the availability of the academic calendar; Myskiw indicated that there is one item pending regarding commencement, but the calendar will be posted with TBA notation.

**Approval of Minutes – October 8, 2019**

Marcelo Simoes

**MOTION:** To approve minutes of October 8, 2019 with correction under brainstorming section regarding first generation students. It should read "first generation and minority students". By Handorean; seconded by Bullock. No abstentions. APPROVED.

## **Briefings and Updates**

- **Student Evaluations**

Alina Handorean and  
Sam Spiegel

Handorean shared that there is language they would like to include in the student evaluation instructions. There were instances in the past where students wrote some inappropriate comments in open responses section; previously there was no way to identify the person. Legal has created some language to encourage constructive feedback and also stating that if there is any violent content, there would be the ability to identify the person completing the evaluation.

Some concerns expressed about students trusting the process; Spiegel indicated that they struggled with this new procedure. Students will know that if their comments were deemed highly inappropriate it will be revealed. Terry added that this is already included in the code of conduct. The instance appears to be low, probably a handful, and it is usually brought up by the faculty. If there are questions about a threat or inappropriate comment, the care team or department head would have to decide if action is warranted. Usually a faculty member or department head would escalate a concern; practice is that department administrators see information prior to all faculty and can be reviewed and escalated as necessary. Spiegel indicated that they considered setting up screening for a glossary of terms; it would be a challenge to identify a bias or threat. Spiegel will offer up suggested language.

- **Brainstorm Session – cont'd**

Neal Sullivan

Pressing Concerns for Campus Moving Towards Mines@150

The original document created in the last several meetings was updated to identify projects that are already underway. A few items were discussed and determined that people need to priority rank the items for consideration and effort. Timm will work with Sullivan on a survey for Senators to rank them for continuing discussion and actions in the next meeting.

## **Other Committee Updates**

- **Campus Surveys**

Jon Leydens

Leydens asked all to hold the date for a faculty forum on Oct 30<sup>th</sup>, 4-5 pm in Marquez 226. The survey committee will present comparative 2016-18 data. Additionally, the committee is looking at externally validated entities to compare results in aspirational and peer schools. He asked if Senators have resources for good surveys from prior history to pass them along to the committee.

- **Calendar Committee**

Angie Sower

Another meeting will be held in November.

- **Library Committee**

Sebnem Duzgun and  
Carol Smith

Duzgun shared that they had their first meeting. Some interesting feedback from student representatives indicated that the library is used as study space and changing this perception will take some time. There are eight members on the committee representing faculty and students; sense is that Senate support is essential to ensure that the time spent is not a waste.

Comment raised that the same issue has been raised, the request for funding, and perhaps there are other items that should be considered. The sense is that Library's role is essential to achieve Mines@150 goals and strategies for implementing the required improvements determined by the previous work of the library committee needs to be developed. As it relates to being viewed as just a study space, it appears that other spaces have been squeezed out and needs to be addressed. Accessibility is another issue. An idea shared that the library could be reframed and perhaps considered

a technology hub which might resonate at Mines. Smith indicates that they have been reframing the library; maybe not the physical space, but the content and programs they offer based on a strategic plan. Several years of work have been underway; renovation in year 1 was declined, year 2 was focused on beginning fundraising efforts, and now the committee is starting up year 3.

- **Mines Online Policy**

Robin Bullock and  
Sam Spiegel

Bullock shared a document that outlined the areas of greatest discussion on the subject.

With respect to the workload associated with development of a course, there is an acknowledgement of hours required. Direction is that this is performed on a department by department basis. In the area of intellectual property; faculty retains the rights to the material which is the same as other curriculum. There is still an outstanding question about how someone's likeness can be utilized or not. Additional language is pending on this particular piece of IP.

Question raised about other institutions potentially taking materials. This is the same as a face-to-face environment; all materials created can be taken by faculty or a student. For online, items are in Canvas, and someone would need to have access to obtain the documents. New language has been approved by legal and Spiegel will send it out to all. Accreditation will not allow Mines to hire lower-level people to teach these courses; they must have the same qualified faculty teaching them.

Support being provided to departments for development was brought up as a concern. This is a significant time commitment; some departments don't allow for the time and expense. Holz shared that he doesn't expect faculty to do this additional work without compensation; there would be resources from Academic Affairs. This can be written into the policy and would provide consistency for all on campus. The workload should be the same for a new face-to-face or online course. Potentially, a course release might include language around minimum number of offerings of the course. In addition, departments should be looking at their resources; if there is money sitting in departmental accounts, it should be utilized. Comment from one department is that there is an unknown about what budgets will be in future years and there are other commitments for recruitment and students. There is a disconnect on when budgets and rollovers are distributed which could be alleviated; this primarily affects foundation accounts. Budgeting process is late in the year based on when funds are received from the state; Holz agreed that this could be done sooner and is in discussion with Finance.

Comment raised about the workload section. Perhaps there should be a separate section related to compensation. Compensation for the course is a concern for adjuncts as they don't receive income for this work unless the department pays for it. Holz indicated that this funding should be for full-time faculty. There is also a related item noted in the training section that would need to be updated.

Question about where this policy will reside. It will not be in the faculty handbook; rather the handbook would refer people to this policy document. Goal is to have similar content for building a course whether it's a face-to-face or online one; the policy update will be used for the accreditation review which will be reviewed and edited as necessary by the committee.

- **New Committees**

Marcelo Simoes

Ethics Across Campus (EAC) and Design Review

Request was received for a committee member to serve on Ethics Across Campus, an Academic Affairs taskforce committee. Simoes asked the EAC Chair or members to brief Senate on their work before the end of the academic year. There are EAC concerns and intersecting items related to curriculum, and Senate should be involved in those faculty and student matters.

Design Review is another committee that is requesting a member to be approved by the Senate. In the past, the Senate has done this; there is no clear procedure on handling outside committees. This used to be called Space Committee; they look at the buildings and plans for classroom space which is important to have faculty input. Question is whether it needs to be a Senator. The Senators are completely loaded with all committee and council assignments; John Spear has already agreed to serve. There should be some forum for faculty to provide input. The Senate has discussed having space for students; this is the committee where an impact could be made.

**MOTION:** To approve John Spear serving on the Design Review committee and request that he bring a report to the Senate. By Greivel; seconded by Herring. No abstentions. APPROVED.

- **Committee Membership Updates – TFPC**

Alina Handorean

The TFPC committee was previously addressed and nominations were approved; however, the Provost came back with some concerns about diversity. One of the nominees decided to step down and be replaced by a female faculty from the same department.

**MOTION:** To substitute the nomination of Scott House with Becky LaFrancois. By Handorean; seconded by Greivel. One abstention. APPROVED.

- **Research Awards**

Yvette Kuiper

Kuiper brought up the topic of managing research awards; there doesn't appear to be a documented process. The awards need to be awarded in Spring. Question raised about the research awards not included in the bylaws; it is partnership between Academic Affairs and Faculty Senate and the funding comes from Academic Affairs.

Discussion around re-establishing the Council; there are several tasks and roles that need to be addressed, including the review of nominations for awards, which related to the Research Advisory Board, but are indeed under faculty purview. There are several other items that would justify having the Council. As part of the forthcoming recommendation as to whether to reinstate the Council, the membership and rules will also be considered. The Research Council Ad-Hoc Committee will present their findings and recommendations in the beginning of Spring 2020. Another question was raised about junior awards and how they are defined. The committee can review.

**MOTION:** To ask research council ad-hoc committee to make nominations for the research awards to the Faculty Senate this academic year. By Herring; seconded by Greivel. No abstentions. APPROVED.

### **Graduate and Undergraduate Council Reports**

- **Undergrad Update**

Gus Greivel

Core curriculum committee is charged. Some confusion around HASS and H&SS and there will be a set of catalog edits to clarify the distinction between these two items. H&SS is a set of classes offered by several units.

- **Grad Update**

Neal Sullivan

### **Questions / Comments**

Guests

A lunch hour will be held in the library on October 23<sup>rd</sup> as well as an open access meeting.

Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Next Meeting: November 12, 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.