

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
 January 14, 2020, 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)	A	Colin Terry (Student Life)
P	Cathy Timm (AA/RO)	P	Jennifer Velloff (Trefny)	A	Brock Gagna(USG)	A	Muthu Thyagarajan (GSG)
P	Sam Spiegel (Trefny)	P	Neil Dantam	P	Nicole Hurtig	P	Rami Abousleiman (GSG)
P	Mehmet Belviranli (CS)						

**Welcome**

Marcelo Simoes

**Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Rick Holz

Holz shared that all classrooms, including “owned” ones, on campus will be put into the registrar centralized system so all requests for space can be accommodated. There are some that need renovation as well which will make this initiative more important.

Holz notified deans of the goal to have FDRs returned by the 17<sup>th</sup> of the month. Then, they are due on February 3<sup>rd</sup>. All have been updating Pathway and P&T documents; these will be handed off to Senate once they are reviewed with Deans.

**Registrar Update**

Paul Myskiw

Myskiw shared a few updates. The spring class of 1236 represents a 96% retention rate; there were 1282 freshman in the fall. This number is very good. Their office will be rolling out the summer and fall schedules in the next week or two. Concern expressed about Math department is not able to get classrooms for their large classes. There is a legacy issue that people typically stay in the same rooms they’ve used regardless of the number of students. Myskiw indicated that they are looking at the pieces to make it work properly; eventually, the system will be better. Myskiw indicated that the Provost sent out a notification to all department heads stating they he’d like their support in making rooms available; as well, he wants to see all teach out the 9-4 window to use the space more efficiently. Oftentimes, this impacts athletes; yet, there are ways that this can be accommodated. Computer labs are very tight. There are some labs that aren’t in the system because they are very specifically purposed for their usage.

**Approval of Minutes – December 10, 2019**

Marcelo Simoes

The approval of minutes was deferred to next meeting.

**Committee Updates**

• **Academic Standards Committee – Grade Appeal**

Marcelo Simoes

Simoes introduced a subject that has time constraints. There are two appeals to be considered. There is an undergraduate class in Computer Science with one student preparing the documentation for an appeal. There is also a graduate class in Civil Engineering that has 17 of the 22 students appealing the grade.

Details will be officially sent to Marcelo in the next week. The Academic Standards Committee will review and bring it back to Senate. The chair, John McCray, is on sabbatical; but the committee can self-organize or an existing Senator, if interested, can step up to serve. No one volunteered.

- **Taskforce for Evaluation of Instructional Effectiveness**

This topic was deferred.

- **HLC Accreditation update and Online Courses and Programs Procedures**

Sam Spiegel, Jennifer Velloff

Velloff shared that they are wrapping up all documentation that is needed to resubmit the HLC application to be able to offer multiple online programs. Plan is to submit by Jan 28<sup>th</sup>; a panel review team will look at all the documentation, and a decision should be forthcoming in 2-3 months. The expectation is that Mines will be approved by end of April or beginning of May.

Data that has been prepared is looking very good. Retention rates on graduate course are about 93% vs. 96% for residential courses. Rates for undergraduates are similar. Space Resources has graduated 5 students and an additional 38 should be ready in Spring. Assessment data is strong; as well as the procedures which are compelling to share. This will be the cornerstone of what is being submitted. The plan is to showcase how unique Mines is and the receptivity of online has been good. Currently have about 50 courses being developed for summer. Open-ended feedback from faculty going thru design process is positive. Some concerns have been raised that online isn't as effective; the data is showing very positive results which indicates that quality is not a concern. Holz has asked departments to think about what courses to launch in 2021; they would include bottleneck, core, or introductory courses to help students. Potentially would like to get student input as well.

- **Faculty Survey – update**

Jon Leydens

As background, Leydens indicated that there are two different types of surveys. The Faculty Climate survey has been run in even-numbered years since 2014. The Perceptions of Leadership survey, since 2015, has been run in odd-numbered years. For the 2018 Faculty Climate data, the committee included comparisons to 2016. Leydens shared a powerpoint which was presented at the Faculty Forum in October and is now posted on the Senate web site. He thanked all the committee members and the participation of faculty at the Forum. Based on feedback from forum, they decided to include additional breakdowns by gender and by teaching and tenure-line faculty. The goal and purpose of today's presentation is to identify what actionable items need to be completed based on the survey. If faculty and committee members have spent time to work on this, it's important to take action.

The key difference noted is number of respondents vs. 2016. Respondents went down significantly; in 2016, the survey was mistakenly sent to all emeritus faculty and others. Comment raised that the email distribution list needs to be managed so that we have the correct list, and so we can send to certain faculty (e.g., tenure-line, teaching-line, and research-line but not adjunct). Future survey committees should address this issue. Response rate of 171 out of 350 faculty is a really good number.

There were several key areas of data presented. For Workload, the theme of paperwork/bureaucracy is a recurring issue. There were two sources of stress that are similar and came in as the top one and two issues in both surveys; they were paperwork and funding for research. Recurring theme from 2018 survey is that distribution of service across departments appears to be an issue. Question raised that this particular data and open-ended comments should be broken out by gender. There is a Women's group that is part of the Mines Community Alliances and concern expressed about women being called on for extra services. Duzgun offered to help Leydens with survey data on this item.

In the Climate and Opportunities section, some of this information indicates that responses vary by departments significantly. The questions assess Mines as well as department climate. One item in particular is fear of retaliation; this is an inhibitor to trust which has a ripple effect on communication.

Evaluations, Promotions, and Tenure was another key segment on the survey. On the annual review, there seems to be a trend that, generally females, are less satisfied with the review process and this result is largely unchanged from 2016 to 2018. In the FDR and gender bias discussions a few meetings ago, this came up as something to consider and review. Leydens shared some thoughts on implicit bias that he learned from a recent workshop he attended and it is significant; Mines needs to be aware of this.

The final section was an open-ended one seeking comments about faculty issues and any thoughts about the survey in particular. Received 40 out of 171 responses. Overall response is not highly excited and enthusiastic or negative; there was a slight decline in 2018 data. Faculty tend to resent bureaucracy. All comments were shared with department heads.

Leydens asked Senate for thoughts on what to do with the data and recommendations. Holz is interested in actionable items so that he can help to reverse trends. There were several references to Guggenheim and Holz takes this feedback seriously. Questions raised about equity of service load; this may be a department level issue. Perhaps some of the service work can be automated to alleviate some of this workload. Holz feels that it is important to know if faculty thinks there is an issue with communication or lack of transparency from department level, dean level, provost or president level. Comments from Senators is that there are concerns at all levels with service loads varying at department levels and the review process doesn't take this into account.

Comment raised about the reasonableness of workload which is flat, but it consistently comes up as too heavy and nothing has changed. Service load is one item that comes out clear across all demographics. It appears to be a statistically high number.

With the P&T data, Senators would like to see the data broken out by various teaching level. This would be interesting to see the various level of satisfaction and perhaps training can be a part of the solution.

With more respondents in the 2016 data, it doesn't appear that this difference in 2018 was taken into account when comparing numbers and it needs to be factored into the results. Additionally, the Library and Physical Education and Athletics groups are not included in each of the breakdowns and it would be helpful to see this individual information throughout the survey. This was not part of the suggestion that came out of the Forum.

Comment raised that without an assessment of the significance of the numbers it is difficult to make conclusions and develop actionable items. As well, from the narratives, several words were raised that should be pursued: transparency and fear. Perhaps a text lining could be performed to see frequently used words to get a sense of the issues; they can be both positive and negative words. Breaking down open-ended comments might represent the people that are squeaky wheels, the ones that are voicing issues and whether they represent other faculty. Concern raised that looking at comments should be done with caution; suggestion is to dig deeper into areas of concerns and collect additional data to confirm thoughts.

Contrasting all data, back to 2014, would also be helpful. Leydens indicated that additional questions can be added to the next survey to get more detail on some of the specific items.

- **Executive Cabinet Update**

Alexis Sitchler

- **Informational Items on Syllabi**

Sitchler indicated that most people should have received an email on the subject. There was some discussion about the length of the syllabi; there is a one-pager of Mines policies and resources for syllabi as well as a recommended syllabus template. The result is that some syllabi are 8 to 10 pages long which is difficult for students to read. The Provost is open to having a different way to do this and would like Senate feedback. Recommendation is that when student logs into Canvas, perhaps have a check off saying that they are aware of the policies and terms of use. The syllabi could, then, contain very specific course policies. Sitchler will draft a memo for Senate to review and approve.

- **Common Exam Scheduling**

The Provost has asked for feedback on this topic, specifically what courses need common exams. As student body gets larger and more classes are added, this becomes more onerous and concern is that this might not be the best way to serve students. It would be best for faculty to get ahead of this item and prepare some recommendations and parameters that justify a common exam. Greivel and Sower will put together a proposal. Myskiw shared that the practice is that if faculty has two or more sections and they want a common exam, the Registrar's office will create it for them. It's a fairly loose structure. For students that have multiple tests or snow days to reschedule, it becomes an issue.

- **Research Council**

Andy Herring, Yvette Kuiper

Kuiper shared a presentation on the subject. The ad-hoc committee put together a team with representatives from the three deans. She shared a list of tasks that could be managed by re-instating the Research Council as well as the coordination and communication issues that need to be addressed. In addition, comment raised that the Council should also develop revised language and membership requirements for bylaws. There was no objection from the Research Advisory Board to proceed; there are complementary functions and activities that can be managed by the Council. The list of activities is long, but can be prioritized by deadlines.

**MOTION:** To re-instate the Research Council effective January 2020, chaired by Herring. By: Kuiper; seconded by Greivel. No abstentions. Approved.

### **Council Updates**

- **Undergraduate Council Update**

No updates provided at this meeting.

- **Graduate Council Update**

#### **New Program Presentations**

1.1 INTERDISCIPLINARY (Computer Science)

Neil Dantam

[status: Provost appr'd 11/13/19; GC appr'd 01/08/20]

4 new programs: PhD, MS, MS-NT, Graduate Certificate in Robotics

Dantam shared a presentation outlining the rationale and need for the Robotics program. Question about the faculty; teaching will be done by faculty across various departments: Computer Science, Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering. Question about pre requisites and the type of student interested in these programs; students would typically come from a related department that make up the interdisciplinary nature of the program. Students with different background wanting to be admitted to the program would be handled in the admissions process like other interdisciplinary programs. As it relates to the prerequisites to get into the program, there are some very specific and general ones which will be part of the individual admissions requirements. Concern expressed that if this is handled by committee, it will be cumbersome and a challenge to continue to manage. Dantam indicated that most places don't have an undergraduate program and want to have some flexibility for incoming students.

**MOTION:** To approve the programs as submitted. By: Sullivan; seconded by Herring. No abstentions. One opposed. APPROVED.

1.2 INTERDISCIPLINARY (Advanced Manufacturing) Neal Sullivan

[status: Provost appr'v'd 11/15/19; GC appr'v'd 01/08/20]

1 new program: Graduate Certificate in Smart Manufacturing

The entire program and courses will be offered online with two new courses being created. This is part of a \$2 million NSF award that the group has secured. As well, Red Rocks students will be taking a part in the program. Various courses in the program make it an interdisciplinary one.

**MOTION:** To approve the program as submitted. By: Herring; seconded by Nickum. No abstentions. APPROVED.

1.3 GEOLOGY AND GEOLOGICAL ENGINEERING Nicole Hurtig

[status: Provost appr'v'd 12/02/19; BC appr'v'd 01/09/20]

2 new programs: Graduate Certificate in Economic Geology

Graduate Certificate in Exploration Methods

Two new certificates have been created for working professionals. The group is ready to offer certificates without creating additional courses. They have talked to many industry partners and feel there is demand. After an extensive market study, it appears that there are no competing programs. Question about how they'll be offered to working professionals; they are being developed in a block course schedule which is being tested this year as a hybrid teaching mode. Hurtig indicated that they have had meetings with the Mining Department and they do not feel there is overlap. Going forward will look at other potential certificate options.

**MOTION:** To approve the programs as submitted. By: Sullivan; seconded by Sitchler. No abstentions. APPROVED.

**Questions / Comments**

Guests

Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Next Meeting: January 28, 2020, 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.