

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
February 11, 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 Stichler (GE)	P	Angie Sower (CH)
P	Neal Sullivan (ME)	P	Brandon Dugan (GP)				

**Other Regular Attendees and Guests**

A	Linda Battalora (Trustee)	P	Rick Holz (AA)	P	Paul Myskiw (RO)	A	Colin Terry (Student Life)
A	Cathy Timm (AA/RO)	A	Jennifer Velloff (Trefny)	A	Brock Gagna(USG)	A	Muthu Thyagarajan (GSG)
A	Gauen Alexander (GSG)	A	Jason Porter	P	Peter Maniloff (EB)	P	Lori Kester (EM)
P	Pete Maniloff	P	John Spear (CEE)	P	Julie Lambert (AA)	P	

**Welcome**

Marcelo Simoes

Brandon Dugan from Geophysics introduced himself; he is being considered as a replacement for the Senate position vacated by McCray who is on sabbatical.

Simoes shared a few announcements. All committees from senate and the two councils will be closing their activities around end of March and Faculty Senate would like to hear about the activities from each of the chairs. One April meeting is reserved for only presentations from Faculty Senate committees. At the other April meeting, Simoes indicated that the Senate will work on updates to the bylaws. Simoes has sent out a file with the latest version for all to bring back suggested edits. He expects to have all items compiled for discussion by the April meetings. Simoes expects to have information from Mitcham from the distinguished lecturer committee to be able to vote at the next meeting.

**Provost / Academic Affairs Update**

Rick Holz

Holz indicated that programs submitted to the Board of Trustees were approved. The Board has asked for a list of enrollments in programs; they want to know about under-enrolled programs or those that are dated so they can be considered for closure. The list will be provided to them in the April meeting. Holz shared that new programs have to be given opportunity to grow and there are no plans to cancel anything just yet.

Holz stated that the accreditation for HLC has been submitted for offering online programs. The decision should follow in May or the beginning of June. There were 12 or 13 programs approved last year with 5 more now; all were included in the HLC request.

Based on recommendations by Department Heads and Deans, the Executive team has allocated \$300,000 to Market graduate programs. Han and Hughes are working on a plan, which includes hiring a couple of people, to utilize the funds in advertising for non-thesis masters programs via the web and social media; this will include some programs from Electrical Engineering. Our non-thesis masters programs draw a significant number of people and marketing should improve the numbers.

Holz reported that the Board is very pleased with the overall direction. He indicated that Kester updated the undergraduate recruiting efforts to reflect a little over 1,200 freshman and 200 transfer students for this year. To date, approximately 250 students have made a deposit and around 5,500 are accepted. This tracks closely with last year.

Holz added there are a couple of departments working on submitting proposals that may be ready by the end of February; therefore they may be ready for review by the Undergraduate or Graduate Council in April or May. With the ability to do an amended catalog, the goal would be to get the board to approve new programs early in fall and launch the programs in January. Simoes indicated that without meeting through the summer, the Council and Faculty Senate will have some restrictions and limited capacity to accommodate this request. Holz asked for the Faculty Senate, Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council to consider how to get this accomplished, if possible, via email through the summer or within the academic year. Holz asked that consideration be given to the process and be creative in looking at approval this year to be able to get them implemented.

Simoes indicated that he wasn't able to complete the report on service yet. People are extremely busy and administration needs to look at the burden. Holz recognizes that people are busy and it was clear from the survey data that people are feeling overwhelmed, in particular women. Question raised about action that administration might be taking around the results of the survey. Holz has reviewed the data and shared with the President. Adjustments around workload and service will be a collaborative effort with Academic Affairs, all faculty, and the deans to reduce workload and stress. According to information in the faculty data report, people are feeling a lot of stress around grant writing, paper writing and bringing funding into the institution. The funding goal was met last year and is on track for the current year; this might be an area that can be alleviated. Service is one area that can likely be addressed and how the distribution of workload can be more equitable. He looks forward to receiving recommendations from the Senate on this topic.

Holz shared that the Academic Affairs Operations and Space person left the position last Friday. He is currently working in collaboration with facilities to redefine the position to hire a person that has authority to make space decisions and move some things forward.

Question raised about the timeline and decision for the Associate Provost position. Holz indicated that the search finished last week, however a couple of meetings were postponed due to snow and the person running the search has been out of the country. Holz would like all the feedback he can get. A questionnaire is being sent to faculty; all data from campus and constituents will be compiled. A decision will be announced as soon as possible.

Holz stated that interviews are in process for the Graduate Dean position. A survey will be sent and open forums will be recorded and distributed online. Regarding the Undergraduate Dean, the position was re-advertised to include some additional information on the request. The goal for all 3 positions is focused on the implementation of Mines@150 and the strategic plan.

#### **Registrar Update**

Paul Myskiw

Myskiw indicated that the Registrar's Office started the DegreeWorks implementation last week. This is a new degree audit software; they anticipate having a working product by October or November. Myskiw indicated that the transfer and operations position is currently vacant and hope to have it filled in about four to five weeks.

#### **Approval of Minutes – January 28, 2020**

Marcelo Simoes

**MOTION:** To approve minutes of January 28, 2020. By Sitchler; seconded by Bullock. No abstentions.  
**APPROVED.**

## Committee Updates

- **Leadership Nomination** – replace Senator on sabbatical

Alina Handorean

Handorean reminded the Faculty Senate that McCray is on sabbatical this semester. Nominations were received from McCray to fill the temporary vacancy until he returns in August. Brandon Dugan has been selected for official consideration and has accepted the nomination.

**MOTION:** To approve a temporary replacement for John McCray as Senator until he returns from sabbatical. By Handorean; seconded by Greivel. No abstentions. APPROVED.

**MOTION:** To approve Branden Dugan as the temporary replacement for John McCray as Senator until he returns from sabbatical. By Handorean; seconded by Greivel. No abstentions. APPROVED.

Regarding elections, Handorean stated that they usually put out a call around mid-March and conduct the elections in April. By the last meeting, all new Senators will be selected. Simoes reminded the Senators to communicate if they are retiring or if they would like to remain.

- **Research Council**

Andy Herring

Simoes introduced Herring as the new chair of the Research Council. Herring indicated that the bylaws need to be updated. The Council was inactive for one and a half years and at this point in time, need to discuss the election of members. In addition, need to discuss the awards for this year. The cohort of members previously elected are still active with some members having terms ending in 2020.

Herring met with Kaufman, who agreed that the Research Council should have some say about the information in the Handbook and the definition of positions. It was determined that these definitions must align with the law regarding equal pay for equal work coming in January 2021. Two things need to be completed in the Faculty Handbook: 1) what is legally required for compliance by the state of Colorado; and 2) definition of research professors as faculty according to the bylaws. The Research Council can revisit any changes next year; this year, there is a legal obligation to get this done.

Question regarding the number currently on the Research Council; there are 12 and an additional 12 members whose terms are up, are no longer on campus, or on leave. The Research Council agreed that 12 members should be invited to finish their terms and then invite departments or programs to nominate new members that would serve through next year, with option to continue for three years. Question regarding two sets of bylaws and whether the group would be out of accordance. Suggestion was raised to suspend the bylaws for an interim period to accommodate the reinstatement of the Research Council.

Herring stated the next Research Council meeting will be February 24<sup>th</sup> and then every two weeks.

**MOTION:** To approve reinstating the members whose terms do not expire and to invite nominations for 12 members to serve the rest of this semester and next academic year. By Herring; seconded by Kuiper. No abstentions. APPROVED.

- **Executive Council Update**

Alexis Sitchler

- **Informational Items on Syllabi**

Sitchler stated that she met with Terry for his perspective, feedback and brainstorming on the topic. She will be meeting with Spiegel, someone from Title IX, and someone from Legal Counsel to guarantee that federally mandated items are left on syllabi and items not necessary can be removed. There are no requirements for contents of a syllabus, however there are federal mandates on program information that must be given to students and the syllabus may be the best method for delivery of that information.

Myskiw mentioned that ADA compliance falls under the federal mandate requiring institutions to be forward facing with accommodations to students, which is accomplished by providing the information to every student via every syllabus. Sitchler indicated there are two categories: one pertaining to policy and federal mandates and one related to student services and practices. There is more leeway on how the student services information is delivered to the students, such as through Canvas or slide presentations on the first day of class. It is too early to determine what it might look like. Sitchler plans to put together a memo to bring all the information back to Faculty Senate, receive input, and then prepare a recommendation for implementation of a different syllabus template. She is considerate of both sides and wants a construct the faculty would adopt.

### **Grad and Undergraduate Council Updates**

- **Undergraduate Council Update**

Gus Greivel

- **Common Exam Scheduling**

Greivel is receiving feedback and recommendations from the faculty that are delivering large courses in the core. Key people missed the last meeting due to snow; there will be more discussions via email. Holz indicated that he'd be happy to meet and include the Deans if necessary.

- **Grad Council Update**

Neal Sullivan

- **Grad Program Changes**

Pete Maniloff

Sullivan addressed grad program changes, specifically pertaining to one from Economics and Business for their Mineral and Energy Economics (MEE) program that has proposed double counting credits toward a graduate degree at Mines. The program proposed a novel construct with Colorado Mesa University (Mesa) where students from Mesa can attend Mines for graduate school and double count two classes toward their Mines degree. Grad Council approved this and would like to see this documented in a more transparent method. It would be appropriate to include language in the catalog to describe the double counting without constraining the program to certain courses that can change overtime. The Council would like to acknowledge the unique attributes of the program and enable flexibility for MEE. The proposal is still awaiting approval for the revised language that has been proposed.

At last Senate meeting, the vote was postponed. Simoes suggested that the vote in front of Senate is whether to allow this sort of program where double counting is allowed from another school. When the topic of double counting was raised a few years ago, there was concern expressed by faculty.

Question raised regarding the background and rationale for this offering: Maniloff described that Mesa is a natural partner with the MEE program and the big picture motivation is to increase the master's non-thesis enrollments. Question regarding whether an existing relationship with Mesa and Mines has been harnessed; currently it is minimal but expect it to grow.

Maniloff clarified that the proposal is to double count 6 credits. The original proposal was for 9 credits and the MOU was re-negotiated for 6. There will also be potential to transfer up to 6 credit hours which coincides with the existing articulation agreement. Mesa is starting a program in this area and will have graduate classes in the future. Question regarding the guarantee of quality of the courses; Maniloff indicated they are requiring a higher grade point of at least a B instead of a B- or C+ and a recommendation from the Mesa Program Director is required for acceptance. It was noted that, in the past, Mesa does not assign a B+ or B-, only a straight B grade. Maniloff will check on this. For admissions, it would be considered a presumptive approval of the double-counted courses.

Concern expressed that Mines is setting a precedent where we are allowing Mesa students to double count and potentially permitting other institutions or programs to do the same: Maniloff reiterated that it made sense for his program and was not looking to expand beyond his program at this time. Holz indicated that the courses that are double counted are vetted by experts in the field, much like other course that we transfer to Mines. This will provide an opportunity and a pathway for students at smaller institutions to attend Mines. Holz indicated that if it makes sense to partner, Mines can vet courses for high quality and talk with those institutions regarding how the program would align and meet the standards at Mines, plus the standards of the industry.

Sitchler added that Mines has already approved 30 credit hour programs, and double counting 6 credits of a 36 credit program brings it to a 30 credit program, which is consistent with what is standard on campus. Students in this program will still take 30 credits of work at Mines. She indicated that a written pathway offered to first generation students, such as herself when she attended Mesa, would have made a world of difference. Another way to look at this is that it's essentially a 30-credit hour, non-thesis masters with specific pre-req requirements for admissions and it's an appealing way to look at the program. This is innovative and helps meet the goals of the school. This should not viewed as a threat.

Sullivan offered that the Senators could evaluate the merits on a case-by-case basis and return those that do not meet the Mines standards. Sullivan said he would take this feedback to the Graduate Council.

- **Zero-Credit Courses**

Neal Sullivan

Sullivan indicated that, historically, Electrical Engineering proposed changes to the graduate program to create a zero-credit seminar course. Students are required to attend, which leads to changes in their programs – masters non-thesis, masters thesis, and doctorate. Students are required to take zero-credit courses to get their degree. This was approved by Grad Council and is now here with the Senate.

Simoes drew attention to the memo emailed by Sitchler earlier today. Sitchler attempted to get an organized structure on paper regarding the conversations; this document is accessible to all of the Senators and she encouraged all to provide edits and comments. She outlined three paths forward.

The first path would be considered the status quo, where we review items that come to Senate individually and determine to approve or not approve. Item to consider in this area is that maybe the use has expanded on campus to a point where zero-credit courses are being used too often. Faculty and students are doing work that is not being counted in metrics. Potentially, zero-credit hours are used to track participation in recitation, which are required and somehow incorporated into the grade in the class. Another consideration is the flexibility that comes with using zero-credit courses, including diligence from Undergrad Council, Grad Council and Faculty Senate to agree with their use. Using zero-credit hour courses, the registrar has a method of tracking requirements for graduation, which is more efficient than coding at the department level.

The second option would be to develop a policy with input from stakeholders. There are lots of things to consider in the second option and require a lengthy discussion. The problem with any policy is that policy does not consider all future events and policy is sometimes ignored in practice.

The last option would be to ban zero-credit hours for any purpose. Again, this requires conversation with stakeholders. This would still require a work around to track degree requirements. It could create an administrative burden and lead to less of a student experience due to lack of incentivizing them.

Question raised about the number of zero-credit courses that exist. Sullivan found more than 4,000 courses; Myskiw filtered out those that should not be included, such as OPT, CPT and international, bringing the current number down to approximately 100 zero-credit courses over the last 3-4 years. Recitation is not tied to a particular class. Some of the zero-credit hours do not include academic work, therefore Myskiw feels that this would not merit applying credit to the course.

Simoes stated four concerns regarding zero-credit hours: 1) the faculty is not accounted for the work of teaching and grading the course, the faculty is essentially working for free; 2) students do not care about zero-credit hours classes because the grade does not calculate into their GPA; 3) departments do not receive resources because the zero-credit hours class is not counted toward their student credit hours; and 4) the school does not charge a tuition.

Sullivan, from Mechanical Engineering, indicated that he has 3 classes that are zero-credit hours each semester and they are growing research culture in the department. Students are presenting and it is dynamic. Faculty are acknowledged for their work through the FDR. In reviewing the memo, there is a positive left out, specifically protection of the student. One of the unintended consequences is that the student pays the bill; for those above 9 credits it does not make a difference. For part-time students, the cost for another ½ credit is \$500 per semester and this is what is charged to the student for zero-credit hours. Sullivan stated that each department handles the zero-credit hours differently, primarily to get students to attend seminars. Comment raised about the value and academic and structural barriers to counting the course; there doesn't seem to be a better way to manage this. It hasn't been an issue that has been a significant problem to address. Sullivan has a real concern about the cost to the student. There is much work to develop the process to develop fractional credits in the system and doesn't seem to be a worthwhile effort.

A robust discussion pursued regarding a potential conflict of interest between advocating and voting on this issue. In addition, abolishing the entire zero-credit issue would not be recommended as it would create challenges for many departments. Holz pointed out that there is no one working for free at the University and each department makes decisions around how they utilize resources.

The zero-credit hour discussion and related voting was tabled to the next meeting.

### **Briefings and Updates**

- **Vote on Memo for Library**

Lisa Nickum

Concern expressed that the context in which the memo was written is not clear; this would include the larger outcome and broader social and political context surrounding the position status of librarians. A rationale and background statement would be helpful.

Nickum indicated she will make changes or adjustments to the memo to detail and clarify the context. She indicated that the academic status of librarians has been a question for decades, which was settled more than twenty years ago, but keeps coming up. She is concerned that the library will definitely lose some of the librarian talent if this is eliminated. The Senators were asked to improve the memo outside of the meeting and an email vote would be pursued for the approval of the memo.

- **Design Review Committee**

John Spear

Spear introduced himself as a faculty in Civil and Environmental Engineering and a prior president of the Faculty Senate in 2012 and 2013. Spear currently serves as a faculty member on the Design Review Committee, which was created to discuss buildings on the campus.

Spear provided details on the proposed subsurface frontiers building behind the USGS building. It will be a five story building and 50% larger than Coors Tech, costing \$140M. One floor will be a garden level. Mechanics are going to be on the roof, which is not designed as a people level. Most of the space is designated for USGS not Mines. The building will model the uplift of the Front Range reflecting the geology of our area with terracotta outside and a slot canyon, 90-foot tall, glass atrium in the middle. Labs will be on the west side of the building and offices on the right. Main concerns pertain to cost overruns and what actually gets built. A parking garage will also be built at the corner of 18<sup>th</sup> and Washington to support this building. This will be as big as Mines parking garage and will break ground in May. It will have L shape wrap for additional space and the garage behind it. The face to Golden will look like a building with the garage behind it. Question regarding the Golden facing side and the neighbors; Spear indicated the tallest part of the building will be next to the Golden neighbors.

Question raised about useable classroom space for Mines; Spear indicated that classroom space is unclear but it will have Mines' lab space. Four areas are not occupied and can be a skeleton space for later purposes. Question was raised about designating a part of the building as a community-type space for the graduate students. Spear will take this comment to the committee. Question was posed about the main floor having a cafeteria available to everyone and 70 to 90 graduate work spaces. Spear confirmed that these are the current thoughts. Spear concluded that the committee focuses on one building per meeting, this building was discussed on November 4<sup>th</sup> and the garage will be discussed in April. Spear will report back after that meeting.

**Long Term CEFF and Mines Cooperation**

John Spear

Spear reported that the Colorado Environmental Film Festival happens the 3<sup>rd</sup> weekend of February in the Colorado Mountaineering Center on 10<sup>th</sup> and Washington. Spear indicated that CEFF would like to move to Mines in 2021 for their 15<sup>th</sup> year of operation. CEFF is looking for a permanent partnership with Mines. Spear started the film festival fourteen years ago with a group of people, including a 501(c)3 non-profit in Golden almost 20 years ago that brought music and movies to the park in the summer. That non-profit was turned over to CEFF which is now a NPO and currently receives funding from SCFD in Denver. Spear asked the Senators if the School of Mines could use and benefit from a partnership with CEFF, in classes, for seminars, and to work with students, faculty, staff and the community. Spear would like to have each Senator take this back to their departments and let him know. The website, [ceff.net](http://ceff.net), is worth checking out.

Question raised about whether CEFF would be open to recommendations from the campus and for information to go both ways in a potential partnership; Spear felt that this would be agreeable.

**Questions / Comments**

Guests

There were no questions or comments from guests.

Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Next Meeting: February 25, 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.