

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
 April 14, 2020, Electronic Meeting via Email

Attendees:

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

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

During the COVID pandemic, all faculty and staff have begun working remotely. In order to conduct Senate business, an abbreviated agenda, containing items needing a vote, was distributed electronically to Senators. All Senators were asked to vote on each item as follows: Yes, No, Abstain, or Abstain/Defer to next meeting on April 28th for further discussion. The results of each item are noted below.

Senator #	Voting Item # (see detail and notes below)											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y	N*	Y	AD*	Y	Y	N*
2	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AD*
3	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y*	AD*	Y	Y	Y
5	Y*	Y	Y	Y	Y*	Y	Y*	Y*	N	Y	Y	N
6	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	AD*	Y	Y	Y	N	N
7												
8	Y*	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y	N*	N*
9	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y*	N*	N*
10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tally Votes w/out Pres	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

* Represents notes accompanying the vote indicated below.

1. Approval of Minutes – March 10, 2020.

The following corrections were noted: Sandy Woodson’s and Qin Zhu’s affiliation is HASS; also need to correct spelling of “Zhu”. In the Distinguished Lecture Committee section, need to insert name of the person that was nominated in the final draft.

Edits were provided for the Leadership Nomination Committee section. In the fifth sentence to the end of the paragraph, updates should read as follows:

Handorean indicated that there should be at least 7 tenure-track members in the Senate and currently there are 6 (there will be 6 tenure track professors continuing next year). The balance will be based on the definitions noted in the bylaws. As it relates to eligibility for the President of Senate, there were three remaining members of Senate that were eligible; two were not able to stand up for election at this time. The remaining candidate, Herring, agreed to serve as President if elected.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of March 10, 2020 with corrections noted above. Electronic majority vote in favor. One abstention. APPROVED.

2. Election of Andy Herring, Faculty Senate President for AY 2020-21.

MOTION: To approve the election of Andy Herring as Faculty Senate President for AY 2020-21. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

3. Research Council – Awards for 1 senior, 2 junior.

The Research Council's recommendation for the Senior award is Yu-Shu Wu; for the Junior award, the recommendation is to share first place between Nanette Boyle and Karin Leiderman.

Simoes indicated that he has secured additional funding from Academic Affairs for two junior awards. The budget allocated for Research Awards is typically for only two total awards yearly. If there will be three awards, as was done last year also, the recommendation for the new Senate in AY 2020-21 is to work very early in August to make sure that the budget will contemplate three awards. Another option would be to decrease the cash award from the budget to allocate more people.

Questions were raised about providing additional information on the research awards. Specifically how many people were nominated for each category, if there were dossiers available, and the selection process. The process seems like a rubber stamp vote which is fine if that is the way the committee chooses to operate. If this is the case, there shouldn't be a need for a senate vote.

Additional clarification on the awards process was provided by Kuiper. There were five nominations for the senior award and seven for junior. Research Council members were asked to rate each candidate on the following factors as high, medium or low: publications (number relative to peers), scholarship impact, publication citations, grants received, scholarship recognition/awards, and student advising. All results were compiled and an in-person, face-to-face, discussion took place at the last Research Council meeting. For the senior awards there was a clear winner, and for the junior awards, the committee ended up with a shared first place.

MOTION: To approve the Research Council recommendations for Senior Award to Yu-Shu Wu and for Junior Awards, shared first place between Nanette Boyle and Karin Leiderman. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

4. Research Council – Memo to Faculty.

Comment raised that the following paragraph might be a little confusing to people:

Based on review of past effectiveness and discussion with the Research Advisory Board and Senate, the Taskforce concluded that there is a need for a Senate Research Council that is complimentary to the VPRTT Research Advisory Board. The Taskforce's recommendation was unanimously supported by the Senate, and Research Council was reactivated in February 2020. Currently, the Research Council operates with the remaining active and new representatives.

The following edits were suggested:

Based on this review and discussions with the Research Advisory Board, Senate voted to reactive Research Council as a committee complimentary to the VPRTT Research Advisory Board. Research Council was reactivated in February 2020, operating with remaining active and new representation as defined in the Faculty Senate By-Laws.

Either way, the main point gets across.

MOTION: To approve the Research Council memo to faculty as written. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

5. Academic Misconduct Policy – from Colin Terry.

Concern expressed over section 3.1 which forces faculty to report the student. However, for minor infractions that may have been or seem to be unintentional, faculty should have freedom of discretion, including the option to not report. Such cases contrast sharply with clear, unequivocal instances of intentional plagiarism or other academic misconduct, and thus warrant a different approach. All other changes to the AMP are fine and should be approved.

Corrections were suggested to address inconsistent language with the most recent Faculty Handbook and the suggestion is that this should be consistent.

The policy as written states the following:

4.4 Student Conduct Appeals Board

The Student Conduct Appeals Board (“Board”) consists of 16 members of the campus community, including 6 students, 6 faculty, and 4 staff, plus the Dean of Students as the chair. A minimum of three Board members (including 1 student and 1 faculty member) are required for all appeal meetings.

The most recent language in the Faculty Handbook states the following:

12.6 Student Conduct Appeals Board (the language comes from the revised version of handbook). The appointed membership of the Student Conduct Appeals Board shall consist of two four academic faculty members, two administrative faculty members, two state classified personnel system members, three undergraduate students and three graduate students. Additionally, the Vice President for Student Life and Dean of Students shall serve as the chairperson of the committee (a voting, ex officio committee member).

MOTION: To approve the Academic Misconduct Policy as written. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

6. End of Course (EOC) Evaluations – from Sam Spiegel.

Comments regarding the evaluations were shared. The EOC provides students with no mechanism by which to evaluate separately the face-to-face and remote learning portions of the semester. That feedback would be tremendously valuable to faculty, but also useful for students to make that distinction. Also, a few of the current questions could be deleted.

If the EOC change goes out soon, some faculty will take that as liberty to abuse or neglect student learning needs, unfortunately, since there are no consequences for doing otherwise. Many students have told me their other faculty have greatly increased workloads and not engaged in interactive or active learning pedagogy. Such instances will only increase among some faculty if we announce the no-consequences-for-ineffective-teaching policy now.

Another Senator felt that the results should be shared with Department Heads.

MOTION: To approve the End of Course (EOC) Evaluations as written. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

7. Proposed New Bylaw for new committee – Non-Tenure-Track Committee – from Lisa Nickum

Several Senators were in favor of deferring the discussion for more time to understand the issues to be addressed by the committee. As well, there was some uncertainty as to the need given current representation and support on Senate and having enough people to serve on a new committee.

Two minor corrections were suggested. Under the Function section, should add “the” in the sentence: “Advocate for “the” advancement and professional matters for Mines teaching faculty.” And it should be noted that this is a Senate Committee.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaws to add a new committee – Non-Tenure-Track Committee. Electronic majority vote in favor. One abstention/defer for discussion. APPROVED.

8. Research Council Bylaw Update – from Andy Herring & Yvette Kuiper

Several questions and recommendations were raised; each item is noted below with comments from the committee representative.

Are the representatives from departments and programs T/TT? If not, then why the additional research faculty representation from each portfolio? If so then it should be stated that these are T/TT faculty representatives.

This has not been stated in the past (at least not in the current bylaws), but the result is that there are no research faculty on the council. Perhaps, the following would suffice: “A T/TT representative from each of the academic departments or divisions and the following programs: Materials Science, Geochemistry, Nuclear Science and Engineering, Hydrologic Science and Engineering, Underground Construction and Tunneling, and in addition a faculty member from the Library, and a Research Professor of any rank from each of the three portfolios on campus.”

The committee is also setting up portfolio-wide voting for portfolio representatives. Who is responsible for running those elections?

The Deans and Department Heads in each portfolio are responsible for this.

Suggestion to add “a simple majority” vote under quorum language.

The thought was that this wasn’t necessary.

In the last line, suggested "recommendations of the Senate" instead of "recommendations of the Research Council" since Research Council is a Senate Committee and Senate will vote on those recommendations.

Either one works; naturally if Senate disagrees with RC then no recommendation goes forward.

This is from the current bylaws and can be changed as necessary.

Two minor corrections were noted. The library is listed twice on the membership and should be noted only once. As well, she requested that the three portfolios on campus should be explained versus just including the abbreviation.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaw on the Research Council. Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

9. Bylaw change – Membership of Academic Faculty (I.B)

Several Senators proposed deferring this discussion to have more time to contemplate this change. As well, additional clarification should be provided as many administrative individuals also teach courses and should be considered.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaw on membership of Academic Faculty (I.B). Electronic majority vote in favor. Two abstentions/defer for discussion. APPROVED.

10. Bylaw Change – Number of Senators (II.B.1 and 2)

Suggestion raised that membership should include Professors of Practice, T/TT faculty, teaching faculty, library faculty, and research faculty. It was stated that the Senate has had Professors of Practice as Senators in the recent past.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaw on number of Senators (II.B.1 and 2). Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

11. Bylaw Change – Certifying Degree Candidates (I.A.3)

Several Senators felt that this was part of Faculty Senate's responsibilities and this particular task represents shared governance; perhaps the Senate could approve of the list after the Department Heads/Division Directors certify the list. The reasoning is if the faculty controls the curriculum (which they do), they should have some say in who has completed that curriculum. Simoes emphasized that this is what he suggested to the Provost yet he felt there were no concerns with having them do this task. The initial concern about Senate certifying degrees was related to a "rubber stamp" of a long list of student without any details. More information should be made available versus voting on a raw list which means nothing.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaw on certifying degree candidates (I.A.3). Electronic majority vote in favor. No abstentions. APPROVED.

12. Bylaw Change – Posting of FS Minutes (II.D.6)

For clarification, Simoes indicated that minutes would still be maintained and posted. Rather than on the website, he is proposing that they be posted on the newly created Faculty Senate Archives and Records Canvas site which is still "under construction". This was created in Canvas to have a one-stop, centralized, all organized place that a "constituent", people represented by the Senate, could easily view. Concern raised that some of the documents are open to the whole internet on a public site where there could be potential adverse publicity on some of the discussions that are captured on minutes, memos, and leadership and campus climate surveys. Therefore, a Canvas site, where a "faculty at Mines" can access is the best option. Simoes has had extensive discussion with people at ITS; in order to populate the site, it is as easy as getting the list that we are right now building for elections (fed by Banner and Cognos), send to ITS as a spreadsheet, and they simply remove the old list and insert the new list.

Several concerns were raised and there was consensus agreement that minutes should be posted on the website in the interest of transparency. All meetings are open and the resulting minutes, with the exception of executive session, should be open as well, not just posted for relevant faculty in the proposed Canvas site. In addition, concern expressed about the need for a new Canvas site as it seems like something else to manage and it not being available to all on campus.

MOTION: To approve the proposed changes to the bylaw on Posting of FS Minutes (II.D.6). Electronic majority vote was not in favor of this motion. NOT APPROVED.

Next Meeting: April 28, 2020, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, via Zoom. Please send all items for agenda to Cathy Timm (cgtimm@mines.edu) one week prior to the meeting.