

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES  
September 15, 2020, 2:00 – 3:00 pm, via Zoom

**Attendees:**

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

P	Andy Herring (Chair)	P	Robin Bullock (EDS)	P	Sebnem Duzgun (MN)	P	Linda Figueroa (CEE)
P	Alina Handorean (EDS)	P	Joseph Horan (HASS)	P	Jeff King (MME)	P	Yvette Kuiper (GE)
A	John McCray (CEE)	P	Cynthia Norrgran (CBE)	P	Alexis Sitchler (GE)	P	Neal Sullivan (ME)
P	Bettina Voelker (CH)						

**Other Regular Attendees and Guests**

A	Linda Battalora (Trustee)	P	Rick Holz (AA)	A	Amanda Field (GSG)	A	Lisa Nycum (LB)
P	Sydney Marchando (USG)	P	Carol Smith (LB)	P	Anna Seiffert (LB)	A	Julie Lambert (EM)
P	Stacie Altman (HR)	P	Steven Richmond (HR)				

**Welcome**

Andy Herring

Herring welcomed the senators and guests to the additional Faculty Senate meeting.

**Equal Pay for Equal Work**

Stacie Altman and Steven Richmond

Altman, Director of Human Resources, thanked the Senate for the opportunity to present on the Colorado Equal Pay for Equal Work Act (the Act), which was signed into law in early 2018 and is effective January 1, 2021. Altman shared presentation slides for the Compensation and Classification Study Project (the Project) that will bring Mines into compliance, outlining the MGT partnership with the project team, project objectives, work plan and timeline, and strategy and support needed for the project outcomes.

Altman introduced the project team lead, Steven Richmond, Total Rewards Consultant in Human Resources. MGT Consulting Resources has been contracted as a partner for guidance through the process. In 2017, a similar study was performed by Sibson Consulting, which did not account for the Equal Pay for Equal Work regulation and lacked foundational outcomes.

The overall objective of the Project is to ensure that Mines compensation system is accurate, equitable, and market competitive to attract and retain highly qualified employees while also ensuring compliance with the Colorado Equal Pay for Equal Work Act. The Act centers around two important aspects: pay equity and transparency obligations. Specifically, the Act makes it illegal to discriminate on basis of a protected class, such as sex or race. The Act imposes transparency to hiring, promoting and record keeping and specifically prohibits an employer from seeking wage history as a condition of employment. Additionally, employers are required to announce job openings internally and provide pay ranges. The Act further encourages companies to internally audit institutional compensation practices. The impact to the institution could range from economic damages and liquidated damages inclusive of legal fees. To fall under the safe harbor of the Act, any identified disparity in pay through the study warrants a good faith effort from Mines to close or eliminate the pay gap.

Altman presented the key differences between the studies conducted by Sibson and MGT Consulting. The current study will evaluate the existing compensation and classification within Mines, including job descriptions, policies, guidelines, compensation treatment standards, market pay, and an internal equity analysis. Potential impacts and anticipated outcomes effect the institution and employee differently.

A communication strategy has been developed to reach all employees with informational emails and hosted Q&A sessions. In the overview of the timeline, attention was called to the item, *gathering and evaluation current employee job data*, which will require the assistance and leadership of the Senators. In terms of market analysis, MGT utilizes data from 20-25 comparable institutions with additional market

research partners, to be statistically sound and defensible. For the Project to qualify under the safe harbor, the work tasks should be completed with a plan prepared for implementation by the end of 2020.

Three academic faculty considerations were identified through a communication campaign, including generalized faculty job descriptions as governed by section 4 of the Faculty Handbook; peer benchmarking to identify appropriate discipline peers; and defining a standardized level structure and strategy for research faculty positions. Discussion followed regarding faculty job descriptions.

There are two primary tasks in the Project plan requiring the assistance and support of faculty: Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) and Management Issues Paper (MIP). The JCQ will be distributed to employees to solicit their direct feedback on job tasks, level of responsibility, discretion latitude, leadership, and unique attributes. The MIP is an optional feedback tool that will be presented to all supervisors to identify hard to fill positions, positions requiring unique skill sets, and sources of competition in the labor market.

Question regarding the timing of the project: The project is a large endeavor for a short time line to fall under the safe harbor in relation to liquidating damages.

Discussion followed regarding research faculty positions and the variety of research faculty hires. In the project, the evaluation of research faculty positions should help define the levels of responsibility and scope of positions while ensuring equity across different disciplines.

Question regarding whether the project will develop a range of salary, with a standard minimum and maximum to utilize for establishing budgets, that also considers the variation and differentiation of duties required of Post Docs, T.A.s, and R.A.s: The intention of the project is to define the skill set and scope in particular positions, which are factored on the front end so that grants are proposed and structured with equitable pay. The JCQ is designed to collect content about the intricacies and unique qualities of positions to help understand the complexities of the role and benchmark the role accordingly to ensure equitable pay. After reviewing the study, executive leadership will discuss the options for addressing disparities.

Question regarding the transition period to secure funding for identified pay gaps: The safe harbor provides two years in which the institution must perform good faith efforts. After two years, the institution would conduct another equity analysis.

Question regarding the banding or guiding principles on equity and equality versus merit and performance: There are bona fide factors under the law that explain the differences in pay, such as performance and seniority. There are many factors relating to the compensation philosophy, which could be re-evaluated.

Due to limited time, further questions will be addressed during the aforementioned information sessions or can be emailed directly to Altman.

### **Library Budget**

Carol Smith

Smith thanked senators for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Faculty Senate Library Committee. Smith began the presentation relating the transdisciplinary experiences that bring elements of the Student Signature Experience together in the Library, including proactively inclusive and welcoming spaces, such as a dedicated International Corner; ongoing DI&A initiatives; cutting edge support in research and engagement through the Scholars Hub; promoting Open Education Resources (OER) and open access texts; instruction and support from library faculty, including a dedicated outreach librarian; leading collaborative workshop series for undergraduate and graduates; partnering with all centers and departments across campus to help students with balance; hosting rotating internal and external art and demonstration exhibits; hosting Concert in the Library and Mindful Mondays series; sponsoring pilots with the Center for

Entrepreneurship and Innovation to foster entrepreneurial activities; and housing the Book & Brew to provide business learning opportunities.

Transitioning to the Library budget: activities at the library are dependent on funding. The Library is an academic department that contributes to the mission and success of all other departments. Although not touched on during the introduction, collections are at the heart of a health library. Collections decisions are developed via rigorous data analysis and collaboratively through faculty and student dialogue in a variety of methods. Due to the switch to remote last spring, there was insufficient time to host the typical dialogue. Therefore, collection decisions for 2020-2021 were finalized after the start of fall semester.

The Library budget experienced a 2.5% cut to collections, around \$50,000, which translates to an 8.6% cut or \$173,000 when incorporated with the annual journal inflation and the loss of purchasing power. The strategy to address the deficit is multi-pronged. First, negotiations with vendors are occurring to eliminate or lower inflationary increases, amounting to approximately \$10,000 in savings. The Library will use donor funds to cover approximately \$123,000, leaving approximately \$40,000 to identify in collection cuts. There are \$33,000 in collections cuts identified to date. The challenge is the limits in determining the best collections decisions, considering collection renewals are periodic and often multi-year contracts.

The collections budget is \$2M, allocated primarily to electronic resources, with 3%-4% allocated to print resources. E-resource usage rates grow annually, including more than 1 million full text retrievals in 2019. On average the collections budget increases 3.55% annually while the average annual journal inflation increases 5.7%, representing a loss of purchasing power. Overall the library has a 13% cut to the operations budget, 88% of which is non-discretionary operations.

The Library continues to work through the budget strategy, including cuts in discretionary operations, and utilizing additional endowment funding. Supporting library subscriptions by drawing from endowment funds will take three or four years for those funds to replenish. The library prefers to apply donor funds to high cost, one-time permanent strategic acquisitions.

Question regarding the frequency of access of physical printed journals: Usage statistics on print materials are kept in-house. Usages varies from browsing to interlibrary loan services, as well as digitization services for remote members. Faculty requested specific journals to remain in print.

Question regarding the basis for inflation numbers: The inflation number is calculated annually prior to the budget request based on subscription portion of the budget, which is approximately 92% actual cost. Mines partners in a consortium and with CDHE to negotiate fair inflation rates and develop more open educational resources. This semester the Library has purchased textbooks to support online learning and provide critical resources to students who are unable to visit the Library.

Further discussion can be facilitated through the Library Committee and brought to Senate. The Library Committee is working hard on managing resources to develop interesting ideas around the Student Signature Experience.

**MOTION:** To adjourn the meeting by Handorean; seconded by Sitchler. No abstentions. APPROVED.

**Adjourn**

Andy Herring

Faculty Senate adjourned at 3:07 pm.

Next Meeting: September 22, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, via Zoom. Please add agenda items in the Teams Working Group more than one week prior to the meeting.