

Colorado School of Mines – FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
 January 23, 2024, 2:00 – 4:00 pm, in Zoom

Attendees:

Voting Members: 15 total (10 needed for quorum). Quorum was present.

P	Brandon Dugan (Chair)	P	Vaughan Griffiths (CEE)	P	Jamal Rostami (MN)	P	Cortney Holles (HASS)
P	Deb Carney (AMS)	P	Soutir Bandyopadhyay (AMS)	P	Ventzi Karaivanov (ME)		Lawrence Wiencke (PH)
P	Mansur Ermila (PE)	P	Pat Kohl (PH)	P	Sid Saleh (EDS)	P	Ning Wu (CBE)
	Mark Eberhart (CH)	P	Shubham Vyas (CH)	P	Cristian Ciobanu (ME)		

Other Regular Attendees and Guests

	Dinesh Mehta (Trustee)	P	Rick Holz (AA)	P	Paul Myskiw (RO)	P	Colin Terry (Student Life)
P	Sam Spiegel (Online)		Tim Barbari (OGS)		Lori Kester (EM)	P	Kristeen Serracino (AA)
	Mark Bowen (USG)		Deb Jordan (Trefny)		Andy Herring (AA)	P	Nicole Becwar (LB)
P	Lauren Guido (GSG)	P	Jon Johnson (Online)		Nichole Bigley (AA)	P	Karla Perez-Velez (CASA)

Special Guest(s): Vibhuti Dave, Jen Gagne, Eric Toberer, Christine Horner, Craig Hess, Sid Saleh,

Welcome

Brandon Dugan

Welcome, everyone! We are already in week three of the semester. I hope everyone is doing well and is recovered from the course disruption last week. Coming up, we have a busy few weeks with events. Exams are starting. The Faculty Handbook Open Forum will be held February 7th at 11:00 am. Founders Day celebrations to kick off Mines@150 are coming February 8th and 9th. Mines Giving Day will be on the 8th, and then a handful of activities in Labriola are being planned for the 9th. Please encourage everyone to make their schedules available for these events. I will send a note out to all Senators to coordinate tours of the Beck Center and Labriola for us to attend. It will possibly be on a Tuesday when we do not have a meeting so people can attend and explore those opportunities.

Approval of prior meeting minutes

Brandon Dugan

MOTION: Motion to approve previous meeting minutes was made by Jamal and seconded by Shubham. The motion to approve the previous minutes was passed with zero opposition and zero abstentions.

Academic Affairs

Rick Holz

We have several searches underway. We have had interviews and made a few offers in both Electrical and Chemistry. There are also department head searches that are ongoing, so there is a lot happening on campus this spring. The ribbon cutting ceremony for the Labriola Innovation Hub will occur at noon on February 9th. The event will start at 10:30 am with remarks from President Johnson and Brian Winkelbauer. We are celebrating on the opening of the building on that day because that is the day is when we received our charter to open the School of Mines.

Additionally, Electrical Engineering is working on an online master's degree with three stackable certificates. They have done a lot of work on this. They are ready to start submitting courses in CIM and present the approval request to Graduate Council. The deadlines have passed because they were earlier this year, but this is a top priority for the university to launch in the Fall. I will request the Graduate Council to consider this even though it is a few weeks late.

Question: Will this be a graduate council item? The Grad Council agendas are full so we are having weekly meetings, so it will imperative that the CIM submission be submitted as soon as possible. We can add Peter to the agenda to present.

Answer: Yes, for the fall. Hopefully, people will see the valuableness of this program. We have found it to be very well thought out. They are currently building the courses. It is just a matter of having graduate council review and vote and send to Senate. Hopefully, we can have it to BOT to begin in the fall. The next BOT meeting will be in April and May.

Comment: We will invite Peter to the next Senate meeting to accelerate the Senate voting process.

Question: Is the program online or on campus or hybrid?

Answer: This will be a fully online program. They have it on campus as a non-thesis master's, but this program will be different. We have been discussing with current programs that we need to differentiate our online from our in-person programs. We need to start looking at the demographic of 25–33-year-old working adults who cannot come on campus. Much of our non-thesis master's programs are on campus and are enrolled by our own students doing 4+1 programs. That is great, but we are missing a whole group of potential students who are trying to get ahead in their careers by receiving a master's degree. That has been working in the mechanical engineering program in the new online program that launched this fall. 24 students, or 75% are adult professionals. We would like to continue this with other online programs and not necessarily duplicate what we do in-person and shift our own students over to online. We would like to bring in a new group of learners.

Question: Will they start all three certificates at the same time?

Answer: Yes. There may be people who would like to take one certificate or all three stackable certificates together plus one other course which would get them to 30 credits for a master's degree. Each certificate is 9-credit hours.

Registrar's Office

Paul Myskiw

Every year at this time, we hit questions about the timing and production of when things are due. This is a question for the Senate to consider looking at models from other institutions who have a faculty committee for curriculum items. It seems like a lengthy process for us to take 8 weeks for a course to make its way through graduate/undergraduate council if there's no contention, and then another two meetings for Senate. Especially when we hit the spring semester, it gives very little time to make the final submission so that we can get things over to the publisher of the catalog. More importantly, it affects how we can articulate course changes into our student information system and degree audit. Last year, with the substantial core changes, it took us all the way through August to get all changes into every major in the degree audits, so there is a lot that is tied into what is ultimately approved such as registration and enforcing curriculum.

Question: We changed the deadline for add/drop. Did that create any complications or was that appreciated by the students since we had a snow day closure?

Answer: Yes. We extended the deadline by one day since campus was closed one day and students were having issues making that adjustment. We were also in desperate need of departments adding additional seats, which several came through for us. We had about 50 undergraduate students who were under 12 hours. We did allow the students to add a section through that Friday to get them full-time.

Undergraduate Council Updates

Ventzi Karaivanov

We had a meeting on January 10th. During this meeting, we voted on four course changes in Math (MATH213, MATH225, MATH310, and MATH334) which were introduced back in November. All changes were related to adding CSCI128 as a prerequisite requirement. The sticking point was the change to Calc III, but still had a majority vote to approve. We are still trying to figure out how exactly to handle the students who are on the older catalog that have not taken these courses. As of now, there are 61 students on campus that this situation applies to from across several departments. One suggestion to address this is to delay this implementation by one year, and AMS is open to that. Another suggestion is to allow those students to take a modified version of the course that does not require computer science knowledge.

Question: Could we possibly have a section of the existing course that does not require CSCI128?

Answer: That is a possible option.

Question: With the added prerequisite, what would these courses, such as Calc III, look like?

Answer: My understanding is that the faculty want to introduce some assignments where coding is leveraged, and certain concepts are implemented using programming.

Question: Are the 61 students that this applies to Sophomores? If so, are they enrolled in Calc III?

Answer: These students include sophomores, juniors, and seniors that are not enrolled in Calc III. We have found that there are quite a few upperclassmen who put off Calc III, if it is not a prerequisite for something else, as long as they can.

Comment: I will extend a discussion with Vibhuti, Colin, and the advisors to see if there is an advising piece that can help with this situation.

Comment: Calc III is always recommended on time, as planned, but students will often prioritize other courses if there is a chance to put off Calc III. It is not an issue at other schools because they have entry requirements where Calc would have to be done before a student could proceed with, for example, junior coursework. For our students, they tend to find loopholes where they can put off these courses and continue with their major-specific courses. Sometimes, that is by way of exceptions made by the department.

We also voted on one program change in the Biomedical Engineering minor which added CHGN451 to the non-engineering elective list. I would like to present this item to the Senate to vote.

MOTION: The motion to approve the MIN-BMECHE program change was motioned by Ventzi, seconded by Shubham. The motion to approve the MIN-BMECHE program change was approved with all in favor and 1 online approval vote. There were zero opposed and zero abstentions.

We had several introductions which are found in our meeting minutes, but I wanted to highlight two program changes. One was a program change in the BS in Applied Mathematics and Statistics which introduced a Data Science emphasis. Another change was in the AMS minor to simplify the program to a single minor. We also had three course changes in MATH433, MATH482, and MATH484 to reduce the number of credit hours from 4 to 3. There were also quite a few changes in the Honors program relating to Teach@Mines. They introduced a new program, Minor in Teaching in Licensure. It is a 24-credit hour program that gives six additional credit hours needed for licensure. There was also an update in the existing minor, adding Computer Science Education, Math Education, and Science Education prefixes (CSED, MAED, and SCED) so that students can take appropriate custom courses for their area of study.

We received an introduction from Colin to a new course in Public Speaking, CSM301. There was a CS course change with CSCI128, offering a synchronous online course in the summer. There was a new course in

EBGN, introducing an introductory management course and program changes to their minor in Business and Entrepreneurship and BS in Business Engineering and Management Science. There was a program change for Electrical Engineering, clarifying language for the combined program and editing the list of electives for the minor. Lastly, there were two replacement courses introduced in Civil and Environmental Engineering.

Question: What is the driver for creating multiple course codes for the Teaching in Licensure program? How many students do they have?

Answer: I do not have the number of students, but I can ask. The course code creation was done to help with advising and for transcripts to be clear on what specific classes the students took.

Comment: There is not a lot of guidance and structure regarding course codes that are viable. There have been a lot of requests this past year for new subject codes. It seems the subject code here should be education and the title of the course and course number would denote the area of study. For a long time, because of how we did funding, we attached a single subject code to a department. Recently, we have seen break offs of that such as the Carbon Capture courses. There should be some guidelines or rules in place that maybe the Senate can create that would help departments know when it is appropriate to ask for additional subject codes.

Question: On the licensure, there are six additional credits. What are they used for?

Answer: Student teaching while they are taking courses at Mines.

Graduate Council Updates

Soutir Bandyopadhyay

We had our first spring Graduate Council meeting last Wednesday. During this meeting, we voted on two policy changes – the proposal on PRG/PRU and the Repeated Course and GPA Policy for Grad Students. Both policies were approved. For our next meeting, we will vote on two new EDNS courses, INNO544 and INNO598 and a program change in Materials Science.

INNO544/INNO598

Sid Saleh

We are appending the Innov8x courses. These courses have been approved and we have offered them for some time, but we want to offer an introductory level of it at the 200-level, so we renamed the courses to Innov8x Create and Innov8x Ignite.

MSPHD-MLAS: MS & PhD in Materials Science

Eric Toberer

This change has been about a year in the making. This program has approximately 75 PhD students enrolled year to year. We have three core courses that the students take. Our qualifying exam, which is part of the candidacy process, has historically been a written exam that covers the same content as the core courses. This has been a bit weird since we are essentially re-grading the students. If a student fails the qualifying exam after getting an A or B in the core courses, we are in this rather awkward position. Furthermore, it does not let us prime the students for a strong thesis proposal.

Over the last year, we have had discussion and a town hall with about 60 people in attendance surveying how participating students and faculty feel about this. There was a strong response in favor of switching to a written proposal that looks much more like a thesis proposal with the goal of students proposing one paper's worth of research rather than the entire body of their thesis. That written document would be reviewed by a panel of three faculty members at Mines and students would do a brief oral examination of the content therein. A positive of this change would be an exam that better serves our students towards the progression of a thesis rather than double testing them on core content from the curriculum. Another change to the program involves slightly increasing the core class GPA to make sure the students, since they are only being tested on content once rather than twice, know the content of the core classes at a level

that the instructors deem acceptable.

Comment: I think this a great change to have students think about proposing research and advancing the research rather than stressing about three courses they already took and be tested again.

Comment: It would be nice to do a survey of all graduate departments to know what is occurring on campus for consistency. Maybe ask each graduate council members to provide this information.

Comment: I agree. We should request one slide that contains milestones for graduate students which would be very useful for faculty advisors as a propose a tentative plan by year for students. We have this for undergraduate students, but not graduate students.

Comment: We should check with Tim Barbari and OGS as they might have this information already.

Question: Is the qualifying exam the same for every department?

Answer: They vary based on the department so it would be good to add the criteria to the department slide.

Comment: Let us try to make the easiest data collection process, even if we must do some back-end cleaning up of the data. We can ask for the data as free-form and sort out the information ourselves.

Question: The catalog says, “admission to candidacy for full-time students pursuing a PhD should finish the following requirement within the first two calendar years from enrollment.” Have any of your students gone beyond the 2-year time frame without being admitted into candidacy and had no consequences? No one enforces this from the departmental side or Graduate Office side. At other institutions, when a student does not finish their candidacy within the defined timeline, they are put on probation and cannot register for the next semester’s course. It would be good to have a mechanism in place to enforce this and be aligned with what is written in the catalog. We could have departments include suggestions in their slide.

Comment: For the departmental slides, we should also ask for a list of course requirements to take the qualifying exam and to move to candidacy. Currently, it is not consistent within each department.

Research Council Updates

Brandon Dugan for Mark Eberhart

The REI award call has gone out. It is open through Feb 29th. We are trying to assimilate information from past years to share on the Senate webpage. The Research Council is also reviewing the Excellence in Research awards and will provide names to Senate. Walt, Mark, and Brandon are setting up a meeting about coordination of roles of Research Council and the Research Advisory Board. The Advisory Board works on bigger picture changes that are campus wide. The Research Council should be looking into our individual research portfolios, research faculty, and what makes an individual successful. We are going to codify some of that to give more clarity.

Handbook Committee Updates

Christine Horner & Craig Hess

We have been talking about expectations and what we face sometimes with faculty and staff when it comes to ethical obligations and standards. We currently have great information about academic fraud and ethical standards and obligations, but nothing that would get to a behavioral level of professionalism expectations, knowing what that looks like, and what we can ask of each other when it comes to faculty and staff on campus. Typically, this would fall under a code of conduct. Currently, we have a student code of conduct, but not one for faculty.

When we encounter a faculty member who is not being kind to people, not engaging collaboratively, missing deadlines, or not communicating professionally, we do not have anywhere to refer to say there is an expectation. We are recommending adding additional conduct expectations under 6.2.3 Workplace Standards of Conduct in the Handbook to include: being engaged with colleagues, demonstrating

punctuality and accountability with delivery of work, being responsive and diligent in completing quality work, and communicating professionally through all communication channels such as face-to-face conversations, Teams chats, emails, phone, and all meetings (in person and online). However, we are questioning whether the Handbook is the best place to express these explicit expectations and are looking to the Faculty Senate to provide feedback.

Question: What would be an alternative place to put these statements?

Answer: The alternative would be to eventually create a code of conduct, but that would take some time. We have found that we turn to the Handbook first before policy, so we thought the Handbook would be a good place to place foundational information. If we want to build on these statements and make them more explicit, we can refer to a code of conduct later.

Question: What is the enforcement mechanism if someone goes against one of these statements?

Answer: If it is a habitual issue, the department head would have an initial conversation. If that did not go well, then they might go to HR for coaching and support. There are procedures currently in the Handbook regarding performance, improvements plans, and a reprimand if things become more extreme., but to have a starting point to refer to as part of the expectation of a faculty member here at Mines would be helpful.

Comment: These four areas are covered in our Professionalism class that we offer on campus right now. We have had about 350 individuals go through the class in the past year and a half.

Question: What is the timeline to provide feedback?

Answer: This will come out in March, and it will be part of the March delivery from Faculty Handbook if we all agree this is something that would appropriately rest in the Handbook. You would then have time to provide your feedback just like we would in any Handbook cycle.

Question: Is it for faculty only or is staff included?

Answer: It will be for everyone -- academic and administrative faculty. Classified staff have a separate process, but they have a 30-40-page code of conduct that covers everything including the four topics.

Comment: An idea might be to design a brief online, 30-minute training on these topics as a refresher (or new item for new faculty) on faculty conduct and professionalism on a regular basis or in lieu of adding the wording to the Handbook. You might require this training as a refresher every other year.

Question: How do we define the wording because, for example, one person's engagement or responsiveness might vary between individuals? Because of that, the wording suggestion seems to have too much squishiness. Therefore, is the Handbook the right place to put this? The Handbook items are very procedural, and policy driven. Maybe this should be put somewhere else where these items are more explicitly stated.

Comment: I agree that the wording would have to be more firmly expressed and explicitly such as in the bylaws of each department.

Comment: We have a section in the Handbook that mentions standards, but it does not define what those standards are. We offer three examples such as nepotism and workplace violence, but we are not talking about the standards we are trying to add. A lot of time, we find faculty members saying, "it's not in the handbook, therefore, it's not a standard I have to follow." It might be better if instead of expanding the wording in the Handbook, we take out the whole section and make it part of a policy.

Question: Do the department head's really need wording like this in the handbook to deal with the people targeted by this wording?

Answer: Some more than others.

Question: Will this be presented at the next Handbook Committee meeting on February 7th? If so, it might be better to receive feedback and bring that back to the Faculty Senate at our February meeting on February 13th.

Answer: Yes, this will be on the agenda for our town hall Handbook Committee meeting.

Comment: There is some wording in the procedure manual on conduct. Would this be a place to put this instead of the Handbook? The procedure's manual is a dynamic, living document that might be easier to change if conduct rules get updated later. There are also items about conduct in the Handbook that direct you to the procedure's manual.

Comment: An idea may be to put these standards in the faculty contract renewal and include a checkbox where faculty sign, acknowledging that the standards have been read and understood?

Upcoming Items and Adjourn

Brandon Dugan

Faculty Handbook Open Forum (February 7 @ 11 AM) – They are working on sending the announcement out for that. We want to have a discussion earlier in the year to get constructive feedback and input. I encourage you to attend if you can.

Founders Day Activities (February 8 and 9) – Labriola and Beck tours, ribbon cutting ceremony and remarks, etc.

GenAI survey results (February) – Estelle is still finalizing the data.

By-laws revisions (volunteers contact Brandon) – We need some straightforward revisions and bigger-scale changes such as the role of the Research Council and meeting frequency of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

Resources, campus space, well-being (February/March) – Collection of resources, space and well-being data is being collected. We are also thinking of ideas for celebrating faculty with Mines@150, highlighting contributions and accomplishments.

Open Announcements/Feedback

In years past, Faculty Senate set up an informal coffee hour. Will we have that this year?

Comment: I will work on that. Last year, there were donuts/coffee with Faculty Senate, but it was primarily only Senators that attended. We need to figure out a better way to engage the community.

Comment: The coffee/donut with Senate last year was held on Mondays at 8:00 am which contributed to the low attendance. This may have caused low attendance because many with young kids are doing school drop-off at that time. A coffee/donut hour at 9:00 am on a different weekday may encourage more people to attend, especially students.

Comment: We need various activities to encourage getting together. I am open to ideas, but we need a variety of opportunities.

Next meeting: February 13, 2024, in the Guggenheim Boardroom. Please send agenda items faculty_senate@mines.edu 1 week prior.