

Colorado School of Mines – RESEARCH COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
 February 7, 2:00 – 3:00 pm, Hill Hall 300

Attendees:

Voting Members: 18 total (12 - majority needed for quorum). Quorum was present.

X	Mark Eberhart (Chair)		Joice Hu	X	James Simmons (GP)		Elizabeth Reddy (EDS)
X	Hussein Amery (HASS)	X	Yvette Kuiper (GE)		John Spear (CEE)	X	Seth Vuletich (LB)
	Mark Deinert (ME)		Annalise Maughan (CH)		Kenneth Steirer (PH)	X	Mike Wakin (EE)
X	Diego Gomez-Gauldron (CBE)	X	Erdal Ozkan (PE)		Eric Toberer (PH)	X	Zhexuan Gong (PH)
	Elizabeth Holley (MN)		Emmanuel De Moor (MME)		Steve Pankavich (AMS)		

Other Regular Attendees and Guests

	Lisa Kinzel (RTT)		Carson Snow (USG)		Barbara O’Kane (EHS)
--	-------------------	--	-------------------	--	----------------------

Special Guest(s): Scot Allen, Tim Barbari

Welcome

Mark Eberhart

Approval of Minutes – January 10, 2024

There have been suggestions for changes in the meeting minutes. Since we have a full agenda today, Mark will make those changes and will send it out to the council members to do an electronic vote.

Subcommittee updates (5 min)

Excellence in Research Awards

Seth Vuletich

We had 3 senior and 9 junior nominations. We reviewed them and met as a subcommittee. Our recommendation is:

- Senior: Timothy Strathmann (CEE)
- Junior: Gabe Walton (GGE)

There was a lot of competition for the junior awards. We came to a decision based on a balanced portfolio and decided to bring Gabe Walton and Timothy Strathmann to the Research Council for a vote.

MOTION: Motion to approve Excellence in Research Awards nominations by Erdal, seconded by Yvette. All were in favor of those present.

Research Instrumentation Awards

Mark Eberhart

Calls were posted a few weeks ago. We have received only one proposal, but I expect more will be submitted closer to the deadline.

Lecture Series

Mike Wakin for Stephen Pankavich

Planning is proceeding. We have scheduled the Research Fusion event for March 15th. The Research Lecture with Matt Siegfried is scheduled for April 1st. Both will be in Student Center Ballrooms at noon. We are working on meal planning and a polling system (such as Slido or Mentimeter) for Research Fusion and waiting for marketing materials to go out soon. We hope that you will help to spread the word and participate in these events to help make them successful. We are waiting on the indexes to purchase food and gifts.

Comment from Mark: We will get you the Faculty Senate index #.

Visitor Presentation

Research Integrity and Procedures for Addressing Research Misconduct

Scot Allen



I am here to talk to you about Mines Research Integrity and how we deal/prevent allegations that we receive due to research misconduct. I am also here to propose a partnership between RC and VRTT and discuss what that may encompass as we create/adapt policies and procedures or guidelines regarding research security and integrity. It is vital to us that we receive faculty input and feedback for this process. In the past, this process has been cumbersome, so we want to make this more available. We are currently making a proposal to remove language from the Faculty Handbook and are seeking a systematic way to receive faculty input.

There are three aspects of research integrity: Education/Training, Policy, Procedure, and Guidelines, and Federal Regulations and their impact on Mines. We created a letter (addressed from Mines) regarding research integrity, security, and safety.

Education/Training: Mines requires all students and employees involved in research to be trained in the responsible and ethical conduct of research through online training, catalog courses, upcoming workshops (authorship and data management), and mentoring (part of recent discussion is to launch and encourage mentorship). An example is asking faculty to mentor new members coming into the lab or all members. We are seeking suggestions.

Policy for Research Integrity: This policy can be found in the faculty handbook. We currently have a revision proposed (taking language out of the faculty handbook; in the future, we may come to RC for input for any future revision).

Procedures for Addressing Research Misconduct and Authorship Guidelines: We are seeking recommendations from faculty and research teams and encourage you to speak early and often to address co-authorship to avoid plagiarism and maintain research integrity.

Federal Regulations: Mines must address changing requirements from NSF and NIH for example (senior personnel must be involved in training). This is an ongoing process for faculty review of procedures for addressing research misconduct allegations and we hope to work together to anticipate future revisions and authorship guidelines.

Comment from Mark: This is an opportunity to become involved with VRTT. I would like to get two people to collaborate with Scot to identify a plan of action going forward. This would be a subcommittee created to collaborate with him to define the role of the Research Council with VRTT and discuss how the partnership would operate. Yvette Kuiper and Seth Vuletich volunteered.

Tuition Recovery on Grants and Contracts

Tim Barbari

Question from Mark: We have a specific question. Last year, there was interest in the council reviewing graduate tuition. Did input ever make it to the appropriate people and where did the results end up?

Answer from Tim: I believe the input we receive involved stipends and the cost of student grants.

Comment from Mark: We are looking for a way for the Research Council to be more involved in these discussions and changes.

We have presented to all campus councils to receive feedback on tuition recovery. This was initially motivated as the non-thesis master's programs are currently priced too high to stay competitive. This is an effort that has been ongoing for the past few years. We are looking at different models of flat tuition rates or moving to a per-credit model (we see this a lot at other institutions). We decided the per-credit model seems more effective but are looking for ways for the per-credit model to be more affordable

and equitable (programs with 15 credits per semester vs programs with 9 credits). Our goal is to have a part-time and full-time student pay the same amount per credit. However, there was a ripple effect in that thesis students and PhD students do not pay for their credits on their own but through grants. I then looked at different ways to implement a per-credit model for our non-thesis master's students. This prompted a discussion and a committee (workgroup) to form consisting of department heads, Financial Aid, Bursar, etc. One of the ideas we came up with is the 25% proposal which includes uniform tuition over the life cycle of a student. This is common in private institutions. Public institution models are similar to what we do currently do, however, the current model does not work for us because we have one of the most expensive in-state tuitions. We want to think of a mechanism that over time is a way to dial up the amount of institutional subsidy we receive and reduce burden on grants (grant relief). One of the Mines' goals is to increase revenue generation through the offering of online programs and non-thesis master's degrees. However, we cannot focus on these without overcoming the high tuition issue.

Other ideas that the committee suggested were keeping tuition the same but reduced registration with a 12-credit requirement per semester (feedback: that is too many credits – 120 credits over 6 semesters). Another idea was a per-credit model but separating thesis vs non-thesis with a 9-12 credit window (budget wants to keep it simpler with the per-credit model).

Question: PhDs eventually take research credits for which they are paying. What does that go towards? There is no return to the PI for overhead or future research.

Answer: It is hard to determine what that specifically goes towards due to cross-subsidies and I do not have a specific answer to that. It may go to TA budget or startup funding, institutional expenses or general need so it is hard to specify where revenue is specifically being allocated.

Question: For the committee, did most DHs only look out for the best interest of their department? Did you not have any research faculty involved in the committee?

Answer: The DH's we had kept a good perspective of looking broadly at the university as opposed to individual departments. The idea for the workgroup was to go to faculty once we had models/ideas proposed and then get input from faculty. The DHs also brought up issues from their research faculty to discuss and take into consideration.

Comment: As an example, it was nice to have VRTT come and ask for a partnership and have representation from Senate or RC to ensure shared governance. We would like for you to think of us in the future to create a culture of shared faculty input.

Question: What could RC do to help?

Answer: You can help by being as critical as possible when reviewing our proposal to give valuable feedback/input.

Question: Is there a chance that a member of RC can be involved when revisions are being made?

Answer: Yes. Our process right now is to provide a proposal of implementation, receive feedback, and then present. There will be a chance after we have received feedback for RC to get more involved.

Adjourn

Next meeting: March 6, 2:00-3:00 pm Hill Hall 300.