

**COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**  
**March 25, 2008 - 2:00 PM**  
**Hill Hall Room 300**

**ATTENDEES:** Dagdelen, Davis, Eberhart, Figueroa, Ganesh, Jesudason, Martins, Mooney, Petr, Vincent, Wu

**APOLOGIES:** Andersen, Mishra

**GUESTS:**

Loring Abeyta – Interim Principal Tutor and Director, McBride Honors Program  
Zach Aman – Editor-in-Chief, Oredigger, and Member, McBride Honors Program  
Dan Baker – Representative, GSA  
Tom Boyd – Dean, Graduate Studies  
Wendy Brost – President, ASCSM, and Member, McBride Honors Program  
Kevin Duffy – Treasurer, ASCSM, and Member, McBride Honors Program  
Ryan Ford – Representative, ASCSM  
Wendy Harrison – Associate Provost  
Alexandra Newman – Professor, Economics and Business

Vincent, Senate President pro tem, called the meeting to order and welcomed the guests.

**ADDITION TO AGENDA**

Mishra requested that the following item be added to this meeting's agenda:

- A.** Volk Gymnasium – [Attachment A](#)

**COMMENTS FROM GUESTS:**

- A.** Loring Abeyta, Zach Aman, Wendy Brost, and Kevin Duffy – Presented a discussion regarding new standards being adopted in the McBride Honors Program. See New Business, Section B.  
**B.** Dan Baker – Baker had no new business to report  
**C.** Tom Boyd – Boyd reported that four candidates for the provost position would be visiting the CSM campus starting in two weeks. The candidates' names and information will be released shortly. The candidates will each stay for two days and will be asked to prepare a presentation of their vision for the CSM campus to be given to all interested parties.

Boyd reported that metal diplomas will not be dispersed at graduation and that they will be sent out by mail shortly after. This also means that faculty will no longer be required to submit lowest possible grades.

Starting with the Fall 2009 commencement the doctorate degree ceremonies will be held prior to and separately from the main commencement ceremony. This will allow the doctorate ceremony to proceed at a more relaxed pace, family members will be able to be closer to the ceremony, and family members will more easily be able to meet with the faculty members. The doctorate degree data will still be published for the main ceremony.

Boyd reported that the Budget Committee has discussed increasing tuition rates roughly ten percent.

Boyd also reported that the Graduate and Research Councils have decided to increase the minimum stipend rates for teacher and research assistants by four percent per year for the next two years.

Boyd requested that faculty and students be made aware of a change in policy for submitting electronic copies of dissertations. Due to some submitted CDs being infected with viruses, an extra day is now required before submittal to have electronic media checked by AC&N to ensure no viruses are included.

Boyd reported that the Consultant group SASAKI will be back on campus on April 10-11 and that faculty will be able to interact with them if they have any questions or concerns.

- D. Ryan Ford – Ford had no new business to report.
- E. Wendy Harrison – Harrison updated the senate on faculty hires. There are currently eleven contracts out for new faculty hires in which the department head and candidate have completed negotiations. There are three more candidates still in the negotiation stage and three or four more positions in which the department heads are still waiting to meet the candidates.

Harrison also informed the senate that the Admissions Report for March 15 is out. Residential applications are up fourteen percent and non-resident applications are up nineteen percent. There have been five hundred commitments and it is expected that CSM will have a wait list for admission for the first time in its history.

Harrison reported that Leslie Olson is concerned about several students being in academic jeopardy after dropping courses they were allowed to register for despite lacking the prerequisite courses.

Harrison reported that a dry run of the new Emergency Alert System would take place on April 23.

Harrison reported that due to a decision to not fund a \$37.5M project on Auraria campus CSM would be receiving \$2M for Brown Hall renovations and \$3.5M for the demolition of the Hall of Justice.

- F. Alexandra Newman – Newman submitted the additional agenda item (Attachment A) and there was a brief discussion. See New Business, Section D.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** The Minutes from the February 26, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting were approved.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

- A. Statutory Amendment Recommendation – Vincent informed the senate that the statutory amendment recommendation should be passed with no further changes.
- B. Faculty Evaluation - Davis reported that the committee had been recreated with the only changes being Wendy Harrison replacing Arthur Sachs and Ryan Ford and Dan Baker serving as student representatives. Davis also submitted a memorandum outlining the Committee's decision and recommendation (see [Attachment B](#)). It was decided to keep the open-ended questions on the faculty evaluation forms. The committee's recommendation is to have the open-ended questions' answers copied and the hard copy stored in boxes. This was found to be preferable to electronic copies as there are more issues involved and an electronic system would take more time to implement. The motion of "It was resolved that Wendy Harrison would work with Academic Affairs, department heads, and Academic Computing and Networking to come up with a workable, low-cost sorting, photocopying, and storage mechanism for these forms, with the hope that the new evaluation forms can be in place and ready to go for the Fall 2008 semester" passed with six in favor and four abstaining.
- C. Alumni membership on BOT – Wu submitted two versions of the Proposed Amendment to Statutes Concerning Alumni Quota on CSM Board of Trustees ([Attachment C](#)) for the Senate to review. The Senate unanimously approved the decision to present the two versions to the Alumni Association for their approval.
- D. Senate Distinguished Lecture – Vincent announced that Dr. Dennis W. Readey, University Emeritus Professor will be giving this year's lecture entitled "A History of Ceramic Engineering Education: by One Who Has Participated in About Half of It" on Wednesday, March 26, 2008 in the Green Center.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. President's Reception for Faculty Senate: April 10: FYI – Vincent announced that Senators and their spouses are invited to the President's Reception for the Faculty Senate on April 10th.
- B. McBride Program – Loring Abeyta, Zach Aman, Wendy Brost, and Kevin Duffy – The three undergraduate students, Aman, Brost, and Duffy expressed their concerns about the proposed changes to the standards for student performance for the McBride Honors Program ([Attachment D, i-iii](#)). The students expressed

concerns about the program's high (57%) attrition rate, GPA not being an appropriate measure of ability in a public affairs curriculum, the fact that both cumulative and individual semester GPAs are used in reviewing students performance when just cumulative should be acceptable, the possible loss of the students' ability of being able to initiate the appeal process, the definition of 'honors' in an honors program, and the possibility of the loss of even more students under the new guidelines. Abeyta stressed that many incoming freshmen students struggle during their first semester and would like to wait to accept students into McBride after they have already been at CSM for one full semester. She also asserted that other Honors programs have similar, or even more stringent, policies on maintaining acceptable GPAs, and that their requirement of a GPA of 2.9 is based on the campus average GPA and is an acceptable standard. Abeyta also reported that the McBride's Executive Committee has been overwhelmed by students' appeals and that the new process would lower that load and allow them to concentrate on improving the program. Due to time constraints discussion on this matter will be continued at a special Faculty Senate meeting set for Tuesday, April 8th.

- C. Summer registration for graduate students – Boyd submitted a report on changes to summer registration requirements ([Attachment E](#)) for the Senate to review.
- D. Use of Old Gymnasium – Alexandra Newman submitted an agenda item ([Attachment A](#)) for the Senate's review. There have been complaints about the new restricted hours available for access and use of Volk Gymnasium and Steinhauer Fieldhouse. Discussion was limited due to time constraints and the issue will be added to the next meeting's agenda.
- E. Review of Admission Standards – Mishra submitted a report outlining the SAT, ACT, High School Rank, and Average Index for entering freshmen Fall 2007 – Fall 2005 for the Senate's review ([Attachment F](#)).

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

##### **A. Senate Committees**

1. Academic Standards & Faculty Affairs Committee – Vincent submitted the Committee's last meeting minutes for the Senate to review:

Academic Standards and Faculty Affairs Committee  
February 28, 2008

Meeting minutes recorded by Tyrone Vincent

Members Present: Sumit Agarwal, Pamela Blome, Harold Chevront, Dean Dickerhoof, Nigel Middleton, Tyrone Vincent, Ray Zhang

Apologies: Kadri Dagdelen, Fred Sarazin

Guests: Mark Eberhart, Chemistry; Lara Medley, Registrar; Bruce Goetz, Admissions; Heather Boyd, Admissions.

Item 1: Reviewed information item concerning minimum GPA from McBride program.  
The committee did not have an objection, but felt the full senate should approve the matter.

Item 2: The Chemistry Department is concerned with the large number of students that receive a D, F, or W in CHEN121. The committee reviewed information presented by Bruce Goetz concerning preparation for students who received a D, F, or W in CHEN121. Of 126 students in this category, only 9 did not have chemistry in High School. Based on this information, the Chemistry Department developed a proposal that was presented by

Mark Eberhart. After some modifications, the proposal was unanimously accepted as:

1. At least one semester of chemistry should be required of students accepted to CSM.
2. The Chemistry Department, in cooperation with Admissions, will administer a chemistry assessment test. Its purpose is to determine whether a student has a fundamental understanding of the structure of the atom, the periodic table, and the mole concept.
3. Those students failing the assessment test will take their first chemistry course in the spring trailer section of 121.

4. CHEN121 will move into the same grade program as MACS111, 112, and PHGN101, where by a C or better is required the first time these courses are taken to move on (as outlined in pages 26-27 in the undergraduate bulletin).

This proposal will be sent to the full senate for approval.

Items 3 and 4: These items were presented and will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

**B. Senate Councils**

1. Undergraduate Council – Jesudason submitted a report outlining the possible adoption of the ‘plus minus’ system to the undergraduate letter grading system:

**From the Undergraduate Council – James Jesudason**

This is what I communicated to the Undergraduate council in the March Meeting.

i) Since the aim of the new exercise is to require more accountability for Independent courses, the Senate wonders why the student is expected to invest only “approximately 25 hours per semester for each credit hour awarded.” We would like the statement to be “at least 45 hours”. Although the Undergraduate Bulletin specifies the 25-hour criterion for Independent courses, the existing rule of thumb is that students put in on average 2 hours (used to be 3) of non-class effort for every hour of course time. To make the Independent Study the equivalent of a regular course, it would seem that at least 135 hours of effort (meeting time, reading, research, etc.) would be required on the part of the student.

\*However, Lara Medley says that there is a state stipulation specifying approximately 25 hours per semester hour. UGC found it acceptable to insert “at least 25 hours” as a compromise.

**2. Grading System**

These are my comments to the UGC regarding the grading system.

The Senate supports the idea of introducing pluses (+) and minuses (-) to the letter grade system we now have in place. The reasons are:

- i) Faculty think that the current spread is too wide to accurately reflect student performance.
- ii) We would like to see consistency between the graduate and undergraduate course grading.
- iii) We don’t see any adverse consequences for the student, certainly not enough to override i) and ii)

\*The discussion was postponed to the next meeting in April to allow Tom Boyd to provide the Graduate level experience with the change.

**C. University Committees**

1. Budget Committee – Mooney submitted the Budget Committee meeting minutes:

**CSM Campus Budget Committee  
February 21, 2008  
Meeting Minutes**

Voting Members Present: K. Volpi, N. Middleton, H. Chevront, T. Parker, L. Havelick, R. Siegrist, J. Dorgan

Non-Voting Members Present: T. Boyd, W. Harrison, G. Barsch, A. Aguirre, S. Sandrock, J. Yeager

State Update

G. Barsch presented an update on SB08-85 (proposed legislation that would allocate an additional \$16M to Colorado Community Colleges and \$3M to the Colorado State University at Pueblo). At this point in time the bill has been tabled in the Senate Appropriations Committee, but there is still concern that if it passes, it will

affect our CCHE allocation. K. Volpi stated that the Governor granted an additional \$5M in funding towards higher education. There seems to be a movement that this additional allocation should go primarily to Community Colleges.

#### CCHE Update

K. Volpi informed the committee that the Colorado Commission on Higher Education approved the allocation model of 7.7% for all higher education for FY09. This would provide \$1.6M funding to CSM in the form of additional COF and Fee-For-Service. The Commission will work on a new allocation model for the following fiscal year that will try to close the NCHEMS identified funding gap between the schools and their respective peers.

#### Legislative Update

G. Barsch distributed a Denver Post article on a federal stimulus package. The federal stimulus package includes some business tax breaks. Since Colorado's income tax is based on the federal income tax, any business tax breaks on the federal side would lower the revenue that Colorado receives from the federal side. This reduction could affect the Capital Construction funding. K. Volpi stated that CSM has two projects on the Capital Construction priority funding list for FY09. Funding for the Hall of Justice is for \$7M to demolish the Hall of Justice and to renovate numerous classrooms. Part of the funding was appropriated for this fiscal year and part is anticipated to be appropriated for next fiscal year. The proposed appropriation for Brown Hall may also be funded in two parts.

#### CSM Update on FY08 Overview

G. Barsch distributed the January 31, 2008 All Funds Operating Budget vs. Actual including second quarter forecast. The forecast column displays the current unrestricted funds and shows that tuition is still coming in fairly strong. The next columns display the current year general fund, prior year balances, and auxiliaries. Those components come together for Current Unrestricted, and that is compared to the annual forecast as of last month. The columns on the far right display sponsored research, non-research grants which are primarily Financial Aid; Federal and State, and Foundation activity. Those all add up to total the current restricted. There will be some minor adjustments to the actual, but it is tracking very close to the projected amounts. Year to date transfers consisted of \$2.8M out of the General Fund (for faculty start up and indirect cost returned to centers) and transfers \$768K out of prior year budget balances. Those funds were transferred to the designated fund. G. Barsch highlighted a few items that will be brought to the Board for a change in year-end forecast. There are three Board approved areas that need an increase in the year-end forecast. Spending from prior year budget balances had some unexpected transfers and will need an additional \$200K in funding. The school's graduate non-resident tuition differential program is trying to catch up with actual activity of awards made to date, as the awards made exceeded estimates by \$420K; commensurate with the fellowship increase is an increase in graduate tuition revenue. A request to fund CERI by \$250K in the fall and \$125K in the spring is being made. There is a plan in place to recoup this expense with next year's indirect cost recoveries.

#### FY09 Overview (Update)

G. Barsch stated that the tuition request (the final step in resident tuition with twice inflation rate plus a 10% tuition increase for non-resident students) should amount to approximately \$5.5M of new tuition revenue. G. Barsch predicts that the State should provide funding of \$1.7M, giving us a total revenue base of \$7.2M. Our expense side totals approximately \$7.7M of which \$729K is non-discretionary. At this point in time there is not a lot of flexibility in the budget. Classified salary increases could be anywhere from 3.4% to 4.3% with a proposed benefit contribution increase of 100%. This funding increase would put the State over their general fund spending authority. In April there is a good possibility they will revise it downward. The 4.3% increase for classified is what is built into the budget under policy increases (faculty and classified increases). This budget only shows tuition and general fund and other revenue sources such as indirect cost recovery and investment income have not been figured into it as yet. K. Volpi stated that because this is the last year of the tuition incremental credit hour increase, a fund balance would need to be carried over to next year.

### Zero-Base Budget Process Draft

The Zero-Based Budget Process will start out with a limited group in the first year to see how time intensive and effective the process is. The Finance and Administration division will be the major focus on zero-base budgeting, although the Museum in the Academic Affairs area and Athletics in Student Life area will also participate in this first year. Hopefully limiting this process to those areas will work out any problems and help make it a worthwhile process before academic departments become involved. A draft template was distributed. This will be an all-fund review involving three steps. The first step is to ask the department to split up their budget into the functions they provide. The second step is to give a detailed description of a five percent increase in revenue and one with a five percent decrease in revenue, which should be linked to strategic goal plans. And the third step is to tell which functions are affected by the increase and the decrease. Along with this will be a very detailed list of expenditures history for each department. These three submissions will give the Executive Committee and the Campus Budget Committee a detailed view of the benefits of the increases and decreases of expenditures and which functions support the strategic plan. N. Middleton stated that it would be helpful on the academic side to review other institutional financial models to develop a consensus of what functions to use for the academic units. G. Barsch stated he would share the Michigan Tech model with anyone interested.

### Operating/Capital Process Update

The budget department will be requesting an updated academic plan from academic departments along with goals and functions for non-academic areas and any request lists they might have. A capital request over \$50K will go through a separate process review by the Executive Committee. Any capital request under \$50K will be considered an operating request.

### Other Items

There was a discussion on a cost allocation model with the academic departments, but there should be no overlap with the budget committee. The data we provide for the departments for their budget process should be the same data used for the cost allocation model and there should be a consistency between the two. N. Middleton stated that in building the academic budget last year he had a sub-committee work on this and maybe that is the way it should be done this year. J. Dorgan wanted to know what the magnitude of the cuts would be in 3-5 years down the road. G. Barsch said we have received approximately \$1M from the step increase in revenue every year, but we have also made tremendous progress on the expenditure side by eliminating a \$1M perennial deficit, and by managing the roll-forward spending, we have gone from a \$3M general fund deficit to a balanced budget last year. If we end up with a stable structural balance this year it will show that our incremental increases can be managed with our incremental decreases.

### **The next Campus Budget Committee Meeting is March 20.**

Meeting adjourned: 4:50pm

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**A.** The next Senate meeting will take place on April 8, 2008 in Hill Hall room 300 to address issues not addressed at this meeting due to time constraints.

The meeting adjourned at 3:49 pm.

## ATTACHMENT A **Agenda Item for March 25, 2008 Meeting Use of Volk Gym and Steinhauer Fieldhouse**

Volk Gymnasium and the adjoining Steinhauer Fieldhouse (subsequently referred to collectively as Volk Gym in this memo) currently contain athletic offices, a gymnasium, an athletic weight room, a 200m indoor track, racquetball courts, and a martial arts (formerly wrestling) room. Until the fall of 2007, the policy was that this facility was open to the campus community (all students, faculty, and

staff) during approximately the following hours: Monday-Friday: 6am-10pm; Saturday: 10am-2pm; Sunday: 1pm-9pm.

During the summer of 2007, the Recreational Facility was opened. This facility consists of a climbing wall, several gymnasiums, a recreational weight room, a 1/16th of a mile (approximately 100m) jogging track (note: with square corners), and various exercise rooms.

As of the opening of the Recreational Facility, Volk Gym hours were curtailed to: Monday-Friday: 6am-5pm; Saturday and Sunday: closed. Additionally, no one except NCAA athletes and students taking PA classes is allowed to use the athletic weight room.

I would like to propose a relaxation of the current policy to revert back to a policy closer to what was in place prior to the fall of 2007.

I base my proposal on the following arguments:

- Volk Gym houses several desirable athletic training assets, including a 200m indoor track and an athletic weight room. The track is twice as long as the track in the Recreational Facility and allows for interval training. The Volk Gym weight room, in contrast to that in the Recreational Facility, possesses squat racks, a vast array of dumbbells, and multiple bench press stations, among other items necessary for serious athletic training. These assets are currently vastly underutilized. While the varsity teams should be and are given priority, the track stands empty many evenings and on the weekends. The weight room has a posted schedule for its use by varsity teams and PA classes from 6am to 5pm Monday-Friday. About half of the time slots during this time frame are empty. Its use is not regularly scheduled either after 5pm on the weekdays, or on the weekends. (NCAA) athletes and non-athletes (students, faculty, and staff) could benefit from the use of the facilities in the Volk Gym during non-peak times, specifically, after 5pm on the weekdays, and on the weekends.
- While it is understandable that athletes should receive priority for facility use, curtailing and/or excluding non-NCAA athlete use of campus facilities seems to be inappropriate, especially at a public institution and where unrestricted funds are used to pay for said facilities. Furthermore, current policies appear to aim to separate NCAA athletes from the rest of the student body and from the faculty. This has a negative impact on athlete-non-athlete interaction among students, and athlete professor interaction. It would seem appropriate that the culture of athletics should be determined by the faculty and not independent of the faculty. We seem to have moved into the realm of the latter situation with recent policies that foster isolation, specifically, restricted building access, separation of NCAA athletes from others, the Recreational Facility fee structure, etc. If one loosely defines "culture of athletics" as including all aspects of physical recreation, exercise, and training, by all members of the CSM community, then the faculty (CSM Faculty Senate) have clearly lost control of the athletics and recreation side of the CSM experience to the detriment of all of the students, faculty, and staff.
- Providing additional athletic facilities and facility hours has a positive impact on the Mines community as a whole, and encourages students and staff to exercise.
- Closing the 200m track at 5pm (or, effectively, 4pm because of track team use), especially during the winter months, creates a hazardous situation for those who then are forced to run on dark, icy streets. Indeed, there is no reason to restrict use of a very fine athletic facility that was enjoyed by faculty, staff, and students (athletic and non-athletes alike) at all hours of the day prior to this academic year. Given we now have access to campus buildings via the Blaster Card, this presents an excellent mechanism to curtail Volk Gym use to the Mines community. The possible result of allowing increased access to Volk Gym would be the necessity for increased janitorial services, which could easily be covered by leveraging a fee (especially on faculty and staff) for their use of the facility depending on the extent of use, e.g., using the showers might be free whereas the weight room might require a maintenance fee.

ATTACHMENT B  
Colorado School of Mines Memorandum

To: Faculty Senate

From: Graham Davis, Chair, ad hoc Committee on Evaluation

Re: Open-ended survey questions on proposed student evaluations of faculty teaching

Date: March 20, 2008

Per the Faculty Senate's request in early 2008, an ad hoc Committee on Evaluation was formed under my chairmanship to reconsider the now dissolved Committee on Evaluation's October 12, 2006 recommendation to Senate that the University move to a new set of forms for Student Evaluations of Teaching. Those recommendations outlined the motivations for the new set of forms, suggested some changes to the administration of the forms, and reported on a pilot test of the new forms. A copy of the memo is available under Course Documents on the Committee on Evaluation Blackboard site.

One of that Committee's recommendations was that there be a set of three open-ended questions on the back of the new bubble scan forms. The Committee was informed by CSM Legal Affairs that these open ended questions would have to be retained by the University as part of each faculty member's personnel file. The Committee did not involve itself with the practical matters involved with storing these forms when it made its recommendations to Senate.

The new evaluation system has yet to be implemented by Academic Affairs due to ongoing questions as to how the open-ended questions would be retained. The Faculty Senate charged this ad hoc Committee on Evaluation with recommending a solution to Academic Affairs. The Committee was also to reevaluate the merits of the open-ended questions, with the possibility that the new student evaluations of faculty contain only bubble responses and no open-ended question.

The ad hoc Committee met on March 20, 2008. It had representatives from faculty, the undergraduate and graduate student societies, Academic Computing and Networking, the department heads, and the administration.

**(1)** Five members of the ad hoc Committee had served on the previous Committee on Evaluation.

The ad hoc Committee felt that it was vital to keep the open-ended questions as part of the new student evaluations of teaching. Their benefit in terms of improved student feedback and consequent improved faculty performance and evaluation was viewed as being far in excess of any additional administrative costs that they would incur.**(2)** After reviewing various mechanisms by which the open-ended questions could be administered and stored, the Committee came to the recommendation that the October 12, 2006 proposal stand: that the open-ended questions be printed on the backs of the new standardized bubble sheets, as in the prototype developed by David Larue in 2006, and that the open-ended questions be completed by students in class at the same time that the bubble responses are answered.

The Committee then came to the recommendation, based on experience in Mathematical and Computer Sciences with a similar open-ended survey format, that for archiving purposes the 15,000 or so response sheets expected per semester be photocopied and retained in boxes. Only the open-ended side of the sheet would be photocopied, and of these only those that have responses would be photocopied.**(3)** These photocopies would then be retained by the University in hard copy. After being reviewed by the department head the original bubble sheets would be returned to the faculty member. Academic Affairs will coordinate with department heads as to where and how the sheets would be sorted (sorting is required if it is desirable or cost-effective to remove the blank sheets from the non-blank sheets prior to photocopying), photocopied and retained. It may be that they are photocopied and boxed by the departments, with any necessary financial support from Academic Affairs. They would then be moved to storage in the new Ford Motors facility. Some department heads may on the other



hand prefer to store the boxes in their departments for at least a few years, such that they can access them easily for periodic reviews of faculty performance.

To get a feel for the volume of paper that this photocopying and storage would involve, a box of photocopy paper contains 5,000 sheets. At an 85% response rate there would be 13,000 photocopied sheets per semester, or three boxes school-wide, or, including summer evaluations, about seven boxes per year. Legal affairs advised the previous Committee that personnel files must be retained for 10 years after retirement or separation of the employee. With an average storage cycle of perhaps 20 years, the steady state number of boxes in storage on campus or the Ford site would be about 140, or roughly 14 per department.

It was resolved that Wendy Harrison would work with Academic Affairs, department heads and Academic Computing and Networking to come up with a workable, low-costing, photocopying and storage mechanism for these forms, with the hope that the new evaluation forms can be in place and ready to go for the Fall 2008 semester.

**(1)**The committee members included Graham Davis (chair, senate representative), Wendy Harrison (Associate Provost), Graeme Fairweather (MACS, department head representative), Ryan Ford (ASCSM representative), Dan Baker (GSA representative), Cigdem Gurgur (EB), Ron Miller (CE), and David Larue (AC&N).

**(2)**The original October 12, 2006 proposal by the Committee on Evaluation noted that there will be some offsetting labor and materials cost savings associated with the standardization of the forms in the new evaluation format. For example, the roughly 14,000 requested but ultimately unused survey forms annually will be recycled and reused, whereas under the current survey format they are destroyed because of their customized nature.

**(3)**In the pilot study, of 387 completed forms, 329 (85%) contained written responses to the open-ended questions.

## ATTACHMENT C

### **Proposed Amendment to Statutes Concerning Alumni Quota on CSM Board of Trustees (first version)**

The current Colorado statutes (23-41-109) on the filling of vacancies on the CSM BOT sets a quota for alumni membership:

*(2) Commencing with appointments made by the governor in 1977, and at all times thereafter, at least four and not more than five of the appointed members of the board shall be graduates of the Colorado school of mines upon each of whom a degree has been conferred by its board of trustees not less than ten years prior to his appointment.*

The faculty senate views this quota as overly restrictive and not in the best interests of the school for several reasons:

A less restrictive quota will allow access to a wider selection of highly qualified candidates without compromising on the essential qualities the original quota was meant to uphold (strong commitment to the interest of the school, an understanding of the values and strengths of CSM). Specifically, a reduction of the quota does not prevent the selection of CSM alumni if they are the best-qualified candidates.

There is a lag in the demographics of alumni fields of study or expertise, and the demographics of current CSM degrees and directions, such as engineering or biology.

The pool of eligible and interested alumni to be drawn from is fairly small, limiting the choice for qualified candidates.

With a broader membership on the BOT, actions taken would draw from a variety of viewpoints and be better informed. An area of concern, for example, has been a drop in standards associated with actions to increase enrollment.

Other Colorado universities have an alumni quota of one, presumably for similar reasons of balance and best interest of their institutions. CSM seeks to be closer to this state (and national) standard. (Prior to 1977, CSM also had an alumni quota of one.)

Accordingly, the following text is proposed as a replacement for the current statute:

*(2) Commencing with appointments made by the governor in 2009, and at all times thereafter, at least one of the appointed members of the board shall be a graduate of the Colorado school of mines upon whom a degree has been conferred by its board of trustees not less than ten years prior to his appointment.*

Note that this amendment neither specifically raises nor lowers the alumni membership on the BOT. It does remove *both* restrictions of the alumni membership being at least four and not more than five.

We believe the alumni and administration will ultimately support this change giving greater flexibility in the selection of BOT members because it will allow the selection of the best BOT composition, whether the optimal number of alumni is 1 or 9.

### **Proposed Amendment to Statutes Concerning Alumni Quota on CSM Board of Trustees (Second Version)**

The current Colorado statutes (23-41-109) on the filling of vacancies on the CSM BOT sets a quota for alumni membership:

*(2) Commencing with appointments made by the governor in 1977, and at all times thereafter, at least four and not more than five of the appointed members of the board shall be graduates of the Colorado school of mines upon each of whom a degree has been conferred by its board of trustees not less than ten years prior to his appointment.*

The faculty senate views this quota as overly restrictive and not in the best interests of the school for several reasons:

A less restrictive quota will allow access to a wider selection of highly qualified candidates without compromising on the essential qualities the original quota was meant to uphold (strong commitment to the interest of the school, an understanding of the values and strengths of CSM). Specifically, a reduction of the quota does not prevent the selection of CSM alumni if they are the best-qualified candidates.

There is a lag in the demographics of alumni fields of study or expertise, and the demographics of current CSM degrees and directions, such as engineering or biology.

The pool of eligible and interested alumni to be drawn from is fairly small, limiting the choice for qualified candidates.

With a broader membership on the BOT, actions taken would draw from a variety of viewpoints and be better informed. An area of concern, for example, has been a drop in standards associated with actions to increase enrollment.

Other Colorado universities have an alumni quota of one, presumably for similar reasons of balance and best interest of their institutions. CSM seeks to be closer to this state (and national) standard. (Prior to 1977, CSM also had an alumni quota of one.)

Accordingly, the following text is proposed as a replacement for the current statute:

*(2) Commencing with appointments made by the governor in 2009, and at all times thereafter, at least one of the appointed members of the board shall be a graduate of the Colorado school of mines upon whom a degree has been conferred by its board of trustees not less than ten years prior to his appointment. Furthermore, at least four of the appointed members of the board shall have degrees from or have degrees equivalent to those granted by the Colorado school of mines.*

Note that this amendment neither specifically raises nor lowers the alumni membership on the BOT. It does remove *both* restrictions of the alumni membership being at least four and not more than five.

We believe the alumni and administration will ultimately support this change giving greater flexibility in the selection of BOT members because it will allow the selection of the best BOT composition, whether the optimal number of alumni is 1 or 9.

**ATTACHMENT D (i)**  
**Colorado School of Mines**  
**McBride Honors Program**  
***Standards for Student Performance***

Students must perform to the highest levels of writing, reading, and discussion before and during McBride seminars. Participation in class projects and discussions is essential. Students who do not maintain an appropriate level of such participation may be asked to leave the program.

Academic integrity and honesty are expected of the students in the program. Any infractions in these areas will be handled under the rules of CSM and may result in dismissal from the program.

The program demands a high level of achievement not only in honors courses, but in all academic work attempted at CSM. To that end, a student must meet the following requirements:

- A semester and cumulative GPA of 2.9 or higher at the end of the fall semester of the freshman year in which the student has applied and passed the preliminary application requirements. Students who meet this GPA requirement at the end of their fall semester in the freshman year will be fully initiated into the Program and allowed to enroll in the freshman seminar the spring of their freshman year. Failure to meet the GPA requirement will result in the voiding of the invitation to join the McBride Honors Program.
- A minimum GPA of 3.0 in Honors coursework to remain in good academic standing. Students who drop below a 3.0 in their McBride coursework will be placed on probation for one semester. If the required minimum GPA has not been met at the end of the probationary semester, the student will be withdrawn from the program. Students who drop below a 3.0 in their McBride coursework for more than one semester will be automatically withdrawn from the program even if the second semester is not consecutive.
- A minimum cumulative and semester GPA of 2.9 in all course work at CSM at any given time. Students who drop below a semester or cumulative GPA of 2.9 will be placed on probation for one semester. If the required minimum GPA has not been met at the end of the probationary semester, the student will be withdrawn from the program. Students who drop below a semester or cumulative

GPA of 2.9 for more than one semester will be automatically withdrawn from the program even if the second semester is not consecutive.

- A minimum cumulative GPA of 2.9 and an Honors GPA of 3.0 at the time of graduation in order to receive the "Minor in the McBride Honors Program in Public Affairs." Graduating seniors who fall below these minima will receive a "Minor in Public Affairs" without the honors designation if they choose to complete the Public Affairs minor instead of transferring their credits to LAIS.
- Under extraordinary circumstances, the McBride Executive Committee may choose to invite a student who has been withdrawn from the program to submit an appeal for readmission. In such case, the student would be required to submit a statement to the McBride Executive Committee for reinstatement after s/he has met the GPA requirements of the program. This appeal must be accompanied by specific legal, medical, or other formal documentation that verifies the reason for the student's failure to meet the academic standards of the Program during their period of academic probation and verification that the semester and cumulative GPA standards have been met by the student.

Effective Fall 2008

ATTACHEMENT D (ii)  
**BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A FULLY DEVELOPED HONORS COLLEGE**  
**(Approved by the NCHC Executive Committee on June 25, 2005)**

An honors educational experience can occur in a wide variety of institutional settings. When institutions establish an honors college or embark upon a transition from an honors program to an honors college, they face a transformational moment. No one model defines this transformation. Although not all of the following characteristics are necessary to be considered a successful or fully developed honors college, the National Collegiate Honors Council recognizes these as representative:

- \* A fully developed honors college should incorporate the relevant characteristics of a fully developed honors program.
- \* A fully developed honors college should exist as an equal collegiate unit within a multi-collegiate university structure.
- \* The head of a fully developed honors college should be a dean reporting directly to the chief academic officer of the institution and serving as a full member of the Council of Deans, if one exists. The dean should be a fulltime, 12-month appointment.
- \* The operational and staff budgets of fully developed honors colleges should provide resources at least comparable to other collegiate units of equivalent size.
- \* A fully developed honors college should exercise increased coordination and control of departmental honors where the college has emerged out of such a decentralized system.
- \* A fully developed honors college should exercise considerable control over honors recruitment and admissions, including the appropriate size of the incoming class. Admission to the honors college should be by separate application.
- \* An honors college should exercise considerable control over its policies, curriculum, and selection of faculty.
- \* The curriculum of a fully developed honors college should offer significant course opportunities across all four years of study.
- \* The curriculum of the fully developed honors college should constitute at least 20% of a student's degree program. An honors thesis or project should be required.
- \* Where the home university has a significant residential component, the fully developed honors college should offer substantial honors residential opportunities.

- \* The distinction awarded by a fully developed honors college should be announced at commencement, noted on the diploma, and featured on the student's final transcript.
- \* Like other colleges within the university, a fully developed honors college should be involved in alumni affairs and development and should have an external advisory board.

#### ATTACHMENT D (iii)

### **BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A FULLY DEVELOPED HONORS PROGRAM (Approved by the NCHC Executive Committee on March 4, 1994, and amended by the NCHC Board of Directors on November 23, 2007)**

No one model of an Honors program can be superimposed on all types of institutions. However, there are characteristics which are common to successful fully developed Honors programs. Listed below are those characteristics, although not all characteristics are necessary for an Honors program to be considered a successful and/or fully developed Honors program.

- \* A fully developed Honors program should be carefully set up to accommodate the special needs and abilities of the undergraduate students it is designed to serve. This entails identifying the targeted student population by some clearly articulated set of criteria (e.g., GPA, SAT score a written essay). A program with open admission needs to spell out expectations for retention in the program and for satisfactory completion of program requirements.
- \* The program should have a clear mandate from the institutional administration ideally in the form of a mission statement clearly stating the objectives and responsibilities of the program and defining its place in both the administrative and academic structure of the institution. This mandate or mission statement should be such as to assure the permanence and stability of the program by guaranteeing an adequate budget and by avoiding any tendency to force the program to depend on temporary or spasmodic dedication of particular faculty members or administrators. In other words, the program should be fully institutionalized so as to build thereby a genuine tradition of excellence.
- \* The Honors director should report to the chief academic officer of the institution.
- \* There should be an Honors curriculum featuring special courses, seminars, colloquia, and independent study established in harmony with the mission statement and in response to the needs of the program.
- \* The program requirements themselves should include a substantial portion of the participants' undergraduate work, usually in the vicinity of 20% to 25% of their total course work and certainly no less than 15%.
- \* The program should be so formulated that it relates effectively both to all the college work for the degree (e.g., by satisfying general education requirements) and to the area of concentration, departmental specialization, preprofessional or professional training.
- \* The program should be both visible and highly reputed throughout the institution so that it is perceived as providing standards and models of excellence for students and faculty across the campus.
- \* Faculty participating in the program should be fully identified with the aims of the program. They should be carefully selected on the basis of exceptional teaching skills and the ability to provide intellectual leadership to able students.
- \* The program should occupy suitable quarters constituting an Honors center with such facilities as an Honors library, lounge, reading rooms, personal computers and other appropriate decor.
- \* The director or other administrative officer charged with administering the program should work in close collaboration with a committee or council of faculty members representing the colleges and/or departments served by the program.
- \* The program should have in place a committee of Honors students to serve as liaison with the Honors faculty committee or council who must keep them fully informed on the program and elicit their cooperation in evaluation and development. This student group should enjoy as much

autonomy as possible conducting the business of the committee in representing the needs and concerns of all Honors students to the administration, and it should also be included in governance, serving on the advisory/policy committee as well as constituting the group that governs the student association.

- \* There should be provisions for special academic counseling of Honors students by uniquely qualified faculty and/or staff personnel.
- \* The Honors program, in distinguishing itself from the rest of the institution, serves as a kind of laboratory within which faculty can try things they have always wanted to try but for which they could find no suitable outlet. When such efforts are demonstrated to be successful, they may well become institutionalized thereby raising the general level of education within the college or university for all students. In this connection, the Honors curriculum should serve as a prototype for things that can work campus-wide in the future.
- \* The fully developed Honors program must be open to continuous and critical review and be prepared to change in order to maintain its distinctive position of offering distinguished education to the best students in the institution.
- \* A fully developed program will emphasize the participatory nature of the Honors educational process by adopting such measures as offering opportunities for students to participate in regional and national conferences, Honors semesters, international programs, community service, and other types of experiential education.
- \* Fully developed two-year and four-year Honors programs will have articulation agreements by which Honors graduates from two-year colleges are accepted into four-year Honors programs when they meet previously agreed-upon requirements.
- \* A fully developed program will provide priority enrollment for honors students who are active in the program in recognition of their unique class scheduling needs.

## ATTACHMENT E

### **REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SUMMER AND FIELD APPOINTMENTS**

ALL Graduate Assistant and Graduate Hourly Appointees WORKING TOWARD DEGREE during the Summer or Field sessions (i.e., May through August) ARE REQUIRED TO REGISTER.

Research Assistant Appointments: By definition Research Assistants are presumed to be working toward degree and, therefore, MUST REGISTER during the summer semester. The required minimum registration requirement for a Research Assistant appointed during the summer term is three (3) credits of research. To insure research appointees have access to the appropriate campus services (i.e., building access, Health Center, Recreation Center, etc.), Research Appointees MUST REGISTER for the required research credits BY THE LAST DAY OF REGISTRATION FOR THE FIELD TERM. All Research Appointees are assessed tuition at the normal summer tuition rates and Mandatory Fees at the "Thesis Research" rate.

If a student on a Research Assistant Appointment is also completing coursework during the Summer or Field terms, the Appointee MUST REGISTER FOR THESE COURSES IN ADDITION to the required three credits of research. The registration deadline for coursework registration is the normal deadline for the Field or Summer session course. Tuition is assessed for both the required research and coursework credit hours at the normal Summer and Field rates. Mandatory Fees incurred by students completing both research and coursework during the summer are assessed at the "Thesis Research" rate.

Teaching Assistant and Hourly Appointments: If a Graduate Teaching Assistant or Graduate Hourly Appointee is not working toward degree requirements at any time during the Summer or Field

sessions (i.e., May through August), REGISTRATION during the Summer or Field terms IS NOT REQUIRED. Such appointees will, however, be subject to the TIAA-CREF payroll deductions.

Summer fees are not automatically assessed for students who do not register. So, unless students proactively indicate they want fees assessed, students working on Teaching Assistant or Hourly Appointments during the summer will not have access to university-provided services (e.g., Health Center, Recreation Center, etc.).

If a Teaching Assistant or Hourly Appointee is also working toward degree requirements during the Summer or Field terms (i.e., May through August), these appointees must register as appropriate.

- Appointees completing research during the summer must register for at least one (1) credit hour of research. The registration deadline for this required research registration is the last day of registration for the FIELD TERM.
- Students completing coursework must register for the appropriate courses by the appropriate Field or Summer registration deadline. Tuition is assessed for all credits in which a student is registered at the normal Summer and Field tuition rates. Mandatory fees incurred by students completing coursework are assessed at the appropriate Field or Summer rates. Mandatory fees incurred by students completing research are assessed at the "Thesis Research" rate.
- Teaching Assistant or Hourly Appointees working toward degree during the summer by completing both research and coursework during the summer (i.e., May through August) are required to register for both research credit hours and course credit hours as defined above by the deadlines defined above. Tuition is assessed for both the required research and coursework credit hours at the normal Summer and/or Field rates. Mandatory fees incurred by students completing both research and coursework during the summer (i.e., May through August) are assessed at the "Thesis Research" rate.

Students required to register during the Summer semester are responsible for all Mandatory fees incurred during the Summer semester. These fees may, or may not be remitted as part of a Graduate Assistant Appointment. Students for whom registration is not required during the Summer semester but who are working on campus may choose to pay Mandatory Fees at the "Thesis Research" rate. Payment of these fees provides students access to campus facilities including, but not limited to the Library, Health Center, Recreation Center, etc. during the entire summer (i.e., May through August). Requests for prorating of this voluntary fee payment will not be considered.

#### REVISED SPRING DEGREE COMPLETION DEADLINE

The Office of Graduate Studies allows students registered in a previous semester to continue to work toward degree and checkout of their degree program as late as the last day to register in the next semester without paying additional tuition. In the past, this has meant that students registered during the Spring semester, could continue to work toward degree and check out as late as the third week of June before being required to register for the Summer semester.

With the change in Summer research registration proposed above, the Office of Graduate Studies will now be using the close of registration for the Field semester as its deadline for checkout from the Spring semester. For the upcoming year, however, as we transition to the new Summer registration requirements, the Office of Graduate Studies will be flexible in allowing students to extend their checkout timeline beyond the new requirement. Starting Spring 2009, however, the Office of Graduate Studies will rigorously enforce this new checkout requirement.

Thanks...  
Tom

ATTACHMENT F

SAT, ACT, High School Rank, and Average Index for entering freshmen Fall 2007 – Fall 2005

**SAT – MATH SCORE RANGE**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Upper 25%</b>	>690	>690	>690
<b>Middle 50%</b>	620-690	600-690	630-690
<b>Lower 25%</b>	<620	<600	<630

**SAT – CRITICAL READING SCORE RANGE**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Upper 25%</b>	>640	>640	>650
<b>Middle 50%</b>	550-640	540-640	540-650
<b>Lower 25%</b>	<550	<540	<540

**ACT COMPOSITE SCORE RANGE**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Upper 25%</b>	>29	>29	>29
<b>Middle 50%</b>	26-29	25-29	25-29
<b>Lower 25%</b>	<26	<25	<25

**HS RANK IN CLASS**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>Top 10%</b>	53%	49%	48%
<b>Top 25%</b>	87%	82%	81%
<b>Top 40%</b>	97%	95%	94%

**AVERAGE FRESHMEN INDEX**

<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2005</b>
123.51	123.38	121.95