

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 1, 2015 2:00-4:00 p.m.

GRL Conference Room

ATTENDEES: 2015-2016 Senators: Ken Osgood (President), Linda Battalora (PE), John Berger (ME), Jürgen Brune (MN), Graham Davis (EB), Jason Ganley (CBE), Paul Martin (AMS), Dinesh Mehta (EECS), Kamini Singha (GE), Roel Snieder (GP), Chuck Stone (PH), Chet Van Tyne (MME), **Representatives:** Hanna Aucoin (GSG), Colin Marshall (USG)

APOLOGIES: Tina Gianquitto (LAIS)

GUESTS: Sarah Hitt (LAIS), Lia Vella (LB), Lara Medley (RG)

-
1. Visitors – There were no presentations made by visitors.
 2. Approvals:
 - 2.1. Vote to approve Minutes for 10-27-15 and 11-10-15: **Motion to approve: Brune, second: Mehta. Vote to approve: Unanimous.**
 - 2.2. Approval of student graduation lists
Motion to approve graduate student graduation list: Van Tyne, second: Brune. Vote to approve: Yes 11, No 0, Abstain 1. Motion to approve undergraduate student graduation list: Van Tyne, second: Singha. Vote to approve: Yes 11, No 0, Abstain 1.
 3. Announcements:
 - 3.1. Provost Reception: December 10, 4-6 p.m. Ballroom BC
Osgood reported there will be a reception for Provost Parker on December 10 from 4:00-6:00 p.m. He encouraged all senators to attend to honor and thank the Provost for his work at Mines.
 4. Topics of discussion
 - 4.1. Proposal for expanding Honors Program (Osgood)
Osgood presented a plan to expand the honors program and asked the senate to provide feedback. The goal is to think about how to enhance the student experience and help the school provide programs for students that it otherwise could not provide. Goal 1: expanding honors opportunities. The McBride Honors program is focused on humanities, Osgood wants to focus on a broader honors program for STEM students. Other ideas include a graduate level honors program to enhance the graduate experience and a secondary-level STEM program for 7-12 grades. Goal 2: recruit and retain students who have the aptitude and interest in an honors program. Identifying Mines as an Honors in STEM school could become a branding opportunity. Goal 3: create a hub for interdisciplinary, experiential, innovative and

experimental programs and pedagogies. Nationally, honors programs serve as laboratories for trying new techniques; successful ideas can then be applied elsewhere. Goal 4: diversify and enrich campus culture and community, recruit a different kind of student, one who wants to be challenged in their thinking. Goal 5: provide flexible fundraising packages and giving opportunities. Goal 6: support the strategic plan. Goal 7: NOT adding administrative layers to the school.

Proposal version 1: create the Center for Honors and Interdisciplinary Programs (CHIP). Osgood placed an emphasis on the word “and.” The program could be called renaissance engineering which is a holistic approach. Students could earn an honors degree through the departments rather than through McBride. There could be 1) a named institute for honors education, 2) a named institute for interdisciplinary studies, and 3) a named institute for experiential learning which could include undergraduate research, international programs, and community engagement.

Proposal version 2: A pared down version, CHIP “lite,” with an emphasis on the first and second year experience. First year honors could include a core class (100 students/year) such as the new NHV/EPICS hybrid course and could involve community living. Students could participate on a trial basis and opt out if they didn’t want to continue in the program. The second year could include a signature honors course. This version of honors would focus on lower division students. After the second year, honors could emerge from the departments. Other components could be included such as an experiential experience, internship, research, semester abroad, etc.

Osgood reported that ASU, Carnegie Mellon and Drexel University are models of excellent honors programs. Stone wants to ensure that honors students have a rigorous program, not just a watered down version of education that is called “honors.” Osgood pointed out that McBride students learn differently than many STEM students and they have an entrepreneurial mindset.

Brune suggested approaching corporations to fund an expanded honors program that would enable Mines to develop the graduates that corporations need. Senators discussed the word “honors” and the pre-conceived connotations that are attached to the word. Singha suggested rather than focus on the word “honors”, the school could find another word that focuses on innovative and creative thought processes and problem solving. Osgood explained an advantage of using the word “honors” is the benefit from the recruiting angle. Stone suggested a fellows program that does not contain the word “honors”. Senators liked the word “fellows”, more than “honors” and “scholars”.

Current McBride students take one course per semester, after four years they earn a minor in honors. An expanded honors program would need to bring in the full campus, LAIS alone could not handle the volume. Honors programs can be very flexible, Mines could design various

paths to honors recognition including at the department level and the university level. Honors has the flexibility to be shaped any way the school sees fit. The manageable way to start is to have honors offered through each department. Osgood discussed the pros and cons of having prelaw and premed as part of honors programs.

An expanded honors program could create more conversations and lead to a more engaged campus. Davis reported that he teaches in McBride and explained it has been a great way to interact and work with faculty outside his department.

Osgood is seeking curricular ideas and suggestions for how to implement an expanded program. Options include: 1) expand the current McBride program or 2) go in another direction by developing honors programs in the departments. Brune suggested seeking feedback from stakeholders such as corporations and students. Most honors programs include about 10% of a school's population, comparatively, Mines has a very small honors program.

Snieder referred to the report *Educating the Engineer of 2020*. He stated Mines wants to attract students that crave learning and honors would provide a great opportunity for that. Snieder asked about letting all interested students into the program as long as they live up to the expectations. Mehta asked about fundraising the resources needed to support an expanded program. Osgood reported Brian Winkelbauer of the Mines Foundation is very supportive of this plan as an avenue to raise money. Winkelbauer likes the way the program is packaged and thinks fundraising for this could be successful. Vella asked about the honors program for graduate students and about the extra layers of administration that may be needed. Stone suggested making this a campus wide program rather offering various programs through the departments because some departments are well-funded while others are not.

Osgood reported that many graduate students hunger for an honors-type community and they seek some of the skills that are developed through the current McBride program. Van Tyne mentioned there are bits and pieces of graduate "honors" work taking place at Mines right now, such as the graduate courses taught by Snieder and others. Aucoin reported graduate students are interested in interdisciplinary training across all departments with an eye toward academic careers. Many would like to learn how to teach a class and master other skills needed to be future faculty. Some may be interested in earning a certificate for developing extra skills and knowledge beyond their major and thesis. Senators agreed these types of learning opportunities exist on campus, but they are not organized into a program. Singha suggested calling it a graduate fellows program. It was noted, if something is going to be an institute then it needs to have a home with some administrative structure, rather than floating between colleges. Snieder says simply having a website isn't enough, as is evidenced by the Center for Professional Education (CPE).

4.2. Organization of Senate issues for rest of academic year (Singha, Snieder)

Singha and Snieder met to discuss the academic culture at Mines. They have an initial plan and

are looking for a simultaneous top-down and bottom-up approach. He noted that faculty need to feel that “we” need to change, not “they” need to change. Snieder will talk to Volpi about utilizing the Coolbaugh House for a faculty area. He reported the administration is willing to look at supporting this idea.

4.3. Library redesign memo from library faculty

Vella reported on the memo drafted by Lisa Nickum and sent to Faculty Senate President Osgood. All librarians provided input to Nickum for creating the memo which summarized their goals for a library redesign. They desire space that is versatile and adaptive that can be used for faculty and students to meet. They want to take advantage of partnerships that will enhance the student learning experience, like the existing CASA and math tutoring programs. A potential additional partnership would be the writing center. They want mixed seating space such as quiet space, event space, and computer lab space with aesthetics that welcome scholars and take advantage of natural light. Osgood asked if there is anything on the librarians’ list of recommendations that is not currently represented in the ongoing renovation discussions. Vella said they want what is best for students, and they support partnering with student focused entities. The goal is to change the library from a collection–centric space to a user-centric space. They want the space to serve as a creative catalyst for learning on campus. The current plan that chops space up into little nooks and crannies may be prohibiting the library’s purposes, rather than supporting the cooperative, flexible, teamwork spaces.

Osgood said if the library has this vision, it may be something the senate wants to support. Van Tyne has concern that stuffing offices that need space into the library will take away from the services being provided for students. Van Tyne is impressed with the high volume of visitors using the library. Vella reported 228,513 visits in FY 2015. Vella reported there was an architect that drew up plans in the past for a library renovation and the foundation was told not to raise money for this plan. The library used to have a person to work with donor relations. Senators agree the library needs a vision. Osgood will take the library memo and the comments from today and draft a memo to President Johnson outlining the senate’s feelings. Osgood reported Parker told him today the administration is revising their plans based on community feedback.

4.4. Calendar Committee Update (Mehta)

Mehta sent out an email after the last Calendar Committee meeting outlining the new set of proposals. The final proposal is to move spring break and align it with Jeffco. He plans to send out a survey to faculty tonight. The next Calendar Committee meeting is Monday, December 7. Marshall reported the students are willing to move spring break to the last week in March, at the latest, as long as President’s Day can be turned into a four day weekend to give them a break earlier in the semester.

4.5. Ethical treatment of graduate students (Osgood)

Osgood has had a few conversations with graduate students that he found disturbing. He has

evidence of callous treatment of students by some faculty. There is a concern by a student with a mental health issue who received poor treatment from a professor. The issue involved the faculty member telling the student that to get tenure he/she needed to graduate students. For P&T, requiring a quantitative number of graduating students is not ideal. Instead, there needs to be a focus on strong mentorship that ensures student success. Martin reported he is on a P&T committee now and they are shying away from relying on numbers.

Osgood noted that the Handbook doesn't elaborate on ethics as it relates to the school's mission to develop and cultivate students. Ethics may be hard to quantify and describe, but people know unethical treatment of students when they see it. Department heads should not allow unethical treatment to take place with students. Faculty hide behind the excuse of "output" for justifying abusive behavior. What should students do if things go wrong with their advisors? Students need to know where to go for raising concerns. Osgood said the senate needs to make a statement of values on this topic for the procedures manual. Snieder noted there is no mentoring or feedback provided to faculty on behavior issues. Aucoin reported GSG is discussing these issues with President Johnson also. Osgood raised the idea of an ethics committee.

4.6. P&T process: delegating drafting responsibilities (Osgood)

Osgood asked for assistance drafting the P&T process proposal for the Handbook. He distributed the senate recommendations list and asked for senators to each take a piece of the document and make edits to a section to get the process started. Singha suggested putting this in a Google doc. The drafts should be done by next week for discussion at Tuesday's senate meeting.

4.7. Other items TBA – Not discussed.

Next meeting, Tuesday, December 8, 2:00-4:00 p.m. Hill Hall 300