

# COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 1, 2003 -2:00 PM

Hill Hall Room 300

**ATTENDEES:** Curtis, Dean, Dickerhoof, Frost, Harrison, Mitcham, Navidi, Readey, Ross, and Thiry

**APOLOGIES:** Eberhart, Illangasekare, and Kee (on sabbatical Spring 2003)

**VISITOR:** Phil Romig, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

**PHIL ROMIG, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research:** Romig discussed the following issues with the Senate:

- A. Alternative Tuition for Graduate Students – Romig stated that the Senate's recommendation that both the advisor and department head must approve a graduate student's registration for an overload will be placed in the Graduate Bulletin (see 3/11/03 Minutes F-2).
- B. Master Degree Structure – With regard to the Senators query as to who approves the transfer hours especially since 21 out of the 36 hours could be earned off campus, Romig stated that department faculty are responsible for approval of transfer credit and that this policy is stated in the Graduate Bulletin. The "paper trail" for each decision should be kept and saved for future referral. The Graduate Council will develop policy and guidelines for departments to follow. This document will be brought back to the Senate for approval.
- C. Guidelines for non-credit registration –

FROM: Phil Romig Jr. -DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH  
TO: Graduate Council  
DATE: 29 Jan 03  
SUBJ: Guidelines for NC registration

It currently is unclear how NC credits are to be treated with regard to Graduate School registration policies. Following are proposed guidelines for Graduate Council consideration:

- 1 Mines requires that all U.S. students who are being supported by the institution register full time, and federal financial aid regulations prohibit us from counting NC registration in determining financial aid eligibility. In addition, the INS requires that international students register full time, and recent anti-terrorism proposals discourage us from counting NC registration toward that requirement. Furthermore, there are no consistent standards for expectations of students who register for NC in a course. Therefore, in order to treat all CSM students consistently, **NC registration will not count toward the minimum number of hours for which students are required to register.** This includes the 3- or 4-hour minimum required of all students and the 4-, 6- or 10-hour requirement for students who must register full time.
- 2 The thesis-only registration policy was based on the principle that the minimum degree requirement (36 or 72 hours) would include only the credits applied toward the degree. Deficiency and extra courses are above and beyond that minimum. NC courses fall into the latter category and may not be applied toward the degree. Therefore, **NC registration will not count toward the number of hours required to be eligible for reduced thesis registration.**
- 3 NC registration may involve additional effort on the part of faculty to give and/or grade assignments or exams, so it is the institution's policy to charge tuition for NC courses. Therefore, **NC registration will count toward the maximum number of credits for which a graduate student may be allowed to register.** If the tuition structure is changed to provide for a surcharge on credits over the maximum, NC

registration will be included in the calculation of that surcharge. Under the current rules, items (1) and (3) could create a "catch-22" for research-based students who are required to be full time and who want to register for a 3-hour NC course. (1) would require that they register for 10 hours excluding the NC course (for a total of 13 hours), but (3) would limit them to 12 hours. In that case, upon the recommendation of the student's advisor and department head or division director, the Dean of the Graduate School will grant an exception allowing the student to register for 13 hours. If the current "maximum registration" rule is replaced by a tuition surcharge formula, this exception no longer would be applicable.

A **motion** made by Mitcham, seconded by Dean and approved by the Senate that there would be no Senate action on this issue until the Graduate Council had made a decision regarding non-credit courses.

D. Proposal for Change in the Granularity of the Grading Scale – Romig presented the following proposal from Alexandra Newman:

I would like to recommend that Colorado School of Mines change its grading scale to more precisely reflect the achievement of its students. Specifically, I would like to request that grades of A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D, D- and F be assigned as standard letter grades, rather than simply A, B, C, D, and F. I would propose that the new scale would translate into numbered grades as follows: A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, B = 3.0, B- = 2.71, etc. I believe that the proposed scale allows instructors to better quantify the achievements of a particular student by allowing for a finer differentiation within the grading scale, and provides students with more incentive to achieve in the classroom than with the current grading system. This grading scale is not uncommon, and, in fact, is used at both the undergraduate institution (University of Chicago) and the graduate institution (University of California at Berkeley) I attended. It should be noted that the introduction of the proposed grading scale would not be an imposition; those instructors not wishing to use a grading scale with a finer level of differentiation would be under no obligation to assigned "signed" grades.

I would hope that the Graduate Committee would strongly consider this recommendation.

Sincerely, Alexandra M. Newman Assistant Professor Division of Economics and Business

A **motion** made by Mitcham, seconded by Dean and approved by the Senate that there would be no Senate action on this issue until the Undergraduate Council has made a recommendation on changing the grading system.

Readey will also ask the undergraduate and graduate student associations for their input on this proposal.

**PROPOSED HANDBOOK CHANGES:** The Senators requested that Readey ask the Vice President for Academic Affairs if the proposed handbook changes are ready for the faculty and the Senate to give their input before they are passed.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** The minutes of the March 4, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting were approved. The minutes of the March 11, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting were approved as amended.

**REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT:**

A. Written Report:

DATE: February 13, 2003

TO: Board of Trustees, Colorado School of Mines

FROM: Dennis W. Readey, President, Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Report to the Board

The Senate has met twice times since the last report submitted to the Board of Trustees and there was a faculty forum presented held on January 29, 2003. Highlights are presented below.

### **January 21, 2003**

The Senate approved the Professional Masters Degree in Environmental Geochemistry and the Professional Masters Degree in International Political Economy. However, the Senate remains concerned about the distinction between the professional masters degrees that have been promoted as being "temporary" based changing markets and more long term, non-thesis MS degrees. The degree in International Political Economy, for example, does not appear to be an ephemeral degree. The Senate would like the graduate council to clearly identify the distinction between the professional masters and the non-thesis MS degrees in the future.

The Senate had planned to hold a faculty forum on January 24th to discuss budgetary issues because of the concern over decreasing State support in FY 2003 and potential greater cuts in FY 2004. Faculty members across campus are extremely concerned since the size of the projected cuts are sufficiently large that it may not be possible to absorb them simply by small shifts in funds. There are concerns that CSM must seriously consider major instructional structural changes with the current and projected future cuts in State support. However, previous discussions regarding structural changes concluded that a strategic plan was necessary to adequately address such issues. Now that the strategic planning process appears to be getting underway, these issues will, hopefully, be addressed by the strategic plan. Furthermore, individual faculty members do not have readily available the complete CSM budget, which makes it difficult to discuss the long-term financial impacts of structural changes such as: trimester system, reducing credit hours for degrees, increasing retention, increasing class size, increasing student to faculty ratios, etc. As a result, the January 24th forum was cancelled.

At about the same time, the Senate became aware of the ad hoc committee formed for the "Campus Campaign for Positive Change" (CCPC) that grew out of the Budget Committee with the purpose of promoting these same issues of structural change and their long-range financial impacts on CSM in light of continuing reduced revenues. The Senate endorsed the goals of this committee and is coordinating its activities with the committee. As a result, a faculty forum was called January 29th to try to formulate issues for further discussion by the CPCC during their proposed all-day workshop scheduled for March 6.

### **Faculty Forum, January 29, 2003**

Approximately 120 faculty members and administrators were present at the start of the meeting. President Readey and Professor Eileen Poeter, representing the CCPC, moderated the discussion. The primary purpose was to generate issues, identify what additional information would be required, and who might be willing to generate the information for the proposed March 6 CPCC workshop. The issues generated and discussed were:

#### **Budget Data**

- lack of a complete budget
- research and student life?
- Financial model of CSM: status ??

### **Trimester System**

- how to handle
- effect on research
- other schools experience

### **Curriculum**

- reduce credit hours
- 4+1 programs
- reduce number of programs

### **Go Private**

- buildings not an issue
- cut down financial aid
- increase tuition

### **New Programs**

- increase retention
- retention = interest
- non-engineering programs
- biology, bioengineering, liberal arts degrees
- survey students
- niche programs
- increase in undergraduate enrollment predicated on having new programs
- Where? Engineering already overloaded
- cost of new programs
- need more infrastructure if increase UG Saturday and night classes

These issues are being posted on the Senate's website for comments from faculty members and others on the campus. As straw vote was held on canceling classes on March 6 for the workshop after some discussion about the pros and cons of canceling classes. The vote was about 40 against and 32 for canceling classes.

### **February 4, 2003**

A resolution was read and approved mourning the loss of the Columbia and its crew.

The Faculty Senate will meet with the Strategic Planning consultants, Eva Klein Associates at their regular meeting on February 18, 2003.

Dr. Murray Hitzman will present the 2002 Faculty Senate Distinguished Lecture on February 26, 2003 at 4:00 PM in Metals Hall.

An extended discussion was held with VPAA Middleton concerning the budget shortfall and the lack of a complete campus budget for the Senate and faculty to use to provide a basis for discussions about the future of CSM. The faculty forum and subsequent faculty contacts clearly indicate that the faculty would like to have access to the entire CSM budget in order to discuss the financial implications of any structural changes in a rationale manner. VPAA Middleton indicated that the budget short fall this fiscal year would be taken care of with funds from the Petroleum Institute. However, it is not clear to the Senate what happens in FY 04.

- B. There will be a meeting with the Strategic Planning Consultants on Tuesday, April 22 from 2:00pm to 5:00pm.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS:

- A. Committee on Committees (Harrison) Need two more Senator nominations at the Senior Senator level. Harrison excused herself while the following item acted upon. A **motion** to approve the appointment of Rick Wendlandt as faculty athletic representative on the Faculty Oversight Committee was made by Dickerhoof, seconded by Curtis and unanimously pass by the Senate.
- B. Sports and Athletics (Ross)
- 1 The Senate needs to make a decision regarding the status of the athletic staff/faculty. Are they academic faculty or administrative staff. The athletic staff would like to be represented on the Senate. A decision needs to be made next academic year. This would require a change in the Faculty Bylaws.
  - 2 This committee recommends that the common exam time be moved from 7:00pm to 7:30pm. Frost will check previous Senate minutes to see if there was a change made last year.
- C. Executive Committee (Readey)
1. This committee has only met once in the last two months.
- D. Research Council (Curtis)
1. Sensor research and lack of institutional support for research are agenda items for the April meeting.
- E. Undergraduate Council (Mitcham)
- 1 The Council is discussing various courses for approval.
  - 2 At their next meeting, Newman's proposal for grading scale will be discussed.
- F. Committee on Evaluations (Readey)
1. A new evaluation form with 10 questions and three open ended questions should be ready for "piloting" next year if the Senate approves it. Ross raised the question if this new evaluation form has been validated. The form has not been validated. Readey will take this back to the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.