Two breakout sessions were held, each lasting ~45 minutes and each with 5-10 participants. Attendance was not taken at the breakout sessions.

At the beginning of each breakout session, the session leaders reviewed the committee charge, introduced the idea of a narrative, and then led a discussion of what key parts of the Mines narrative currently were and what participants wished the Mines narrative included. Finally, participants were given a chance to answer Q1 – Q3 at the end of session 1. After talking with participants and realizing that few, if any, had read the committee report the approach was updated for session 2 and Q1 – Q5 were presented to the attendees.

Several high-level themes emerged from the discussion that were not captured in the written meeting notes. These included:

- Having a strong university level narrative was generally supported, however there was no consensus on what that narrative should be.
  - The committee is probably not the one to propose the narrative, however the committee would do well by defining how a narrative could be utilized by programs on campus to become distinctive.
- “Distinctive to whom? As defined by whom?” was a common concern among participants.
  - A strong university narrative could help us define that question with a definitive “defined by the institution”
  - The committee would be wise to address this question head-on as it was a source of much discussion and concern.

**Q1 Written Responses:** Which comments/observations/recommendations in the committee report do you find compelling and worthy of further consideration? Why?

- “+ Innovative Undergrad Education”
- “+ Narrative of earth energy environment that would link to the future – how does Mines prepare/shape the future
  - Then align program distinctives (sic) w/that narrative”
- “Emphasis on innovative education is important”
- “For Physics, there are some connections to industry, but that doesn’t fit areas that are more basic research.
  - Our field session is successful by giving students hands-on skills”
- “Emphasize innovation and preparation for transformation”
- “Chang (sic) some departments’ names. For example the petroleum can be fossile (sic) energy”
- “Introduce new R&D Centers such as Alternative energies”
• “The narrative must include a sense of problem-solving, adaptation, communication, and service.”

Q2 Written Responses: Which comments/observations/recommendations in the committee report do you not compelling? Why not?

• “Ties to industry
  o but as more than a way to get a highly paid job
  o this (bullet above) is too much of the story now”

Q3 Written Responses: What, if anything, is missing from the committee report? That is, what challenges, opportunities, or other factors should the committee consider as work on these initiatives continues?

• “Programs can become more distinctive by incorporating travel abroad, service to community, and development of communication skills.”
• “Missing: didn’t see words like: hands-on, practical”
• “Field session and senior design and unique programs”

Q4 Written Responses: What, in your view, are the Degree Programs of Distinction on campus currently.

• “1. PE – appreciated by the industry, success in their career. 2. Geology & Geological Eng. – they have a more integrated understanding.”
• “Mining Engineering, Geophysics, Chemical & Biological Eng., Hydrology”
• “Petroleum Engineering, Mining, Physics, Geology/Geophysics”
• “Humanitarian Engineering, Petroleum Engineering”
• “Future Characteristics for Distinction – Socially Responsible, Social Justice, Critical Thinkers”
• “Undergrad Physics – novel, innov.; Petroleum Engineering – tight connections to industry”
• “Recognized as amongst top programs in country: Physics B.S., CBE B.S., PE B.S., Hydrology Grad, Materials Grad”

Q5 Written Responses: Should the committee continue to pursue the Mines narrative approach, and if so what should the narrative be?

• “Mines should move from an ‘Earth, Energy, Environment’ slogan to a mindset that nurtures the whole student, building on his or her academic talents in the fields of engineering and applied science.”
• “Yes; the current one is not very good (too narrow, etc.). No; if the idea is to bring all of the depts. to daylight even if they are not doing great.”
• “Yes – but it is challenging to create one that is unifying in its inspiration but not exclusive/alienating to people with other interests/desires. This requires real leadership to be willing to make a stand for something that may be unpopular to some.”
• “Narrative 2.0 – Care about our students (not a mill), grand challenges save the world mentality, hands-on education, all undergrads do research/internship, real life experience, small classes, mentorship”
• “Yes if it will move us beyond the ‘high salary’ ‘good jobs’ existing one. How about a new narrative that says “Mines graduates are socially responsible engineers who can define + solve the most complex problems.”
• “Good students, ‘compliant’ students, not globally focused, small size, specialized, strong alumni”
Whiteboard Notes Regarding: What is Mines current narrative?

- Smaller school
- Like to be challenged
- Athletics and academic reputation
- Hardworking designers and problem solvers
- "not a party school" (I can be serious)

Narrative
- Small size
- Focus on specialization
- Challenge
- "Their intelligence" / smart people here
- No essay, easy to apply
- Top school / rigor
- Good science/math HS coursework
- "Mines experience"

Characteristics
- "Crunching problem" / solve given problems
- Work hard
- Compliant / disciplined
Whiteboard Notes Regarding: What should Mines narrative be?

Narrative 2.0

- Leadership "in field"
- Link to a tradition: to make a diff. and run the place.
- Creative + identify problems: "taking charge"
- Entrep. +
- Classroom + = portfolio
- Capability to content prob. of future & +

Earth, NRG, Enu.

+ transformative research?