

NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, April 3, 2018

Workman 101 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

1. Call to order and approval of minutes

Chair Tom Kieft called the meeting to order at 4:02 with a call for approval of the March 6, 2018 minutes, seconded by Dr. Steve Simpson.

2. Announcements

a. Library Staff Introductions – *David Cox*

David Cox introduced two new librarians, Sarah Edwards Obenauf as Public Services Librarian and Chandra Reed as Technical Services Librarian.

b. Student Research Symposium – *Steve Simpson*

Dr. Simpson stated that the Student Research Symposium (SRS) will start with oral presentations on the evening of April 18. The majority of events will happen on April 19. Posters will be all day. SRS is in need of evaluators as they would like to be able to provide students with feedback on research and communications skills. There is an incentive for those who send students. A Keurig will be given to the person who sends the most students.

c. Science Fair – *Troylyn Zimmerly*

Troylyn Zimmerly stated that the Science Fair is coming up this weekend. They only have about 10 faculty who have agreed to help out and they are in desperate need of judges. President Wells stated that he will host a barbeque for those who help judge.

d. Finals – *Angela Gautier*

Angela Gautier asked faculty to remind students that the Counseling and Disabilities Office is doing a pilot program for finals for those who need disability accommodations.

e. Evaluation Kit – *Peter Mozley/Michelle Creech-Eakman*

Dr. Creech-Eakman stated that an electronic evaluations test run will happen in about 20 classes starting tomorrow. The test is to see that the system is populating correctly. Students getting the test will answer questions to determine the ease of logging on. If the test runs correctly, on April 17 evaluation emails will be sent out to every student on campus. They will have a unique portal for each student to log into. If they do not see the results that they want, we will have to fall back to using paper.

Dr. Mozley stated that our greatest concern going to the electronic system is that we have a good response rate. He encouraged faculty to set aside some time for

students to do this in the classroom. Also, there will be a drawing for a number of prizes for students who complete the evaluations on time.

f. Commencement Speaker - *President Wells*

President Wells stated that Terry Wallace will be the speaker at commencement.

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee – *Mike Heagy*

Dr. Mike Heagy first discussed the Hiring Policy. He stated that based on feedback, the committee reconvened and made some minor changes. Under Associate Professor Rank, reference letters have been changed to recommendation letters. Under Full Professor Rank, “tenured faculty” has been changed to “full professor” and upon department approval, the hiring committee will compile all documentation, including the department’s “final decision” has been changed to “recommendation”.

Dr. Heagy moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

Dr. Heagy discussed the policy on research faculty and staff. The idea is that the committee is stipulating three main categories.

1. Research Associate, Senior Research Associate. Research associates are generally post-doctoral students. They are hired solely at the discretion of their research sponsor. They would not vote in departments or faculty senate.

2. Research Scientists (Assistant, Associate, Full). These hires are those who are still dependent on external research funding. They are expected to have a 3-to-12 month soft-money salary. They are not expected to teach courses and they would not vote in departments or faculty senate.

3. Research Professor (Assistant, Associate, Full). Research Professors are independently funded researchers who are closely associated with an academic department. They are expected to obtain external research funding. They have obtained a 2/3 vote from the department. They are encouraged to teach and they have the right to vote within the department and at faculty senate. They can get promoted through the criteria stipulated throughout the document.

Dr. Heagy moved to approve this policy. Motion passed with one nay.

Friendly amendments were made. On the first page, “post-doctoral students” has been changed to “post-doctoral scholars”. Under “Duties and Responsibilities” on the first page, the last sentence dealing with Senate voting has been deleted.

On p. 2 under “Duties and Responsibilities” for Research Scientists the last sentence, dealing with senate voting, has been removed. On p. 5 under “Duties and Responsibilities” for Research Professors the last sentence, dealing with senate voting, has been removed.

Dr. Wells stated that typically research faculty will often get paid more than tenure-track faculty. Dr. Wells stated that we have faculty on campus that are exceptional at research and we don't want to lose them. A way to hold on to them would be to structure their contract, change their title, retain tenure in their department, but then issue a 12 month contract where we change their duties and they can earn more money funded by their grant or contract. Discussion was held that this policy does not have tenure track positions and it could create confusion if put into it. It should be discussed and possibly be put into the policy on tenure and promotion. We also need to discuss a different situation such as tenured faculty who steps into an administration role and then returns.

Dr. Heagy stated that faculty were requesting an extended tenure clock. If we do pursue this, we are finding that with longer tenure periods there is a significant mid-probationary review. At the end of three years, there is a serious review. If it's not going well, it would be a hard 3rd year and the candidate would know that they are not recommended for tenure. If it is going well, the committee can recommend an abbreviated tenure clock and recommend early tenure for the candidate.

The general sense is that we should keep doing the annual reviews and have the committees get more serious prior to the last review.

b. ASAC – *Lisa Young*

Every semester, the committee reviews appeals for students who have been denied admissions. In addition, the committee had cause to look at a proposed catalog change. The strategic plan requires us to look at our admissions criteria so that we can focus on students. The retention committee did a study and recommended raising the admissions criteria basically to deny entrance to students who would place into Math 101. They have formulated a specify change to the wording of the catalog. Incoming first time undergraduates would place into at least Math 103. Incoming students who don't meet the criteria have a low graduation rate roughly 12% compared to 50% for those who do meet the new criteria. The committee worries that we may be harming these students as they leave on suspension and have lost the lottery scholarship.

President Wells stated that we need to be careful as we are a public entity. Therefore, we have an obligation to the citizens of this state. There are many universities that admit these students into a general science/studies program and then mentor them to see if they can move on. It was also stated that this change will impact the dual credit students as they have to meet the entrance requirements of the class.

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Lisa Young moved to accept this change. Motion passed with several nays.

c. Honorary Awards and Degrees Committee – *Bhaskar Majumdar*

Dr. Majumdar stated that an email was sent out to the faculty senate. Nominations for the Langmuir and Founders award should be sent to Lyndsey Lewis prior to the May Faculty Senate meeting.

4. Report of Council of Chairs – *Douglas Wells*

a. Engineering Science Catalog Changes

Dr. El-Osery discussed the engineering science catalog changes. Dr. El-Osery moved to accept these changes. Motion passed with several nays.

Discussion was held regarding mechanics and the removal of statics as a prerequisite. Several faculty who previously taught the course have said they could do without it. Several overrides have been done with students coming out of the class successfully.

b. Mineral Engineering Catalog Changes

Dr. Mojtabai discussed the mineral engineering catalog changes. Dr. Mojtabai moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

c. Petroleum Engineering Catalog Changes

Dr. Leclerc discussed the petroleum engineering catalog changes. Dr. Leclerc moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

d. Civil Engineering Catalog Changes

Dr. Richardson discussed the civil engineering catalog changes. Dr. Richardson moved to accept these changes. Motion passed.

5. Old Business

6. New Business

a. Long-term Budgetary Goals of AA – *Doug Wells*

Dr. Wells stated that he shared a document with the chairs and deans with the goal to establish clear long term budgetary goals in Academic Affairs. We are roughly \$4 million shy of where we should be and of that \$2.5 million is faculty salaries. Dr. Wells encouraged faculty to talk to their chairs and work through the document and rank the priorities. Dr. Wells argues that salaries and anything that affects retention or recruitment should be a top priority.

7. Discussion

8. Adjournment

By unanimous decision the faculty senate adjourned at 5:34 pm.