

NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, October 4, 2011

Workman 101 4:00 p.m.

Minutes

1. Dr. Borchers called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m. by calling for approval of the September 13, 2011 minutes. Dr. Cormack so moved. It was seconded by Dr. Stone. Dr. Salehpoor asked for discussion regarding the report of May meeting participants and the proceeding vote count. He posed the question, should the number of members dissenting be four or one. Dr. Stone clarified the count at the meetings was not the point. Dr. Stone moved the minutes reflect the count was not unanimous. This motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The amendment was approved and the minutes will be corrected.

Dr. Salehpoor questioned the reference to the policy of missing grades. It was pointed out the minutes report what was discussed. Dr. Salehpoor felt the minutes are misleading. Dr. Borchers asked for specific changes to be presented. Dr. Salehpoor moved that policy be removed and replaced with incident. There was no second.

Dr. Salehpoor moved the statement “The implementation of an automatic A is to motivate faculty to post grades on a timely basis.” be removed from the minutes. There was no second.

Dr. Salehpoor moved for removal of the following sentence, “Our professionalism toward students is a minimum expectation and posting grades is an important role as professors”. The motion was seconded. There was discussion. The reasoning given for the removal of the sentence is that it gives the impression that a faculty member was not responsible to a student. Dr. Dezember pointed out the minutes should reflect the proceeding of the meeting. The phrase in question was stated and therefore, should remain. Dr. Borchers called for a vote on the amendment with the majority voting against the amendment. Dr. Salehpoor asked the minutes be clarified regarding the phrase, “A motion to continue on questions presented was made”. To, “Dr. Salehpoor asked for a continued address to the six questions presented by Dr. Salehpoor, sent to the faculty to be discussed regarding missing A’s and were emailed to the Senate by Dr. Stone”. It was seconded. Dr. Salehpoor went on to say that clarity in two years will make more sense than what is currently recorded. The vote was unanimously in favor of the amendment. The minutes will be corrected

In the section regarding change to the Add deadline, Dr. Borchers – asked for a change of “friendly amendment” to read “amendment”.

Dr. Borchers called for a vote on the minutes as amended. The vote was favorable and the minutes were approved as amended.

3. **Announcements.**

a. Academic Affairs Deadlines – Dr. Dezember had some reminders for the Faculty Senate. Tech Scholar Nominations are due to Academic Affairs by October 21. Council of Chairs will meet October 11 at 4pm in Brown 210. She reminded the Senate to respond to the faculty survey sent out by Gabi Constatinescu. This is needed for establishing baseline data for our Higher Learning Commission efforts. Please complete the surveys.

b. SAFRA / HSI Stem Award – Dr. Dezember announced NMT has received a third Department of Education grant for 4.3 million over 5 years. This brings the total funding for the three Department of Education grants to 10.7 million. She introduced Dr. Borchers who will serve as PI on the grant.

Dr. Borchers gave a presentation on the scope of the grant pointing out this was only available to Hispanic Serving Institutions. The primary focus will be to increase success of graduation rates and overall enrollment of Hispanic and low income students.

Funding for a Math Boot Camp for students not ready for calculus is included for both transfer and incoming freshman. Additional funding is available for curriculum redesign, new lab space, and lab equipment.

Funding for software is in the grant to help identify and manage the students identified as at-risk. This includes software to assist in the advising through case management of those identified students. It introduces a new approach to advising of the first semester students. Advisors will be trained to coach and mentor students to avoid the crisis. Stipends are available for this

When questioned about the institutionalization of positions created by the grant, Dr. Borchers pointed out through the increase graduation and retention rates, state funding should increase and that would be the budget source for these positions going forward.

c. Dr. Borchers introduced the student representatives; Sohaib Soloman, President of the Student Association, and Sarah Hendrickson, President of the Graduate Association.

d. Dr. Pullin gave a progress report of the SES group. He pointed out the freshman curriculum for the group is using ENVE 189, taught by Dr. Huang. This course serves to give the group a cohesive project. He was asked about the endowment element of the grant. The endowment has met its first year commitment and feels confident the second year will meet the requirements as well. The grant calls for a total of \$700,000 that can be spent to sustain the program going forward.

e. A continued discussion regarding the faculty survey results was announced by Susan Dunston. These discussions focus on the negative aspects of the report and possible solutions to mitigate the problems. The next meeting will be October 5 in the conference room in Fitch.

4. **Committee Reports.**

a. Financial Aid and Scholarship Committee – Dr. Ghosh spoke on behalf of the committee that consists of himself and Dr. Zheng. The purpose of the committee is to serve as an appeal body for students who feel they should not have lost funding. The current process requires students to first meet with the Director of Financial Aid, Annette Kaus. Their only appeal is through the Financial Aid and Scholarship Committee. Ms. Kaus gave historical perspective about the committee. In 2002 the procedure changed to have the committee function as a review. It currently only meets as needed. The committee has met

two times in nine years. Dr. Ghosh asked the Senate if the committee is not needed could there be a motion to disband? Dr. Stone moved to disband citing the issues are dictated by federal law. The motion was seconded. Annette responded that occasionally the faculty input is welcome even though the majority of cases are federally regulated. As director she serves on other Faculty Senate committees that could also serve this purpose.

Dr. Heagy pointed out, from a practical level, the ability to fill all the committees is difficult. Additionally, scholarship policy could be addressed through other existing committees. It was moved to table the motion. The motion to table was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

b. Student Discipline Committee – Dr. Doug Dunston reported the committee meets as needed. This is usually prompted by a student appeal. He is happy to report there is no business to report for this last year.

5. **Old Business. None**

6. **New Business.**

a. Final Exam Schedule – Dr. Liebrock reported the conflicts in scheduling final exams is getting worse every semester. A proposal to change the methodology will be presented at a later meeting.

7. Dr. Liebrock moved to adjourn, it was seconded and approved at 5:05p.m.