

## **Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

February 8, 2018

Bump Conference Room

### **I. Call to order**

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order at 11:04 AM.

### **II. Roll call**

Senators present: Drs. Andrea Brickey (MEM), Robert Corey (PHYS), William Cross (METE), Patrick Gilcrease (CBE), Mark Novak (CABS), Darin Pagnac (GEOL/GEOE), Adam Piper (IEEM), Marc Robinson (CEE), Albert Romkes (ME), Charles Tolle (ECE), and Frank Van Nuys (SS), Jon Weiss (MCS for Mengyu Qiao), and Professor Deb Mitchell (HUM)

Visitor's present: Drs. Tim Brenza (CBE), King Adkins (HUM), Christy Tidwell (HUM)

### **III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

### **IV. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the January 18, 2018 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved by voice vote.

### **V. Report from the Chair**

Dr. Rice reported that house bill proposing the removal of collective bargaining had not yet made it out of committee in the state legislature [n. b. Dr. Rice later informed the faculty that on 27 February 2018, the SD Senate killed the bill with an 18-16 to not approve it]. The City is considering a Transformation Center for homeless people with possible sites including the old NAU campus near SD Mines. The SD Mines administration has announced publicly that SD Mines supports the effort to improve conditions and opportunities for the homeless but also voiced some concerns about the safety of our students given the proposed location of the facility on E. Kansas City St.

Dr. Rice also stated that the Provost has been fielding an increased number of parental complaints concerning registration issues and classroom behavior. As a partial response to this trend, the Student Success Center has intensified their focus on helping students learn resiliency to help them take accountability for their actions in order to cope more effectively with the academic environment. On other fronts, Dr. Rice noted that he recent Colorado marketing push seems to be working as interest in SD Mines from Colorado students is increasing.

## **VI. Committee reports**

Committee reports are covered in old and new business.

## **VII. Old business**

### **A. Collective bargaining bill joint resolution**

This was covered in the Chair's Report.

### **B. Chair of Faculty nomination committee**

At least one candidate has been nominated. The full slate of candidates will be unveiled at the March All-Faculty Meeting. The nominating committee had a question if those who serve on the nominating committee can be counted among the five faculty needed to support a nomination. Also, a question arose concerning whether the names of those nominated were to be kept secret prior to the announcement of the entire field. After some discussion, the Senate decided that the nominating committee could serve as supporters of a nomination and that secrecy was not required.

### **C. Department Senate elections**

Most of the Departments needing to elect a new Senator have done so. This is to be completed by March 1, 2018.

## **VIII. New business**

### **A. Curriculum proposals** (see [http://sdmines.sdsmt.edu/cgi-bin/global/a\\_bus\\_card.cgi?SiteID=424025](http://sdmines.sdsmt.edu/cgi-bin/global/a_bus_card.cgi?SiteID=424025) )

Dr. Brenza was invited to attend the Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the Intent to Propose a B.S. degree in Biomedical Engineering (BME). Dr. Brenza gave some background to the Intent to Propose, which started approximately 2 years ago, when SD Mines faculty were approached by USD faculty about the possibility of having B.S. degrees in BME in addition to the existing graduate degrees. A committee was formed which decided that each school should have its own degree granting program with USD focused more on the biological sciences and SD Mines on engineering. The program will be modeled after programs such as those at North Carolina and North Carolina State where separate programs were developed between universities to accommodate engineering and biology/medicine programs. The proposed start date is Fall 2018.

Question and answers about the proposal are as follows:

*Q: Have all affected Department Heads been contacted yet?*

*A: They have not all been contacted yet.*

*Q: Why is there support for new programs when current programs are not being supported?*

*A: We may attract more students, 1,530 pre-college students have expressed an interest in the program.*

*Q: Is there a demand for B.S. graduates in BME? Some other schools have had considerable trouble in placing such students.*

*A: There appears to be some interest in the Sioux Falls area. A medical background may make graduates more marketable for some jobs, although students with a graduate degree appear to have better job prospects. Virginia Tech and Drexel are starting to see more demand for B.S. graduates. These programs may lead to students better prepared for the BME graduate programs.*

*Q: How will this be administered?*

*A: The committee's recommendation was to create a separate department with 2-2.5 FTEs funded by reallocation of FTEs from existing departments; however, the current plan is to house this within an existing department. Presently, the BME graduate program has faculty from CABS (6), ECE (3), NANO (2), and CBE, MET, CEE (1 each) with some of the courses taught being at the 400/500 level.*

*Q: What will be the impact on other majors?*

*A: The program committee created a list of interested students that contains at least 250 students interested in the BME program from CBE and ME. The effect on the existing courses to be included in the program is not yet known as the coursework has yet to be determined. The intent to plan will help resolve that question.*

*Q: If the program is adopted, will the USD program have any say in the SD Mines program?*

*A: The programs are separate, except for sharing some courses.*

*Q: As this appears to be rushed, should the request be tabled?*

*A: Tabling was not thought to be a workable solution.*

**All curriculum requests were approved by voice vote with no nay votes.**

#### **B. General education assessment update (Drs. Adkins and Tidwell)**

Drs. Adkins and Tidwell presented an update in the review of the General Education Curriculum. Here's a copy of the memo they circulated to the Senate explaining the review process:

## MEMORANDUM

With the end of the CAAP exam as an assessment tool, the Academic Affairs Council created a General Education committee, made up of two faculty representatives from each regental institution. This committee, under the leadership of Paul Turman, was tasked with developing a new assessment procedure for gen ed.

Once this procedure was in place, the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology used it as a framework for further developing its own assessment procedure in line with the state's guidelines.

The official document outlining the state's guidelines can be found at:

[https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/8\\_Guidelines/8\\_7\\_Guideline.pdf](https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/8_Guidelines/8_7_Guideline.pdf)

These guidelines are summarized below.

### General Information

- Each of the six gen ed goals will be assessed over three year periods, two each year.  
Goals 1 and 5 – 2018  
Goals 3 and 6 – 2019  
Goals 2 and 4 – 2020
- When possible, disciplinary councils will be responsible for creating assessment rubrics; in the event a discipline council doesn't exist for a given goal, a representative committee will be formed for the purpose of creating an assessment rubric.

### State Guidelines

1. Prior to the semester in which the goal assessment will take place, the school will identify courses associated with the particular gen ed goals to use for assessment. From these courses, the school will choose five random sections (ideally, no instructor should be asked to assess more than one section).
2. Each instructor will choose an artifact or artifacts (assignment[s]) that address each outcome identified as essential to the goal.
3. Instructors will score the class set of artifacts using the discipline's rubric, sorting work into three categories: Exemplary, Proficient, and Below Proficient.
4. Instructors will then choose two representative artifacts from each category (6 total).
5. These six representative artifacts, together with a cover sheet providing information about the assignment(s) and the course demographics, will be collected by the school's designated assessment officer (Tom Mahon).
6. The assessment officer will scrub identifying information about students and instructors from these materials and forward them to the state.
7. During the summer after the assessment, a disciplinary summit will occur where two representatives from the given discipline from each institution will examine and evaluate these materials and participate in norming activities. As this summit will occur over two days outside the faculty contract period, participants will be given a stipend to be provided by their individual institution.

### SDSMT Guidelines

1. In addition to completing the state assessment, each instructor chosen for assessment will maintain ALL of the course artifacts for the given assignment(s).

2. These artifacts, together with a copy of the state cover sheet, will be collected from all five instructors to be used in a university/ departmental assessment.

Note: the specific procedures for these evaluations will be worked out in conversation between the departments, Kate Alley, and Dr. Kouris.

#### **Additional Note**

Now that the assessment guidelines have been worked out, the Gen Ed committee will turn its attention to evaluating courses for their suitability under the “Gen Ed” designation. Initially, this evaluation will occur with new course proposals, but over time the committee plans to revisit existing gen ed courses as well.

Senate observations and concerns: The SD Mines faculty would like to keep the collected documents to perform their own assessment, although the form of this assessment has not been decided. Some senators were concerned that this information may be used for faculty evaluation purposes but that is not the intention. The Regents are interested in norming across all campuses and ensuring that all instructors apply the teaching outcome rubric correctly. At this point, it is not clear how long the records will be kept, nor how privacy concerns will be addressed.

#### **C. Plus/minus grading**

The Board of Regents is now interested in exploring the possibility of returning to +/- grading. Generally, the Senate favors this idea. As a result, the Senate Academic Affairs Committee was charged with developing a resolution to this purpose.

#### **IX. Other**

Recently, an SD Mines undergraduate student who left in 1998 wanted to finish his/her degree by taking the remaining required courses that were unfinished at the time the student discontinued enrollment. This created a difficult situation for the department as the program had changed considerably in the intervening 20 years. Although there is a time limit policy for graduate students, currently there is no policy related to counting courses after a set amount of time has elapsed for undergraduates. For many on the Senate, proposing such a policy seems worth exploring. Dr. Rice said he would run the idea past the Provost to gather further feedback.

#### **X. Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 12:20 PM.