

NEW MEXICO INSTITUTE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

Tuesday, October 2, 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 4:07 pm with a call for approval of the September 4, 2018 minutes. Dr. Michelle Creech-Eakman moved to approve, seconded by Dr. Michael Hargather.

2. Announcements

a. 49ers –*Lisa Majkowski*

This year, the theme for 49ers is “Game On”. A flyer was passed out showing the full schedule. There are more family activities this year than in the past. Chemistry, Mathematics, Computer Science, and Mineral Engineering are being highlighted this year. Lisa also encouraged faculty to enter a float for the 49ers parade. There will be prizes for the top three floats.

There will also be a Slide Rule Competition in the Mathematics department with Dr. Doug Wells on Saturday at 4:00 pm.

b. STORM FORCE – *Sharon Sessions*

Dr. Sessions announced that she would like to make faculty aware of the STORM FORCE organization. This started out as building a relationship with NMT and the Socorro Consolidated Schools and has turned into a community partnership. STORM FORCE is a community partnership whose mission is to inspire and empower Socorro County residents by promoting mentoring, skills in STEAM and a culture of lifelong learning. This involves some of the mentoring programs that we have established including the Lego League program and robotics program.

c. Socorro County Teen Science Café Network – *Sharon Sessions*

Socorro along with Magdalena and Alamo were recently awarded small grants to create a teen science café. A scientist or engineer receives training on how to communicate with teenagers. It is expected to create a conversation and would have a trial run before giving a live presentation with a large group of teenagers. If you would like to be a presenter, let Dr. Sessions know.

d. Introductions

Dr. Andrei officially introduced Dr. Mustafa Hassanalian of the Mechanical Engineering Department.

3. Senate Committee Reports

a. Nominating Committee – *Raul Morales-Juberias*

Eligible faculty senate members filled out paper ballots. The Nominating Committee counted the ballots with the results showing:

Chair, Tom Engler
Vice-Chair, Mike Hargather
Parliamentarian, Sally Pias

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

Dr. Heagy stated that several pieces of this policy have been approved at past meetings. This essentially is a shoring up of policy comments, mechanics, and more rigor in the overall procedure.

Part A has a change that asks that Department Chairs not be members within their respective department. However, in some circumstances it may be necessary for a Chair to serve.

Part C has some substantial changes including a meeting will be held prior to the first submission of the tenure candidates review. Committee meetings should be held well before Jan.15 so that there is time for the candidate to prepare.

Part E has a new statement which reads “Letters solicited by the candidate are not appropriate to be included.”

There were also substantial changes on the external review. We are now requiring no less than five outside reviewers. Some guidelines were given for conflicts of interest. Also, committees should indicate in their recommendation how many reviewers were contacted and how many declined to review. If the committee has to contact twice as many potential reviewers as usual that may signal peer concern about quality of the candidate’s work and should be noted with an explanation.

Several changes were also made to the committee recommendation including that the committee should meet with the candidate before submitting their final recommendation.

Dr. Mike Hargather, who is on the committee, stated that these changes were made to enhance transparency and opportunities to the candidate.

The committee was asked to provide a template letter that can be sent to others to help get the outside letters. Also, to add language specifically that allows the candidate to provide a list of outside reviewers. It does state “may allow” and maybe we change it to should or will be asked. Another example was to have some of the reviewers from the candidate and some not.

It was decided that we are not at the point where we are ready to make a motion for this. Send suggestions to the committee.

4. Council of Chairs Report – *Doug Wells*

a. Earth & Environmental Science

Dr. Glenn Spinelli discussed the changes for his department.

Motion was moved and approved. Friendly amendment was made for Earth 480 Field Camp. The same class was divided up into three 2 credit classes and they should be the same pre-requisites as the 6 credit version.

b. Fine Arts – *Bill Stone*

Dr. Stone discussed the Fine Arts changes. They are proposing seven classes increase from 1 credit to 2 credit courses.

Discussion was held regarding graduate students will have to pay extra to take these classes now and this change would mean more money for the community to pay. Dr. Stone stated that we are hoping to offer a non-credit class that would require paying a fee that would be less than tuition. This may also help these students.

Dr. Wells stated that he met with the community education instructors and they argued that when we lowered the credits from 2 to 1, it hurt their enrollment numbers.

Motion moved and approved with several nays.

c. Gen Ed's

Under the State Law we have a new set of requirements for general education. Currently, NMT has 53 general education requirements. The new State requirements are only 31 credits. They mostly overlap ours with the exception of 3 credits of Fine Arts.

Dr. Stone proposed that we split our general education requirements and our Institute's requirements. They can overlap. The one change for our students is that instead of 6 credits of social science, 6 credits of humanities, and 6 credits of either, Dr. Stone proposed 6 credits of social science, 6 credits of humanities, 3 credits of either, and 3 credits of Fine Arts.

Motion moved and approved.

5. Graduate Council Report – *Lorie Liebrock*

a. Announcements

Dr. Liebrock discussed nominations for STEM Fellows. They had one nomination but the student withdrew so there are two open positions.

Also, Graduate Day is February 11.

b. Earth & Environmental Science

Dr. Spinelli proposed to remove GEOL 553 as they no longer teach this course.

Motion moved and approved.

c. Mineral Engineering

Dr. Wedeward proposed some prerequisite changes to five different courses. The prerequisites previously stated consent of instructor but will now state graduate standing or consent of instructor.

Motion moved and approved.

d. Materials Engineering

Dr. McCoy proposed to change their Masters with independent study to a Masters of Engineering program. This is largely driven for the Distance Ed students.

Motion moved and approved.

6. Old Business

7. New Business

a. Draft faculty policies on complaints against faculty – Doug Wells

Dr. Wells stated that we have a huge gap in policy. If there is a complaint against a faculty member, we do not have adjudication process. For instructional faculty the academic freedom and tenure policy points to the employee handbook and vice versa.

AA proposed a draft interim policy for a year while this body creates a more permanent policy and then advance it to the President and Regents. The shell of this came from the employee handbook.

The biggest issue that conflicts with the current interim policy and the current research misconduct policy is the standard of evidence. There are three common standards of evidence: preponderance of evidence, clear and convincing, and beyond a reasonable doubt. Each of these was discussed. One problem with “preponderance of evidence” is on September 20, 2018, in a UNM Title IX case, Judge Browning of the U.S. NM District Court ruled that “preponderance of the evidence is not the proper standard for disciplinary investigations” for cases with “significant consequences”.

Dr. Wells proposed that the evidence standard for this policy should be clear and convincing. The evidence is highly and substantially more likely to be true than untrue. There is a very different scale of punishment for beyond a reasonable doubt and this is a reason why we didn’t choose that. This is what is appropriate.

There is a formal resolution process that would go to the AVPAA. They can also advance to a formal complaint to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and then to the VPAA, and finally to the President.

Dr. Wells will email the policy and at the next meeting we will review and ask for a vote. In the mean-time, President Wells will take it to legal counsel.

8. Discussion

9. Adjournment

By unanimous decision, the faculty senate adjourned at 5:37 pm.