1. Proposed income tax on Tuition and fees—Randy Lemon (GSG)

Discussion at the GSG meeting regarding the new tax proposal introduced in the House of Representatives. There is a section in it will strikes the current tuition waiver for graduate students. The tax rate would go from approximately 7% to 30% on the graduate stipend. Untenable to attend college for graduate students. Lemon wanted to make sure the conversation was happening at the higher levels at Mines. Boyd said there is a lot of discussion and awareness on campus regarding this issue. Mines is working with local legislative representatives, along with every other university, to make sure this does not go through. Nickum said there is a new AAUP chapter on campus, and it is also against this. Lemon will pass on the information to the GSG.

2. Graduate and undergraduate degrees, programs, new minors and certificates approvals discussion—Tom Boyd and Aurea Tlnay
Academic Affairs is developing a new timeline for approval of new or revised degrees, minors, certificates, etc. AA had to take into account Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, and Faculty Senate deadlines for approvals when drafting the timeline. In addition to those deadlines, new degrees and existing degrees with name revisions will also need approvals from the Board Of Trustees and the Department of Higher Education. A communication will be sent out to the Deans, Department Heads, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council representatives with the revised timelines and deadlines for proposals going forward. Boyd said the timelines are primarily driven by the annual catalog deadline and the Department of Higher Education meeting, both in early March. The last Board meeting to present to and still make it into the catalog is on February 9, 2018. The Board will need the approved documents two weeks prior. AA worked the steps back from all those deadlines to create the timeline. The Board is interested in broad degree program information and in the business side of the degree. Such as, who is the market going to be, and what is the projected enrollment for this proposed degree. Because of this, Boyd has put together a template that he has asked the six proposed degrees he knows of that will need Board approval to complete by January 9, 2018. This way, the Board will receive the proposals in a consistent format. Historically there have been a lot of ad-hoc procedures for new proposed degrees and programs, and AA would like to create a standardized process going forward. The degrees this year will be guinea pigs for the new process.

Tolnay created a Canvas site for the Faculty Senate prior to this meeting, and sent an initiation to all Senators. Once in the site, go to the “file” link to find the folders for proposals that have been approved in Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. Tolnay uploaded available power point presentations and supporting documentation for the proposals that will be up for vote in the November 28th Faculty Senate meeting. PDFs of the approved CIM proposals will also be uploaded to the folders so that the senators will have a consistent format. Maxwell said the idea was to streamline the processes and provide a common place for documentation. Tolnay proposed a revised UGC and GC schedule that will have a built-in initial training in CIM for council representatives. Ideally, this schedule would have some overlap with outgoing council chairs and incoming council chairs in the spring so there is some institutional memory and a standardization of the process. The proposed schedule would also increase the frequency of meetings in the fall when the agendas are full and meet less often in the spring when the agenda tend to be lighter. Maxwell is looking for any input to standardize the presentations of proposals that will need Senate approval. First step is moving the materials to a centralized location for the documents. Boyd suggest that Senate and
Tolnay work on a standardized template that covers both the needs of Senate and what Boyd needs to present to the Board. Seger does not want the presentation to Senate to be repetitive with what has already been presented to the councils. It was suggested that a champion of the proposal should be present in case the Senate has questions. Faculty Senate should not just be a rubber stamp. Maxwell said no conditional approvals should move from council to the Senate. Senate should only be dealing with the final degrees completely approved by the councils to vote on. King agrees that it should be council approved before it arrives to the Senate. Maxwell said the Senate has to trust the process and trust what comes from the council. Seger said the Senate should not have line item veto, only a yes or a no vote. Simoes says that it can mess up the timeline if the Senate reviews proposals that do not have full approval from the councils. Tolnay said these are all reasons why the council schedules are being revised for upcoming academic years. The expectation will be made clear this academic year, so going forward there are no issues. Tolnay explained that if a proposal is entered into CIM and approved in a council, but revision to the approved proposal are made before it goes to senate, there is too much work on the back end. The CIM software will not allow revisions to be made once a proposal enters the workflow, therefore, the revisions must be made on the admin or back end of the software through the Registrar’s Office. To eliminate those issues, the same proposal entered into CIM and approved by council should be the same final version presented to the Senate. Going forward, the Senate will see the final version for vote, with no changes. The intent is that in the future, graduate degree proposals will be presented early in the academic year and working their way through the entire workflow. Hancock asked that her degree would be allowed to be presented at the BOT’s December 8th meeting so that they would have time for recruiting. During the meeting, Boyd was able to verify that the Space Resource degree from Angel Abbud-Madrid and the Natural Resources & Energy Policy degree from Kathleen Hancock can be added to the December 8th BOT agenda if they are approved in the November 28th Faculty Senate meeting. Boyd said he would need the template for both degrees by November 27.

2. EDS / BSE history and update—Kevin Moore

Moore is here to discuss the new division of EDS (Engineering, Design and Society) in the CECS (College of Engineering and Computational Sciences) Department, and the new degree BSE 2.0. This is a brief synopsis of the presentation.

2.1 EDS: A new division devoted to educating engineers and applied scientists about their key and complex roles in society.
In the summer of 2015, as part of a campus wide strategic planning activity, groups were charged with proposing the future of the former BSE. The genesis of the degree and program evolved from there. In January 2017, CECS developed a new division devoted to educating engineers in applied sciences education in their roles and society. The division integrates the nature of the technical, social, cultural, economic and environment dimensions that students encounter in the workplace. The socially responsible engineer. EDS incorporates three programs:

**Design@Mines**
- Cornerstone Design@Mines—formerly EPICS with enhanced EDS expertise and services.
- Capstone@Mines—formerly CECS Capstone Senior Design.

**Humanitarian Engineering Program**
- Activities associated with the Shultz Family Fund
- Two Minors: Eng. For Community Development (formerly HE) and Leadership in Social Responsibility (LSR)
- Two BSE 2.0 focus areas (Community Development and LSR)
- A possible MS in Humanitarian Engineering
- Possible Certificate in HE and/or CS

**The proposed BSE 2.0**—New Degree effective FY19 is a rigorous, interdisciplinary program of study that integrates:
- The strength of a Mines’ technical degree with coursework in the fundamentals of mathematics, science and engineering with
- Challenging and integrated education in humanities, social sciences, and economics, business, and
- A Focus Area related to the student’s interest
- A set of unique education experiences built into six Integrative Design Studios and culminating in the Capstone Senior Design Studio

**BSE 2.0 Curriculum FY19:**
- Mines Core: Math, Science, Engineering (45.5 credits)
- Engineering Breadth and Depth (30 credits)
- Integrative Design Studios (19 credits)
- Humanities, Social Sciences, Economics, Free Electives (15 credits)
Focus Area Coursework (18 credits)
Focus Area Capstone, Senior Design Studio (6 credits)

The BSE 2.0 proposed rollout will include program development (2018-2019 Catalog), program promotion (including web presence), and program rollout (first design studios FY2019). Moore was invited to the Senate by Maxwell to re-cap the BSE 2.0 history. The BSE 2.0 degree was approved by the Senate in April 2017.

3. Graduate and Undergraduate Councils:
Discuss new guidelines for Senate approval process with the new timeline created by Tolnay going forward. There are at least two new degrees that will be voted on at the next meeting, and more in the pipeline. Tolnay said that there are also many proposals for changes or certificates. Maxwell asked what does the Senate want to see in these new degree presentations? A detailed presentation, no presentation, a representative of the council present? Seger said that a lot of the items that flow through undergrad council that need Senate approval are ASI and minors, these items are straight forward. They do not need a large presentation. New degree programs need more time and effort invested, and a larger presentation. Suggest in the future a one page vision as the first item that goes to Senate for a ‘heads up’. The council chairs will also have a heads up for a new program coming through council. There will be no surprises. Tolnay said that her concern is that some of these degrees are approved only in theory. The actual courses do not get approved or even created until later. Senate should approve the idea first and give authority to go create it. Items cannot be added after programs are approved by the councils. Two recommendations moving forward:

- For future degrees, a short one page big picture proposal before the degree moves through Council. Do we need degree X at all on this campus? Before all the details are in place. Have council present a synopsis of what was some of the discussion? Was it largely supported, or was there some dissention?

- For the next meeting, the two degrees that will be presented, what do we want the presentation to look like? Test drive the procedure in two weeks and tweak for next year. The degrees presented are approved by Graduate Council. What additional information will the Senate want from the champions of these degrees? Trust the councils to fill in the details. See the
big picture at the Senate. The champion of the degree should present. Invite the Deans to come to show support for the degree. A short five slide presentation. Follow the flowchart for next year to champion a new degree or program.

4. Teaching/Library Faculty Advancement Committee survey—Chuck Stone
Two surveys have been presented and came back clear cut. Please review and will discuss next time.

5. Library committee survey update—Paula Farca
Will be discussed at the next meeting.

6. EPA ‘War on Science’ discussion—Marcelo Simoes
Will be discussed at the next meeting.

7. Distinguished lecture series.
Will be discussed at the next meeting.

**Adjourned at 4:00**
**Next meeting November 28 2-4**
**Hill Hall**