Minutes of the Graduate Faculty Council Meeting

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

**Members** (16): Andrew Storer (SFRES), Simon Karn (Geo), Kari Henquinet (PCorps), Erika Hersch-Green (BioSci), Ashutosh Tiwari (Chem), Audrey Mayer (SocSci), Jiguang Sun (Math), Tom Merz (Bus), Caryn Heldt (ChemEng), Veronica Griffis (Civ&Env), Warren Perger (Elec&Comp), Patty Sotirin (Rhet), Shane Mueller (CogSci), Zhenlin Wang (CompSci), Craig Friedrich (MEEM), Yu Cai (SchTech)

**Guests** (8): Jackie Huntoon (Grad Sch), Debra Charlesworth (Grad Sch), Nancy Byers-Sprague (Grad Sch), Amberlee Haselhuhn (GSG), Laura Brown (Comp Sci), Mari Buche (Bus), Heather Suokas (Grad Sch), Sarah Lucchesi (Lib)

1) Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm.

2) Review and approval of 12/10/13 meeting minutes.

3) Committee Reports:
   b. Thesis/Dissertation Review Committee (D. Charlesworth): The following recommendations have been made (please see the handouts section of the GFC website for complete list of recommendations with reasoning):
      1. Change and clarify the deadlines for completion of a degree within any given semester. These changes, if this proposal is accepted, would first be implemented in fall 2014.
      2. Discontinue reviewing draft dissertations, theses, and reports. Instead, provide a simple checklist of the most common items students need to consider as they prepare the final document for submission.
      3. Do not accept documents with any formatting errors.
      4. Revise web site, Guide, and title/approval page template based on student and faculty input to make content clearer and friendlier.
      5. Provide more training opportunities to students and advisors to better understand document preparation. Examples could include workshops on copyright and hands-on formatting assistance. These workshops would emphasize why the formatting requirements are needed and how they will help prepare students professionally for future career activities such as paper and proposal submission.
         - (Q): What happens when a student schedules their defense but the student and/or committee determines that more time is needed and the date keeps changing?
         - (A): If a student holds their defense after the deadline then their degree will not be completed until the following semester.
         - (Q): If the student needs to finish the following semester, how many credits do they need to register for.
         - (A): If the student has successfully defended (passed) then the student can enroll fulltime at one credit for up to two semesters following the defense semester which includes summer.
   • **TO DO:** Please take the proposal (handouts section of the GFC website) back to your departments and bring feedback to the next GFC meeting. Please be prepared to vote. If there are questions that you would like answered before the next GFC meeting please direct them to A. Storer or D. Charlesworth.

4) Old Business:
a. Rhetoric and Technical Communications Program Name Change – PhD and MS (P. Sotirin): Members were asked to bring this proposal back to their departments and to be prepared to vote at this meeting. Questions and concerns from last month’s meeting were recorded and responded to which can be viewed on the handout section of the GFC website.

• (Q): There has been some concern that this should be proposed as a new program rather than a name change. Has the department considered that option?
• (A): Yes, this has been discussed in great length. This program is not being proposed as new because it is taking our current program and moving it into the 21st century. It is not a new program.
• (Q): Do you have a timeline in mind for when you plan on reorganizing the curriculum?
• (A): The hope is to finalize the curriculum this semester.
• (D): Motion to approve the proposal passed.

b. Data Sciences Master’s Program Proposal (L. Brown/M. Buche): Members were asked to bring this proposal back to their departments and to be prepared to vote at this meeting. Questions and concerns from last month’s meeting were recorded and responded to which can be viewed on the handout section of the GFC website.

• (C): As opposed to what is in the current proposal it has been determined that there will be one GTA line rather than three. This as determined by the Provost.
• (C): Cognitive and Learning Sciences may have a course or two that would qualify for this program.
• (R): This should be communicated to the department. Please send appropriate course(s) to L. Brown, M. Buche, or S. Nooshabadi.
• (Q): From which departments would you expect undergraduate degrees to populate this program?
• (A): Primarily (but almost any department on campus would qualify a student) Math, Computer Science, and Management Information Systems.
• (Q): Do the twelve credits of core courses have prerequisites?
• (A): Yes. Undergraduates who are interested in this program should be planning what courses they should take in order to meet the requirements.
• (Q): Will there be a placement exam to assess the student before being accepted into the program?
• (A): No. It will be up to the committee, advisors, and/or faculty who are reviewing the student’s application packet to determine if they qualify or not.
• (D): Motion to approve the proposal passed.

c. Data Sciences Certificate Program Proposal (L. Brown/M. Buche): Members were asked to bring this proposal back to their departments and to be prepared to vote at this meeting.
• (D): Motion to approve the proposal passed.

d. Non-departmental/Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs (Dean Huntoon): Members were asked to bring this proposal back to their departments and to be prepared to vote at this meeting. On the handout section of the GFC website you will find program characteristics and governance.
• (D): Motion to approve the proposal passed. The Dean will forward this to the Senate as an information item.


6) Other:

a. Informal Poll: How do departments evaluate their current graduate students? Cognitive and Learning Sciences has a process or conducting an annually or each semester written review of graduate students in their PhD program. What are other departments doing – annually vs. each semester, MS and PhD, etc?
• Chemistry conducts their evaluations every semester. Each student has a form that needs to be filled out to show compliance on three or four areas. This system has been helpful in identifying problems early and having the information available to either address problems so the student has an avenue for improvement or take action when action is needed.

• Environmental Policy has a similar process as Chemistry. A form is sent to all faculty asking for evaluation of the students. The director sends out the forms and evaluates them as they are returned. They are then forwarded to the student’s advisor.

• Forestry does not have a process. Individual faculty decide whether or not they want to periodically evaluate a student. Some do it every semester, some do it rarely, and some do not do it at all.

• Math does not have a process. Some faculty do meet with their students each semester to discuss progress and to see if additional help is needed.

7) Motion to adjourn at 5:00 pm.
January 13, 2015
(Last update: 12/3/14)

Handouts of the Graduate Faculty Council

Michigan Tech
Graduate Faculty Status Review Template

Version 2.1

This template is meant to assist unit chairs/deans with the periodic review of the qualifications of each of their graduate faculty-eligible members as per Section 1.5.3 “Graduate Faculty Status” of the Faculty Handbook. Completed forms will be reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School and will be used to update the listing of eligible Graduate Faculty.

This review shall take place every 6 years from the start of the member’s eligible status as graduate faculty. To retain the status of Graduate Faculty, the unit chair/dean must circle at least one item in Section 1 and one item in Section 2 related to the faculty member under review.

1. Qualifications of Graduate Faculty. Does the faculty member under review meet one or more of the following criteria? (Circle all that apply.)

a. Possesses experience and continued interest in the conduct of research.

b. Has the necessary background for, and a continued interest in, teaching graduate courses.

c. Has continuing interest in serving as a graduate student advisor.

2. Evidence of Qualifications. Does the faculty member under review meet one or more of the following criteria? (Circle all that apply.)

a. Is currently involved in research work or graduate instruction or in advising graduate students.

b. Regularly publishes articles in recognized journals having national distribution or books related to their field of study.

c. Has earned the terminal degree in his/her field.

Response by reviewee:

Faculty members should indicate in writing below whether or not they concur with the unit chair’s/dean’s review. If the faculty member does not concur, the member should support their argument with reasons, providing relevant evidence.
1.5.3 Graduate Faculty Status

A. Membership

The Graduate Faculty consists of tenured and tenure-track members of the academic faculty holding the rank of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, or PROFESSOR who have been appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. Tenured and tenure-track faculty who are awarded EMERITUS status upon retirement remain members of the Graduate Faculty.

The Dean of the Graduate School may also grant graduate faculty status to others with an on-going professional relationship with Michigan Tech, including RESEARCH, PART-TIME, VISITING, or ADJUNCT faculty members, LECTURERS and INSTRUCTORS, RESEARCH ENGINEERS, and RESEARCH SCIENTISTS.

Under special circumstances, the graduate dean may appoint individuals with special technical expertise to the Graduate Faculty for a specific term and purpose, such as serving as a member of a student's advisory committee.

Graduate faculty members are eligible to teach graduate courses (5000 level and above), serve as examining members on Masters and PhD committees, and supervise Masters and PhD students.

Persons who are not members of the Graduate Faculty may teach 5000 and 6000 level courses only after obtaining written approval from the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. Qualifications of Graduate Faculty

1. Qualifications expected for graduate faculty appointment:

   a. Experience and continued interest in the conduct of research.
   b. The necessary background for, and a continued interest in, teaching graduate courses.
   c. Continued interest in serving as a graduate student advisor.

2. Evidence of Qualifications
Faculty may meet the qualification requirements if they:

a. Are currently involved in research work or graduate instruction or in advising graduate students.
b. Regularly publish articles in recognized journals having national distribution or books related to their field of study.
c. Have earned the terminal degree in their field.

C. Appointment Procedures

Graduate Faculty appointment and retention decisions are made by the Dean of the Graduate School with recommendations and advice from department chairs, deans of colleges and schools, and the Graduate Faculty Council.

Recommendation for Graduate Faculty status is made in writing by the department chair of the appropriate academic unit or by the dean of the appropriate School. These recommendations are forwarded to the college dean, where appropriate, and then to the Graduate Dean.

D. Review of Graduate Faculty

It is expected that department chairs/school deans will continually review the performance of all individuals holding graduate faculty status in their respective units using criteria outlined in Section B above.

When, in a department chair/school dean's professional judgment, a faculty member holding a graduate faculty appointment is no longer satisfactorily functioning in this capacity, s/he must recommend that the individual in question be removed from graduate faculty status. The Dean of the Graduate School may also initiate the removal process in consultation with the appropriate chair/dean. The Dean of the Graduate School will act on recommendations with the advice and consent of the Graduate Faculty Council.
Prerequisites for graduate students

Background information:
- Prerequisites have not been checked for graduate students for several years
- Prerequisites are included in the course description (in the catalog and online) as background information only; students are expected to police themselves and make sure they are prepared for a course, but that often is not the case
- Academic misconduct cases have increased recently for graduate students, often because students do not have the prerequisite knowledge to be successful in a course
- In the last few years, two different programs (MBA and MEEM) have asked to have the prereqs checked for their students
  - Students in these programs are checked for prerequisites for all of their courses, even undergraduate level courses
  - Students in other majors can take a MEEM course without being checked for prereqs

Additional Information:
- Prerequisites are checked based on student level, not course level
- Departments may also restrict registration in a course by including or excluding by
  - Major
  - College
  - Student level
- When prerequisite checking is turned on, the process checks the prereqs on all courses the student registers for, even if it’s an undergraduate course
- Graduate level courses should have graduate level prerequisites
- Need to decide on what the minimum grade should be for prereqs (B or C?); students can get a prerequisite waiver if they do not have the minimum grade
Update on Graduate Program Review

The Graduate School has been working to take the guidelines for Graduate Program Review (approved by the GFC on October 21, 2010) and update them so that it is clear how they align with the University Learning Goals, University Strategic Plan, and guidance regarding assessment provided to the University by the Higher Learning Commission. This will be helpful for communication with our accreditation authority.

One thing that has become clear (and is not surprising) is that for PhD students, the Qualifying Exam, Proposal Defense, Final Oral Defense, and Dissertation are key elements in the assessment of PhD students.

PhD Student Goals:

1) Disciplinary knowledge (measured by the Qualifying Exam)
2) Ability to design a research project (Proposal Defense)
3) Ability to conduct research (Final Oral Exam and Dissertation)
4) Ability to communicate the results of research orally and in writing (Final Oral Exam and Dissertation)

In addition to these university-wide goals for PhD students there may also be program specific goals.

On the following page you will find some draft rubrics that could be used by faculty (and potentially others) to assess student learning outcomes at the Proposal Defense, Final Oral Defense, and Dissertation stages (prepared by Alex Guth).

We are interested in receiving feedback on these rubrics from the GFC.
Please evaluate the written document on the following criteria, using the attached rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lumina</th>
<th>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: Quality of language use to communicate meaning and control over errors</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3e: Comm. fluency</td>
<td>Organization &amp; Conventions: Clear and consistent organizational pattern and structuring elements including introduction, thesis and main points, conclusion, and transitions; follows formal and informal rules of genre or disciplinary expectations about organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Info Resources</td>
<td>Sources and Evidence: Uses a variety of quality sources and acknowledges different views to support ideas appropriate for discipline and genre of writing (e.g., citation styles); may use data to support observations and draw conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a: Analytic Inquiry</td>
<td>Proposes Solutions/Models/Hypotheses: Ability to propose and evaluate questions, solutions, models, and/or hypotheses related to a problem or a description of a natural phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Specialized Knowledge</td>
<td>Content Development: Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop ideas, situate ideas in a disciplinary context, and shape the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Integrative Knowledge</td>
<td>Thinking Innovatively: Creating and applying significant ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Syntax and Mechanics:</strong> Quality of language use to communicate meaning and control over errors</td>
<td>Shows some understanding of writing basics but errors distract from meaning.</td>
<td>Shows understanding of writing basics and conveys meaning although may have noticeable errors.</td>
<td>Shows competent use of writing to clearly convey meaning with few errors.</td>
<td>Shows skillful use of writing to communicate meaning with clarity, fluency, and virtually error-free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization &amp; Conventions:</strong> Clear and consistent organizational pattern and structuring elements including introduction, thesis and main points, conclusion, and transitions; follows formal and informal rules of genre or disciplinary expectations about organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.</td>
<td>Develops unclear or inconsistent organizational pattern; shows little awareness of genre and disciplinary conventions.</td>
<td>Develops organizational pattern unevenly; follows disciplinary or task expectations at a basic level of understanding.</td>
<td>Develops recognizable organizational pattern that structures the whole work; uses disciplinary or task conventions consistently.</td>
<td>Develops organizational pattern that enhances flow and cohesiveness through the whole work; demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of disciplinary or task conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and Evidence:</strong> Uses a variety of quality sources and acknowledges different views to support ideas appropriate for discipline and genre of writing (e.g., citation styles); may use data to support observations and draw conclusions</td>
<td>Demonstrates minimal support for ideas in the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources.</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources.</td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, diverse, and relevant sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposes Solutions/Models/Hypotheses:</strong> Ability to propose and evaluate questions, solutions, models, and/or hypotheses related to a problem or a description of a natural phenomenon.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a basic understanding of the problem or phenomenon, but is unable to provide even a superficial approach to solve the problem, or to understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern discipline—specific frameworks.</td>
<td>As appropriate to the given problem or phenomenon, is able to provide an appropriate solution, model, or hypothesis to solve the problem or understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern disciplinary frameworks. Carries out only superficial or workmanlike solutions, perhaps incorrectly. Is able to pose basic original questions about phenomena.</td>
<td>As appropriate to the given problem or phenomenon, is able to provide an appropriate solution, model, or hypothesis to solve the problem or understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern disciplinary frameworks. Carries out correct analysis to solve the problem or evaluate models and/or hypotheses, is able to pose insightful original questions about phenomena.</td>
<td>Proposes one or more solutions, models, or hypotheses indicating a deep understanding of the problem or phenomenon. Carries out correct, detailed solution or discipline—specific analysis to completion, with awareness of limiting factors based on approximations and/or assumptions. Poses insightful original questions about phenomena, and can articulate a reasoned approach for further investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Development:</strong> Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop ideas, situate ideas in a disciplinary context, and shape the work</td>
<td>Demonstrates simplistic development of content in some parts of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate development of ideas and disciplinary context through most of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates compelling ideas and subject development through the whole work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates subject mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking Innovatively:</strong> Creating and applying significant ideas</td>
<td>Reformulates a collection of available ideas.</td>
<td>Experiments with generating a significant or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Creates a significant idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Extends a significant idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral Presentation Evaluation (for everyone in attendance at presentation)

Student Name: ______________________________

Program: ________________________________

Defense date: ______________________________

Student Level: (MS, PhD)

I am a…. (Faculty in program; faculty outside program; committee member; student)

Please evaluate the oral presentation on the following criteria, using the attached rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lumina</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery &amp; Composure</strong>: Posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness; impression of composure and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pattern</strong>: Clear, consistent and recognizable structure (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, use of transitions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aids</strong>: Visible, attractive, and comprehensible visual display materials support major points or themes; appropriate to situation; design and handling add to effectiveness of presentation and speaker’s credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Comm. fluency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation of Issues</strong>: Clear and comprehensive communication of issues or problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3d: Quant. fluency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong>: Ability to explain information that is presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3b: Info. Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong>: Critical analysis or synthesis of information from a variety of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery &amp; Composure:</strong></td>
<td>Detract from the understandability of the presentation or speaker appears</td>
<td>Makes the presentation understandable or speaker appears tentative</td>
<td>Makes the presentation interesting and speaker appears composed</td>
<td>Makes the presentation compelling and speaker appears polished and confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uncomfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pattern:</strong></td>
<td>Is not recognizable</td>
<td>Is intermittently recognizable</td>
<td>Is clear and consistent</td>
<td>Enhances the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aids:</strong></td>
<td>Do not support main points and/or detract from or overwhelm the presentation</td>
<td>Provide basic support for main points with minimal contribution to</td>
<td>Enhance the effectiveness of the presentation</td>
<td>Increase the effectiveness of the presentation, add insight to main points, and augment speaker’s credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effectiveness of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of Issues:</strong></td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered is stated without clarification or</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated,</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>description.</td>
<td>description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored,</td>
<td>described, and clarified so that understanding is communicated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation:</strong></td>
<td>Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorrect conclusions about what the information means.</td>
<td>in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related</td>
<td>mathematical forms.</td>
<td>mathematical forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>computations or units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence:</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from one or a few sources without any interpretation/</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with some</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with enough</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation. Views of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
<td>interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop an analysis</td>
<td>interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or</td>
<td>interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with</td>
<td>synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are possibly subject to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>little questioning.</td>
<td>questioning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal XX-15

(Voting Units: Academic)

“Definition of “Joint” Faculty Appointments”

I. Background

This proposal is to formalize the definition of a term applied to tenured or tenure-track faculty who contribute scholarship in more than one discipline at the University.

This proposal also rectifies the current situation regarding the use of the term “adjunct” at Michigan Tech. At Michigan Tech, the term “adjunct” is currently applied to faculty members who contribute scholarship in more than one discipline at the University but only receive financial compensation from one discipline. This use of the term “adjunct” is not in alignment with the usage of the term at other institutions of higher education.

II. Proposal

The proposed changes are intended to be added to the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook.

II.a. Joint Faculty Appointments

**JOINT FACULTY APPOINTMENT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor):**
Joint faculty appointments are used to acknowledge and support the scholarly contributions that faculty may make in more than one discipline.

All faculty members holding joint appointments must have a primary affiliation within an academic department or school. The primary department or school will be responsible for annual reviews for the faculty member’s reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary consideration. The primary department/school will seek and consider written input from the chair of the department(s) and/or dean of the school(s) hosting the faculty member’s joint appointments.

Joint faculty appointments may or may not be associated with the distribution of salary for a faculty member among two (or potentially more) academic units at Michigan Tech.

Joint faculty appointments are at the same rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, or assistant professor) as a faculty member’s primary appointment.
Joint faculty appointments are possible with non-departmental and interdisciplinary programs as well as with departments or departmental programs.

All requests for joint appointments must be approved by the provost. Requests for joint appointments also need approval from the:

- faculty member’s primary academic department chair or school dean,
- dean of the faculty member’s primary college (if in a college)
- faculty member’s joint-appointment discipline’s department or school (for disciplinary appointments) or the appropriate executive group or director and Graduate Dean for interdisciplinary appointments.
- dean of the faculty member’s joint appointment college (if the joint-appointment discipline is housed in a college)
The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal XX-15

(Voting Units: Academic)

“Modify the Definition of the Term “Adjunct” Faculty”

I. Background

This proposal is to modify the definition of adjunct faculty to bring the usage of this term as it is applied at Michigan Tech into line with how the term “adjunct” is used at other institutions of higher education.

II. Proposal

The proposed changes to the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook are as shown in the remainder of this document.

II.a. Adjunct Faculty

Current Definition of Adjunct Faculty (from Section 1.5.5, Non-Tenure-Track Academic Rank Definitions, Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook; http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/prov/facbook/ch1/1chap-19.htm)

ADJUNCT (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor): An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within the academic unit to which the appointment is made. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of academic departments. Ordinarily no remuneration is associated with adjunct appointments, but on the approval of the President, remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent appointments.

Proposed New Definition of Adjunct Faculty (shown with changes from the original tracked)

ADJUNCT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor): An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within the academic unit to which the appointment is made at the University. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of
Ordinarily no remuneration is associated with adjunct appointments, but on the approval of the President, remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent reappointments.

Proposed **New Definition of Adjunct Faculty** (shown with all changes from the original accepted)

**ADJUNCT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor):** An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within an academic unit at the University. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of academic departments. Remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent reappointments.
Graduate Faculty Council—Draft Agenda

January 14, 2014
NOTE: (all handouts connected to a single pdf file)

1. Review minutes of 12/10/13

2. Committee Reports:
   a. Research Only Mode
   b. Thesis/Dissertation Review Committee

3. Old Business:
   a. Rhetoric and Technical Communications Program Name Change (R. Strickland)
   b. Data Science Master's Program Proposal (L. Brown/M. Buche)
   c. Data Science Graduate Certificate Program Proposal (L. Brown/M. Buche)
   d. Nondepartmental/Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs (Dean Huntoon)

4. New Business