

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

## Minutes of Meeting 327

9 February 2000

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard that the president approved Proposal 6-00, Supplemental Sabbatical Leave Funds, with the proviso that the program will be funded if and when budget support becomes available.
  - (2) heard a report from the Academic Policy Committee on season days.
  - (3) heard a report from the Research Policy Committee on Carnegie Classification.
  - (4) tabled Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors.
- 

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 327 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 February 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Reed called roll. Absent were At-large Senators Goltz, Kunz, and MacLennan, and representatives from Education, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Mining Engineering, and Institute of Materials Processing. Liaisons in attendance were Anthony Moretti (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marilyn Urion (Graduate School), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Williams MOVED and Pegg seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. [**Appendix A**. NOTE: Only official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

### 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 326

Pickens MOVED and Ftaclas seconded the motion to remove the additional comments from Gary Neumann on page 8318 and include them as an appendix item. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

Snyder MOVED and Prince seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 326 as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

### 5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

Seely reported that Proposal 6-99, University Web Page Policy, has been transmitted to the administration for implementation. [**Appendix B**]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 6-00, Supplemental Sabbatical Leave Funds, with the proviso that the program will be funded if and when budget support becomes available. [**Appendix C**] Tompkins has raised some questions relative to Proposal 5-00, Changes to University Sabbatical Leave Program. Seely will discuss these concerns with Provost Dobney.

Seely described the budget process procedures:

1. Units budget requests are due to the vice presidents by February 16.
2. Vice Presidents will bring forward their budget requests by February 23.

3. Budget scenarios will be assembled by the Budget Office and reviewed by President Tompkins.

4. Board Finance Subcommittee will hear the scenarios on March 3.

5. McGarry and the Senate Finance Committee will meet on March 6 and the Senate will hear a presentation on March 8.

6. The Board of Control will hear the same presentation on March 10.

The Health Care Liaison Group met on February 7. Ellen Horsch asked that the group focus on two specific issues: approaches the University can take to stop loss insurance coverage and the advantages of self-insurance versus full coverage insurance.

The Strategic Planning Working Group has received 14 portfolios. They have begun to assemble an outline for dissemination to the University community for feedback. The portfolios can be found at <http://www.doe.mtu.edu/strategic/draft.html>.

The Provost Search Committee will meet with a search firm member on Friday, February 11. This member has personally interviewed 18 individuals. A list of individuals that will be invited for initial interviews will be the result of this meeting.

Bob Keen, Fred Dobney, Ellen Horsch and Seely will discuss the separation proposals (1-99, 2-99, 3-99, and 4-99) with Andrea Dixon of Butzel Long on February 17.

Requests for course offerings in summer school 2001 has been delayed for about six months. The Instructional Policy Committee will meet with Vice Provost Bowen to discuss semester summer school compensation, schedule, and other details.

Senator Barna reported that the MTU Chapter of AAUP did not presently have representatives of the professional staff as members and that the Chapter was uncomfortable conducting the straw poll of professional staff without such representation. The Chapter was actively seeking volunteers to serve as representatives of the professional staff in the conduction of a straw poll.

## **6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

### **A. Academic Policy Committee [Appendix D]**

Erik Nordberg, Chair, Senate Academic Policy Committee, reported on the Committee's discussions of the soft money research staff failing to receive the season days awarded to other university employees between Christmas and New Year's. The Committee does not see this as discrimination, but it does emphasize the different type of relationships with different groups of employees. The soft money research staff, for instance, received their annual salary increases last July 1, while the other university employees had a portion deferred until January 1, 2000. The administration was aware of this issue when the decision to award the season days was made, and decided that the cost of awarding the days to the research staff was excessive.

### **B. Research Policy Committee [Appendix E]**

Steve Hackney, Chair, Senate Research Policy Committee, summarized the Research Policy Committee discussions of the Carnegie I Action Plan submitted by Vice Provost Lee. The Committee believes the three major factors in achieving Carnegie I status will be: 1) the scholarship of the faculty; 2) the ability of MTU to attract and retain quality PhD students; and 3) administrative support of faculty research efforts.

The Committee believes that GTA allocation should be moved to Dr. Lee's office and that REF funds should be restored to their previous uses. There is also Committee support for a study of graduate student tuition rates. The Committee did not support the addition of a new research administrator or the establishment of a government liaison office in Washington.

Marilyn Urion discussed the context of the Carnegie I Action Plan. MTU is just on the edge of qualifying as category I under the new classification system. Dr. Lee developed a plan to qualify as Carnegie I in 2001 and to retain that status in 2005. Under this timeline, the need is to produce PhDs from currently enrolled students in order to meet the category I criteria in 2005. The plan submitted is formulated to get students through to degree completion, and keeping the currently enrolled students here until completion of their degrees. At the same time, it is important to establish means to sustain PhD production levels in order to retain Carnegie I status. The Research Policy Committee concerns centered on the role of the faculty in sustaining the Carnegie I classification.

The Carnegie I Action Plan was discussed in meetings with deans, chairs, and GSC, but not with any faculty groups. There are concerns that there are inadequate incentives to departments and faculty to take on PhD students. The Action Plan is incorporated into Dr. Lee's strategic planning portfolio, and some of the issues are addressed there.

Hackney noted that the GTA allocations had formerly been done by the Graduate School, but this responsibility had been moved to the Provost's Office in recent years. The Committee supports returning this responsibility to the Graduate School. How to allocate is being discussed with GSC.

The Research Policy Committee's concerns about graduate student tuition were noted and a Task Force is being formed to examine this and a report is due by the end of the month. Michael Gretz from the Research Policy Committee is a member of this Task Force. Urion noted that GSC also felt that health benefits for graduate students was an important issue.

Urion noted that the new research administrator was important to the long-term sustainability of our PhD programs and our ability to sustain a Carnegie I classification. She also noted that the government liaison in Washington would serve to identify contacts and form linkages with federal agencies.

Seely noted the need to accord the Research Policy Committee a greater role in the discussions concerning Carnegie I status and other issues.

Soldan asked about the cost of attaining Carnegie I status and the resulting impacts. Urion noted that Carnegie status affects the state funding tier for appropriations. It also affects how MTU is viewed by granting agencies, faculty we are trying to recruit, etc. The focus is on how to use our resources more wisely to maximize the benefit.

Senator Snyder asked how many state universities of our faculty and student size are Carnegie I. No one knew the answer, but generally, Carnegie I institutions tend to be larger universities.

## **7. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors [See minutes, page 8351, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Senator Snyder reviewed the Curricular Policy Committee deliberations of the administration's recommended changes to Proposal 14-99. The Committee suggested revisions to the administration's suggested changes, including a statement that, when a student's situation would require more than 32 credit hours to complete a double major, that another solution (such as a dual degree) may be preferable for the student.

The Committee examined the question of listing both majors on the student's diploma. Senator Snyder called the Accreditation Director at ABET (Daniel Hodge); ABET's response was that if a student met the program criteria in both areas, then there was no problem. ABET has no problems with a diploma listing a combination of ABET-accredited and non-ABET accredited programs as long as the requirements for the ABET accredited program are met.

The Committee reviewed concerns with state boards of professional registration. Snyder indicated that the 'and in' language suggested for the diploma should address these concerns. Snyder checked with RPI and Carnegie Mellon and they reported no problems with registration boards created by this language.

When the double major includes both BS and BA programs, only one degree would be awarded with only the primary major listed on the diploma. Completion of both majors would be noted on the transcripts.

Carr MOVED and B. Reed seconded the motion to approve the amendments as presented. **[Appendix F]**

Senator Ouillette asked what exactly would be indicated on the transcript.

Snyder replied that we have to be careful about the difference between dual degrees and double majors. We will need to ask peer institutions about their language for listing double majors on transcripts.

Senator Hodek asked if this was in the best interest of the students and the institution. Snyder replied that it is in the students interest due to increased marketability, acknowledgment of accomplishments, etc. and in the institutions interest in that it gives more options to students, which should benefit student numbers. Senator Ftaclas noted that this proposal would allow students to be recognized for their accomplishments.

Gale MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to table the proposal until March 8. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Gale MOVED and Ouellette seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by David D. Reed  
Secretary of the University Senate