

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 329

8 March 2000

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Introduced as new business Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures.
 - (2) Introduced as new business Proposal 8-00, Senate Resolution on Recruitment and Enrollment.
 - (3) Amended and approved Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 329 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 8 March 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Reed called roll. Absent were At-large Senator Goltz, and representatives from Biological Sciences, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Education, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Mining Engineering, Institute of Materials Processing, Keweenaw Research Center, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Anthony Moretti (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*) was the only visitor.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Seely proposed amending the agenda by moving the President's Report after New Business.

Blanning MOVED and Carr seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. 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 MEETINGS 327 AND 328

Senator Barna proposed an amendment to his comment regarding a straw poll of the professional staff on page 8359.

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.

Williams MOVED and Davis seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 327 as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

President Seely asked for approval of the minutes of meeting 328 by acclamation. There were no objections.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures [**Appendix B**]

President Seely provided a brief background of the proposal. He outlined the stages of approval for the proposal: 1) Senate approval, 2) recommendation to the Committee on Academic Tenure, and 3) referenda of the faculty.

Dave Nelson, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures, introduced the proposal. The motives of this revision are equity, consistency, and clarity; consistency with a semester calendar;

and to specify the process, but not the standards, for tenure, promotion, and reappointment.

Nelson reviewed changes to the current policy:

- 1) uniformity of review process among colleges and schools;
- 2) consistency of process among units;
- 3) establishment of a meaningful appeal process and the definition of appropriate bases for appeal;
- 4) move the revision process from the Committee on Academic Tenure to the University Senate;
- 5) specification of the process for early tenure;
- 6) clarification of 'promotion at time of tenure' language; and
- 7) definition of the tenure 'clock' starting date under the semester calendar (November 1).

In a detail question, D. Reed noted that the dean's recommendations go to the Interschool Committee for promotion, but not for tenure. MacLennan indicated that this will be checked for consistency before the next meeting.

Moretti questioned the need for different probationary periods by rank. Nelson indicated that this is standard procedure in academic institutions.

Moretti also asked if it was appropriate for students to sit on the appeals committee. Nelson indicated that the appeals committee reviews the process, but not the standards, of tenure and promotion, and felt that student participation was not appropriate at this point.

Moretti also stated that consistency is good, and asked if breakout by department is normal. Nelson indicated that it was because the department review is done by people most familiar with the candidate and the field.

Seely stated that reappointment policy clarification was also a goal.

Nelson stated that reappointment is in some ways tied to tenure, and this is an attempt to bring it under the same umbrella.

Pegg noted that the last sentence of Section 7 was not clear on who was voting - the entire faculty or the faculty in the Senate. Nelson replied that the intent was for the entire faculty to vote.

Both Senators Williams and Ftaclas requested a list of detailed changes from the current policy. Nelson replied that this is difficult because of the greater level of specificity in this new proposal. MacLennan indicated that the Committee on Academic Tenure may sponsor a forum and that that is a place where there could be more discussion of detailed changes.

Pegg asked if the Committee on Academic Tenure does not review departmental standards, who does? Seely noted that departmental charters are to define the standards, but Nelson noted that these are general standards and not numerically specific.

B. Proposal 8-00, Senate Resolution on Recruitment and Enrollment [Appendix C]

The proposal was introduced as new business. Seely stated that the proposal was drafted by the Senate Executive Committee in response to Gary Neumann's report to the Senate on Enrollment Management. The proposal suggests five specific action items. The Senate will begin debate on the proposal at the March 22 meeting.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 6-99, University Web Page Policy. **[Appendix D]**

Seely has received two documents from USG. The first is a request to the Board of Control for an increase in the Student Activity Fee and Memorial Union Building support and the institution of a new fee to support the operations of the Student Development Complex. **[Appendix E]** The second is a resolution opposing Public Act 118 preventing Michigan residents from voting at an address different from the one listed on their drivers' licenses. **[Appendix F]**

Seely received the annual report on research from Vice Provost Sung Lee. **[Appendix G]** The report has been sent to the Research Policy Committee for review.

The Curricular Policy Committee is currently reviewing the following: 1) Proposal to Establish a BS in Biomedical Engineering, 2) Proposal for a Designing Engineer Certificate, and 3) Proposal for a General Science Teaching Certification Option.

Seely reported that he has received from Human Resources the document that describes the procedure for delivering supplemental contributions to qualified individuals under Proposal 9-99.

The Budget Liaison Group met on February 16 and looked at an overview of budget matters that had been committed to and items the administration expected such as utility increases and building openings. The Group met again on March 1 to hear a basic overview of decisions made by the Vice Presidents and President on the proposed budget.

The budget calls for a 6 percent salary increase pool with the raises delivered in two stages (3% on July 1, 2000 and 3% on January 1, 2001). The deans and vice provosts were directed to prepare budgets for the 2000-2001 academic year on the assumption that they would have 95 percent of their 1999-00 budget. They should also assume that that process will continue for the next two years.

The Senate will not see a draft budget until sometime in April. Seely has asked the Senate Executive and Finance Committees to draft a response to the budget situation.

Seely stated that Proposals 1-99, 2-99, 3-99, and 4-99 relative to financial crisis and stress have a key statement that these are matters that emerge largely out of control of the University. Seely felt that the proposals do not apply to the current budget situation.

Members of the Provost Search Committee are in the process of interviewing nine candidates. The Committee intends to have a short list of candidates for campus visits soon.

The strategic planning retreat kicks off today culminating with the Board of Control meeting on Friday.

President Seely reported that Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures has been pending final approval of the administration until there have been cases moved through the process. A few cases were moved this year and Peck Cho, Ombudsperson, and Ellen Horsch, Human Resources, have questions to be reviewed. Seely requested permission to form an ad hoc review committee to expedite the review. Members would include Joe Heyman, Peck Cho, one or two Senators, and Ellen Horsch as an ex-officio member. The charge to the committee would be:

"Review the interim faculty grievance policy and examine any questions that have been raised in light of the experience working under the procedures during this trial period. To seek input from the administration and ombudspersons which would include Larry Julien. Bring any recommended changes to the Senate in the form of amendments to Proposal 13-95."

Davis MOVED and Carr seconded the motion to authorize Seely to appoint such a committee. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Query Regarding Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies (Mid-Semester Grades and Drop

Policy) [Appendix H]

Bonnie Gorman, Student Affairs, presented some suggested changes to the Mid-Semester Grades and Drop policies. The matter was referred to the Instructional Policy Committee for review.

B. Procedures on Religious Observance Policy [Appendix I]

Seely introduced a set of procedures to implement the Policy on Religious Observance. The procedures were developed and approved unanimously by the Ad Hoc Committee on Religious Observance.

Senator Nordberg questioned the section regarding staff usage of vacation and personal days. Seely responded that we will seek clarification on the language.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors [See minutes, page 8372, for a copy of this proposal.]

B. Reed MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to remove the proposal from the table. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Seely proposed an amendment to the fifth paragraph of the proposal.

Davis MOVED and Ftaclas seconded the motion to amend the paragraph as follows.

A student who completes a double major earns one degree. Students must select a first-named major and a second-named major at the time degree audits are filed. **The diploma shall record the fact that the student has completed a double major, and shall identify the student's field of study in keeping with the Registrar's regular procedures governing diploma language.** ~~The diploma will list both names separated by "and in" when both majors result in either a Bachelor of Science degree or a Bachelor of Arts degree, for example, "Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering and in Mathematics." When the majors result in different degrees, only the first-named major will be listed on the diploma.~~ Completion of both majors will be noted on the final transcript and the commencement program for all students.

The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Seely ruled that the amendment was editorial. There were no objections.

The motion to approve the proposal as amended PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Drummer MOVED and Davis seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

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