Proposal to Change MS Degree Title from
“Industrial Archaeology” to “Industrial Heritage and Archaeology”
Department of Social Sciences

Contact: Hugh Gorman, Chair, Department of Social Sciences (hsgorman@mtu.edu)

1. General description and characteristics: This proposal is to change the name of the Department of Social Science’s MS program in “Industrial Archaeology” to “Industrial Heritage and Archaeology."

2. Related Programs: The new MS degree title will match the existing PhD degree program title “Industrial Heritage and Archaeology.” No other historical archaeology degree programs in the Great Lakes region focus on industrial heritage.

3. Rationale: Industrial heritage is an integral component of the Department of Social Sciences’ MS program in “Industrial Archaeology.” Hence, when the PhD program was established in 2004, building on the older MS program, the broader name “Industrial Heritage and Archaeology” was determined to be more accurate than “Industrial Archaeology.” Changing the title of the MS program would not only accurately convey the broader nature of the MS program but would also bring the title in alignment with the PhD program.

4. Accreditation Requirements: No additional accreditation requirements

5. Planned Implementation: The proposed change will be implemented in Fall 2020.

Approved by Dept. of Social Science faculty: October 23, 2019
Approved by CSA Dean: Dec. 7, 2019
Approved by Dean’s Council: Jan. 10, 2020
Approved by the University Senate:
Approved by Provost:
Ensuring Independent Assessments of Graduate Students

Management Plan Guidelines

Policy Statement
The University is committed to protecting the educational interests of students and maintaining an open and transparent environment in the evaluation of students. Faculty in close personal relationships should not be members of the same graduate student’s committee. If there are compelling reasons such that two (or more) faculty in a close personal relationship are recommended as members of a student’s committee, the relationship must be disclosed during committee formation (or when advisors are named if the co-advisors are the faculty in the relationship), a rationale for including these faculty on the committee must be included, and a management plan must be developed for the committee.

As every potential conflict of interest is unique, so every management plan is unique. This document is meant to provide some general guidelines and suggestions, not serve as a generic template for management plans for faculty in close personal relationships (hereafter, simply called “relationship”) serving on the same student’s committee.

General form of the management plan

Statement of the relationship necessitating the Management Plan:
Reason(s) that the faculty in the relationship are recommended for the committee:
Management Plan:

The management plan should consider the following
- Who is primarily responsible for timely written feedback to the student. This is particularly important if the faculty in the relationship are co-advisors.
- Who is primarily responsible for advocating for the student with respect to funding, space, access to electronic resources, etc…
- Who is primarily responsible for assigning grades for research credits.
- Who is primarily responsible for providing feedback on written work such as documents for a proposal defense, presentations, manuscripts, etc…
- How communication between the student and various members of the committee will be handled. In general, the student should communicate directly with all members of the committee individually, and vice versa.

This is not an exhaustive list. If there is potential for confusion, miscommunication, or ambiguity of who is responsible for direction or instruction or who the student should be reporting to, address it in the Management Plan.
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