

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 288

18 February 1998

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Approved Proposal 7-98, Amendment to University Closure Policy, striking the paragraph pertaining to weather advisories. This means the university will either be open or closed; there will be no advisories.
- (2) Approved Proposal 5-98, Masters of Engineering.
- (3) Approved Proposal 3-98, Social Studies Education Option in the BS in Social Sciences Degree.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 288 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 18 February 1998, in Room U113 of the Minerals and Materials Building.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Tom Drummer, Harold Evensen, and William Shapton, and representatives from IWR and IMP. Liaison in attendance was Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fritz Erickson (Education), Les Leifer (Chemistry), Neil Hutzler (Associate Dean, College of Engineering), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), and Terry Reynolds (Social Sciences).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Seely requested that the agenda be rearranged so that item 7 and item 8 be exchanged. In addition, in the new item 7 items should be rearranged so that C becomes A, A becomes B, and B becomes C.

Nesbitt MOVED and Prince seconded the motion to approve the agenda. 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 287

Ouellette MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 287. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. OPEN MOTION ON PROPOSAL 7-98, AMENDMENT TO UNIVERSITY CLOSURE POLICY [See minutes, page 7299, for a copy of this proposal.]

The essence of Proposal 7-98 is to strike 9.4.1B from the closure policy. The remaining language is designed to provide flexibility for exempt employees.

Senator Haapala asked for an example of flexibility for exempt personnel.

President Seely explained that they can make the decision to report or not report on days with bad weather. Seely ruled that the full Senate should vote. The motion to approve Proposal 7-98 passed on voice vote with no opposition.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

There is still no meeting date set for the Finance and Fringe Benefits Committees to meet with the Administration due to the administrative travel schedule.

Chris Anderson sends a reminder of the 1998 Equity in the Classroom Conference (#8) at Saginaw Valley State University 19 & 20 March.

MTU faculty and staff may attend with no conference fee because MTU is a cosponsor. Highlights this year include redefinition of merit - its impact on diversity in admissions; creating engaged classrooms; graduating students - addressing attrition; creating successful college/university transfer programs.

Dr. Vincent Tinto, Distinguished Professor of Education, Syracuse University, and Dr. Brenda Wilson, President of California State University, Northridge, are keynote speakers.

Interested persons should register with Chris Anderson by 4 March. Senators should pass the information to their constituents. Registration materials are available from Chris Anderson.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 5-98, Masters of Engineering [Appendix B]

Nesbitt reported for the Curricular Policy Committee that questions on the proposal related to the residency requirement and the senior rule. These concerns were not great enough to hold up the program, but the committee felt that the person in charge of the program should give a report to the Senate in three years. This report should address the usage of the senior rule, who is taking advantage of the program (fifth year students, distance ed students, etc.), the types of programs and courses that are required in them, and how effectively the program is being advised.

Senator Snyder commented that the senior rule does not apply to 300 and 400 level courses.

Sandberg MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to accept Proposal 5-98.

Hutzler agreed that Snyder had a good point.

Vice President Soldan asked why the program will cost more if students take courses under the senior rule. Snyder responded that students can take a number of courses at no cost to them under the 20-hr credit limit, and they are paying only the undergraduate rate for their courses.

Soldan commented that some stay around to take more credits.

President Seely countered that the program will be more coherent if the student is under the guidance of an advisor. Therefore, the program could require one year with an advisor guiding the student toward the degree.

Senator Suryanarayana commented that these things are already happening.

Senator Ouillette clarified that a student can take two graduate courses under the senior rule, but that there is no limit to the number of undergraduate courses that can be taken.

Senator Sandberg asked why the university gives 8 credits free (12-20 for the same tuition).

Senator Reed asked about the residency requirement.

Senator Nordberg suggested that we could set a maximum number of credits that could carry over from credits taken while an undergraduate.

Snyder stated that the current MS program only permits 18 credits of 300-400 level courses; this program has 3 more. We could limit the number to be carried over.

Senator Williams stated that the cost to the university for a graduate student to take a 300 level course is the same as for an undergraduate to take the course.

Snyder countered that courses counted toward the ME degree should be part of a coherent program.

Senator Barna stated that you can't later petition to count 300-400 level courses as graduate courses.

Suryanarayana stated that if the students really want a 300 level course they should take it, but it should not count toward the degree. The student must have a home department. He questioned how this program differs from a plan C Masters. If it is for practicing engineers, MTU should develop new courses, like air conditioning engineering. Who will administer the program? We need to sell it to the faculty, and this should have happened before it came to the Senate as a proposal.

Nesbitt countered the objections to 300 level courses, arguing that this degree may represent an expansion of the student's major to one that is more interdisciplinary, and the 300 level courses may be prerequisites for graduate courses.

Hutzler added that this program is different from plan C because plan C is strictly coursework, whereas this program requires a practicum. If the program is all design courses, is it really appropriate for the MS? It should be ME.

Suryanarayana countered that we need more practical courses in the curriculum.

Sandberg supported the idea that there should be a limit on the number of 300 level courses. Snyder added that the number should be 18 hours of 300-400 (as in the other programs).

Sandberg countered that it is important to retain the 300 level flexibility; for example, many students will need business courses, but the 500 level courses are no longer there because they have been renumbered to 300 level.

Nesbitt supported retaining the 21 credits of 300-400 level, saying that the advisors still have control.

Suryanarayana disagreed, stating that the Associate Dean has control.

Hutzler argued that the Associate Dean must approve the programs but does not have the control.

Seely agreed that the college serves to police the program, but it doesn't put it together; rather, it helps to assure some consistency.

Hutzler added that the quality control is through the Associate Dean.

Pennington asked about the inconsistency in nomenclature in the proposal and asked if it is meant to be MS or ME. Seely responded that it should be ME throughout.

Senator Reed asked if the engineering faculty have voted to have this program. Hutzler responded that there is no mechanism to do this. The degree has been discussed with the chairs, who should have discussed it with their departments.

Sandberg added that his department supports the proposal.

Pennington commented that he was getting a mixed message from his department. Faculty questioned if it is a benefit to the student; companies expect a thesis with the MS degree and may not want students with this type of program.

Suryanarayana suggested that we should run this proposal through the departments to see if they support it.

Nesbitt responded that each department can choose to offer or ignore the ME degree. Hutzler agreed.

Senator Nadgorny stated that his department thinks that the program can be widened to include the area of applied physics. Hutzler stated that he thinks this could be done, or that a student could design a program in computer engineering.

Reed stated that he is bothered that there is no faculty endorsement; is there any understanding that there should be such endorsement?

Seely stated that if a department puts a program forward, then they must agree with it. This proposal is the result of efforts of a few departments and is a spin off. In fact there has been considerable debate about whether it is really a new degree. Vice Provost Lee said that it would be difficult to explain why this is not a spinoff. Each department must decide if it will participate in this program; the proposal provides the framework.

Reed responded that he would be more comfortable if at least one department supports the program; he is uncomfortable with setting this precedent.

Soldan took the discussion a different direction, asking for verification that 100 students in the program would net a cost to the university, whereas with only 50 students the University would break even due to use of unsubscribed seats. He asked if we should cap enrollment.

Barna asked if this information would be part of the requested report. Nesbitt responded that it would be.

Barna stated that departments can refuse to admit students, but the students won't know which departments won't accept students into this program.

Senator Chavis stated that all this discussion is assuming that students will find this program attractive with no financial aid.

Hutzler responded that opinions vary on this subject; some find it attractive.

Chavis asked what would happen if we don't have enough faculty to teach them.

Snyder responded that the department won't admit new students if there are too many. He is concerned that we do not now issue a ME degree and therefore we must go to the Board of Control for approval.

Seely agreed, and that is why we need approval from the Senate now.

Snyder suggested that we should modify page 4 of the proposal and bring in the language of the senior rule from the current policy.

Snyder MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to change the last sentence of paragraph 2, p. 4, to read "Courses taken while an undergraduate at Michigan Tech may be used for graduate degree credits *in accordance with the senior rule.*"

Williams suggested that the motion be tabled.

Senator Gale asked for a poll of the departments to determine what kind of departmental support there is for the program.

Senators were polled by department for their sense of the support from their department:

Civ/Env: yes

EE: no opinion

ME-EM: no formal discussion

Chem Eng: only permit plan A

MY: only permit plan A

Soldan stated that if only one department wants to have the program, we should give them the opportunity.

Sandberg added that now a department has to use plan C for this type of program. This lets them differentiate the program as not being appropriate for the MS

Suryanarayana again raised the question of why permit 21 credits of 300 and 400 level courses instead of only 18 like the rest of the Masters programs.

Sandberg responded that typically there are at least 9 credits of thesis research; by having no thesis, most of the coursework is still at the 500 level.

Suryanarayana objected that the student would not know that a committee would decide on the specific coursework requirement.

Sandberg countered that it is that way now.

Seely summarized that all places in the proposal should designate the program as ME (not MS). Reading from the graduate catalog, he stated that under the senior rule a senior may apply for graduate credit. This requires permission of the major department and the prospective graduate department and dean. These courses are not counted in the undergraduate GPA. The course must be approved by the graduate advisor and the credit cannot be changed to graduate credit after the course is over.

Suryanarayana argued that the policy does not cover transfer students.

Seely again referred to the catalog and responded that transfer credit must be in accordance with the department and cannot exceed more than 1/3 of the non-research credits.

Suryanarayana argued that in this proposal residency only requires that 50% of the credits be taken at MTU.

Nordberg explained that the proposal was written to accommodate the distance education program already in existence with some of the major corporations.

Pennington added that the residency and transfer credits are not parallel; distance education taken as MTU credits is considered as residence.

Nesbitt added that residency is defined as paying MTU tuition, which students in the distance education program currently do.

Ouillette verified that they do indeed pay MTU tuition. He added that he understands that the senior rule covers 300-600 level courses.

Seely, reading from the graduate catalog, stated that a senior may apply to take a course for graduate credit, but it must be done prior to the end of the affected quarter.

Ouillette added that such a course is flagged and cannot be used for undergraduate credit.

Senator Green asked what prevents a student from taking courses under the senior rule for 3 quarters of the senior year.

Seely responded that it would require approval by the graduate advisor, the undergraduate department, and the graduate department, as discussed earlier.

Suryanarayana felt that this would punish the MTU student compared to a transfer student.

The amendment to add the wording *in accordance with the senior rule* PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Suryanarayana stated that we should limit the number of courses to be counted for graduate credit if they were taken outside the university as an undergraduate.

Snyder responded that the graduate school rule says that courses from another university will not normally transfer.

Seely clarified, based on the graduate catalog, that the graduate school rule is that 1/3 of the non-thesis credits can transfer.

Senator Long stated that this requirement should be the same as for the existing MS.

Nesbitt stated that the only difference is in the residency requirement.

Hutzler explained that in designing the program, they wanted more flexibility in the residency requirement.

Gale asked if this discussion could go back to the committee instead of taking Senate time.

Seely responded that the College of Engineering and Graduate School would like to see this proposal go to the Board of Control on 20 March, since that would be the last opportunity for them to consider it this year.

Suryanarayana MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to change the minimum coursework credits to 2/3 at MTU (consistent with the MS).

Nesbitt suggested that students could take courses at Ann Arbor and count them as part of the degree rather than as transfer credits.

Nordberg stated that this amendment would permit no more than 1/3 transfer credits.

Nesbitt clarified that transfer refers to credits taken before the student is in the program. Residency is affected when a student takes a course while enrolled but the course is a non-resident course that counts; this is not considered a transfer credit.

Reed added that a student can transfer only graduate level courses for the graduate degree.

Ouillette stated that residency means that the student must be on campus physically taking courses. A student must have the department and provost's permission to do it elsewhere. GM and Ford have classes at other universities for their employees and we evaluate the credit from those universities and bring it in as transfer credits.

Suryanarayana stated that the residency requirement should be the same as that for the MS degree.

Nesbitt stated that the intent in the smaller percent required was to provide for distance learning.

Leifer stated that several things are obvious. We do not need to get in the trap of being a mail order degree program.

Nesbitt agreed, but stated that advising prevents being a mail order degree.

Sandberg stated that the advisor, committee, college of Engineering, and Dean of the graduate school have to approve each student's program. It is up to the faculty to control the courses counted for the degree.

The motion to amend FAILED on voice vote with some assent.

Suryanarayana asked if it would be more appropriate to clean up the proposal before voting so that there is no question what it means.

Seely clarified the needed editorial changes. On page 1, the title should be *Master of Engineering*. Michigan Technological University will award the *Master of Engineering* Degree as described below. Under part 2. Rationale, the first sentence should begin *The Master of Engineering* degree.

Nadgorny asked if the applied program could be outside engineering.

Seely responded that remote sensing will cross colleges and that the program could include applied physics.

Suryanarayana stated that physics is not precluded by the proposal.

Seely ruled that all units would have to vote by secret ballot to determine if this should be handled as an emergency proposal.

Sandberg MOVED and Snyder seconded the motion to treat Proposal 5-98 as an emergency proposal.

The motion to treat this as an emergency proposal PASSED on a secret ballot, 21 yes to 13 no.

Seely stated that to insure that the suggestion for a three-year review does not get forgotten, it will be part of the request to the administration.

Only academic departments are eligible to vote on the proposal. The motion to approve Proposal 5-98 PASSED on voice vote with dissent.

B. Proposal 3-98, Social Studies Education Option in the BS in Social Sciences Degree [Appendix C]

Seely stated that another proposal for an education option will be coming from the Department of Humanities for an English teaching option.

Reynolds (Chair, Social Sciences) stated that the Social Sciences Department has few majors. This program will increase the number of majors in the department. They expect no more than 20 matriculating students (about 5 per year) and therefore there should be no strain on their faculty. They will need a part-time adjunct faculty member to teach the SS methods in an education course once a year.

Erickson (Chair, Education) stated that the Education Department can absorb the new students with no additional cost. There are about 32% vacant seats now.

Nesbitt stated that the Curricular Policy Committee supports the proposal. It needs a clarification as to whether the minor referred to is the MTU minor or the state-required minor teaching field. **[Appendix D]**

When asked by Seely, Barna stated that the Finance Committee had not discussed this proposal. However, at 5 students per year, the cost would be no more than \$10,000 per year.

Senator Walck asked if we would be likely to capture Northern's students.

Erickson responded that we might keep some from going there, but that Northern was aware of our intent and did not seem too worried.

Seely stated that the program was first viewed as competing with Northern.

Erickson responded that he doesn't view it as straight out competition.

Seely asked if the Curricular Policy Committee would be meeting again before March 11.

Nesbitt responded that the committee plans to discuss the HU education proposal by email.

Barna stated that there is no meeting scheduled for the Finance Committee, but that they might meet the first week of spring term.

Seely asked Erickson if the delay would pose problems. Erickson responded that it takes approximately six months to get a new program through the state, so we need to move rapidly to begin the program in the fall. [The hope is to accommodate some enrolled students who want to be in the program.]

Seely stated that we would try to get both proposals through on 11 March.

Pennington stated that the proposal seems to be straight forward and should not need to be delayed.

Sweany MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to treat Proposal 3-98 as an emergency proposal. The motion to treat as an emergency proposal PASSED on a secret ballot, 28 to 5.

Nesbitt MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to accept Proposal 3-98, Social Studies Education Option in the BS in Social Sciences Degree.

Pegg was concerned that there had been no discussion of the proposal from the HU department for a similar option and that these two should be discussed together. Seely responded that the SS proposal had come to him first because no copy came to him when the HU proposal went to the Administration, so he only received it a few days earlier. The Senate had had this one to take to their departments.

Discussion ended. The motion to approve Proposal 3-98 PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m. by acclamation.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the University Senate