

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 312 21 April 1999

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) elected Dick Blanning and Vern Watwood to serve on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee.
 - (2) approved nominations of Marty Auer (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Susan Martin (Social Sciences), Bogue Sandberg (Civil and Environmental Engineering), and Fred Williams (Chemistry) from the faculty-at-large, to be voted on by the entire faculty.
 - (3) heard a report from Tim Schulz (Electrical Engineering) on the proposed degree in Computer Engineering.
 - (4) passed Proposal 13-99, Amendment to Grading System Policy.
 - (5) defeated Proposal 20-99, Announcement and Commencement Date of Raises.
 - (6) tabled Proposal 22-99, Marginal Cost/Revenue Information for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs.
 - (7) heard a report from Tom Drummer on Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 312 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 21 April 1999, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Pete Tampas and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Institute of Wood Research, Metallurgy and Materials Engineering, and Institute of Materials Processing. Liaisons in attendance were Ted Soldan (Staff Council) and Anthony Moretti (USG).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Les Leifer (Chemistry), Marilyn Haapapuro (Human Resources), Tim Schulz (Electrical Engineering), Jon Soper (Electrical Engineering), and Luke Trier (USG).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Williams MOVED and Drummer 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 311

President Seely reported that the minutes would be corrected to reflect that it was Senator Suryanarayana, not Alternate Arici, who resigned and was replaced by Peck Cho.

Long MOVED and Vanden Avond seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 311 as corrected. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Seely announced that he had forwarded to the Administration Proposal 19-99, Extension of Insurance Benefits to All Employees. [**Appendix B**]

He has received a preliminary response regarding Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors. **[Appendix C]** There is discussion about the problems related to receiving the second major in a different college from that of the primary degree. Provost Dobney added that he had talked with the Dean of Engineering and they had concluded that the degree title cannot read "degree in engineering and physics" because of the difference in colleges, but that both majors would be indicated.

Seely has received a proposal to create a remote sensing minor and will forward this to the Curricular Policy Committee. **[Appendix D]**

Seely alerted chairs and officers that the Executive Committee would meet the next week. Among other items, they must consider a constituency issue.

Seely met with Dobney, Lassila, McGarry, Barna, and Pickens and will have a follow-up meeting next week to budget funds for Proposal 9-99, Transition to Full Co-Pay of Health Care Benefits for Retirees. Dobney will present two different budget scenarios to the board based on possible state funding models.

The officers, Tom Drummer, and Marcus Gioe will meet on 4 May regarding a USG proposal on teacher evaluations.

Seely reported on a conference on reclaiming the faculty role in governance, which he will discuss in more detail with the Executive Committee. Briefly, other universities have many of the same problems we face, but we also have some problems unique to our situation. We need to clarify what we mean by shared governance to members at all levels of our governance.

Seely reported that we have only half the nominees needed for the Administrative Evaluation Committee. The Senate must approve the nominees no later than the 5 May meeting, and he implored the Senators to get nominees from their units.

Senator Blanning asked what we could do if no one would be willing to serve in a unit. Seely responded that it would be the same as when no one wishes to be a Senator. The unit must work out a mechanism to provide a nominee; each unit is required to provide one.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Seely reported that there are three nominees for the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee and that the Senate must select two. These nominees are Vern Watwood (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Barry Pegg (Humanities), and Dick Blanning (Fine Arts).

The Senate ELECTED Dick Blanning and Vern Watwood to serve on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee.

Seely announced that there are four nominees from the faculty-at-large, and that the faculty must select two. These nominees are Marty Auer (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Susan Martin (Social Sciences), Bogue Sandberg (Civil and Environmental Engineering), and Fred Williams (Chemistry).

Seely expressed concern that there is only one nomination thus far for Senator At-large. It is desirable to have 4-6 nominees for the two positions. He stated that this is one position for which the President should not participate in the nominations because of the possible perception that he/she is stacking the Senate.

Vice President Soldan stated that the step of getting signatures of nominees discourages people from nominating.

Secretary Glime pointed out that the agreement could come by way of email and need not be done by visiting the nominee to get a signature.

7. NEW BUSINESS

Seely stated that Proposal 25-99, BS in Computer Engineering, had been delayed due to a misunderstanding in

the department concerning the next step in its progress. We can expect a report at the 5 May meeting. [**Appendix E**]

Tim Schulz (Electrical Engineering) presented the what and why it is needed regarding the proposed degree in computer engineering.

Senator Nadgorny asked what the difference was between computer science and computer engineering.

Schulz explained that computer engineering merges the fields of computer science, electrical engineering, hardware, and information systems.

Provost Dobney asked to what extent we can support the program with the existing faculty.

Schulz stated that a lot can be done with existing faculty, but that certain specialty areas will require some new faculty. The program would require the cooperation between electrical engineering and computer science.

Jon Soper (Electrical Engineering) added that the Department of Electrical Engineering is losing three faculty and that the department would attempt to fill these three positions with faculty having expertise in needed areas of computer engineering. It is difficult or impossible to survive in the current field of electrical engineering without this area of expertise.

Secretary Glime asked how much difficulty they anticipated in finding faculty to fill such positions.

Soper responded that MTU offers a very competitive salary, benefits, equipment, and facilities. The department would like to change to a ratio of 50:50 electrical to computer engineers.

Leifer (Chemistry) asked how many new students, not major changes, did they expect.

Schulz responded that they had discussed this at length but had been unable to make any predictions.

Soper stated that many existing majors are changing from the electrical engineering option to the computer engineering option.

Schulz added that MSU had moved their program from an option to a degree program and that approximately 1/3 of the electrical engineering students were in computer engineering. The same trend seems to be occurring here. Computer engineering is growing rapidly on a national scale, having exceeded the enrollment for civil engineering.

Senator Gale asked if the growth would continue if there is a crash in the computer industry.

Schulz responded that most electronic devices now use computer technology.

Soper added that all electronics are becoming digital; one cannot be an electrical engineer without understanding computer technology.

Leifer asked how many faculty they expected to need in 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 years into the program.

Schulz stated that if there are no new students, only change in emphasis, then there are no new faculty needed, but if they get lots of new students they will go to the Provost to request more faculty. He stressed that they are not creating a new department.

Senator Sutter asked if there would be space or lab needs at the outset.

Schulz stated that none would be needed to start the degree program.

Soper added that almost 400 students had been enrolled in the option at one time.

Barna asked if the proposal estimate of 80 new students per year was still an accurate estimate.

Soper responded that it was a scenario, but it was just a guess.

Dobney stated that admissions gets lots of queries about computer engineering.

Schulz stated that the degree program would require a large amount of computer science and indicated that all but one of these requirements would be for existing courses.

Sutter stated that the Computer Science Department is already constrained and asked if this additional program wouldn't aggravate the problem.

Dobney stated that a first priority for buildings is to expand and renovate Fisher Hall; however, this is probably five years away.

Schulz stated that the required new courses had been planned into the semester program.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 13-99, Amendment to Grading System Policy [Appendix F]

Williams MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to bring Proposal 13-99 from the table. The motion to remove from the table PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Senator Pegg asked what the effect of a Q grade is.

Senator Drummer explained that it is a wake-up call to warn students who are not progressing satisfactorily on multi-term projects.

Senator Reed asked if these would eventually change to letter grades. Drummer responded that they would.

Senator Ouillette stated that faculty can give a P grade for 500 and 600 research credits, which turn into S or E at the completion of the thesis. Faculty have been asking for some sort of indicator grade for undergraduate project courses.

Provost Dobney asked what the history was for S and E grades. Every other school he knew about gave P and F grades.

Secretary Glime asked, for the record, if it was correct that the Q grade would not be considered in the GPA.

Ouillette stated that Q would have no effect.

Senator Williams asked about the difference between an E and an F grade.

Ouillette stated that the E grade is not included in the GPA, but that a student would earn no credit in a course with an E. However, temporary grades might be considered if a student's record is being reviewed for dismissal.

Dobney stated that the committee should look at the Pass/Fail grade and the lack of penalty on the GPA if a student gets an E.

Senators explained that the purpose of the P/F grade was to encourage students to take courses to broaden their education that they might not take otherwise.

Reed asked if a student can take any class he/she wants in the P/F mode.

Ouillette explained that P/F is not an option for required courses.

Reed asked who must approve the type of grade allowed.

Ouillette responded that it requires departmental approval. The Q option is open for a multi-term sequence course.

Glime asked if the Q would be allowed if the student were to continue a project for another term but did not take additional credits.

Senator Snyder responded that the appropriate grade would be an I.

President Seely stated that the intent is for project courses that continue for more than one term.

Several changes were made in the wording to clarify this intention. In both the P and Q definitions, the word "may" was struck and "quarter" was changed to "semester." Seely ruled these changes to be editorial.

Glime reiterated her concern that faculty should be able to give a Q grade for a project even if the student did not take credits for it in a succeeding term.

Snyder responded that a student would not be allowed in a lab if that student is not taking credit, so an I should be given.

Seely ruled that the vote should be academic departments only. Proposal 13-99 PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

B. Proposal 20-99, Announcement and Commencement Date of Raises [Appendix G]

Pegg MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to remove Proposal 20-99 from the table. The motion to remove from the table PASSED with opposition.

Leifer (Chemistry) stated that the research office has indicated that there would be no problem in implementing this change and that payroll can handle the change. Most faculty teach or do research or do both in the summer.

Senator Pennington stated that some faculty teach during track A and others only during track B. If passed, this proposal would influence which track they teach.

Senator Snyder added that if faculty teach only one track they will choose B.

Senator Vanden Avond asked if faculty members would have to pay back part of their salary if they decided to leave the university at the end of the summer, since the summer salary would be based on the contract that begins in September.

Leifer responded that they would not because the new salary would go into effect in July.

Provost Dobney asked if the committee had found any other universities that do this and what would it mean for faculty responsibilities in July and August if the contract date began on 1 July.

Leifer stated that if a faculty member is not here in July and August, that faculty member does not get paid.

Senator Reed stated that he doesn't see any problem in the contract term.

Moretti (USG) asked what the logic is for starting the new pay level in July.

Leifer stated that it is because the administrators and professional staff already start their raises on 1 July.

Barna stated that the proposal would allow the Administration to change starting dates so that all employees start their raises at the same time in September. The proposal merely states that all start at the same time.

Reed stated that this seems like another way to provide an incentive for teaching in the summer.

Snyder MOVED to send the proposal to the Finance Committee for an appraisal of the financial impact on the university. The motion FAILED for lack of a second.

Senator Henkel asked what would happen if a faculty member was hired for nine months but stopped working for MTU half way through the year.

Dobney responded that the proposal would not affect this.

Leifer answered Dobney's first question by stating that the committee had not looked at what other universities did.

Senator Green stated that it would be easiest for the Administration to respond to this proposal by starting everyone in the fall.

Senator Blanning asked what would occur if someone taught the last half of summer and got the higher salary and then left at the end of the summer.

Dobney responded that the person would get the additional money in summer as dictated by the would-be raise.

Senator Nordberg explained that staff have different kinds of responsibilities and are expected to work during the summer, so a different start date for them is appropriate.

Pennington stated that there are only two possible outcomes from the decision to pass this proposal: faculty get a slight benefit, or staff get a slight detriment; faculty can't lose anything.

Seely stated that the full Senate would vote on this proposal. The motion to approve Proposal 20-99 FAILED on voice vote with many supporting votes.

C. Proposal 22-99, Marginal Cost/Revenue Information for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs [See minutes, page 7975, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Barna stated that the purpose of the proposal was to get a third party opinion on cost of programs. We can't look at where the voids are. This appraisal can be done annually and be available to the campus community to identify the costs of a program.

President Seely asked if there would be a common marginal cost for each student.

Barna replied that if we have an ideal student to faculty ratio and are at capacity, then the costs will be true.

Seely stated that then we have to be aware of the voids.

Barna responded that voids would not change the cost estimate, but would change the extent to which the costs apply.

Sweany asked why we have to hire a consultant if we know these numbers.

Barna explained that the Provost does not agree with the numbers calculated by the Finance Committee, so maybe the committee has missed something.

Sweany stated that maybe it is the use of the numbers he (the Provost) is concerned about.

Pennington stated that he agrees with getting another point of view, but every expansion is a special case. He stated that it would be better if the proposal were to state that the information would be made available, not that it be "used" because that might imply that all decisions must be based on a formula.

Pennington MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to change Proposal 22-99 so that the last sentence reads, "The methodology so established will be used annually, preferably at the end of each academic year, to

develop marginal cost/revenue information to *be made available* to the entire campus community for planning and decision making in the following year."

Seely ruled this to be an editorial change.

Vice President Soldan stated that the sum of \$5000 anticipated for the consultants is a small amount of money if this is a tool that will help in planning.

Green asked what part of the Senate budget this would require. Seely responded that the Senate budget is only \$7500 and that the following year they would have to bear the expense of the Administrative Evaluation.

Dobney added that we would not get much for only \$5000. Every program is special. If we use a formula, then we would close Forestry and Mining. It would make more sense to work with the Provost, Dean, and Chair to determine the cost.

Pickens stated that this proposal had been the end result of that interaction. It doesn't take an elegant analysis to figure the cost. Only 1/3 of the money comes from the new students brought by a new program. Our goal is to educate students and that needs to be part of the analysis.

Snyder stated that this proposal started when the first computer engineering proposal came to the Senate because a quick calculation indicated that it would have cost big time for the next 20 years. All agree that some programs are beyond the scope of what we can do. On the other hand, Electrical Engineering will produce fewer electrical engineers and more computer engineers. This is a pencil and paper exercise; we can't decide not to add a new program just because it will cost some money up front.

Senator Gale stated that we need to answer what the cost will be to hire the consultant(s).

Snyder stated that his guess would be closer to \$25,000.

Seely added that we need a firm with an understanding of higher education. He suggested that he and Barna identify potential firms and get a cost estimate before the next meeting.

Senator Long stated that other Senates must have struggled with this issue; we should contact our colleagues from other Senates and find out how they have provided such estimates.

Pickens stated that there is a web page on the cost of higher education.

Nordberg added that we can't be the first university to look at marginal cost.

Seely stated that an economist's analysis goes no where in running a university because they are concerned with different factors. It requires a judgmental use of the numbers we have gotten.

Barna stated that we could let the administration specify a firm that we already use. Somehow we need to get over the hurdle that the Provost thinks that the Finance Committee approach is flawed.

Williams MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to table the motion on Proposal 22-99. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Dobney stated that he would like to meet with the Committee and the appropriate chairs to discuss the proposal on Computer Engineering.

D. Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies [See minutes, page 7989, for a copy of this proposal.]

Drummer reported that the new drop period is proportional to the one in use with quarters; it follows the precedence at other schools; and it permits sufficient time for a report on mid-semester grades for freshmen and sophomores before the drop period ends. All cases of academic dismissal are decided on an individual basis after

a student becomes eligible for dismissal. The 3-quarter probation period has been changed to two semesters. Students are eligible for dismissal if they earn 0 credits in any term, have a GPA of less than 1 in any term, or have a cumulative GPA of less than 1 in any term. The cumulative GPA for the department will be based on a minimum of 16 credits instead of 15, as a basis of determining unsatisfactory performance.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Gale MOVED to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

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