

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 338

27 September 2000

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a general report from Provost Wray.
 - (2) heard a report on the proposed Enterprise Park from Pete Radecki, Corporate Services.
 - (3) elected John Gierke to the Academic Integrity Committee.
 - (4) elected Joe Heyman to the Conflict of Interest Committee.
 - (5) elected Dave Ouillette to the Graduate Council.
 - (6) elected Mary Carol Friedrich and Dana Johnson to the Presidential Commission for Women.
 - (7) elected Anand Kulkarni, Bill Sewell, and Chung-Jui Tsai to the Presidential Commission for Diversity.
 - (8) introduced Proposals 1-01 and 2-01.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Keen called University Senate Meeting 338 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 27 September 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Pickens called roll. Absent were At-Large Senators Kunz and Beck, and representatives from ME-EM, Materials Science and Engineering, Mining Engineering, Finance and Advancement, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Josh Bennett (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Pete Radecki (Corporate Services), Phil Musser (Keweenaw Industrial Council), Jay Meldrum (KRC), Peck Cho (ME-EM), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Keen presented the agenda. There were no objections to the agenda. [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 334 AND 335

Hodek MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to approve the minutes from meeting 334 as presented. Motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Long MOVED and Pegg seconded the motion to approve the minutes from meeting 335 as presented. Motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Tompkins thanked the Senate for appointing Wayne Pennington to the Senior Vice President for Advancement and Marketing Search Committee. [Appendix B]

The Strategic Planning Working Group met on September 18.

Keen met with Provost Wray on September 21. Discussions covered the flow of items through the Senate and administration.

The Space Committee met on September 21 and heard a presentation on the proposed Enterprise Park by Pete Radecki.

Keen met with Provost Wray on September 27 and discussed the separation policies. They have been reviewed again by President Tompkins, and will now be reviewed by Provost Wray. After Provost Wray's modifications, it will return to President Tompkins again, then be submitted to the University attorney. After this process, the policies will be returned to the Senate, then back through the administration and finally the Board of Control (BOC).

The matter of field trips and student absences was referred to the Instructional Policy Committee for review and development of appropriate policy.

The Executive Committee will meet as soon as possible to consider changes to the Bylaws.

The Senate is seeking nominees for the Academic Tenure, Faculty Review (Grievance), Inquiry (Scientific Misconduct) and Sabbatical Leave committees.

President Keen will meet with Jo Deaton, GSC President, and Alesha Culp, USG President on September 29.

6.REMARKS BY PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS KENT WRAY

Provost Wray expressed a strong commitment to shared governance.

Provost Wray requested guidance from the Senate concerning seeking a replacement for Sung Lee. He noted that most universities who do as much research as MTU have a vice president directing research efforts, and that he intends to suggest this change to the BOC. He added that this would be a no-cost change, and that the new vice president will report to the Provost. The change would give the new vice president more stature externally. He sought input from the Senate concerning the search procedure to be used, specifically the makeup of the committee and its relationship to the Senate policy for senior administrative searches. Specifically, he asked if the Senate policy applied to the creation of this search committee, and if so was he limited in terms of the number of people he could appoint to the committee? Wray's concern is that he would like as broad of representation on the committee as possible, especially representation of the research centers and institutes.

Vice President Soldan asked if Provost Wray would continue the budget presentations similar to Provost Dobney's practice. Provost Wray responded that he did intend to continue that practice.

Senator Ftaclas asked about the responsibility for administration of the budget. Provost Wray clarified that the Provost does have the responsibility for administering the budget, but that the person who had previously been responsible for day-to-day monitoring of the budget is now in the Vice President for Finance and Administration staff. They will be developing a job description for a person who will monitor the budget from his office in the next few weeks. He is currently being supported by the VP for Finance in this responsibility.

Senator Adolphs asked about the responsibility for the graduate school portion of Sung Lee's position. Provost Wray said that he was consulting with Graduate Council and was waiting for recommendations from them before making a decision.

Senator Pennington asked what specifically the administrative search policy specified. President Keen provided a summary of the policy, specifically the makeup of the committee. The policy did not include specific representation from the institutes and centers. Therefore, the request to include representation by these units lies outside the guidelines. President Keen also noted that the guidelines will be reviewed by a Senate committee. There is some question if the new Vice President for Research is covered by the administrative search policy. Pennington asked how many representatives of the research institutes and centers the Provost would want. The Provost responded that he did not want a large committee, but felt it was important that the institutes and centers be adequately represented. Pennington suggested that we should allow the Provost to add up to four additional committee members from the research community. Senator Ftaclas asked what background Wray was looking for in the new VP for Research. Was the person to have had an active research program, or would the person be a fund raiser? Wray responded that he was looking for a person with extensive research experience, who understood the entrepreneurial aspects of research, and who was familiar with the funding agencies. The person would help us develop expanded research.

Senator Roggemann asked about what resources MTU was planning on committing to expand research here. Wray answered that there was no clear target yet, and that the research area has been underfunded. However, the current budget is very limiting, and that there is not much flexibility this year and next. He also noted that Research Services is extremely short of staff given their workload, and that they need help.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Enterprise Park Update -- Pete Radecki [Appendix C]

Pete Radecki (Corporate Services) provided an overview of the smart park idea and the proposal to create one in this area. This project considers creation of a technology park, which is an entity that will encourage high-tech startups in Houghton and Hancock. It would be a partnership between the cities of Houghton and Hancock, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, and MTU. The goal of the technology park program is to take technology developed at research universities and commercialize it by providing an appropriate environment and services for private sector technology companies, especially new startups.

Senator Green asked what the state was providing to encourage the technology park idea. Pete Radecki said that they are offering tax incentives. These would be recapture of a portion of the state taxes, which would be retained to help the technology park rather than going to Lansing. Furthermore, the state would give preferential treatment to companies using the smart zone for a wide range of state assistance.

Senator Oberto asked what area would be included in the technology park, and Radecki answered that it could be as large as a county, but in this case would only include Houghton and Hancock.

Concerns were raised about the Tech Ventures problems. Radecki responded that there was a major difference in that the enterprise park would be a landlord for the startup companies, not an owner. Also, the enterprise park could be closed on short notice if financial results were not satisfactory.

In closing, Pete Radecki asked for some formal expression of support from the Senate for the proposal. Senator Strong stated that the Senate should not make a formal statement of support for the enterprise park because the Senate had not received enough information to evaluate the risks associated with the concept. Some concerns Strong had were uses of MTU services such as Human Resources and Information Technology. Radecki responded that the companies in the park would not use MTU human resources or information technology services. Radecki stated that there is no general fund money involved. Strong responded that funds could easily be moved around to be spent without ever being in the general fund, but that the expenditure still takes funds that could have helped the general fund. Radecki also emphasized that negotiations are ongoing with potential residents of the technology park, and that confidentiality was required. He reiterated that the budget task force had seen preliminary financial projections.

Senator Ftaclas asked if any commitments, such as signatures, by MTU had been made. In other words, what is the financial or in-kind commitment to the project. Radecki answered that no MTU funds or resources were involved or committed. He did say that his and Jay Meldrum's time has been contributed to the project.

B. Curricular Policy Committee [Appendix D]

The Curricular Policy Committee met to consider five PhD spinoff proposals. The Forest Molecular Genetics and Biotechnology is clearly a spinoff of the current PhD in Forest Science, the Engineering Physics and the Astrophysics proposals can also be considered as spinoffs of the PhD in Physics. In the opinion of the committee, the PhD in Atmospheric Science is different enough from any existing program that it should be considered a new degree, and the Biomedical Engineering proposal is also a proposal for a new degree. The last two have no students who could be expected to graduate this year. The Forest Molecular Genetics and Biotechnology has students who may graduate this year, while the other two may have one graduate each. Only the Forest Molecular Genetics and Biotechnology has a complete packet with all supporting material. Therefore, only this program was forwarded to the Senate for consideration.

Senator Roggemann commented that splitting programs did not help us grow and improve our graduate programs overall, which should be the goal. Senator Barna expressed a similar concern, mentioning that the College of Engineering currently has a plan for a non-thesis, or plan C, PhD, which he thought was not well conceived. The general laughter this statement caused seemed to indicate skepticism about this idea among the Senators present.

C. Instructional Policy Committee

The Office of Student Records and Registration asked President Keen to evaluate a due date for grades this fall term of December 27. This issue was sent to the Instructional Policy Committee. Bill Yarroch, Chair of the committee indicated that the committee met to discuss this issue, and had no problem with this due date. They did suggest that the Senate should look at the 48-hour deadline given the switch to semesters. President Keen agreed. Also, he indicated that there are several hundred manual changes that need to be done because of the transition to semesters. Senator Barna pointed out that we have charged ourselves with reviewing the current calendar at the end of this academic year.

D. University Committee Elections

President Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Academic Integrity Committee: John Gierke (Geological Engineering and Sciences) and Anil Jambekar (School of Business and Economics) and opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. Gierke was elected with 16 votes and Jambekar had 10.

Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Conflict of Interest Committee: Vernon Dorweiler (School of Business and Economics) and Joe Heyman (Social Sciences) and opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. Heyman was elected with 16 votes and Dorweiler had 7.

Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Graduate Council: Bob Johnson (Humanities), Dave Ouillette (OSRR), and Mark Roberts (School of Business and Economics) and opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. Ouillette was elected with 16 votes, followed by Johnson with 8, and Roberts with 3.

Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Presidential Commission for Women: Mary Carol Friedrich (Fine Arts) and Dana Johnson (School of Business and Economics) and opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The election resulted in a tie. The Senate agreed to have Friedrich and Johnson decide who will have the three-year term and who will have the one-year term.

Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Presidential Commission for Diversity: Anand Kulkarni (College of Engineering), Bill Sewell (College of Sciences and Arts), and Chung-Jui Tsai (School of Forestry and Wood Product). There were no objections to the slate. The individuals will serve three-year terms.

Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Athletic Council: Bob Baillod (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Phil Beckwith (Mathematical Sciences), Vernon Dorweiler (School of Business and Economics), Larry Lankton (Social Sciences), and Carl Vilmann (ME-EM). There were no objections to the slate. President Keen will forward the slate to President Tompkins for selection.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 1-01, Summer Instructional Session [Appendix E]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

B. Proposal 2-01, PhD Program in Forest Molecular Genetics and Biotechnology [Appendix F]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

9. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 23-00, Amendments to Senate Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures [Appendix G]

Senator Reed reviewed the major proposed revisions to the policy and procedures. The major concern was the role of the Ombudsperson. This person was participating in the process in two distinct roles. One role was as a mediator, while the other was as the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee. These two roles are in conflict. Review of policy at other universities showed that none had a similar structure. The change in the proposed policy was to remove the Ombudsperson from being the Chair of the Faculty Review Committee, leaving this person only as the mediator. The composition of the Faculty Review Committee was adjusted as appropriate. Also, the case of potential conflicts of interest on the committee was addressed in the revision. Finally, the new policy clarifies that a representative of Human Resources should participate at all stages as an ex-officio member.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Roggemann MOVED and Hodek seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by James B. Pickens
Secretary of the University Senate