

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

## Minutes of Meeting 344

17 January 2001

### Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard that Proposals 7-01, 1-01, and 6-01 were approved by President Tompkins.
  - (2) elected Mike Gilpin, Bill Sproule, and Jerry Taylor to the Distance Learning Implementation Committee.
  - (3) approved Proposals 5-01 and 8-01.
- 

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Keen called University Senate Meeting 344 to order at 5:34 p.m. on Wednesday, 17 January 2001, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Pickens called roll. Absent were At-Large Senator Kunz and representatives from Materials Science and Engineering, Mining and Materials Processing Engineering, and Research and Graduate School/University Relations/Administrative Offices. Liaisons in attendance were Josh Bennett (USG) and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Bill McGarry (Vice President for Finance and Advancement), Dan Greenlee (Controller), Marilyn Urion (Graduate School), Sheryl Sorby (Engineering Fundamentals), Beverly Baartmans (Department of Education), Larry Davis (School of Business and Economics), 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 MEETING 343

President Keen noted a correction on page 8807, "know" should be "known." He asked for additional corrections to the minutes of Meeting 343. There were none. Williams MOVED and Long seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion PASSED with no dissent.

### 5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Proposals 6-01, Recommendations on Distance Learning, and 7-01, PhD Program in Computer Science, were transmitted to the administration for approval. [**Appendices B and C**]

Proposals 7-01, 1-01, Summer Instructional Session, and 6-01 were approved by President Tompkins. [**Appendices D-F**]

The Budget Advisory Group will meet on January 18.

President Keen met with President Tompkins on December 14. They discussed the membership of the Board of Control (BOC). The Governor has not appointed new members to the BOC for the past three years. Several members continue to serve without having been reappointed, and it is not clear that four of

the people now serving are actually members of the BOC. This is a legal issue, and may invite questions concerning the legality of BOC actions.

The Senate officers met with Provost Wray on January 15. They discussed the status of the separation proposals (1-99 through 4-99), Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment, and Proposal 12-00, Encouragement of Sabbatical Leaves. An additional meeting between the Provost and the Chair of the committee that drafted the separation policies (Keen) is needed. The tenure policy has been evaluated by the MTU lawyer, and the Senate officers will discuss the suggested modifications. The sabbatical leave proposal raised questions concerning the intent of the Senate proposal. The question is whether the Senate intended this proposal to be policy or recommendations. The resolution of this discussion will be reported at a future Senate meeting.

Keen met with Ellen Horsch on January 17 regarding the status of Proposal 23-00, Amendments to Senate Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures. The discussions came very close to a consensus, with most changes being editorial in nature.

The Vice President for Research Search Committee met on December 20 and January 15. They are currently finalizing a job description.

Peck Cho has asked if he could take a sabbatical leave and return to his position as Ombudsperson after the sabbatical. President Keen concluded that, because of the unique nature of the Ombudsperson position, it was not possible to take a sabbatical and then return to the position. The logic of this conclusion was that the Ombudsperson is a very unique position in the university. The Ombudsperson cannot be removed by the President, Provost, or BOC. The only way the person could be removed is by a 2/3 vote of the Senate. Because of this relationship, it seems inconsistent with the goal of the position to have a temporary Ombudsperson.

Senator Ftaclas questioned whether the Ombudsperson actually needed to be on campus to perform their duties. Discussion focused on the possibility of doing the Ombudsperson duties while not on campus. Keen responded that the role of the Ombudsperson makes it critical that the person be available for in-person consultation on very short notice. Senator Beck noted that an Ombudsperson might be unable to do their duties because of illness. President Keen asked that the Senate Academic Policy Committee address the areas where current policy concerning the Ombudsperson position is vague.

Senator Snyder revisited the issue of Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures, noting that the University Committee on Academic Tenure has primary responsibility for promotion and tenure issues. Therefore, he questioned whether the Senate officers should be discussing revisions to the policy rather than the Committee on Academic Tenure. President Keen agreed that the Committee on Academic Tenure has authority in this area, but also noted that under F.1.a.6 of the Senate Constitution the Senate is given authority over appointment, promotion, tenure, and leaves of the academic faculty. There is a conflict within BOC policy, and any Senate proposal approved by the administration must then return to the Committee on Academic Tenure. They will review the policy and conduct a vote of the faculty concerning approval of the new policy.

## **6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

### **A. Board of Control Relations Committee**

The Senate officers met with the Vice Chair and past Chair of the BOC for 45 minutes on December 17. The focus of discussion at that meeting was the Referendum on Presidential Performance. The Senate officers asked that the BOC meet with the members of the Academic Forum, which was one of the items requested in the Referendum on Presidential Performance. The BOC representatives agreed to that meeting at the March retreat.

In his presentation at the BOC meeting, President Keen asked for more rapid turnarounds on items with the University attorney. Response times have improved dramatically since that request.

## **B. Elections of members to the DLIC**

President Keen presented the slate of nominees for the Distance Learning Implementation Committee: Mike Gilpin (Mathematical Sciences), Anil Jambekar, Dana Johnson, Weiqi Li, and Terry Monson (School of Business and Economics), Bill Sproule (Civil and Environmental Engineering), and Jerry Taylor (School of Technology).

Terry Monson was one of the nominees, and it is not entirely clear if he is eligible to serve. He is a faculty member, but also serves in an administrative post as Associate Dean. Senator Pennington noted that we have a large slate of nominees, and that we could let the Senators decide by either voting for him or not. A vote to decide if Terry Monson could serve passed with dissent. Senator Strong abstained.

Keen asked for additional nominations from the floor. There were none.

Sproule was elected to a three-year term with 26 votes, Gilpin to a two-year term with 21 votes, and Taylor to a one-year term with 18 votes.

## **C. Search for Dean of the Graduate School**

President Keen noted that the search for the Dean of the Graduate School is in a gray area of Senate responsibility. The Senate Constitution defines responsibilities for the Senate in different areas as being either on the "a" list, where the Senate is responsible for reviewing and establishing policy, or on the "b" list, where the Senate can make recommendations but is not responsible for developing policy. The Dean of the Graduate School is on both the "a" list in F.1.a and the "b" list in F.4.b. The school deans and department chairs are covered under F.1.a, while university wide administrators such as the college deans are covered under F.4.b. The question is which section of the constitution applies to the Dean of the Graduate School.

Keen suggested that one way to solve this difficulty is to involve the Chair of the Administrative Policy Committee, Lee Oberto, and the President of the Graduate Faculty Council to formulate a Senate proposal defining the policy, but to allow the search for the Dean of the Graduate School to follow the draft policy and start before the policy is approved by the Senate.

Senator Ftaclas questioned the interpretation of the word "Dean" having two different definitions in the Constitution. Keen noted that the distinction between school deans and college deans was consistent with Senate defined policy in place for filling vacancies in those positions. Senator Ftaclas asserted that the word "dean" should be used consistently. A consensus was reached that we need to revisit the policies for administrative appointments to remove ambiguity.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 5-01, MS Program in Applied Science Education [Appendix G]**

Snyder MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve Proposal 5-01.

This proposal comes to the Senate with a recommendation for approval by the Senate Curricular Policy Committee.

Senator Beck asked if any additional faculty would be required. Dean Seel said that no additional faculty would be needed to offer the program. Beck also asked what evidence was available to indicate that sufficient demand for the program exists. Beverly Baartmans responded that she had no specific numbers, but they believe that there are quite a few potential students based on requests her office has received. She noted that many teachers will be retiring soon, and that the replacement teachers will need supplemental classes that this program would provide. Her office would also like to market the program regionally.

Senator Roggemann asked what the capacity of the program would be. Baartmans responded that they believe that the program could accommodate between 30 and 40 students at any one time. They intend to use adjunct faculty extensively. These adjunct faculty are faculty in other units at MTU.

Senator Beck asked if students who have previously taken workshops at MTU would receive credit for those workshops, and if so what would be the time limit for receiving credit. Baartmans responded that promises had been made in the past that workshop credit would apply to any future masters program, and that those promises should be honored. Marilyn Urion noted that the Graduate School has a five year limit on courses for masters degrees, and that any workshops taken more than five years before the time of graduation would be evaluated carefully by the Graduate School.

Strong MOVED and Hodek seconded the motion to add "The Senate approves the program as described below." to the beginning of the proposal. There was no discussion. The motion to amend PASSED with no dissent. President Keen ruled the amendment as editorial.

Senator Strong noted that there is an NSF grant to support program startup, but that funding would disappear at the end of the grant. He asked if the classes would follow the same summer school policy presented to the Senate earlier. Under that approach, courses would not be offered if their enrollment was insufficient to cover the cost of teaching the class. Baartmans responded that the courses would not be offered if the enrollment would not cover costs. Strong then asked if sufficient staff resources were available to support the program without additional costs. Baartmans noted that much of the load would be covered by the faculty and adjunct faculty involved in the program. Senator Snyder commented that we are morally committed to offer the classes for the students who have been accepted into the program. However, stopping accepting new students into the program would limit the potential financial losses.

Senator Vilmann emphasized that we currently do not offer any degrees in education. He stated that he could see no reason why we would want to try to enter the education area. He objected to widening the focus of MTU to compete directly with Northern Michigan University. Sheryl Sorby noted that they had met extensively with faculty and administrators from Northern Michigan University, and that the NMU representatives stated clearly that they did not want to offer this program at Northern. She continued that the program was distinct in the state of Michigan since no other school offers an MS in Applied Science Education, and that it would make us a leader in the field. Seel asserted that this would not move MTU toward education, but would allow us to use our strength in math and science. Baartmans noted that the demand for our education offerings has increased greatly over the last few years.

Blanning MOVED and Ftaclas seconded the motion to end debate. The motion to end debate PASSED with no dissent.

The motion to approve Proposal 5-01 PASSED with dissent.

## **B. Proposal 8-01, Financial Reporting Standards [Appendix H]**

Pickens MOVED and Prince seconded the motion to approve Proposal 8-01.

CFO McGarry stated that we will need to implement the proposal by June 30 or we will lose our federal funding.

Senator Strong motioned to end debate but then withdrew the motion.

Senator Pegg asked for clarification of the role of the Michigan Tech Fund under this proposal. Senator Davis provided clarification that, since the MTU Fund is a separate legal entity, it would not be included under this proposal. Pegg stated that the picture was incomplete without coverage of the Tech Fund. Davis responded that the Tech Fund is part of the overall picture, but that financial accounting rules do not allow its consolidation with MTU's financial statements. McGarry added that the issue of entities like the Tech Fund was discussed extensively by the financial standards policy body, and that the final conclusion was to not include them.

Senator Davis emphasized that this proposal goes beyond the standards that must be implemented by June 30 in that it deals with budgetary matters brought before the Senate as well as reporting standards. One

major improvement of financial reporting using the combined fund approach is that the inter-fund transfers no longer obscure the financial affairs of the university.

The motion to approve Proposal 8-01 PASSED with no dissent.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Senator Strong MOVED and Senator Blanning seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

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