

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 375

25 September 2002

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) approved Proposal 3-03, BS Program in Computer Network and System Administration
 - (2) approved Proposal 4-03, BS Program in Computer Systems Science.
-

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 375 to order at 5:36 p.m. on Wednesday, 25 September 2002, in Room B45 EERC.

1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were At-large Senators Beck and Selfe and representatives from Chemical Engineering, Fine Arts, ME-EM, Keweenaw Research Center, Finance and Advancement and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Karl Haapala (GSC), Ike Micheau (USG), and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Jim Moore (SFWP), Tim Collins (School of Technology), Linda Ott (Computer Science), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Keen presented the agenda and asked for additions or modifications. There were none. There were no objections to the agenda as presented. [**Appendix A.** NOTE: Only official senate and library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Keen read into the record the following statement on the September 17-20 faculty referendum on 14-week semester:

"Last week the Senate conducted a referendum of the faculty, asking whether a change to a calendar of 14-week semesters was favored. The ballot noted that if a change was to occur, there would be a prompt referendum on alternative 14-week calendars. Ballots were distributed on Tuesday, September 17, and were due on Friday, September 20.

By any assessment, this referendum was conducted with a very short fuse. I have a filled email in box reminding me of this. I would like to offer an explanation here for the precipitate referendum, and describe my interpretation of the outcome.

A brief history: On May 2, President Tompkins surprised the Senate forum with an announcement of his support for a 14-week calendar. There was little time to deal with this before classes ended, although a call for volunteers for a Calendar Task Force was issued during finals week. I issued another call for volunteers at the first Senate meeting in August, and assembled the Task Force for a meeting as soon as possible, three weeks ago. Task Force membership and their charge was approved at the Senate meeting two weeks ago, and some initial feedback on 14-week options was collected then.

Although the Senate was proceeding about as rapidly as possible, I was being reminded on a daily basis that any change to the calendar for 2003-04 had to be undertaken immediately, if not sooner. On campus are persons whose job it is to schedule events - cultural, athletic, academic, social, and otherwise - more

than a year in advance. The uncertainty associated with the calendar for 2003-04 was hindering their necessary activities. Their reasonable requests of me, on behalf of the Senate, involved such items as when would Xmas break begin? When would orientation take place? When would spring break occur, when should motel rooms be reserved for commencements and winter carnival, etc. I had to reply that I did not know.

The day after the last Senate meeting, I had one of my semiannual lunches with President Tompkins, and he asked specifically on behalf of the schedulers that the Senate resolve the calendar issue quickly.

As an additional time pressure applied to my consideration of the problem, and as I explained to the Calendar Task Force, the deadline for changing the 2003-04 calendar was the Board meeting of October 3. In fairness to everybody, if the 2003-04 calendar was to be changed, the Board would have to approve the change at that meeting. And the difficulty here was that Board agendas are set and distributed two weeks in advance of the meeting. In order to put an item about calendar change on the October Board agenda, it would have to arrive in the Board office by Thursday, September 19. That deadline has occasionally been stretched a bit, and I thought that it might be as flexible as Monday, 23 September.

My personal guideline for going to the Board with a calendar change has been to do so only with a majority of faculty in support of the change. This decision is not a difficult one to make, and is based on some bitter experience of my two predecessors as Senate president. Ted Bornhorst went to the Board with a clear majority of all faculty in support of semesters. As a result we have semesters. Bruce Seely went to the Board with a plurality of faculty, but not a majority, in support of a 14-week semester, and as a result we have 15-week semesters.

The Calendar Task Force had discussed the possibility of putting the matter on the Board agenda and asking for their assent to 14-weeks in general, with a detailed calendar to be supplied later. This seemed a logical approach, given the short length of time available to develop a detailed, compromise calendar. To do this, it was necessary to demonstrate a faculty majority in favor of the change.

The problem was to make that demonstration. A referendum was necessary. Within the available time, there was really only one option for authorizing a referendum. Under the Senate constitution, referenda may be requested by the Senate, by a group of senators dissenting to a Senate action, by a group of constituents, by the University President, or by the Board. The Presidential request was the only quickly available option. Accordingly I asked the Provost and President to request a referendum. They conferred over the weekend, and formally requested the referendum on Tuesday, when the ballots were distributed.

The Senate assistant, Jeanne Meyers, deserves commendation for a prompt distribution of the ballots, which were in faculty mailboxes within a couple hours of the decision to conduct the referendum.

The result of the referendum has been reported to you. I now ask the Secretary to make part of the minutes of this meeting a copy of my emails reporting the results and establishing the referendum.
[Appendix B]

As explained in the email of results there was not a majority of faculty voting in favor of the change. Accordingly, I did not ask the administration to put the calendar issue on the Board agenda. To do so would have been to invite questions about how representative the vote was. I would have had to say that a majority of faculty had not voted in favor of the change. The Board debate would have focused on the vote, and not on the 14-week calendar, a trap that had closed on President Seely.

I indicated to the President and Provost that the issue of a change for 2003-04 would not proceed. It cannot, in fairness to those responsible for scheduling university activities.

There is a side benefit to this determination. The issue of salary increases was a focus of debate on the calendar, with some constituents voicing a fear that a salary cut would accompany a change to a 14-week calendar; that is, working fewer hours would mean less pay. A memo from the provost that I circulated

addressed this issue. There was further concern that the decrease in hours might count for a raise for 2003-04. Now, this is not possible. Any raise for that year will come in the form of real dollars.

We learned from the referendum that an overwhelming majority of faculty who did respond were in favor of a change to a 14-week calendar. The Senate will proceed with the development of a 14-week calendar and will prepare a calendar or alternative 14-week calendars for a faculty referendum later this year."

Senator Dickie Selfe asked why the senate hadn't debated whether a 14-week calendar was desirable before considering which option for a 14-week calendar was preferred.

Keen said that an overwhelming majority of the faculty who voted in the referendum voted in favor of a 14-week semester.

Selfe said that it had seemed like the procedure going forward prior to the referendum had cut off the debate on the desirability of a 14-week semester.

Keen said that if the senate wished to reopen this debate and conduct another referendum on this question, it could do so.

Senator Erik Nordberg asked if the outcome of the referendum negated any change in the 2003-2004 calendar.

Keen said that in the past--usually at the request of the administration--the senate has made minor adjustments in the calendar even in the middle of the year. He said that the senate has not yet voted on the 2003-2004 calendar.

Nordberg asked if a change to a 14-week semester for 2003-2004 was unlikely at this point.

Keen said that such a change was unlikely at this point.

Senator Bill Gregg asked about the extra week that had been added to Christmas break in 1999-2000 in anticipation of needing additional time to address any problems that might be caused by the Millennial Bug.

Keen said that this problem should be raised with the Instructional Policy Committee, which is charged with organizing academic calendars.

Senator Bill Yarroch, chair of the Instructional Policy Committee, said that last year, the senate was not presented with a proposed calendar until early December.

Keen said that at that point, the senate voted to approve a calendar for an academic year that was half over.

Yarroch said that the senate had earlier voted on a number of specific calendar items, such as when Winter Carnival would be held.

Senator Larry Sutter asked if there was a policy or a precedent for which count takes precedence: of those who voted, the percent who voted in favor of the proposition; or of all eligible voters, the percent who voted in favor of the proposition.

Keen said that for the purpose of going to the Board of Control, he wanted to avoid any question about how well a proposed 14-week semester represented the wishes of the faculty. He said that in any democracy, the 75 percent approval of a 14-week semester would carry the day because it is common practice to base the outcome of an election on percentage of votes cast, not on percentage of eligible voters. However, the Board of Control is not a democracy; it is an oligarchy; not even the state legislature

can challenge many Board decisions. Hence, Keen prefers to approach the Board with a clear majority of all faculty.

Sutter said that this should be a matter of voting procedure. If majority support is defined on the basis of returned votes, then the faculty has approved a 14-week semester. According to the senate bylaws, a vote of a faculty referendum is equivalent to a vote of the senate. Therefore, the senate has approved a 14-week semester.

Keen agreed, but said that based on past experience, he would feel uncomfortable proposing a 14-week calendar to the Board without the clear majority support of all eligible faculty. Keen said that the charge of the senate is to approve a specific calendar. The Calendar Task Force is charged with presenting the senate with a 14-week calendar, which the senate will vote up or down. He said that he had explained his reasoning and would follow the wishes of the senate on this matter.

Keen called for further discussion on the calendar. There was none.

Keen said that former Board of Control member Dr. Ken Rowe delivered a \$1 million check to the administration last December, shortly before Rowe's death. Keen said that the check represented much hard, volunteer work by Rowe, retired MTU faculty member Walt Anderson, and others to repay, partially, a debt owed to Michigan Tech by Michigan Tech Ventures, Inc.

Last spring, the senate tabled Proposal 22-02, Policy on Consensual Relationships. An amendment to this policy has since been proposed and is available on the senate's Web site.

Keen said that Janice Glime, who chairs the Faculty Review Committee, has informed him that Chemical Engineering, Materials Science, Forestry, Education, and ROTC do not have grievance procedures in their charters. He encouraged those units to include grievance procedures in their charters.

Keen said that nominees are still needed for several university committees, including the Task Force on Career Opportunities for Professional Staff, which still needs at least one faculty nominee.

Keen said that Waddell had asked if the senate might propose updating the Michigan statute that defines Michigan Tech's mission. He said that President Tompkins agreed that this might be an opportune time to propose such a change. Hence, Keen has charged the Institutional Planning Committee with reviewing the Michigan Tech Charter, and the administration will determine the best way to present any proposed change to the Michigan legislature.

At their recent lunch, Keen and President Tompkins discussed conflict of interest at the level of the Board of Control. Keen asked the senate to help to identify universities that--unlike the public universities in Michigan--employ one firm to recommend law suits and a second firm to prosecute those suits.

The new Board of Control chair, David Brule, has indicated that he will conduct the Board's business slightly differently than did former chair Claude Verbal. Brule would like the Board to focus on how to fix problems rather than on how to fix blame.

Keen said that Sabbatical Leave Committee Chair John Lowther has submitted the committee's annual report to the senate. Keen said that to his knowledge, this was the first time that the committee had submitted its report on time. **[Appendix C]**

Keen said that he would like the senate's advice on the use of the University Senate's e-mail list, usenate-l@mtu.edu. The senate has never established guidelines on how this list should be used; however, the list has normally been used for one-way communication from senate officers to constituents, and debate has normally been limited to the floor of the senate. Keen said that he had received a number of comments from senators and constituents who felt that the debate about the referendum on a 14-week calendar carried out over the past week on usenate-l was inappropriate for that list.

Senator Steve Seidel said that it is possible to establish a list that only works in one direction.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked why anyone would not want to carry on debate between meetings of the senate. He said that if this is not inappropriate, then if usenate-l is not the right list for such debate, perhaps another list could be formed.

Keen said that several people said that they didn't want to have to read these messages.

Senators Kelly Strong and Dana Johnson said that those who did not want to read such messages should delete them.

Keen said that one option would be to establish a senate debate list from which people could freely unsubscribe.

Nordberg said that conducting senate debate over e-mail might be in violation of the Michigan Open Meetings Act, since, unlike debate that occurs during senate meetings, this debate might not be officially documented and reported.

Waddell said that he believed that the Open Meetings Act applied only to decision making.

Keen said that the senate should provide guidance on how this list should be used.

Waddell asked if this would be discussed at the senate's next meeting.

Keen said that it would be, as part of the president's report.

Keen said that President Tompkins will meet informally with the senate on Wednesday, November 6, in Memorial Union Ballroom A at 3 p.m.

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 3-03, BS Program in Computer Network and System Administration [Appendix D]

Keen said that in the past, the senate had repeatedly been told that new degree programs would not cost the university anything more than one-half of a secretarial position. Having repeatedly found this cost analysis to be flawed, the senate now asks its Finance Committee to review all proposals for new degree programs. Technically, however, the senate can only make *recommendations* to the administration on financial policy. Hence, the senate cannot vote against a degree program proposal for financial reasons. The senate can, however, advise the administration that a given degree program proposal is unreasonably expensive and, hence, recommend that it be given low priority. The senate can approve or disapprove of a given degree program proposal based on academic reasons.

If the senate approves a proposal on academic grounds but has severe reservations about the cost of the proposal, then the senate can forward one recommendation approving of the proposal but noting financial concerns, or the senate can forward two separate recommendations, one based on academic merits and a second based on financial concerns.

Senator Scott Pollins MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to approve Proposal 3-03.

Senator Adolphs presented the Curricular Policy Committee's report on Proposals 3-03 and 4-03. Adolphs said that the Curricular Policy Committee had found no fault with Proposal 3-03 and no fault with Proposal 4-03. However, he said that there was some question as to the names of the two programs and asked if it would be appropriate to discuss both programs simultaneously. He said that after deliberating with the respective parties, the currently proposed titles are "Computer Network and System Administration" for the degree proposed by the School of Technology and "Computer Systems Science" for the degree proposed by the Department of Computer Science.

Keen asked what title had originally been given to the degree described in Proposal 3-03.

Adolphs said that the original title was "Computer Systems Administration" and that the Department of Computer Science had raised concerns about this title.

Keen said that adopting the proposed revised title would be a clarifying amendment to the proposal as circulated.

Gregg MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to change the title of the degree described in Proposal 3-03 to "BS Program in Computer Network and System Administration."

Senator Chris Williams said that a significant portion of the proposed degree is geared toward management of information systems and not necessarily computer network administration, which isn't clear from the new title.

Senator Dana Johnson said that taking into account prerequisites for courses required for this degree, the program will require seven or eight courses from the School of Business. This is of some concern to faculty in the School of Business.

Keen said that the current discussion was limited to the title of the proposed degree, and that discussion of the degree itself would follow.

Keen called for further comments on the title of the proposed degree. There were none.

The motion to amend the title PASSED on a voice vote without dissent.

Keen ruled the amendment to be a clarifying amendment. There were no objections.

Senator Jim Pickens asked permission to simultaneously present the Senate Finance Committee's reports on Proposal 3-03 and Proposal 4-03. There were no objections to this request.

Pickens said that the Senate Finance Committee does an independent analysis of the financial implications of new programs. The academic aspects of new degree programs are on the senate's A list, and financial aspects of new degree programs are on the senate's B list. However, the senate only votes once on new degree proposals. Hence, the vote should be based on academic considerations; although financial considerations might be raised separately.

Pickens said that the administration evaluates proposals for new degree programs before sending those proposals to the senate. The Senate Finance Committee then conducts an independent analysis of these proposals.

Pickens said that both the administration and the Senate Finance Committee assumed the number of students in the combined programs (Computer Network and System Administration and Computer Systems Science) would be 150, somewhat fewer than the number projected by the sponsoring school and department. Both analyses also assumed the same tuition per student (\$5000) and the same General Education support for classes outside of the School of Technology, the Department of Computer Sciences, and the School of Business (\$28,000). Both analyses concluded that the proposed programs will generate some surplus revenues. Pickens said that the most significant assumption in both analyses was that of 150 new students: 100 to the School of Technology and 50 to the Department of Computer Sciences.

Pickens said that the two analyses differed in the following respects. The administration's (provost's) model assumed 20 percent of tuition would be applied to administrative overhead (student records and registration, etc.). Hence, the provost's model assumed \$4000 in net tuition per student. The analyses also differed in terms of their estimates of the number of new faculty lines that would be required for these two programs (six estimated by the Senate Finance Committee and five estimated by the provost), and in the number of new faculty lines charged to the programs (six estimated by the Senate Finance Committee and four estimated by the provost). As a result of these differences, the surplus revenue from these two

programs estimated by the Senate finance Committee is \$155,000, and the surplus revenue estimated by the provost is \$181,750.

Pickens said that the committee had also concluded that as a result of these new programs, more classes will be closer to capacity and more teaching responsibilities will be fulfilled by graduate students and non-tenure-track instructors. He also said that the cost of space for the programs was not included in either analysis, but that adequate space would be available.

Senator Jacek Borysow asked how the estimate of 150 new students was derived.

Chair of Computer Sciences Linda Ott said that based on experience with other new programs and discussions with prospective students, the proposers estimated that the combined programs would attract about 25 new students each year.

Adolphs said that both proposals include costs for promoting the new programs.

Pickens said that Michigan Tech has approved three new majors in the past five or six years (Computer Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, and Bioinformatics), and enrollments in those majors now total approximately 500 students.

Strong asked if the estimated number of new students was with respect to immediate enrollment or with respect to phased enrollment.

Pickens said that the estimate was based on a steady-state analysis; that is, on the situation after the programs reach projected enrollment.

Keen said that the floor was now open for debate.

Senator Dana Johnson asked in what areas new business faculty would be added to support these two proposed programs.

Pickens said that one faculty member would be added in Management Information Systems (MIS) and one would be added in management.

Johnson said that one of the prerequisites for courses in the proposed programs was BA2310 Accounting Principles II, which has as a prerequisite BA2300 Accounting Principles I. She said that taking into account prerequisites for courses required for these two proposed degrees, the degrees will require not five but seven or eight courses from the School of Business.

Provost Wray said that the basis for the School of Business and Economics course line was analysis conducted by SBE Associate Professor Larry Davis, who identified a need for 1.5 new faculty members, listed by course. Wray said that his analysis differed from the Senate Finance Committee's analysis in that he used Davis's 1.5 lines whereas the committee said that SBE could not hire 1.5 faculty, and hence, rounded up to 2.

Johnson said that there has been a lot of concern in SBE about resources because a lot of SBE sections are full, and students don't want to drop.

Wray said that Davis had taken this into consideration in making his estimates.

Senator Mike Roggemann asked if the two proposals competed with one another.

Dean of the School of Technology Tim Collins said that he was comfortable with the two proposals. He said that the two programs were so significantly different that a student who wanted to switch from one to the other would almost have to begin all over again from the beginning of the second program.

Chair of Computer Sciences Linda Ott said that she too was comfortable with the two proposals. She said that the differences between these two programs were analogous with those between the Electrical Engineering and Electrical Engineering Technology degrees. She said that the proposed BS Program in Computer Systems Science would prepare graduates to someday assume the responsibilities of chief information officer (CIO), focusing more on the design of networks than on the how-to.

Senator Bill Gregg said that Michigan Tech really does need new degree programs, since it is currently at the bottom of the list of Michigan public colleges and universities in terms of number of degree programs offered. He encouraged other departments to look at the possibility of developing other low-cost proposals that can use existing faculty to produce more degrees.

Johnson said that interdisciplinary programs should be encouraged.

Keen called for further discussion. There was none.

The motion to approve Proposal 3-03 PASSED on a voice vote without dissent.

B. Proposal 4-03, BS Program in Computer Systems [Appendix E]

Senator Scott Pollins MOVED and Senator Dennis Lewandowski seconded the motion to approve Proposal 4-03.

Senator Susan Martin MOVED and Senator Steve Seidel seconded the motion to change the title of the degree described in Proposal 4-03 to "BS Program in Computer Systems Science."

Roggemann asked if titling the degree "Information Systems" or "Information Systems Science" might help to keep it distinct from Computer Engineering.

Ott said that "Information Science" is more often used to designate programs that focus on managing data-information systems.

Keen called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve Proposal 4-03 PASSED on a voice vote without dissent.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Senator Tim Malette MOVED and Senator Scott Pollins seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell
Secretary of the University Senate