

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 385

23 April 2003

Synopsis: The Senate

1. passed a motion to sponsor a vote of no confidence in the university president.
 2. passed Proposal 12-03, Teaching Effectiveness
 3. passed Proposal 13-03, BS Program in Software Engineering
 4. passed Proposal 14-03, Transfer Credit Evaluation.
-

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 385 to order at 5:34 p.m. on Wednesday, 23 April 2003, in Room B45 EERC.

1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were Senator at Large Pilling and representatives from Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Keweenaw Research Center. Liaisons in attendance were Karl Haapala (GSC) and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Madhu Vable (ME-EM), Ibrahim Miskioglu (ME-EM), Bill Kennedy (CTLFD), Linda Ott (Computer Science), Faith Morrison (Chemical Engineering), Joan Nelson (School of Business and Economics), Max Seel (College of Sciences and Arts), Ryan Olson (*The Daily Mining Gazette*), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Keen presented the agenda and asked for amendments. None were offered. Keen said that if there were no objections, the agenda would be followed as presented. There were no objections. **[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 said that the senate had transmitted to the administration Proposal 2-03, Conflict of Interest Procedures; Proposal 15-03, Procedures for Loss of Untenured Faculty and Staff Positions; Proposal 22-02, Policy on Consensual Relationships; and Proposal 16-03, Senate Referendum on Reorganization. **[Appendices B-E]**

Keen apologized for comments he made at the April 16 open forum sponsored by the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee. He said that he had not intended to offend women faculty. His comments were not made in reference to women faculty but in response to past senate policy and a feeling of ownership for the procedures that the administration has adopted with respect to the establishment of the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee.

Keen said that in the future, degree programs scheduled to be discontinued will not be brought to the senate for official discontinuance. Instead, administrative support for such programs will be withdrawn, but the programs will remain on the books so that they can more easily be reinstated should the need arise.

Keen said that on Monday, April 14, the Board of Control's Finance Committee met with University Senate officers, two members of the Senate Finance Committee (Larry Davis and Jim

Pickens), the new president of the Undergraduate Student Government (Matt Sayler), the president of the Graduate Student Council (Michelle Trim), and a representative of the *Michigan Tech Lode* (Britta Vande Hei). BOC Chair David Brule and board member Michael Henricksen participated in person; board members Claude Verbal and Rodger Kershner participated via conference call. The discussion lasted for approximately 75 minutes and covered a wide range of topics, including tuition increases, course offerings, raises versus layoffs, and the pace of reorganization. Keen said that at the end of the meeting the BOC members indicated that they would value an opportunity to discuss such matters more fully. Keen said that the senate could further discuss this meeting later in the agenda.

Keen said that he serves on the Dean of Students Search Committee. The committee has interviewed one candidate and will interview two more shortly. Keen encouraged senators to attend the candidate forums. He said that he has asked the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee to consider how this search should proceed if the dean of student's position is included in reorganization plans.

Keen said that the senate is seeking nominations for senators at large and that senate officers will be elected at the next senate meeting (Wednesday, April 30). Keen said that he has tentatively agreed to run for president again, but he welcomes opposition because the election warrants discussion.

Keen said that the senate's informal meeting with President Tompkins scheduled for 3 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7 will have to be rescheduled because that time is now taken by a rescheduled public forum on the Budget Reduction Advisory Committee's recommendations to the president.

Keen called for questions on his report.

Senator Erik Nordberg asked if this would be the first public forum on the BRAC's recommendations.

Keen said that the tentative plan is to post the BRAC's recommendations on the Web two to four days prior to this meeting. The May 7 meeting would then be the first opportunity of open public comment on the recommendations.

Senator Jacek Borysow asked Keen to provide more details about the April 14 meeting with BOC members.

Keen asked others who attended this meeting to comment.

Senator Larry Davis said that the reorganization of the university was a key topic of conversation at this meeting. He said that he had asked BOC members why they felt that it was essential to reorganize the university at this time. He asked if this was a means to the end of conducting university business differently. He said that simply redrawing lines on the organizational chart is an exercise in frustration. Davis said that his impression was that the BOC members want reorganization but that they may not be certain as to exactly how to reorganize an institution of higher education. Most BOC members come from business backgrounds where restructuring is a common approach to financial crisis. Davis said that he believes that BOC members are aware that the business model of restructuring may not apply well to higher education, but they don't want Michigan Tech to continue doing business as it has been doing.

Davis said that the new USG president, Matt Sayler, indicated that students do not want to see large increases in tuition.

Keen said that Saylor also urged that the Office of Student Affairs continue to be supported as least as well as it had been supported in the past.

Senator Don Beck asked if the BOC members had indicated what their timeframe was for restructuring.

Davis said that he believed that the BOC expects restructuring to occur sooner rather than later.

Senator Chris Williams asked if any BOC members had said schools would be reorganized as profit centers.

Davis said that they had not said this. In effect, they said "reorganize and make yourselves better; we can't tell you specifically how to do that because we're business people, not higher-education administrators."

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if anyone had specifically discussed what "make yourself better" means. He asked if the BOC's assumption is that the problem is with organization at the academic level.

Senator Craig Waddell said that what he derived from this meeting was that the BOC members were very consciously employing a business metaphor for the university and that what a business does when faced with a financial crisis is to restructure. He said that the BOC members indicated that we could not delay restructuring long. The metaphor used by BOC Chair David Brule was "If you see a snake in the grass, you kill it. You don't form a committee to study it." In this case, the snake is our financial problems, and the proposed solution is restructuring. Waddell said that he believed that the BOC expected a restructuring plan to be delivered by the end of June 2003.

Davis said that the BOC Finance Committee plans to formally recommend such a plan to the full BOC at the Board's May 9 meeting.

Waddell said that BOC members also explicitly requested feedback on the performance of the entire administrative hierarchy, including the president's performance and their own performance. Waddell said that he took this as an invitation for dialogue with some subset of the university community. Waddell said that the BOC members seemed sincere in asking to be let know if they were part of the problem and how they might better carry out their responsibilities as a board.

Keen said that this leads to the next agenda item.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee

Keen said that on Tuesday, April 22, the Senate Executive Committee met to consider a request from several senators that the senate consider sponsoring a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins. The Executive Committee discussed this request. No motions were made or approved; however, the committee agreed to present two questions for senate discussion and deliberation: (1) Should the University Senate organize a referendum of faculty and professional staff on their confidence in President Tompkins' ability to lead Michigan Tech? and (2) Should the University Senate organize a referendum of faculty and professional staff on their confidence in the Board of Control's ability to lead Michigan Tech?

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if the discussion at the Senate Executive Committee might be summarized for the full senate.

Keen agreed that this would be helpful. He asked members of the Executive Committee to summarize for the record the comments they had made at the April 22 meeting.

Waddell said that he could try to summarize some of the argument that had been made for and against the proposals and let others follow with additions and corrections.

Keen said that it would be best for each person to summarize his or her own key points.

Waddell said that at the Executive Committee meeting, he had raised three concerns about the proposed vote of no confidence. First, the Board of Control has just invited the senate to give feedback on the performance of the president and on the performance of the board itself. Waddell said that he took this as a call for some form of dialogue, not as a call for a vote of no confidence. He said that he would prefer to see some form of dialogue about problems precede any vote of no confidence. Second, Waddell said that he would also like to see what recommendations come from the BRAC and what the president does with those recommendations before proceeding with a vote of no confidence. Finally, Waddell said that if the senate were to organize a vote now and the vote was not overwhelmingly one of no confidence, the purpose of the vote would be undermined.

Senator Bruce Pletka said that he was not sure how effective the BOC had been in the past. However, recently, some of the decisions the BOC is making are based on a business model. He said that most BOC members have backgrounds in industry and government, not in higher education. Pletka said that regardless of the outcome of any vote of no confidence in the president, if the senate is not confident that the BOC will act on this vote, then the senate is just wasting its time. He said that he doesn't know of any other way of getting the Board's attention than by conducting a vote of no confidence in the Board itself.

Pletka said that there seems to be a total disconnect between the Board and the Michigan Tech staff and the faculty. The BOC hasn't met with staff and faculty. They don't know our feelings and concerns; yet they are going to be making decisions that affect the livelihoods of staff and faculty. If they want to use a business model, all you have to do is look at the Enrons and the World Coms of the world to see what happens when a Board of Control doesn't take the time to find out what's going on among the rank and file.

Pletka said that we need to have some engagement with the BOC. They seem to be fixated on reorganization as the key to reducing the budget deficit; yet we haven't been shown how reorganization will save money. We're only told that this is the way things are done in industry. A university is not an industry. We don't produce a widget. We educate students. We try to prepare young men and women to become professionals in their chosen fields. Trying to hold a university accountable to a business metaphor is a gross injustice to higher education.

Pletka said that BOC members are political appointees. They were appointed by a governor who is now out of office, and they cannot be recalled. At their last several meetings, they've had trouble getting a quorum. They seem to have already made up their minds as to how they want to solve the problem without really understanding what the problem is. Pletka said that in the film *Network*, William Holden's character said, "I'm mad as hell, and I'm not going to take this any more." He said that this is just how many Michigan Tech faculty and staff feel. He said that we would not be considering a vote of no confidence in the president if the BOC was doing its job.

Keen said that one proposal at the April 22 Executive Committee meeting was that the Executive Committee attempt to arrange a meeting with the Board of Control, perhaps the evening before their Friday, May 9 meeting. He said that the senate could return to this proposal later in this discussion. Keen said that BOC member Kathryn Clark is or has been on the faculty at the University of Michigan, and BOC member Ruth Reck has a faculty appointment at the

University of California, Davis, but she is a laboratory administrator rather than a faculty member. Keen said that based on the contact he has had with the BOC, he truly believes that this Board wants to do what's best for Michigan Tech, but we need to educate them as to how best to do that.

Senator Cindy Selfe said that she was grateful that Board Member Rodger Kershner had written to Janice Glime today to say that the more vigorous the debate and the wider the participation, the better the data and the better the decisions will be. She then offered the following comments:

"As one of the Senators at Large, I've been asked by some constituents from several departments across the campus to outline their concerns about the current situation on campus--and in particular about the current Presidential leadership.

After conferring with a number of senators, I should note that there is a wide range of opinions about this matter and about productive ways of approaching it. As the representative of these constituents, however, I feel an obligation to present their case to the Senate for open debate.

The individuals who came to me wanted the Senate to know that they were fully aware of the sensitivity of such concerns--and of the risk of discussing them when Dr. Tompkins is negotiating with legislators in Lansing about budgetary matters. They believed, however, that silence would prove more detrimental than an open discussion of concerns.

The faculty constituents who talked to me identified three major problems. I'll try to summarize their points briefly.

The first point concerns fiscal leadership. Although most faculty understand that the state budget crisis has precipitated our current financial situation, many do not believe that the state reductions are the primary cause of MTU's budgetary problems.

Rather, the constituents with whom I spoke consider the lack of sound fiscal practice during the 5-10 years leading up to the current state crisis to be the major problem facing us. During this period, they believe that the President failed to assemble and supervise an administrative team that worked consistently to place the university on a sound financial course, nor did he communicate effectively with the Board of Control about the importance of a fiscally sound university, nor did he attend to the financial advice of the Senate's own finance committee.

These constituents have noted that more prudent financial leadership on the President's part during this period--while it would not have allowed the university to escape the current state budget reductions unscathed--would certainly have put Michigan Tech in much better position than it now is to cope with them in responsible ways.

The second point these constituents asked me to make is that the President has not succeeded in exerting effective leadership with the Board of Control, especially with regard to recent plans for reorganizing the university, nor has he succeeded in making a convincing case for his re-structuring proposal to faculty, staff, or students. Although most faculty and staff understand the necessity of budgetary reductions--having coped with static salaries and shrinking departmental budgets for some years--they also understand that universities, as academic institutions, can neither be run nor re-structured in quite the same manner as businesses in order to achieve these reductions.

These constituents believe the original re-organization proposal put forward at the President's direction would result in a loss of key faculty, reduced student enrollments, and a seriously diminished national reputation for the university. They believe that the proposal poses serious difficulties with accreditation and tenure and promotion policies; and that it would displace key

mid-level administrators who make it possible for the university to function effectively. They believe most importantly, that the proposal would neither address the university's problem with fiscal responsibility nor would it result in an adequate level of savings or the long-term health of the university.

These faculty constituents note, as well, that the President has failed to organize input and decision-making about this proposal in a manner conducive to considered, careful, and productive feedback. They note that this lack of effective leadership has created more problems on campus than it has solved.

Finally, these faculty constituents maintain that the President's general lack of leadership has exacerbated all of the problems I have just mentioned. Because the climate on campus is so problematic, they note, faculty, staff, and student moral is lower than they have ever experienced it to be. These faculty constituents have little confidence that the President is attending carefully to the productive suggestions of departmental and college leaders or to those of the Senate, or that he is convincing the Board of Control to do so. They are deeply disturbed by the very real possibilities of staff layoffs, significant tuition raises, and ill-considered program cuts. These constituents, in sum, see few good reasons for nationally recognized faculty to stay at Michigan Tech.

These faculty constituents believe that the President has a responsibility for helping the university community function effectively, and for working with faculty, staff, students and the Board of Control to make it so. Instead, these constituents maintain, the President's leadership has contributed to a climate of uncertainty; a lack of clear direction, productive energy; and a very uncertain future."

Senator Dick Prince said that he agreed with Pletka. At least four members of BOC are relatively new to the Board and need to be educated about the nature of university administration. A vote of no confidence might initiate a dialogue to this end.

Senator Tony Rogers said that the general university community has contributed to the university-as-business model by referring to students as "customers." He said that students might more accurately be considered clients. Hence, we should avoid thinking of students as customers.

Senator Debra Bruch said that the student-as-customer metaphor suggests that students buy a degree rather than earn one.

Rogers agreed.

Senator Dickie Selfe said that he had asked many of his constituents if they favored conducting a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins. The majority do. He said that he believes that his constituents would be interested in extensive and immediate dialogue with the BOC.

Senator Erik Nordberg said that what most troubles him is trying to find a way to effect change. Much of the frustration on campus is caused by people being or feeling disenfranchised. He asked how the senate might effect change. He said that he wasn't sure that a vote of no confidence would effect change. If the problems are traceable to the structure of the BOC and the backgrounds of Board members, a vote of no confidence might send a signal, but it's not clear who will be there to receive it.

Nordberg encouraged the senate to continue to find ways to effect change. He said that the work of the Budget Advisory Group provides an example of faculty and staff influencing changes in the ways in which Michigan Tech's budget is managed, particularly with respect to openness. Problems remain, but progress has been made.

Nordberg said that rather than conducting a vote of no confidence, he would prefer to see the senate develop a series of steps that the senate would like to see the administration take in order to address Michigan Tech's problems and then give the administration a timeframe within which to take these steps. If this fails, then a vote of no confidence would be appropriate.

Senator Larry Sutter said that he agreed with Pletka about the need to get the BOC's attention. He said that he believes that a vote of no confidence in the president would open a dialogue with the BOC. He said that if the BOC did not respond constructively to such a vote and to the summary of constituent concerns that C. Selfe had just presented, then there might be grounds for conducting a vote of no confidence in the Board. To this point, however, the senate has not had much dialogue with the Board; hence, a vote on the Board is premature.

Waddell said that since the Board members are appointed by the governor and cannot be recalled, they are a power unto themselves. Hence, he asked what effect a vote of no confidence in the Board would have.

Pletka said that the intended effect would be to capture the attention of the Board. He said that at a recent senate meeting, it was reported that BOC members were under the impression that morale on campus was good; this suggests that they need to be better informed about conditions at Michigan Tech. He said that he was also uncertain about the usefulness of conducting a vote of no confidence in the president other than letting the president know that many people are angry about the way in which the university is operating. Pletka said that he didn't know who would receive the message, but somehow, the senate needs to get people's attention, and the proposed referenda provide a means of doing that.

Senator Steve Seidel said that if we took this same approach with our students, we would declare them ignorant in order to get their attention so that we could start a dialogue. That is not an elegant means of initiating dialogue. He suggested that the senate consider other means of initiating dialogue.

C. Selfe asked when the senate last evaluated the senior administration.

Keen said that the official evaluation of the senior administration run by the senate takes place every four years. The next scheduled evaluation is to begin next fall. In the last evaluation, only about 30 percent of the faculty and staff polled responded. Keen said that President Tompkins has repeatedly requested more frequent evaluations. Keen said that he hopes that next year, the senate will develop a proposal in response to this request.

Waddell asked if such evaluations would be tied to reappointment schedules.

Keen said that they should be and that this would be more easily accomplished if evaluations were conducted annually.

Senator Don Beck said that in a highly compressed period of time, an enormous number of decisions are about to be made that are crucial to Michigan Tech. He endorsed Nordberg's suggestion that the senate establish specific benchmarks for the administration's performance, including how the administration should involve faculty and staff in the reorganization plan that they will present to the BOC in June. Beck said that the senate should also indicate to the BOC its specific desires as to meeting with the BOC prior to the Board's final decision on reorganizing.

Beck said that the senate should consider itself in session for the summer. Senators should either be in town or find alternates to serve in their place; they should let the senate president or secretary know where they will be and how to reach them so that meetings can be called in response to actions taken by the university president or the BOC. He said that--for whatever

reason--important administrative decisions are often made during the summer, and the senate abrogates its responsibilities if it doesn't attend to such decisions.

Keen requested that all senators inform either himself or Waddell as well as Senate Assistant Jeanne Meyers as to how they can be reached this summer in the event that it should be necessary to call an emergency meeting of the senate. Keen said that the Senate Constitution also provides a mechanism whereby members of the senate--not just officers--can convene a meeting of the full senate.

Williams said that she supported the suggestion to meet during the summer.

Keen said that it was up to the senate to either hold regular meetings during the summer or to convene meetings as necessary.

C. Selfe said that it would be good to meet during the summer; however, the senate should not have to respond to the unreasonable timeframe set for restructuring.

D. Selfe said that many faculty he has talked with have pointed out that they don't work on campus during the summer because they have to write grants, do research, and publish. They should guard that time jealously. D. Selfe also said that many of the staff he has talked to have said that they want a vote of no confidence to proceed now; they believe that there is not time for administrative benchmarking criteria to be developed and applied. He said that whether the vote was strong or weak, someone would be there to receive it. The impetus for voting now might be frustration, but there are reasons for that frustration, which C. Selfe had already articulated.

Senator Gerry Caneba said that the Department of Chemical Engineering has not discussed the question of a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins. However, in the last department meeting, a feeling of dissatisfaction was expressed in the way the university is being run; hence, the department will compose a letter expressing this viewpoint.

Senator David Hand said that one thing the senate should consider is the timing of the proposed vote of no confidence. President Tompkins is currently lobbying Michigan state senators and representatives to try to improve Michigan Tech's financial situation. A vote of no confidence at this point would undermine the president's efforts. Also, the BOC might take such a vote as a stick in the eye and respond by appointing a more autocratic president. Hence, Hand recommended beginning with dialogue; if that fails to achieve the desired results, then a vote of no confidence would be appropriate.

Senator Jacek Borysow said that the senate should ask how successful the president has been in lobbying the state government on behalf of Michigan Tech. He also said that if the BOC members truly have the best interests of Michigan Tech at heart, they will not take a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins as a stick in the eye.

Rogers said that whatever the senate communicates to the BOC must indicate that the concern is with a multi-year problem, not just with a one-time crisis in state appropriations.

Beck said that summer meetings could be attended by alternates if senators themselves are out of town.

Senator Lee Oberto said that communication is critical at this time. The university is on a three-year planning horizon. We need to form a relationship with the BOC--the sooner the better.

Waddell said that at the senate's request, the BOC Finance Committee met with representatives of the senate on April 14. The BOC members who participated in this meeting extended an

invitation for further dialogue. Waddell asked if it would be appropriate for the senate to accept that invitation and request, perhaps, a meeting with the BOC and the Senate Executive Committee followed, perhaps, by some form of open forum. The Executive Committee meeting might allow people to express their views more openly and also prepare the BOC for the kinds of issues that would likely be raised at an open forum. This could also allow an opportunity for establishing administrative benchmarks, which if not met could precipitate a vote of no confidence.

Keen said that he could request a meeting between the BOC and the Senate Executive Committee for May 8. He asked if there were objections to this.

Hand asked if this meeting could be arranged earlier than May 8.

Keen said that it might be possible to meet with a subset of the BOC prior to May 8; however, the full Board probably would not be able to attend prior to May 8.

D. Selfe asked if both meetings would be possible.

Keen said that this might be possible. BOC Chair David Brule spends a fair amount of time on campus; he has been doing his homework.

C. Selfe said that this was a great suggestion. However, she said that she still felt obliged to move that a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins be held as her constituents had requested.

Senator Cindy Selfe MOVED that the University Senate sponsor as a referendum of senate constituents a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins and communicate the results of that referendum to the President and to the Board of Control.

Senator Tony Rogers seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion on the motion.

Davis asked how the senate would proceed after such a vote.

Keen said that he would communicate the result to Provost Wray, as the designated contact between the senate and President Tompkins. He would note in his communication with the provost that he will convey the results of the vote to the BOC at the Board's next meeting.

D. Selfe MOVED that the motion be amended to attach the statement C. Selfe had read earlier in the meeting.

Senator Susan Martin seconded this motion.

Beck MOVED that the minutes of Senate meeting 385 be attached to the referendum so that senate constituents' votes might be informed by the senate's full discussion of this issue, both pros and cons.

Williams seconded the motion.

D. Selfe withdrew his motion in support of Beck's motion.

The motion to attach the minutes of meeting 385 to the referendum PASSED on a written ballot 29 to 5.

Senator Debra Bruch called the question.

Senator Jim Pickens asked if the vote of no confidence should be considered an emergency measure.

Keen said that it should be.

The senate voted 23 to 11 to take up the motion to sponsor a vote of no confidence as an emergency measure.

The senate PASSED by a written vote of 22 to 12 the motion that the University Senate sponsor as a referendum of senate constituents a vote of no confidence in President Tompkins and communicate the results of that referendum to the President and to the Board of Control; that motion having been amended to include that the minutes of Senate meeting 385 be attached to the referendum so that senate constituents' votes might be informed by the senate's full discussion of this issue, both pros and cons.

Provost Kent Wray said that he had no standing in the University Senate, but that he would like to make a comment. He said that senators had publicly made specific charges against President Tompkins. There has been a balanced discussion of these charges. The senate will distribute the minutes of this meeting, which will include the charges made against the president, but the senate has not provided the president with an opportunity to respond to those charges and to defend himself. Wray asked if the senate might invite President Tompkins to address these charges at the senate's April 30 meeting and also attach the president's responses to the referendum.

Williams said that this was a reasonable request. Other senators agreed.

Sutter MOVED and Rogers seconded the motion to invite President Tompkins to the senate's April 30 meeting and to attach the president's responses to the referendum

There was no further discussion of the motion. The motion PASSED without objection.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposal 12-03, Teaching Effectiveness [See minutes, page 10056, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Bill Yaroch MOVED and Senator Cindy Selfe seconded the motion to accept Proposal 12-03, Teaching Effectiveness. There was no discussion. The motion PASSED on a voice vote of the academic departments with opposition. Keen said that the proposal would be forwarded to the administration.

B. Proposal 13-03, BS Program in Software Engineering [See minutes, page 10059, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Bill Gregg MOVED and Senator Steve Seidel seconded the motion to approve Proposal 13-03, BS Program in Software Engineering.

Keen asked for a report on Proposal 13-03 from the Senate Finance Committee.

Senate Finance Committee Co-Chair Larry Davis said that the committee did not find the financial information persuasive one way or another. However, the committee does not object to the proposal.

Keen said that Proposal 13-03 has received the approval of the Curricular Policy Committee.

There was no discussion. The motion PASSED on a voice vote of the academic departments without opposition. Keen said that the proposal would be forwarded to the administration.

C. Proposal 14-03, Transfer Credit Evaluation --Undergraduate [See minutes, page 10080, for a copy of this proposal.]

Keen said that Proposal 14-03, Transfer Credit Evaluation was brought forward by the Instructional Policy Committee.

Senator Bill Yarroch MOVED and Senator Bruce Pletka seconded the motion to accept Proposal 14-03, Transfer Credit Evaluation.

Yarroch said that Proposal 14-03 was an attempt to put into writing things that were already being done at Michigan Tech.

The motion PASSED on a voice vote of the academic departments without opposition. Keen said that the proposal would be forwarded to the administration.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 17-03, Amendment to Proposal 16-97, Minors in Degree Programs [Appendix F]

Senator Bill Gregg said that the Curricular Policy Committee has been working on this proposal over the course of the year. He said that Proposal 17-03 amends the original proposal that created minors. The proposal prohibits students from taking a minor with exactly the same title as their major. To pass a pass/fail course, students would have to earn the equivalent of a C or better. To successfully complete a minor, students must have a 2.0 GPA. Minors may include pass/fail courses. Minors may also include independent studies and research courses if deemed appropriate by the Curricular Policy Committee.

Gregg said that departments can design minors that are intended primarily for their own majors, for majors outside their department, or both.

B. Proposal 18-03, Amendment to Proposal 10-00, Approval of Minors in Degree Programs [Appendix G]

Gregg said that Proposal 18-03 deletes the section on operative rules from Proposal 10-00 because some of these rules conflict with the original policy.

Bruch asked how passing a Pass/Fail course affects a student's GPA.

Gregg said that passing a Pass/Fail course does not affect a student's GPA. Gregg said that if a student fails a Pass/Fail course the course won't affect the student's GPA and won't count as credit toward degree completion.

Senator Erik Nordberg suggested that the question of summer meetings of the University Senate be addressed at the senate's next meeting. Keen accepted the suggestion.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Bruch MOVED and C. Selfe seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell
Secretary of the University Senate