

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 393

8 October 2003

Synopsis: The Senate

1. heard a report by James P. Cross, Executive Director of the Center for International Education.
2. heard a report by Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Chair Tom Snyder.
3. selected three candidates for the Athletic Council.
4. heard a report by Instructional Policy Committee Chair Rosalie Kern on the 2004-2005 Academic Calendar.
5. agreed to send Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees to committee.

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 393 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 8 October 2003, in Room B45 EERC.

1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were At-large Senator Don Beck and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Chemical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Materials Sciences and Engineering, the Keweenaw Research Center, Auxiliary Enterprises, and Information Technology.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Pam Eveland (Director of Planning and Budgeting), Bob Warrington (Dean of COE), Max Seel (Dean of CSA), Jim P. Cross (Director of the Center for International Education), Wellesley Pereira (Center for International Education), Pushpa Murthy (Chair, Department of Chemistry), Ravi Pandey (Chair, Department of Physics), Tom Snyder (Department of Biological Sciences), Rosalie Kern (Department of Education), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), and Hannah Mongiat (*Michigan Tech Lode*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Keen presented the agenda and asked for corrections, alterations, or additions. Senator Terry Monson said that the senate needs to nominate one person to serve on the evaluation committee for the dean of the School of Business and Economics. Keen said that there needs to be an official request for this nomination. He said that this would be addressed under committee reports at the senate's next meeting. Dean Max Seel said that the senate also needs to nominate a member for his evaluation committee. Keen said that the senate has recently sent out email requesting nominees for committee service and would send additional requests shortly.

Keen said that if there were no objections, the senate would follow the agenda as circulated. 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. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETINGS 391 and 392

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 391 and asked for corrections or amendments. There were none. The meetings were approved as distributed.

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 392 and asked for corrections or amendments. Senator Beth Wagner said that Vice President for Research Dave Reed's title needed to be corrected. There were no further corrections or amendments. The minutes were approved as corrected.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Keen said that the senate had forwarded to the administration for its approval Proposal 15-03, Procedures for Loss of Untenured Faculty and Staff Positions, and Proposal 19-03, Changing Principal Investigators on Funded Research Projects. **[Appendices B and C]**

Keen said that the senate has received a reply to the sense of the senate memo indicating the senate's wish that the search for a vice provost be conducted internally. Keen asked that President Tompkins' responding memos be included in the minutes. **[Appendix D]**

Keen said that the Instructional Policy Committee will review Michigan Tech's current add-drop policy.

Keen said that the senate has received a request that the name of the Master of Science Degree in Math be changed to Master Degree in Mathematical Sciences. This request has been referred to the Curricular Policy Committee.

Keen said that the current math exam tends to flush students out of calculus. The Differential Tuition Committee has noted that this may have undesirable implications for retention. This problem has been referred to the Curricular Policy Committee.

Keen said that on the morning prior to the Board of Control's October 7 meeting, he and Senate Secretary Craig Waddell had met with Board President David Brule and Board members Mike Henricksen and Kathy Clark. They discussed the evaluation of President Tompkins and problems with recruiting and retaining students. Keen said that the Board members tended to be sympathetic with the senate officers concerns about both issues.

The senate met with President Tompkins on September 18. Although a number of issues were discussed, the principal topic of discussion was the university's budget situation.

Keen said that the senate has received a report from the Faculty Review Committee, which is responsible for reviewing any faculty grievances that come from departments. The committee is required to report annually on such grievances and on how they have addressed these grievances. Over the past year, the committee spent most of its time ensuring that all departments have charters; they had no faculty grievances to address.

In regard to the Administrative Evaluation Commission and the request that the senate conduct an accelerated review of President Tompkins, Keen asked that his two email messages on this topic be included in the minutes. **[Appendix E]**

Keen said that the senate had decided to refer the issue of an accelerated evaluation of President Tompkins to the Senate Executive Committee. He said that the Executive Committee may only now have enough members to function. The Executive Committee met ten days ago, even though only a bare majority of the senate committee chairs had been elected. Keen said that he had had a 75-minute discussion about presidential evaluations with President Tompkins the previous week. He also had a 30-minute discussion on the same topic with Board of Control Chair Dave Brule. These discussions led Keen to believe that it would be futile to conduct an accelerated evaluation of President Tompkins.

Keen said that he had met with the Administrative Policy Committee and had asked this committee to work expeditiously on three evaluation items: (1) to initiate the evaluation of the

dean of the graduate school; (2) to codify the evaluation of the college deans; and (3) to revise the procedures for evaluating the president and the provost. He said that he has asked the Administrative Policy Committee to interview the administrators who are to be evaluated to find out what they think would be the most useful questions to include on the evaluations. He also asked the Administrative Policy Committee to look at professional evaluation organizations, such as the Association for Governing Boards, and to other universities for models that Michigan Tech might follow.

Keen said that in connection with the change to a 14-week calendar, the starting date for academic appointments will be two weeks before the start of the first day of classes, and the ending date for academic appointments will be one week after the last day of spring final exams. This will maintain the 19-19 week split that Michigan Tech currently operates with, giving a total academic year of 38 weeks.

Keen said that he would meet with the Academic Policy Committee on Friday to discuss the sabbatical leave policy and other issues. One of many problems with the current sabbatical leave policy is that it prohibits faculty on sabbatical from using university funds for travel.

Keen said that the Tenure and Promotion Committee needs a faculty representative. He encouraged senators to solicit nominations for this committee.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked Keen if the senate-initiated evaluation of the president and provost could be synchronized with the Board of Control's evaluation of the president and provost.

Keen said that more frequent evaluations of the president would help to avoid this problem.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if he was correct in assuming that the Executive Committee was not going to pursue the issue of an accelerated evaluation of President Tompkins.

Keen said that the Executive Committee would not pursue this unless there was some burning reason to do so.

Selfe asked if it was correct that the Executive Committee had not met on this issue because the committee did not have a quorum.

Keen said that the Executive Committee met without a quorum, and he followed the requests of the members who were present and contacted President Tompkins and BOC Chair Dave Brule about an accelerated evaluation. He said that he has asked the Administrative Policy Committee to draft an evaluation procedure as promptly as possible. If this procedure is efficient, the evaluation could be conducted expeditiously. He asked the Administrative Policy Committee to confine the senate's evaluations to those administrators whose positions the senate helps to fill (through search-and-appointment procedures). This would exclude, for example, the vice president for advancement and the chief financial officer.

Senator Terry Monson asked if the Administrative Policy Committee would be charged with developing a uniform process for evaluating deans.

Keen said that for evaluation purposes, school deans are considered equally with the department chairs in the colleges; hence, these evaluations follow the procedures defined in the school charters. However, there currently are no defined procedures for evaluating a graduate dean.

Senator Marilyn Cooper said that during the senate's September 18 meeting with president Tompkins, she had difficulty understanding some of the statements about the university's financial situation. For example, she said that it wasn't clear to her whether or not the university

was spending money to finance its debt. She asked if others in the senate who had a better understanding of the university's finances might prepare an analysis of what President Tompkins said during this meeting and during in his 2003 State of the University Address.

Keen said that Senator Larry Davis had analyzed the university's budget situation a year or two ago. He said that Director of Budgeting and Planning Pam Eveland is scheduled to make a presentation to the senate in November.

Cooper said that she was especially interested to know whether paying down the deficit was more important than having a reserve fund.

Senator Tony Rogers said that he agreed with Cooper. He suggested that the Senate Finance Committee prepare such an analysis for the senate.

Waddell said that he believed that half of Michigan Tech's \$9 million deficit is owed internally, from one unit of the university to another. He asked to whom the other \$4.5 million is owed and whether Michigan Tech pays interest on this debt. He asked if there is any pressing need to repay immediately the \$4.5 million that is owed internally.

Keen said that he would ask the Senate Finance Committee to address these questions. He asked Finance Committee Co-Chair Jim Pickens if it would be possible to do this at either the next senate meeting or in the meeting following that meeting.

Pickens said that this would be possible.

C. Selfe asked that the committee produce something that senators could distribute to their constituents.

Keen said that the last such document, Introduction to University Financing, was created by the administration for new members of the Budget Advisory Group. This document was several hundred pages long.

Pickens said that there were not a lot of notes from President Tompkins' September 18 remarks but that the president had provided extensive documentation on his remarks at Senate Meeting 386 (30 April 2003). He asked if it would be appropriate for the Finance Committee to focus its analysis on the April 30 comments.

D. Selfe said that that had been a quite different statement.

Cooper said that she would appreciate an analysis of the April 30 meeting as well. She asked Pickens if he could just provide an analysis of what he could remember of the September 18 meeting.

C. Selfe said that the senate should get an analysis of everything.

Keen said that a budget of over \$100 million impacting close to 2,000 people could not be simplified.

Waddell said that one way to inform people was by giving them a lot of information, but that this could also be a way to obscure information. He suggested that rather than giving the Senate Finance Committee a blanket charge of explaining everything, it might be better to pose specific questions to the committee.

Keen asked people with such questions to forward them to Senate Finance Committee Co-Chairs Jim Pickens and Larry Davis.

C. Selfe said that she belongs to a national organization that has a budget at least as large as Michigan Tech's budget, and this organization produces an annual report of about five pages that is easy to understand.

Keen said that the Finance Committee would work on this.

Waddell asked Keen if the senate was going to discuss proposals for enhancing undergraduate enrollment.

Keen said that the senate would soon receive the results of another discussion in the Senate Executive Committee, which was about ways of enhancing on-campus, undergraduate enrollment. These results will be in the form of three or four proposals from the senate to the administration. Keen said that the proposals offer constructive suggestions for increasing undergraduate enrollment. He said that senators should receive these proposals by next week.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. The IILM-MTU Connection

James P. Cross, Executive Director of the Center for International Education, said that Michigan Tech had begun a new program in India this fall. He said that the Center for International Education has led the effort to establish this program but that the program really belongs to the colleges and department that are implementing it. He provided the following overview of the program:

A. Program Overview

1. First two years of five engineering programs offered in cooperation with the Institute for Higher Education (IIHE) in New Delhi.
 - Electrical Engineering
 - Mechanical Engineering
 - Computer Engineering
 - Chemical Engineering
 - Materials Science and Engineering
2. Michigan Tech provides curriculum and quality control of branch campus (e.g., approves applications and accepts students, coordinates registration, provides input for orientation and student services, approves all marketing initiatives, approves faculty/facilities, provides assessment).
3. IIHE (not for profit institute of higher education authorized by the Government of India) provides infrastructure and pays all on-site costs associated with instruction and marketing. IIHE 2003-04 estimated expenditure for salaries, marketing and capital expense = \$192,105. Expenditures for 2004-05 = \$296,200.
4. Program reviewed and approved by participating units, departments, colleges, planning and budget, CFO, Provost, President, BOC, State Auditors and NCA Higher Learning Commission. Administration is through an Executive Committee and an Implementation Committee.

B. The Numbers

1. Year one we have 10 students enrolled in Mechanical and Electrical Engineering
2. Year two IIHE is guaranteeing payment for 60 new students.
3. Year three IIHE is guaranteeing payment for 90 new students.
4. IIHE pays Michigan Tech a tuition or "royalty" of \$875.00 per student in year one, \$1,000.00 per new student in year two, and \$1,200.00 per new student in year three. This covers our quality control/administration costs.

5. When students move to Houghton tenure track faculty lines will be added at approximately a 15 to 1 ratio. Faculty lines are maintained as long as enrollment is sustained.
6. Based on current projections in steady state the program will have 169 students in Delhi and 90 students in Houghton.
7. Cumulative loss peaks in year two at \$149,806 (Cost of Investment). In year 3 we make a profit of \$52,601. By year four we have recovered our investment costs and cumulative profits are \$381,200. By year six we have 3 tenure track faculty lines and 3 lecture lines plus cumulative profits of over \$2 million. Year eight we have 5 tenure track faculty lines, 3 lecture lines and \$3.9 million in cumulative profits.

C. Rational and Benefit

1. International Competition for best/brightest minds

- Visa/immigration regime makes study in US more difficult.
- Increasing costs of US higher education deter international students.
- Competition from Australia, UK, Europe (Bologna process)

Australia:

- a. Curtin established successful campus in Malaysia.
- b. All top universities competing internationally

UK:

- a. University of Bradford 4+0 Engineering/Business degrees in India and working in China.
- b. University of Herefordshire 4+0 Engineering/Business in Malaysia.
- c. Competing for international students globally.

Europe: 2004 3+2 BS/MS programs in English/subsidized

US competition:

- a. Texas A&M 4 accredited BS engineering degree programs in Doha, Qatar beginning 2003.
- b. IIT distance graduate engineering programs in India
- c. Many offer transfer/articulation with Malaysia/India and beginning in China.

Michigan Tech is riding the lead wave (innovation/leadership) at little risk and minimal cost. Greater risk in not participating in the global marketplace.

2. Economic Impact of International Students (IIE Open doors 2002; figures based on 2000-01)

- \$12 billion to US economy
- \$500 million to the State of Michigan
- \$14 million to Michigan Tech and community
- 43% of grad students; 6% undergrad; 11% overall.

3. Impact for Michigan Tech (Mission, Strategic Plan)

- Support undergraduate enrollments
- Feed graduate programs (advertising MS, Ph.D.)
- Support research goals and create research opportunities/corporate links
- Develop opportunities for international alumni/friends to support Michigan Tech

- Build a presence/reputation in an important international market
- Revenue

Cross concluded his remarks and called for questions.

Senator Terry Monson asked how the program would be accredited.

Dean of the College of Engineering Robert Warrington said that he had discussed this program with the director of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) at a meeting during the past summer. The director didn't see any difficulty with accrediting this program, but he wants a letter describing the program and requesting direction as to how to proceed. Michigan Tech's next general ABET visit is scheduled for the fall of 2004, and students will not enter the IIHE program until the fall of 2005. Warrington said that ABET accredits many universities outside the United States.

Senator Peck Cho asked why enrollments of international students at Michigan Tech were projected to decrease.

Cross said that in two-plus-two programs, students complete the first two years of study in country and then transfer to Michigan Tech for the final two years. However, since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, international students have had greater difficulty obtaining visas to enter the United States. Consequently, parents of students enrolled in two-plus-two programs ask if Michigan Tech can guarantee visas for their children in year three. Michigan Tech cannot guarantee such visas. Cross said that the program should grow after the first few groups of students demonstrate that Indian students do not have difficulty getting student visas to study in the United States. Cross said that IIHE has now been accredited in India as a four-year university. Hence, if students were not able to come to the United States after their first two years at IIHE, they would be able to apply that first two years of education toward a degree from IIHE.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked if Michigan Tech was doing anything to help Indian students to make the transition to Michigan Tech.

Cross said that the communication path is open through semester visits by Michigan Tech faculty and administrators and through email and other means of correspondence.

Provost Wray said that some of the IIHE faculty had visited Michigan Tech this past summer in order to help facilitate the transition of their students from India to Michigan Tech.

Senator Jacek Borysow asked what out-of-state tuition was at Michigan Tech.

Cross said that out-of-state tuition was \$590 per credit hour this semester.

Borysow asked what the median household income was in India.

Cross said that approximately 200,000,000 people in India would be classified as middle or upper-middle class.

Borysow asked if these students could attend universities other than Michigan Tech after their first two years in the program.

Cross said that they could but that these students were not IIHE students but Michigan Tech students from the moment they enroll in this program.

Senator Marilyn Cooper asked what preparation teachers of general education courses had for working with the students in this program.

Cross said that all of the faculty teaching in this program have been approved by the Michigan Tech departments. For the five degrees involved (electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, computer engineering, chemical engineering, and materials science and engineering), these faculty are teaching the first two years of Michigan Tech's curriculum in India, including Perspectives on Inquiry, World Cultures, Revisions, and Institutions.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if students in this program had access to learning centers.

Keen said that as the former coordinator of Perspectives on Inquiry, he wanted to know into which department the teacher of Perspectives on Inquiry had been appointed at Michigan Tech.

Cross said that Mary Durfee approved this appointment.

Keen said that Durfee had not received the appointment papers for this person.

Keen asked Dean Max Seel if he had processed the appointment papers for the IIHE faculty.

Seel said that he had not.

Keen said that in this case, Michigan Tech students are being taught by people who are not Michigan Tech faculty.

Cross said that he didn't think this was the case.

Keen said that the IIHE instructors have not had their appointment papers processed at Michigan Tech.

Seel said that Michigan Tech does not process appointments for IIHE. Michigan Tech does make sure that the IIHE faculty are teaching Michigan Tech's curriculum, but they are not employees of Michigan Tech.

Keen said that IIHE faculty who teach Michigan Tech's curriculum have to receive Michigan Tech faculty appointments. Senate policy 4-95, which was approved by the Board of Control, requires all people teaching Michigan Tech classes to be appointed at Michigan Tech in an academic department. Keen asked Chemistry Department Chair Pushpa Murthy if she had processed the appointments for chemistry.

Murthy said that she had the c.v.'s of IIHE faculty who will be teaching Michigan Tech's chemistry curriculum but that she had not processed appointments for these faculty. She said that the plan was to appoint these people as adjunct faculty.

Senator Dave Hand asked how much Michigan Tech is investing in this program.

Cross said that based on the model, Michigan Tech will invest \$149,000 in this program.

Hand asked if this \$149,000 would come from Michigan Tech's general fund.

Director of Planning and Budgeting Pam Eveland said that it would.

Senator Jim Pickens said that the Delhi-based college expenses need to be clarified.

Cross said that these expenses were for assessment and quality control, including workshops and counseling sessions and related travel.

Pickens asked if this included the salary of Michigan Tech faculty visiting India while they are actually in India.

Cross said that it did not. It does include travel costs, hotel costs, per diem costs, and so on. He said that these people would only be in India for four or five days, not for a whole semester.

Eveland said that these costs do include any overload pay to faculty for seminars and workshops.

Senator Bill Gregg asked if there were other two-year institutions like IIHE in India.

Cross said that IIHE also has four-year (two-plus-two) programs with other universities.

D. Selfe asked if any of the courses in this program were being taught as distance-learning courses.

Cross said that they were not but they could be in the future if they were affordable.

Senator Tony Rogers asked how revenues were split between the program and the participating departments.

Eveland said that the tuition revenue comes in to the central university, and the participating departments are rewarded with faculty lines.

Seel said that he would make sure that the IIHE appointments were processed as soon as possible.

C. Selfe said that the IIHE students would contribute greatly to the culture of the local community.

Cross said that Michigan Tech currently has 706 international students from 82 different countries.

B. Report of Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment

Keen said that the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment was established in September 2001.

Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Chair Tom Snyder said that the committee consists of himself, Bogue Sandberg, Sue Beske-Diehl, and Carol MacLennan. The committee has reviewed the way in which promotion and tenure are handled at Michigan Tech. Snyder said that the process began in 1997 with a previous committee. This previous committee produced a document that became Senate Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures. Snyder said that when Michigan Tech's attorney reviewed this document, she raised some legal objections. Hence, the new task force was formed to revise this document.

Snyder said that the Michigan Tech Faculty Handbook includes sections on tenure and promotion policy that should be included in the university's policy on tenure and promotion but that are currently not included. Snyder said that Dave Nelson, who chaired the previous committee, told him that the previous committee had only intended the document they produced to describe tenure and promotion procedures and that the committee had intended to develop tenure and promotion policy later. Snyder said that some policy issues addressed in this document that at variance with the Board of Control promotion and tenure policy.

Given this situation, the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment decided to (1) produce a set of tenure, promotion, and reappointment procedures; and (2) recommend modifications to the Board of Control policy on tenure, promotion, and reappointment that would remove procedures from the policy and combine promotion and tenure policy in one document.

Senator Ron Roblee said that individual units define their own promotion and tenure procedures in their charters.

Snyder said that this was true, but that while some P&T procedures can vary across units, the flow of P&T documents must be made uniform.

Snyder said that the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment will distribute the new documents on P&T policy and P&T procedures. He said that apart from striking out procedural matters, most of the proposed changes in BOC policy are minor. Two significant, proposed changes are allowing tenure of half-time faculty and linking promotion and tenure, except in the School of Technology, which has a history of tenuring people as assistant professors.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked how this change would affect people who are hired as associate professors.

Snyder said that they would still be considered for tenure as associate professors within a four years of being hired at Michigan Tech.

Senator Bill Gregg suggested that the senate petition the Board of Control to amend its policy to conform with the recommendations of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment.

Snyder said that the BOC could initiate the amendment of its own policies but that since the P&T policies are a contract between the BOC and the faculty, it would be appropriate for the faculty to initiate the amendments. He said that the procedures and policy must be consistent with one another.

Roblee said that he has been on the School of Technology's P&T Committee for the past three years and that during that time, there has only been one case of someone being tenured without simultaneously being promoted.

Snyder said that nothing in the proposed policy prevents simultaneous tenure and promotion in the School of Technology, but that the proposed policy would allow for someone to be tenured without being promoted.

Roblee asked if the committee would accept feedback on this point from the School of Technology.

Snyder said that it would.

Senator Jim Pickens said that one advantage of the committee's proposal was that separating policies and procedures leaves policy to the BOC but makes procedures internal to Michigan Tech.

Snyder said that the method for changing P&T procedures was essentially the same as the method for changing P&T policy. However, while the BOC could reject proposed procedural changes, the board would not have to process such changes as they would policy changes.

Snyder said that at this point, the documents belong to the University Committee on Academic Tenure. The senate cannot do anything to amend the current BOC policy. To amend the current BOC policy, the University Committee on Academic Tenure has to have an election by the faculty, for which voters must appear at the meeting in order to vote. Once the University Committee on Academic Tenure disseminates these documents to the faculty, the documents cannot be amended until they are voted upon.

Gregg asked who controls the University Committee on Academic Tenure.

Keen said that the University Committee on Academic Tenure is a five-person group controlled by the faculty with severe restrictions. Two members are appointed by the president of the university, and three are elected by the faculty. Keen said that this committee is the last refuge of faculty who disagree with the administration over tenure decisions.

Gregg asked to whom the committee reports.

Keen said that the committee reports to the university president.

Snyder said that all of the committee members must be faculty members who do not hold administrative appointments. He said that the committee only had advisory status, but that if the administration decided a tenure case in opposition to the recommendation of the committee, this would have severe consequences in any legal challenge to the administration's decision.

Hand asked how many people have been denied tenure at Michigan Tech in the past 15 years.

Snyder said that he did not have the answer to this question. Snyder said that the University Committee on Academic Tenure does not look at routine tenure cases but only at cases where tenure is denied and the faculty member in question appeals this decision on the grounds of violation of policy or procedure. He said that many people have been denied tenure in the last 15 years, but most of them have not appealed.

Snyder said that the new documents also detail procedures for reappointment.

Snyder said that committee would provide the senate with copies of the document. He said that the senate could provide feedback on the document because it won't become codified until it is sent to the faculty for a vote. However, at this point, the committee is interested in feedback on substantive problems, not in wordsmithing. The committee proposes that the faculty accept the procedures and support amending the policy. Once these documents become policy and procedures for the university, amendments would be processed through the senate.

C. Elections -- University Committees

Keen said that the Athletic Council includes three members of the academic faculty appointed by the university president for staggered three-year terms. Each faculty member of the council must hold tenure and will be recommended to the president by the University Senate. The current faculty members of the council are Carl Vilmann, Bob Baillod, and Randy Freisinger. Baillod's term has expired. The nominees are Baillod, Dave Karnosky, and Larry Lankton. Keen said that the senate must forward a slate of three candidates to president Tompkins.

Monson MOVED to close nominations and forward these three names to President Tompkins.
D. Selfe seconded the motion.

The motion passed without objection.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 1-04, 2004-2005 Academic Calendar [Appendix F]

Instructional Policy Committee Chair Rosalie Kern said that the senate and the Board of Control had already approved Senate Proposal 21-03, Guidelines For An Academic Calendar of 14 Instructional Weeks. She said that at this meeting, she would present a draft of the proposed 2004-2005 academic calendar. Kern said that the Instructional Policy Committee would also like to request approval of provisional calendars for the next two years.

The provisional calendar for 2004-2005 meets all of the guidelines defined in Proposal 21-03.

The provisional calendar for 2005-2006 meets all of the guidelines defined in Proposal 21-03 except for the stipulation that the last day of class of spring semester should be between April 22 and April 28. In the current provisional calendar, the last day of class for spring 2006 is April 21.

Kern said that if the calendar meets all of the guidelines defined in Proposal 21-03, during years when the fall semester begins after Labor Day, the last day of final exams will be close to December 25. For example, if all of the guidelines defined in Proposal 21-03 are followed, the last day of final exams in fall 2006 would fall on December 22. Kern asked how senators would prefer resolving such problems.

Senator David Hand suggested not scheduling final exams on Thursdays and Fridays when doing otherwise would end exams too close to Christmas.

Keen said that the senate would need to confer with the Office of Student records and Registration to see if this would be possible.

Senator Ron Roblee said that the real issue was travel time.

Senator Terry Monson asked if final exams could be started on a Sunday.

Keen said that this would be a violation of BOC policy.

Senator Jim Pickens said that the senate is charged with officially reviewing the academic calendar next year, and a lot of things might change between now and then. He said that approving a provisional calendar now could compromise that review.

Keen asked the Instructional Policy Committee to bring back to the senate a separate proposal on provisional calendars so that the senate would only work on the calendar for the 2004-2005 academic year at its next meeting. He said that at its next meeting, the senate would vote only on the 2004-2005 calendar.

B. Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees [Appendix G]

Keen said that there are problems with Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees. Hence, he asked for a motion to approve Proposal 2-04 followed by a motion to send the proposal to the Academic Policy Committee for review.

Senator Cindy Selfe MOVED to approve Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees. Senator Terry Monson seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion of the motion. There was none.

Senator Susan Amato-Henderson MOVED to send Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees to committee. C. Selfe seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion of the motion. There was none.

The motion to send Proposal 2-04, Honorary Posthumous Degrees to committee PASSED without objection.

C. Proposal 3-04, Minor in Municipal Engineering [Appendix H]

Keen said that Proposal 3-04, Minor in Municipal Engineering has been favorably reviewed by both the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. The proposal will be eligible for a vote at the senate's next meeting.

Senate Finance Committee Co-Chair Jim Pickens said that the only concern the Finance Committee had was to ensure that this new minor would pay for itself.

Senate Curricular Policy Committee Chair Bill Gregg said that the Curricular Policy Committee has approved this proposal.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Senator Tim Malette MOVED and Senator Debra Bruch seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell
Secretary of the University Senate