

# THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 394

22 October 2003

## Synopsis: The Senate

1. heard a report on the proposed child development center at Michigan Tech.
2. elected Chris Williams to the Conflict of Interest Committee.
3. elected Ann Maclean to the Distance Learning Implementation Committee.
4. elected John Gershenson, Tami Olson, Dongwook Kim, and Dianne Sprague to the Presidential Commission for Diversity.
5. elected Mary Carol Friedrich to the Presidential Commission for Women.
6. elected Pat Martin to the School of Business and Economics Dean Review Committee.
7. passed Proposal 1-04, 2004-2005 Academic Calendar.

---

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 394 to order at 5:34 p.m. on Wednesday, 22 October 2003, in Room B45 EERC.

### 1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were At-large Senator Cindy Selfe and representatives from Education, Materials Science and Engineering, ME-EM, Physics, the Keweenaw Research Center, and Finance and Advancement. Liaison in attendance was Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Sue Beske-Diehl (Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences), Carol Plichta (Child Care Board member), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), and the following MTU students: Charles Jousma, Andy Hendricks, Heather Riker, Maddie Norman, Matthew Rauch, Natalie Graiver, Toni Larche, and Rachel Robertson.

### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Keen presented the agenda and proposed adding the Conflict of Interest Committee to the list of committee elections and adding a discussion of a proposed rewording in the undergraduate catalog to New Business. There were no additional amendments, and there were no objections to the agenda as amended. [**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 at the Senate's last meeting, Tom Snyder had reported on the revision of Michigan Tech's tenure, promotion, and reappointment procedures. Keen said that since that meeting, the senate has received some proposed revisions. The senate will circulate to senators representing academic departments the unedited document with a list of some of the proposed alterations. The purpose of this review is to determine whether there are major flaws in the proposal. The deans and department chairs will also review this document. The document will then be reported to the Academic Tenure Committee, after which there will be no more changes. The Academic Tenure Committee will then distribute the document to the full faculty, who will vote on the document.

Senator Don Beck asked Keen to summarize why the proposed changes in Michigan Tech's tenure, promotion, and reappointment procedures were necessary.

Keen said that the Board of Control policy includes a number of procedures that should not be included in a policy document. Also, in many instances, Michigan Tech's practice has departed from written procedures.

Keen said that Michigan Tech has been developing a policy on how best to record policies and make them accessible to people. Keen objected to the lack of senate involvement in the previous draft of this policy on policies. Consequently, the senate has been invited to participate in the development of the next draft. Keen and Senator Bill Gregg will serve on the Subcommittee on Policy Development of the Cross-functional Planning Group; the larger group is chaired by Director of Planning and Budgeting Pam Eveland.

The Michigan Tech Department of Education has submitted to the senate a proposal for a bachelor of science degree program in psychology. This proposal has been forwarded for review to the senate's Curricular Policy Committee and to the senate's Finance Committees.

Keen said that Provost Wray has asked the senate to develop a recommendation on ways to develop rules for determining what courses are under-enrolled. Currently, any course with fewer than ten undergraduate students or fewer than five graduate students is likely to be canceled. However, this is only an informal policy.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked why Provost Wray had initiated this request.

Keen said that the provost initiated this request at the suggestion and urging of the state auditors. The state auditors don't think state money should be spent on having a faculty member teach a course for only one or two students. Keen said that the senate is not being asked to determine how many people constitute an under-enrolled course; the senate is being asked to recommend a process by which this determination might be made.

Keen said that the senate has also been asked to help develop a proposal for a university-wide process for setting admissions standards. Currently, admissions standards are set by departments, colleges, or schools.

Keen said that the State of the Public Universities Address would be broadcast live at 5:00 p.m. on November 12 in ME-EM 111. This address by the president of the President's Council will describe what Michigan's 15 public universities do for the state and the effects that budget reductions have on the universities' abilities to carry out their collective missions [a copy of the address is available at <http://www.pcsu.org/>] Keen encouraged senators to attend this address.

Keen said that the senate office has received the Sabbatical Leave Committee's follow-up report on sabbatical leaves. **[Appendix B]** Keen commended the committee for submitting its report on time. He said that in its recent review, Michigan Tech was told that it needed to do a better job of following up on the results of sabbatical leaves. He said that the Academic Policy Committee is currently reviewing Michigan Tech's sabbatical leave policies.

Keen said that nominees are needed for the following committees: Academic Integrity Committee, Faculty Review Committee, Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct), and the College of Sciences and Arts Dean Review Committee.

Keen said that the senate also needs nominees for senators at large.

Keen called for questions. There were none.

## **5. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Proposed MTU Child Development Center -- Sue Beske-Diehl**

Professor Sue Beske-Diehl, Chair of the Michigan Tech Child Care Board, presented the following information about child care at Michigan Tech:

## **Vision Statement**

- Create and maintain a high-quality, full-service, child care center to serve the needs of MTU faculty, staff, and students.
- Child Care Board is composed of staff, faculty, students, and community volunteers.

## **History of Child-Care Effort at MTU**

- 1978 - Plans for child care center halted
- 1994 - Women's Climate Survey suggests need for on-campus child care
- 1997 - Child Care Survey of faculty, staff, and students reveals need for on-campus child care
- 1998 - Curt Tompkins forms Child Care Board
- 1998 - Little Huskies Child Care Center starts at church on College Avenue. Baraga-Houghton-Keweenaw (BHK) Child Development Board operates center
- 2001 - Meeting with Bright Horizons Family Solutions - initial planning of facility
- 2002 - BHK funding cut forces MTU Little Huskies to move to centers away from campus
- Move emphasizes need for MTU's own child care building
- 2003 - Heightened fund-raising development with Fred Hensley and other advancement staff - established as mini-campaign

## **What will an on-campus child-care center do for MTU?**

- Help MTU implement and achieve goals of Strategic Plan
- Help recruit and retain-faculty, staff, and students
- On-campus child care is good business - it saves money

## **MTU's strategic plan is to become a national university of choice.**

- Increased recruitment and retention of quality faculty, graduate students, minorities and women
- Implied by the strategic plan are recruitment and retention of quality staff and undergraduate students

Recruit and retain new faculty with strong research and graduate interests.

- "Faculty increasingly ask about the availability of quality child care during interviews" - Ingrid Cheney, Human Resources
- Stiff competition exists for best potential faculty - "war for talent"
- Ability to accommodate dual-career couples

## **MTU Faculty Statement**

- *"Due to (our previous) experience, one of the first things we inquired about during our interview was availability of child care."* Dr.'s Nilufer and Soner Onder, Computer Science Faculty

## **Child care is important in recruiting and retaining graduate students.**

- Graduate Student Council chose child care as part of the benchmarking study of graduate student programs
- Top universities have child care subsidies or discounts for grad students

## **On-campus child care saves money.**

- Cost of turnover - 1.5 to 2 times salary to replace faculty, e.g., start-up funds, advertisements, time
- Bright Horizons' studies

-- Union Bank

-- Bryan LGH Medical Center, Nebraska - 0.7% turnover of Nurses versus 11%

-- Ford, Motorola, Merck, Xerox, Bank One, Pfitzer, IBM

- Reduces Absenteeism

-- care giver is sick

-- mildly sick children

- Improves Morale

-- parents have confidence in center

-- can visit children for lunch

## **Need for quality on-campus child care**

- No full-service child care centers within two miles of MTU that take all children under 5 years
- BHK Child Care is now serving low-income children only
- Difficult to find quality child care, especially for those new to area such as faculty, students, and professional staff
- Critical need for infant care because few child-care providers take infants

## **Child Development Center Plans**

- Place where children are safe and happy
- Place where children can experience wonder, pleasure, and delight
- Place where children's natural curiosity is enhanced for learning and development
- Place to keep the child in "childhood"

## **Unique Aspects of the Center**

- Use innovative, age-appropriate methods to encourage learning
- Enhance Michigan Tech's reputation as a high-quality technical institution
- Use engineering enterprise programs and class project to develop new products & technology

## **A Full-Service Center**

- Capacity 50 - 75 children
- Offer evening and weekend care
- Care for snow-days and teacher in-service days
- Mildly sick child care
- Accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children

## **Finances**

- Phase 1 - Building cost funded by alumni and friends of the University - \$2.5 million
- Phase 2 - Endowment for scholarships and special programs - \$2.5 million
- Fees paid by parents
- Center will help low-income parents receive government subsidies
- Independent child care provider will be contracted to operate child care center

## **Fund Raising**

- Facility will be funded by private donations
- Child Care Board is working with the Michigan Tech Fund, Fred Hensley, and Curt Tompkins to identify potential donors for lead gifts
- Corporate and Foundations office is making exploratory approaches to foundations to find level of interest - several foundations fund projects like this once they see some funds have been committed to the effort

## **The Future**

- The presence of a high-quality child development center will change the culture of Michigan Tech making it even more attractive to faculty, staff and students and will bring us closer to the goal of becoming a national university of choice.

Beske-Diehl asked if there were any questions.

Senator Debra Bruch asked if the volunteers taking care of the children would be licensed.

Beske-Diehl said that the professional childcare providers would be licensed. She said that any volunteer helpers would be well screened.

Senator Jim Turnquist asked if the fund-raising activities planned by the MTU Child Care Board include raising funds for operating the facility.

Beske-Diehl said that some of it would. She said that the buildings and utilities for most university child-care centers are provided by the universities. She said if Michigan Tech provided utilities and maintenance, it would see a return on this investment in terms of recruiting and retaining students, faculty, and staff.

Senator Tony Rogers asked what level of operating subsidy Michigan Tech had committed to.

Beske-Diehl said that Michigan Tech hasn't committed to anything yet; however, the larger the endowment the center gets, the less subsidy the center would need.

Senator Ron Roblee asked if the committee was seeking a motion to approve the proposal.

Keen said that he expected the senate's Fringe Benefits Committee to issue a recommendation on the proposal.

Fringe Benefits Committee Chair Senator Tony Rogers said that the committee supported the proposal in principle, but needed more information about Michigan Tech's subsidy level.

Beske-Diehl said that the Child Care Board did not have this information as of yet.

Rogers said that the senate's Finance Committee had reviewed this proposal as well. He said that he would like to hear a report from that committee.

Beske-Diehl said that people should remember that despite the subsidies, childcare centers have been shown to save money for their corporate sponsors.

Keen thanked Beske-Diehl for her presentation.

## **B. Elections - University Committees**

Keen reported that Sue Beske-Diehl (Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences), Beth Flynn (Humanities), Dave Shonnard (Chemical Engineering), and Barry Solomon (Social Sciences) are nominees for the Academic Tenure Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The slate will be sent to the tenured and tenure-track academic faculty for election.

Keen reported that Chris Williams (ME-EM) is a nominee for the Conflict of Interest Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate elected Williams by acclamation.

Keen reported that Ann Maclean (School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science) and I.D. Wijayarathne (School of Technology) are nominees for the Distance Learning Implementation Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate elected Maclean to a three-year term.

Keen reported that John Gershenson (ME-EM) is a nominee for the College of Engineering representative on the Presidential Commission for Diversity; Tami Olson (Mathematical Sciences) is a nominee for the College of Sciences and Arts representative; Dongwook Kim is a nominee for the School of Business and Economics representative; and Dianne Sprague is a nominee for the School of Technology representative. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate elected Gershenson, Olson, Kim, and Sprague to three-year terms by acclamation.

Keen reported that Mary Carol Friedrich (Fine Arts) is a nominee for the Presidential Commission for Women. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate elected Friedrich to a three-year term by acclamation.

Keen reported that Gerry Caneba (Chemical Engineering), Sonia Goltz (School of Business and Economics), Walt Milligan (Materials Science and Engineering), and Kurt Pregitzer (School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science) are nominees for the Sabbatical Leave Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate approved the slate by acclamation. The slate will be forwarded to President Tompkins for appointment.

Keen reported that Pat Martin (Social Sciences) is a nominee for the School of Business and Economics Dean Review Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The Senate elected Martin by acclamation.

## **6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 1-04, 2004-2005 Academic Calendar [Appendix C]**

Keen said that Instructional Policy Committee Chair Rosalie Kern had presented Proposal 1-04 at the senate's previous meeting. Keen said that the senate is obliged to approve each calendar. He said that this is essentially a pro forma confirmation of the calendar. Guidelines for the academic calendar are approved by the senate and the Board of Control. The proposed calendar fits those guidelines. The calendar is not as detailed as it should be because some policies still need to be worked out, such as determining drop dates.

Senator Terry Monson MOVED to approve Proposal 1-04. Senator Dave Hand seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion. There was none.

Proposal 1-04, 2004-2005 Academic Calendar, PASSED without objection.

**B. Proposal 3-04, Minor in Municipal Engineering [See minutes, page 10414, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Keen said that the senate's Curricular Policy Committee and the senate's Finance Committee had reviewed Proposal 3-04, Minor in Municipal Engineering. He asked those two committees to report their recommendations. He said that voting units on this proposal would be senators from the academic units and the senators at large.

Curricular Policy Committee Chair Bill Gregg said that the Curricular Policy Committee had received Proposal 3-04 in February 2003 and requested only a few adjustments. Those adjustments have been made. He said that this minor was primarily designed for distance learning but would also be available to on-campus students. He asked for questions.

Monson asked if the proposal called for new courses or if it relied only on existing courses.

Gregg said that he believed that all of the courses required for this minor were already offered at Michigan Tech.

D. Selfe asked if all of the courses required for the minor had already been offered as distance learning courses.

Gregg said that he didn't know.

Based on his recollection of discussions in Distance Learning Implementation Committee meetings last year, Roblee said that he believed that most of these courses had not yet been taught as distance learning course, but that they would be.

Monson asked if Michigan Tech had the technical capability to offer all of these courses as distance learning courses.

D. Selfe said that that was a question for Director of Educational Technology Services Patty Lins. He asked if there was some discussion of this in the proposal.

Senate Finance Committee Co-Chair Jim Pickens said that the proposal says "The distance education model requires that the courses make money for the University so distance offerings will not increase costs." Pickens said that the Senate Finance Committee was uncertain about the implications of this statement because the committee did not understand the mechanisms by which costs would be recovered from the Distance Learning Program. He said that up until this year, all distance learning funds went directly to the sponsoring departments; now, however, a 29 percent portion of these funds is taken by the Distance Learning Program; that converts to a 41 percent overhead. Pickens said that overhead on grants and contracts is 57 percent.

D. Selfe said that the proposers should have clearance the proposal either through the Distance Learning Implementation Committee or through the Director of Educational Technology Services. He said that Educational Technology Services is at near capacity now.

Roblee said that D. Selfe had participated in Distance Learning Implementation Committee meetings last year when this proposal was discussed. He said that Director of Educational Technology Services Patty Lins had participated in these meetings. He asked Selfe if he thought that Lins would have raised this issue at the time if capacity was a problem.

Selfe said that he attended some of the Distance Learning Implementation Committee meetings last year but that he didn't remember discussing this proposal.

Senator Scott Pollins MOVED that the senate table Proposal 3-04 for two weeks until issues of costs and capacity could be clarified. Monson seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion of the motion.

Roblee suggested that the senate invite Interim Dean of Distance Learning Bruce Rafert to participate in the next senate meeting.

D. Selfe suggested that the chair of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering also be invited to the next senate meeting.

Keen said that he would issue the appropriate invitations. He asked if there was further discussion of the motion to table. There was none.

The motion to table until the senate's next meeting Proposal 3-04, Minor in Municipal Engineering PASSED without objection.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Discussion of proposals on undergraduate enrollment**

Keen said that in working on the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee (BRAC), Senate Secretary Craig Waddell had devoted a great deal of time to examining issues involved in undergraduate enrollment. Waddell developed a report for the BRAC, which he subsequently submitted to the senate. At Keen's suggestion, Waddell developed three draft senate proposals based on this report. Keen said that Waddell would present these proposals to the senate for feedback and comment.

Waddell distributed copies of the three draft proposals. He said that since peaking at 7,588 in 1980, Michigan Tech's on-campus undergraduate enrollment had declined by 30 percent. Waddell said that he believed that this decline contributed to Michigan Tech's budget problems. He said that national surveys reveal that the first factor that students consider in choosing a university is whether or not a university offers the degree program in which they are interested in majoring. He said that Michigan Tech offers by far the smallest number of undergraduate degree programs of any of Michigan's 15 public universities. For example, Michigan Tech offers 42 undergraduate degree programs, while the University of Michigan offers 272 undergraduate degree programs.

Waddell said that developing new degree proposals takes a lot of time and effort. Consequently, potential proposers of new degree programs are reluctant to develop proposals if they feel that the proposals will not have a receptive audience. Hence, Waddell said that the point of the first of the three proposals he offered was to encourage the administration to explicitly and formally invite proposals for new undergraduate degree programs. Waddell said that since 1993, Michigan Tech has only introduced seven new undergraduate degree programs.

Waddell said that his draft report to the BRAC and the senate included five recommendations. He said that Keen had recommended compressing these five recommendations into a smaller number of proposals. To this end, the first proposal includes two additional recommendations: (1) that the University Senate support the Differential Tuition Committee's efforts to restructure tuition such that Michigan Tech does not charge engineering tuition for non-engineering degrees; and (2) that the University Senate encourage the administration to continue to support institutional marketing and student-recruiting advertising, which last spring were scheduled to be cut by \$100,000 and \$59,000 respectively.

Waddell said that his full report notes that the 1984 planning document "2005: Two Decades into Michigan Technological University's Second Century: A Long-Range Plan" committed Michigan Tech to making the transition from an engineering school to a technological university;



that is, to a university that maintains a strong technological focus, but that is comprised of a more disciplinarily complex student body than that typical of the traditional engineering school. However, Michigan Tech has thus far failed to expand in areas outside sciences, engineering, and technology.

Waddell said that when President Tompkins goes to Lansing to lobby on behalf of Michigan Tech, he makes the case that Michigan Tech needs more state support because engineering degrees are expensive. Waddell said that this same argument needs to apply at home as well: It's hard for Michigan Tech to compete for students outside the area of engineering if the university is charging engineering tuition for non-engineering degrees. For example, it's hard for Michigan Tech to compete for students in business if the same students can get a degree in business for less money at Northern Michigan University. Also, whereas an engineer might have a starting salary of \$60,000, a social science major might start at \$20,000. Hence, in addition to the cost of a degree, Michigan Tech might also consider the financial value of a degree and a student's ability to repay costs after graduating.

Senator Dickie Selfe said that he agreed with the first proposal. Selfe said that he was concerned, however, about what appeared to be a contradiction in the administration's position on new programs. He said that at the senate's September 18 meeting with President Tompkins, Tompkins said that the university's debt had grown because he (Tompkins) had too readily approved new program requests. Selfe said that he took this to mean that new programs would not be so readily approved in the future. At the same time, there was much discussion at this meeting about the need for increasing undergraduate enrollment. He referred to a line in the proposal under discussion: "Plans to develop new undergraduate degree programs should spring from the grassroots level, but they need the strong support of central administration." He asked Waddell what he meant by "strong support of central administration."

Waddell said that the particular support that he was recommending was a formal invitation to develop new degree programs. He said that if new programs succeed in attracting students, they might be eligible for increased funding through Provost Wray's hot-majors program. He said that people he has talked with who are developing program proposals are sufficiently committed to the success of these proposals that they are currently willing to take on the extra work without additional financial resources. They do hope and expect that if the programs are successful in attracting students that they will eventually be rewarded with additional faculty lines.

Roblee asked if the hot-majors program guaranteed one new faculty line for each 30 new students attracted into a program.

Keen said that the hot-majors program guaranteed one new faculty line for each 34 new students enrolled in a program.

D. Selfe said that other programs, such as computer science, had grown by 200 students and had not been assigned any additional faculty. He said that the proposal should make clear that financial support for new programs was needed and expected.

Waddell asked if he should proceed to the second proposal.

Keen indicated that he should.

Waddell said that Michigan Tech's current strategic plan, "The Michigan Tech Plan: An Action Agenda for 2010," includes six points defined as "Our Guiding Principles." The last of these points reads as follows: "Engineering, science and technology, and the business of technology, will remain the focus of our university. We recognize that success in this focus requires vital

programs that contribute to the cultural development, social skills and well-rounded education of our students."

Waddell said that this guiding principle is at odds with the goal of making the transition from an engineering school to a technological university. This principle defines the Departments of Humanities, Social Sciences, Fine Arts, Education, and Physical Education not as ends in themselves but only as means to someone else's ends. These departments are seen not as valued and equal partners in the university's mission, but only as service departments that add "polish" to other departments' majors. Waddell said that, instead, these departments should also be viewed as disciplines in their own right, capable of making valuable contributions to the university with their own degree programs, both undergraduate and graduate, and both current or potential.

Waddell said that this sixth principle was added by a former Board of Control Member, not by the Strategic Planning Working Group. He said he had mentioned this problem to BOC Chair David Brule and BOC members Kathryn Clark and Michael Henricksen when they met with senate officers on October 7. He said that all three of these board members seemed sympathetic to changing the wording of this principle.

Waddell said that non-engineering departments certainly provide valuable service to engineering programs through their contributions to general education. However, he said that non-engineering programs can also contribute beyond this to the overall health of the university through their own majors. Hence, the second proposal recommends changing principle six to read as follows: "Engineering, science and technology, and the business of technology, remain the focus of our university. We recognize, however, that the Departments of Humanities, Social Sciences, Fine Arts, Education, and Physical Education not only provide valuable complements to an education in science and engineering but also make valuable contributions to the university with their own degree programs. These programs can play a vital role in the long-term viability of Michigan Tech."

Waddell said that this might seem like only one paragraph in a document, but that various committees at Michigan Tech--such as the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee--are repeatedly referred to the strategic plan for guidance.

Monson said that Michigan Tech does not have a Department of Economics. He said that economics is a social science, but it is not housed in the Department of Social Sciences at Michigan Tech; it is a program and a degree within the School of Business and Economics. He said that he would like to see economics included in the revised language for principle six.

Waddell said that that change would be easy to make.

Roblee said that the currently proposed rewording limits the sense of principle six to only those departments listed. He said that Michigan Tech has the potential for growing in ways that we might not imagine.

Senator Becky Christianson suggested prefacing the list with "for example."

Waddell agreed that this should be changed.

Waddell said that when discussing Michigan Tech's declining on-campus undergraduate enrollments, there had been much controversy about the role played by Michigan Tech's distance from population centers. He said that it finally became evident that people were arguing about two different variables: (1) how far students say they are willing to go to attend a university prior to enrolling; and (2) the average distance from home that students are once they are actually enrolled at a university. In the first instance, students report that distance from

home is not a significant consideration. In the second instance, the average distance from home is 500-600 miles.

Waddell said that to entice prospective students to travel more than 500-600 miles from home, Michigan Tech has to provide a compelling combination of programs, price, and place. Waddell said that Michigan Tech does promote the fact that the Houghton area offers outstanding recreational activities but that simply promoting the place is not enough. He said that the campus and community need to think as well about enhancing the place to take advantage of the opportunities that nature and history have provided us. For example, Waddell said that Michigan Tech should better develop its lake-front property for recreational use by students. He said that a recent article in the Daily Mining Gazette cited 2000 census data indicating that Houghton County has the oldest average house age of any county in Michigan. He said that what Michigan Tech and the larger community do with such houses determines whether parents of prospective students perceive older neighborhoods as slums and fire hazards or as historic districts.

Hence, Waddell said that the third proposal was to create a committee to screen proposals for enhancing and better promoting the campus and surrounding, similar to the committee created to review Vision Initiative Proposals. Waddell said that this should include everything from classroom design to recreational activities to historic preservation.

Waddell called for questions.

Senator Terry Monson said that he had surveyed students in his UN1001 Perspectives on Inquiry course this fall to determine why they had chosen to attend Michigan Tech. He said that prestige was commonly mentioned, but that additional incentives--such as Mount Ripley, the Tech Trails, and hunting--made Michigan Tech special.

Waddell said that one of his students who is on the Michigan Tech crew team had mentioned that the Houghton Rotary Club wants to build a waterfront facility for crew. He said that this student told him that the facility would probably be built on city-owned property near Motel 8. Waddell said that the facility could just as well be built on university-owned property along Portage Lake north of the Rozsa Center. He said that such a facility could be used as a base for a variety of activities, such as crew, canoeing, kayaking, and scuba diving. He said that such a facility could be particularly helpful in Michigan Tech's efforts to develop a 14-week summer semester.

Senator Jim Turnquist said that he had spent 11 years recruiting students to Michigan Tech. He said that key to recruiting students was a sense of friendliness of faculty.

Senator Dickie Selfe said that this was why UN1001 Perspectives on Inquiry was, in concept, an important course: it gets faculty together with small groups of first-year students. He said that he was concerned that this class might be dropped because of its expense.

Turnquist said that he hoped that Michigan Tech wouldn't just add programs for the sake of adding programs but would consider the viability of proposed programs and the employment prospects for graduates of such programs.

Waddell said that for the sake of brevity, he had not included in the three proposals much of the detail included in the longer report upon which the proposals were based. He said that the longer report offers a list--compiled by MTU Director of Enrollment Management Gary Neumann--of in-demand majors including architecture, psychology, music, physical education, art, nursing, hospitality management, aerospace engineering, leisure and recreation, wildlife management, sports medicine, and physical therapy. Waddell said that many of these majors could be offered at Michigan Tech.

Turnquist said that healthcare is one of the hottest fields in terms of employment opportunities. He said that companies are now getting away from hiring computer science majors, especially for IT-related fields. They prefer, instead, to hire people who have only a certificate because this is cheaper.

Waddell said that Professor Patricia Heiden (Chemistry) had just sent him an email message about the growth in demand for people trained in geriatric care.

Senator Beth Wagner said that undergraduate enrollment is affected by retention as well as by recruitment. She said that more diverse majors will help not only with recruitment but also with retention.

Waddell said that during his three years as director of Michigan Tech's undergraduate program in Scientific and Technical Communication, approximately 35 students per year transferred into the major who might otherwise have left Michigan Tech to pursue another degree elsewhere. He said that the most common story these students told when asked why they wanted to change their major was that their father had urged them to major in engineering and they (the students) had quickly found that they didn't like engineering.

Turnquist said that many students do not know what they can do with their degrees. He said that a person with an engineering degree could be the next president of the United States.

Waddell said that several years ago, the Michigan Tech Chapter of Student Pugwash, which he advised, brought to campus Dr. Taft Broome, professor of civil engineering at Howard University. Broome discussed the downturn in the market for engineers and said that one response from engineering schools might be to consider engineering as a new liberal art; that is, as a curriculum that would be required for informed participation in public life in a technologically advanced democracy.

Keen asked how the senate wished to proceed with these three proposals. He asked if an ad hoc committee or the Senate Executive Committee would be an appropriate place to which to refer these proposals.

Senator Dick Prince said that he thought that an ad hoc committee would be appropriate.

Senator Ron Roblee asked if, once approved by the senate, the proposals would be sent to the administration as recommendations.

Keen said that these matters fall on the senate's B-list; hence, the senate only has authority to make recommendations on these matters to the administration.

D. Selfe said that he didn't think that the proposals needed significant revision. Hence, he said that he would not want to see them delayed. He said that the proposals should be directed to specific units or individuals within the administration.

Waddell said that the action requested in the first proposal would be from the president in the form of an explicit call for new undergraduate degree proposals.

Monson said that the first proposal calls for three things: (1) that the senior administration issue a formal call for proposals for new undergraduate degree programs; (2) that Michigan Tech continue to develop its differential tuition program; and (3) that the university continue to support institutional marketing and student-recruiting advertising.

D. Selfe said that specific groups are responsible for these activities, and the proposal should be addressed to or called to the attention of those groups.

Monson said that he would like to see the three proposals combined into one proposal. He asked if there was a senate standing committee that could address these proposals.

Keen said that the Institutional Planning Committee, chaired by Peck Cho, could address these proposals. Keen said that the proposals could also be addressed by the Senate Executive Committee; he said that this committee could process these proposals promptly.

Senator Erik Nordberg said that it would be helpful if people conveyed any concerns they might have about the proposals to Waddell or to the Executive Committee so that these concerns might be addressed before the proposals return to the senate floor.

Keen agreed.

Senator Debra Bruch said that she did not agree that the three proposals should be combined into one proposal. She said that although the proposals are related, they address three distinct issues. She said that she would like to see these proposals returned to the senate soon.

Keen said that he would seek the advice of the Senate Executive Committee on these proposals to ensure that the proposals come to the senate floor in a well-prepared form so that time is not wasted on word smithing. He asked if there were any objections to this course of action. There were none.

## **B. Discussion of minor wording changes in the MTU catalog**

Keen asked the senate's feedback on the proposed removal from the Michigan Tech Undergraduate Catalog of any indication of the semester during which courses are offered.

Several senators said that this was a ridiculous idea and asked why the idea had been proposed.

Senator Ron Roblee said that he agreed that the idea was ridiculous but said that in some cases the course schedules listed in the catalog were inaccurate.

Senator Bahne Cornilsen said that he believed that the two motives for this proposal were to save space and to eliminate inaccuracies. He said that a lot of the inaccuracies were a result of the transition from quarters to semesters; he said that these inaccuracies could be corrected. Cornilsen said that another motive for the proposal was to eliminate any indication of which courses will be offered in the summer, since this is subject to change. He said that there was also a proposal to not publish a paper copy of the summer class hour schedule but that this proposal may have been withdrawn.

Senator Ron Roblee said that frequently, a course is offered during the summer but not taught due to lack of enrollment. Therefore, he said it is especially important to list summer courses in order to encourage registration in these courses.

Cornilsen asked how students could plan their schedules if they didn't know when courses would be offered.

Keen said that the only rationale he could envision for this proposal would be to protect against courses being listed as available in semesters during which they were not actually offered.

Senator Dickie Selfe said that a disclaimer on this point could be offered in the catalog.

Senator Erik Nordberg said that the catalog should continue to list the semesters during which courses were offered.

Senator Chris Williams asked if the reduction in space was intended to reduce the overall size of the undergraduate catalog.

Cornilsen said that this was apparently the case.

Several senators asked how much space could possibly be saved by such a change since the semester designations are simply S, F, and SU.

Keen suggested that the senate vote a sense of the senate that semester designations be retained in the undergraduate catalog.

Senator Jim Pickens MOVED that the senate transmit to the administration a sense of the senate that semester designations be retained in the undergraduate catalog. Senator Becky Christianson seconded the motion.

Keen called for discussion of the motion.

Senator Bill Gregg said that catalog descriptions of courses have gotten worse over the years. He suggested that they be improved.

Keen said that this suggestion was out of order relative to the motion on the floor. However, he said that catalog descriptions probably fall within the senate's A-list and that the Curricular Policy Committee could produce a recommendation that the course descriptions be revised.

Gregg said that he would rather not do this because this was procedure rather than policy, and this gets into an administrative area.

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

The motion to transmit to the administration a sense of the senate that semester designations be retained in the undergraduate catalog PASSED without objection.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Senator Bruch MOVED and Senator Pollins seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell  
Secretary of the University Senate