

**THE PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (UNIVERSITY SENATE) OF MICHIGAN
TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 417
24 January 2005

Synopsis:

- (1) Heard proposals for 8 new degree programs, minors, and certificates.
 - (2) Passed Proposals 09-05 and 10-05 on Sabbatical Leave Procedures and change in Board of Control Policy on Sabbatical leave.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Monson called Presidential Advisory Committee Meeting 417 to order at 5:34 pm on Wednesday, 24 January 2005, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Don Beck and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Education, Physical Education, Physics, and Keweenaw Research Center. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council) and David Forel (GSC). Academic Services – Engineering and Finance and Advancement currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included David Reed (Provost), Pushpa Murthy (Chemistry), Milton Olsson (Fine Arts), M. C. Friedrich (Fine Arts), Christopher Plummer (Fine Arts), Max Seel (Dean Sciences & Arts), John Jaszczak (Physics), and David Pray (Math).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Monson added Item K under New Business, Report of Staff Committee, and Item L, Election for Provost Search Committee Senate Representatives.

C. Selfe MOVED and Maplethorpe seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

[**Appendix A.** NOTE: Only official senate and library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING

Nordberg MOVED and Turnquist seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 416. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

C. Selfe MOVED and Maplethorpe seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 415. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. CHAIR'S REPORT

1. Ballots for the constitutional referendum were distributed earlier this week. Please contact Mechelle Normand if your constituents have not received their ballots.

Monson apologized for the confusion on who is supposed to collect and return ballots. The next election will have return envelopes addressed to the elections committee.

2. The Committee officers met with Provost Reed Monday and learned that he is planning to proceed with the evaluation of Dean of the College of Engineering despite the College's inaction on developing an evaluation procedure as described in Senate Proposal 39-04, Review and Reappointment of Deans of Colleges.

3. The Executive Committee met and approved a proposal for Senate consideration that adds to the responsibilities of the Elections Committee found in the By-Laws. It will be introduced at the next Senate meeting.

4. A reminder – The PAC is still searching for volunteers to serve on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee; there are enough nominees for the Provost Search Committee. The PAC will also need to appoint two members to the Search Committee for the Dean of the Graduate School, once the Graduate Faculty Council nominates its representatives.

5. Monson introduced the new Senate Liaison from USG, Wayne Bell.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Janners, chair of the Senate Curricular Policy Committee, reported that all the proposals are on the web. The first four are fine arts proposals and these represent the first program proposals from that department.

Nine proposals were introduced.

A. Proposal 11-05, Fine Arts Theatre and entertainment Technology, B.S.

B. Proposal 12-05, Fine Arts Audio Production and Technology, B.S.

C. Proposal 13-05, Fine Arts Theatre and Entertainment Technology, B.A.

D. Proposal 14-05, Fine Arts Sound Design, B. A.

[Appendix B-E]

Fine Arts faculty M. C. Friedrich and Christopher Plummer presented a rationale for the four Fine Arts proposals. Employers are looking for technical expertise in theater and entertainment. Minors now exist in which a student can have an Engineering major with Technical Theatre or Music Technology as a minor. Less technical programs include theatre with entertainment technology or audio production with a technology major. This program is one of very few in the nation and

will help us to recruit students from under-represented groups. It also provides opportunities for new partnerships with companies and businesses and partnerships with other departments in the university, including the School of Technology and the Department of Computer Science. The new program will result in no increase in teaching loads because the latest faculty hires in the department were selected to develop these degrees and support them. By using alternate year courses the current faculty can teach all the courses needed. We have a new facility with two theatres plus the Calumet theatre and a small classroom theatre, dressing rooms, computer control rooms, a recording studio, and acoustical analysis equipment.

Turnquist (Career Services) asked what type of industry would employ these graduates. Plummer responded that they could find jobs in theatre, concert, internships on Broadway and other performing groups, theme parks, convention centers and conference displays, architectural lighting, stock-holder meetings, corporate shows, and presidential conventions. C. Selfe (Humanities) added homes and churches.

Shene (Computer Science) asked if the program covers theory or only operation of equipment and what sort of connection is there with computer science. Friedrich responded that graduates will be prepared to design equipment to fit the needs of the client. Computers are used to control light, sound, and animation. Rather than the traditional specialist for each aspect of light, sound, etc., one person now typically controls all of these through the computer. Plummer added that he has been working with faculty from the School of Technology and Computer Science to evaluate network bandwidth requirements. Shene asked if they had talked to anyone in computer graphics. Plummer responded that they do not have anyone in their own department in that area. Bruch (Fine Arts) asked if that implied that the proposal was incomplete, but Plummer responded that it is complete for now; they hope to go to graphics in the future.

Vable (ME-EM) asked what kinds of numbers of students are expected. Plummer responded that they expect about five in each of the four degrees for each year cohort. That number is small but it is an appropriate number.

Turnquist (Career Center) expressed concern that companies typically cancel interviews when not enough students sign up for them. Plummer responded that many of the companies looking for these students are small and would not come even for a large group of candidates. Friedrich added that at a convention they had attended there was strong interest in engineering students who knew theatrical applications or in theatre people who knew the technical aspects. They requested résumés from some of the students at the convention. Turnquist asked if representatives of the career center could go there and Friedrich said they could.

C. Selfe stated that she had recently taken one of the theatre courses and it was the most difficult course she had ever taken.

E. Proposal 15-05, Chemistry Cheminformatics, B. S.

F. Proposal 16-05, Chemistry Pharmaceutical Chemistry, B.S.

[Appendix F-G]

Murthy (Chemistry) explained that many students now go to the pharmaceutical chemistry industry. This program (Proposal 16-05) would give students a molecular structure basis in this program. Turnquist added that the occupational outlook is extremely high in this area.

Murthy explained Proposal 15-05, which combines chemistry and information technology. The role of computers has increased greatly in many areas of chemistry.

G. Proposal 17-05, Interdisciplinary Minor in Nanoscale Science and Engineering (Nanotechnology).

[Appendix H]

Jaszczak (Physics) explained that there is high interest in this area. They offered a course in nanotechnology for the first time last spring and had 100 students. The program has two required courses – a broad introductory course and a course on societal implications. The electives broaden the program, so they can take courses like biology and get hands-on experience.

H. Proposal 18-05, Certificate in Actuarial Science, mathematical Science.

[Appendix I]

Pray (Mathematical Sciences) reported that there is an error in the proposal. The proposal states that a professional exam is required to earn the certificate. It should state that passage of the external exam in actuarial science can be used to replace one course in the program. There are 18 students now in the actuarial option and approximately half are taking the exams. The exam is offered on campus. Dean Seel (Sciences & Arts) will work with Bray to reword the requirements. Vable asked what advantage there would be to have this as a certificate program. Seel responded that it helps to attract more students to the sciences.

I. Proposal 19-05, Name Change in Social Sciences, Pre-Law to Law and Society.

[Appendix J]

There was no discussion of this proposal.

Nordberg (Library) asked if there were any comments from the finance committee on any of the proposals. Sloan (chair of the Finance Committee) stated that the committee had no problem with any of the proposals.

J. Proposal 20-05, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units.

[Appendix K]

Vable summarized the proposal on transfer. The process began in fall 2003 as an outcome of closing the Mining Department. A draft was sent from the Committee to the Deans and Provost on 20 April 2004. Provost Wray wanted to coordinate the administrative input and met with the committee henceforth. The committee looked at procedures at six other universities, then met with the Provost toward the end of October 2004. He made editorial corrections and one substantial change – the elimination of the tenure buy-out from the committee draft. Wray and Durfee gave the committee a document that contained two procedures that weaved in and out regarding mandatory transfer due to closure of a unit and transfer initiated by a faculty member. The committee recommended separation of the two procedures. This change was completed and sent to Wray on 3 December 2004. There has been no comment from Provost Reed.

The key points of the proposal are that two procedures exist: transfer initiated by a faculty member and mandatory transfer due to reorganization. Faculty tenure and rank are based in the university and not in the academic unit. All affected parties must have an opportunity to provide input into the process before a final decision on transfer is made. If the faculty vote no on a mandatory transfer, that is only a recommendation. If they vote no on a transfer initiated by the

faculty member, that faculty member must stay in the original department. Thus, the gaining academic unit faculty have a say in who comes into their unit. Deans have the right and duty to facilitate transfer. Any reorganization plan must indicate where affected tenure and tenure-track faculty are proposed to be affiliated. The Provost has the right and duty to resolve disputes that may arise during mandatory transfer.

The administration has moved faculty from a closed department to another with no say from the faculty of the receiving department. D. Selfe (Humanities) asked what problem the Provost had had with the tenure buyout. Vable responded that faculty could be asked to give up tenure, but that didn't solve the problem. Wood (Geological & Mining Engineering & Sciences) added that it is a serious issue and that departmental faculty have had little say.

Sutter (at-large) stated that if a school is closed or there is a transfer of a faculty member between schools or colleges, the deans should be involved in the discussions. Vable responded that the Provost **can** involve them, but is not required to.

K. Polzien reported on the discussions of the Professional Staff Policy Committee regarding eligibility as staff constituents. Constituents must be considered full time, *i.e.* work at least 30 hours per week and at least 9 months per year. If we use the organizational chart, all directors at the top level could be eliminated, but not all director positions are equal. They tried to find those who were on the level of chair to consider as constituents, while those at the dean level would not be considered. The next task will be to re-organize the representation units to make them more equal.

D. Selfe (Humanities) asked what happens to those booted out. Monson responded that now the professional staff are defined as non-represented staff. Christianson (Staff Council) stated that we have 40+ non-exempt employees with no union representation. The only ones to be taken out are the ones considered to have administrative positions. D. Selfe suggested we give that group a name and include them. Polzien responded that the committee is still working on the constituency and the PAC will not be voting in two weeks. Monson suggested Senators should look at the university organizational chart. Christianson stated that direct reports to top level administrators are not included. Nordberg added that it is the same as the current academic constituent criteria.

Waddell (at-large) expressed concern about the words non-represented, non-exempt; it may not be constitutional.

Monson raised the possibility of excluding based on union representation. D. Selfe suggested giving a name to the various groups included and including them. Christianson responded that the only way to define all of them is by exclusion. C. Selfe countered that the "nons" are the problem. We should define them by inclusion.

L. Election for Provost Search Committee

Monson presented a slate of nominees: Engineering – Madhu Vable & Tess Ahlborn; Sciences and Arts – Barry Solomon; Schools – Larry Sutter; at-large – Ralph Hodek. He said that since there was already a candidate from Engineering, he would put Tess Ahlborn as a candidate for the at-large position. Sloan responded that the Senate usually votes on the school/college representatives first, then adds the losers to the at-large pool.

There were no nominations from the floor. Waddell MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to close the nominations and declare the uncontested candidates as winners for those positions. Waddell MOVED and Milligan seconded the motion to vote for two of the candidates for those remaining positions.

Madhu Vable won for representative of the College of Engineering and Tess Ahlborn won for at-large representative, with only academic representatives voting.

Monson presented the slate of nominees for staff representatives: Betty Chavis, Ellen Seidel, Shalini Suryanarayana, and Jim Turnquist. Only staff voted. The first vote on four candidates resulted in a tie. Shalini Suryanarayana won the runoff vote.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Proposal 09-05, Sabbatical Leave Procedures.

[See minutes, page 11300, for a copy of this proposal]

Nordberg MOVED and Vable seconded the motion to approve Proposal 09-05. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

B. Proposal 10-05, Request for Change in Board of Control Policy 6.1 on Sabbatical Leave

[See minutes, page 11311, for a copy of this proposal.]

Monson introduced the two proposals, stating that the changes allow the President to permit a faculty member on sabbatical leave to work full time. Vable (ME-EM) corrected him, stating that the Sabbatical Leave Committee recommends that the faculty member be allowed to work full time and earn full salary while on leave and the President approves it. For example, the cost of living could be much higher at the sabbatical location.

Wood (Geology & Mining Engineering & Sciences) asked the advantages of a sabbatical leave with work over a leave. Vable explained that it gives more flexibility. Wood asked if there is any downside to the proposal. Monson responded that some may be able to earn more than their full MTU salary.

Vable MOVED and Wood seconded the motion to approve Proposal 10-05. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

Monson announced that the referendum Constitution should be available on Tuesday. If the vote is negative, he will propose that this body continue to operate as the Presidential Advisory Committee and he will ask President Mroz to form a University committee to formulate a new Constitution.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Janners MOVED and Maplethorpe seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Presidential Advisory Committee (University Senate)