

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

Minutes of Meeting 419

23 February 2005

**Synopsis:**

The Presidential Advisory Committee (Senate)

- (1) heard a report on state funding from President Mroz.
  - (2) approved Proposal 21-05 to charge the Elections Committee with responsibility for finding nominees for Senate representatives to University Committees and for Senate officers.
  - (3) approved Proposal 22-05: Minor in Bioprocess Engineering.
  - (4) heard a report from Mary Durfee on switching from the PEAQ method of accreditation with North Central to the AQIP method.
- 

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

President Monson called Presidential Advisory Committee (University Senate) Meeting 419 to order at 5:32 pm on Wednesday, 23 February, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Computer Science, Education, Fine Arts, Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences, Materials Science and Engineering, ME-EM, Physics, Keweenaw Research Center, and Information Technology. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council), Wayne Bell (USG), and David Forel (GSC). Academic Services – Engineering and Finance and Advancement currently have no elected representatives.

**2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Guests included Glen Mroz (President), Dave Reed (Provost), Mary Durfee (Special Assistant to Provost), and Susan Bagley (Biol. Sci.).

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

President Monson pointed out that the date of the meeting should be changed from February 9 to February 23 on the agenda. In Item 8A, NCAA should be NCA.

C. Selfe MOVED and Rogers seconded the motion to approve the agenda as corrected. 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 the appendices.]

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 418**

Rogers pointed out that in item 3c "compliment" should be "complement."

D. Selfe MOVED and Turnquist seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 418 as corrected. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

**President's Report**

1. The Senate welcomes President Mroz who will give a presentation on University budgetary matters and Dr. Mary Durfee who will give a presentation on changes in NCA accreditation procedures.
2. President Mroz convened the Search Committee for a new Provost last week. It will be meeting weekly over the next several months to develop a job description, to place ads for the position, and to begin screening applicants.
3. The Senate Elections Committee is seeking nominations for Senate officers for next year. Please contact Erik Nordberg if you are interested in running for office. The Senate President's department/school receives a stipend of one-third of the President's annual academic year salary and the President receives a month of summer salary. The Senate Secretary's department/school receives a stipend of one-sixth of the Secretary's academic year salary. The President and Secretary must be faculty Senators; the Vice-President must be a staff Senator.
4. A reminder to the Professional Staff Committee. It should develop new staff Senate constituencies in time for elections later during this spring semester.
5. The new Senate Constitution is on the agenda for the Board of Control meeting this Friday. When it is approved, it will be immediately implemented and the PAC will become the University Senate. However, new voting rules will be implemented to select next year's Senators.
6. Senate Proposal 10-05 asking for a change in Board policy on sabbaticals is also on the Board agenda for Friday.
7. Memos have been sent to the Administration on Senate Proposals approved at the last Senate meeting. The Proposals dealing with new degree programs in Fine Arts and Chemistry are also on the agenda for Friday's Board meeting.
8. The Administration is still discussing Senate Proposal 09-05, which recommends changes in procedures for sabbatical leaves, and the Provost has indicated that the President is likely to approve the remaining proposals from the last meeting.
9. Proposal 20-05 on procedures for transfer of tenure among programs is being revised and will be re-introduced at the next Senate meeting.

#### 6. PRESENTATION BY PRESIDENT MROZ

President Mroz reported that the Governor does not want to cut higher education, but she must balance revenue and expenses. Therefore, the Governor's executive order proposes to cut \$27 million from the 15 universities. For Michigan Tech this means \$855,600 loss this year **from the base budget**. The good news for us is that our tuition revenue is above the projection plus we have made a number of internal cuts and should be able to manage without taking money back from units.

The Governor has also proposed \$100 million in maintenance money, which would mean approximately \$6 million over two years to MTU. However, the use of this money is restricted and does not replace the money lost from the base budget. Its use is limited because we can't do operations with bonded money. The House approved this executive order, but the Senate did not. The House also filed a supplemental bill to index the EO cuts to the May Revenue Conference estimates of tax revenue: Since more tax revenue than anticipated was collected in January, they proposed that if this is still happening in May they will rebate lost money to the universities proportionally, thus modifying the implementation of the Executive Order.

We would actually lose \$159,900, in King Chavez Parks money from the FY'06 budget as it is currently written. We would be able to apply for it competitively, but naturally, we'd prefer that this appropriation remain as it is now.

Another aspect of the Governor's proposal is that if a university raises its tuition, it must increase institutional financial aid by the same percent. MTU has the highest % of its state money given in financial aid of any Michigan university. The Governor also put a cap on tuition increase, amounting to \$307 or 5%, whichever is greater. MTU would be able to raise tuition by more than \$307 if we use 5%. No new fees or fee increases would be allowed. President Mroz will argue that only the need-based scholarships should go up. The Board of Control Finance committee has not met; the state funding is still very uncertain. The administration would like to break the budget out into categories like instruction, research, etc.

The President thanked the Senate for getting new proposals approved so quickly. There are lots of new applications in programs approved last year. Applications are up by 20%, but some of this increase is due to the new free online application process. Acceptances are up 14%, totalling 348 more students. Deposits are up 5%. This is also the first time students could pay bills by credit card.

President Mroz presented the administrative strategy to increase revenue. First, enrollment needs to increase. We need to optimize financial aid. Through these means we hope to balance revenue and expenses.

President Monson asked if we got a rebate from holding our tuition down. Mroz responded that we got \$1.9 million in the fall as one-time money.

Beck (Physics) commented that maintenance bond money is only helpful for things we were already planning to do. D. Selfe asked what the constraints were on the bond money. Mroz responded that projects must be at least \$100,000, cannot use in-house labor, must be started by 1 October 2005 and completed by December 2007, involve existing buildings, and not be used for self-liquidating projects like dorms and the MUB. D. Selfe responded that some buildings on campus need repair.

Gorman (Soc. Sci.) asked about vouchers and their benefit to MTU. Mroz responded that the governor is proposing a \$2500 merit award to be paid to students at the end of two years. Approximately 35% of our students' financial package includes merit awards. We are second only to the University of Michigan.

Mattila asked how retention is. Mroz responded he doesn't know for this year.

## **7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. Proposal 21-05: Additional Responsibilities for Elections Committee. C. Selfe MOVED and Polzien seconded the motion to approve Proposal 21-05.

**[see minutes, page 11403, for a copy of this proposal]**

Bell (USG) asked what is being added. D. Selfe also asked for clarification. Monson explained it has mostly been the officers who have been finding people for the positions needing nominees.

The motion to approve Proposal 21-05 PASSED on voice vote of the full PAC with no dissent.

B. Proposal 22-05: Minor in Bioprocess Engineering.

**[Please see minutes, page 11404, for a copy of this proposal]**

Janners (Biol. Sci.) stated that the Curricular Policy Committee thought this was a good proposal.

Turnquist MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to approve Proposal 22-05.

Nordberg (library) asked for comment from the Financial Committee. Sloan (chair) responded that the committee had no formal report, but that all three members were present and have raised no objection.

The proposal PASSED on voice vote of the academic faculty with no dissent.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Mary Durfee reported on the North Central Accreditation and AQIP. The University has applied to shift from the present PEAQ self-study to the relatively new AQIP method of accreditation with the Higher Learning commission of the North Central Accreditation. In the AQIP method, there is the expectation of continuous improvement and no self-study. Instead, the university develops a series of projects to improve the processes or help achieve their goals. NCA offers ways to use resources more effectively and links accreditation to better on-going planning.

If accepted to AQIP:

1. The University is instantly accredited for seven years – until May 2012. There is no progress or monitoring report.
2.
  - a. The University needs to do surveys of awareness of the process for improvements on campus.
  - b. There must be campus forums to develop projects we think we should implement. NCA will analyze the data.
  - c. The University must select the top 4-6 projects and submit these to the Higher Learning Commission.

D. Selfe (Acad. Serv. Non-Eng.) asked if they have a survey engine that we can use to develop our own surveys. Durfee responded that she didn't know, but would find out. We also have several survey programs on campus.

- d. Colleges and universities share ideas. For example, they are very interested in active learning, with which we have had much success.
- e. We must prepare a systems portfolio of 80-100 pages.
- f. This portfolio should be updated as the processes are changed.
- g. The coordinator sends a yearly report.
- h. There is a Strategy Forum meeting every four years to review projects and systems portfolios among the universities and to learn from each other.
- i. This is a formative assessment and provides advice and suggestions.
- j. There are site visits every four years, but no preparation is needed.

If the University doesn't like it, it can drop out and return to the old method.

Rogers (at-large) asked what constitutes a deficiency under AQIP. Durfee responded that it means you have never made progress on a single project and never improved.

Monson asked if she could give an example. Durfee responded that in one case a university had made suggestions to departments, then closed down the committee.

D. Selfe asked why the change in process came about. He is concerned about the clamoring for accreditation by marginal institutions, especially online universities. Durfee responded that if a university is not accredited, students can't get financial aid. The proposal is actually coming from the state Department of Education. We are trying not to be regulated by them. NCA is usually the leader in

accreditation processes. This alternative is seen as avoiding waste in committee and resource time. She estimates that it costs the university over \$1 million each time.

Cornilsen (Chemistry) noted that the representatives involved are approximately 50% community colleges and asked if it was the same ratio under the old method. Durfee responded that she would check.

Nordberg asked what MTU projects would fit. Durfee responded that the Benefits Liaison Group was a good example. Another might be decision making on instructional technology.

Clancy (Chem. Eng.) asked what effect this would have on ABET accreditation. Durfee responded that ABET won't accredit if there is no regional accreditation.

Beck (at-large) suggested that Durfee read the reports of the various university committees; we have already started the process.

D. Selfe commented that they have had difficulty expanding the Enterprise Program to the entire campus and that would make a good project.

Nordberg asked if it would require staff to monitor the process. Durfee responded that she spent 60-80 hours per year under the traditional process. She anticipates that her time would go up with this. However, it would eliminate a lot of other time costs on campus.

Cornilsen asked if we have decided yet. Durfee responded that we have already applied to be placed under the AQIP process, but we need to know what sorts of concerns the campus has with this change.

Monson asked if we have any choice on who evaluates our deficiencies. Sloan responded that ABET can "black ball" accreditors without even giving a reason.

B. Proposal 24-05: Amendment to the By-laws. (redefining a quorum)

## **[Appendix B]**

Beck stated that he was unhappy with items 3 & 4 of the proposal. We should talk with people with experience, like Bob Keen. There should be a quorum of those appointed as Senators to date.

Sloan (Elec. & Computer Eng.) cited Roberts Rules of order that states if a quorum is not defined it will be a simple majority. The U.S. Houses of Congress require only a simple majority. We should do the same.

Mattila (Civil & Environ. Eng.) stated that we could just not mention a quorum in the by-laws.

Johnson (Technology) stated that others not being here wastes time of those who are.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at ~7:00 pm; there was no longer a quorum so there was no motion to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime

Secretary of the University Senate/Presidential Advisory Committee