

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF  
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 429  
26 October 2005

**Synopsis:**

The Senate

- (1) Heard a report from Tim Schulz (Blue Ribbon Panel on National Rankings) on what it would take to put MTU in the top 50 public universities; the panel concluded that it required changing the perception of the other university presidents surveyed.
  - (2) Elected members to seven university committees.
  - (3) Heard three proposals for new programs: Coaching Endorsement Certificate, Minor in Coaching Fundamentals, Bachelor of Science in Anthropology.
  - (3) Passed [Proposal 2-06](#), Undergraduate Certificates.
- 

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

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 429 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 26 October 2005, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Craig Waddell and representatives from Education, Fine Arts, Materials Science & Engineering, School of Forest Resources and Environmental Sciences, Auxiliaries, Enrollment Management/OSRR Financial Aid, Career Center, and the HR group. Liaisons in attendance were Liz Van Heusden (USG) and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Academic Services – C, and Army/Air Force ROTC currently have no elected representatives.

**2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Guests included Kurt Hauglie (Mining Gazette), Mir Sadri (Engineering Fundamentals), Max Seel (Sciences and Arts), Tim Schulz (Elec & Computer Eng), and Dan Freeman (USG).

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

President Sloan requested that Item 6a be moved up to follow approval of the agenda so that Tim Schulz could give his report and leave.

Pollins MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. [Appendix A. NOTE: Only senate and library archival copies of minutes will have a full complement of appendices.]

**4. REPORT ON BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON NATIONAL RANKINGS (TOP 50 COMMITTEE), TIM SCHULZ**

This committee was appointed by President Glenn Mroz to consider what it would take to put us back in the top 50 universities. The committee included Tim Schulz (chair), Steve Carr, Dana Johnson, Walt Milligan, Kurt Pregitzer, and John Sutherland.

Schulz stated that most universities do not consider the US News rankings to be valid, but over a million people read them, so they are still important, and high-ranking universities usually advertise their ranks. Although graduate schools and other categories of programs are also ranked, this report will deal only with the ranking of undergraduate college programs.

The evaluation includes both objective and subjective criteria. The criterion of peer assessment is 25% of the evaluation and is based on an evaluation rating given by presidents of colleges and universities included in the ranking. It was this criterion where MTU suffered most, ranking 153 among the 248 schools in the evaluation.

The other evaluation categories (%) and MTU's rank are as follows:

1. Faculty research (20%, rank 91) – compensation, % Ph. D.'s, % full-time faculty, student faculty ratio, and class size
2. Graduation and retention (20%, 109) – 6-year graduation rate, freshman retention rate
3. Student selectivity (15%, 98) – acceptance rate, top 10% of HS graduating class, SAT/ACT scores
4. Financial resources (10%, 123) – dollars spent per student
5. Alumni giving (5%, 77) – percent of alumni who give
6. Graduate performance (5%, 152)
7. Peer assessment (25%, 153) – evaluation by presidents

MTU ranks 125 out of 248 schools being evaluated. These include 162 public and 86 private schools that offer undergraduate, Master's, and doctoral degrees. This means that MTU is currently in tier 3. The low rank in peer assessment is the primary factor keeping MTU out of the top tier. Schulz showed a graph of what it would take to get to the top tier. If MTU could achieve position 100, it would put us in the top 50 public schools. It would do little good to raise any of the objective criteria without raising the peer ratings.

Our acceptance rate is 94%; we have gone from 2.8 to 2.7 to 2.6 in ratings (out of 5 high) in the past three ratings. Our percent freshmen in the top 10% have gone from 31 to 30 to 28%. Our graduation rate has gone from 65 to 61 to 62% in that time period. But it appears that our slippage from the top 50 to a rank of 128 is primarily due to our changing from a primarily undergraduate institution to a research university. The schools that have jumped ahead of us include a number of undergraduate institutions. These schools are ranked by their peers based on the quality of their undergraduate education, whereas MTU is ranked on how well known its faculty are known for research. We do not have many Nobel prize winners or other highly distinguished and famous faculty, despite having many good faculty. The average peer assessment is 3.0 with a median of 2.8. MTU has gone from 2.8 to 2.7 to 2.6 in ranking in the last three ratings. If we could change our peer assessment to 3.0 we would be in the top 50 public schools.

Senator Wood asked what contributes to the opinions of the peer group. Schulz responded that it is research. Wood asked if Mroz is trying to move us up. Schulz replied that he is.

Senator Beck commented that the problem is that we are unknown. We should invite the presidents here and put on a show for them. We need to publicize our accomplishments more. We should especially show our new departments that are doing really well and have a big party for the presidents in the summer.

Georgia Tech is doing many things differently from what MTU is doing.

Dean Seel stated there are several factors that are related in the evaluations and that tinkering with one of them would most likely affect the others.

Wood asked if there is a report. Schulz responded that the report is not ready yet but there will be one. Wood responded that so far the panel has stated the problem but has not suggested a solution.

## **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 428**

Jambekar MOVED and Dalquist seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 428. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## **6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

None

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 3-06, Coaching Endorsement Certificate [Appendix B]**

Senator Fynewever stated that the PE department has been doing all the things for certification for years. Of the ones who fulfill the requirements, 80% are not athletes. The program has been very successful and gives students other options. Making the certification an official program helps to recognize the need for trained coaches nationally.

Senator Gorman stated that the program is useful for students in the education program. Fynewever added that students have told her they felt they were hired above others to teach because they could also coach.

### **B. Proposal 4-06, Minor in Coaching Fundamentals [Appendix C]**

Fynewever stated that this minor would require only two more classes and would provide more recognition for students. There are a number of other schools in the state that already have this minor.

Dean Seel expressed his support and stated that there was strong support in the College Council for the program.

Senator Jambekar asked who would teach PE4080, listed for Cheryl DePuydt. Seel responded that it could be the new chair, or one of the members of the department had indicated he could teach it.

When financial issues were questioned, Senator Beck (Finance Committee) stated that there shouldn't be any added expenses because there were no new programs.

Senator Pollins responded that all programs have costs, including marketing and other administrative costs, but these often seem to be ignored. President Sloan responded that the Curricular Policy Committee had approved the proposal. Dean Seel added that in the two new programs added recently (psychology and the Ph. D. in industrial archeology) the need for a new hire was recognized and approved.

Senator Fynewever stated that coaches in the area can take courses to be certified and don't have to be MTU students, thus paying no fees. To earn a minor a student must be enrolled. The program may help to retain students.

### **C. Proposal 5-06, Bachelor of Science in Anthropology [Appendix D]**

Senator Gorman stated that the SS department already has a Ph.D. program in industrial archaeology, so they already have the needed faculty. The program would use resources that are already there and give students more choices and bring up the number of SS majors. The main cost request is for a JSTOR database of \$10,000 initially and \$2,000 per year thereafter.

Dean Seel stated that the College Council supported the proposal. The department got a new professor position to support their Ph.D. program. He will use Tech Fund money for the \$10,000 needed for JSTOR and the Provost has approved the \$2,000 needed yearly in the library budget.

Senator Beck stated that he sees no expense problem.

Seel asked Senators to email Bruce Seely or himself if they had questions.

Senator Vitton asked who would accredit the program and how. Seel responded that most arts and sciences programs do not have an accreditation process. There are societies that accredit some programs, but it is not like ABET.

Senator Johnson asked what the expected student enrollment would be and what revenue is expected. Seel responded that any new students would generate revenue, minus the cost of JSTOR. Gorman added that most courses are already being taught as service courses. Seel stated that the department is expecting 3-5 new students per year. Boschetto-Sandoval stated that this program has a strong potential to attract minorities and women. Senator Wood added that this is a popular program with the public.

Senator Nitz asked how many new students would be in the new courses vs. students in other programs. Seel responded that one course is a senior projects course and one is a methods course, so small class size was not a problem. The other two would be offered every two years. He will try to find an answer regarding enrollment before the next meeting.

Senator Gorman added that the landscapes perspectives course is already being taught as a special topics course.

## **8. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. University Committees**

Sean Clancey and the two students counted ballots for the elections.

Two people were needed for the Academic Tenure Committee. The three nominees received votes as follows, ELECTING JAMBEKAR AND VABLE:

|                  |    |
|------------------|----|
| David Flaspohler | 9  |
| Anil Jambekar    | 15 |
| Madhu Vable      | 13 |

One person was needed for the Academic Integrity Committee. The three nominees received votes as follows, ELECTING STEVE CARR:

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Nancy Auer   | 5 |
| Steve Carr   | 8 |
| Terry Monson | 4 |

Nominees are needed for the Athletic Council so that President Mroz can choose one. Janners MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the slate of DANA JOHNSON AND LARRY SUTTER to be forwarded to President Mroz. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Two members were needed for the Conflict of Interest Committee. The three nominees received votes as follows, ELECTING HELMINEN AND JOYCE:

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| Brenda Helminen | 19 |
| Pat Joyce       | 19 |
| Jim Wood        | 17 |

One person was needed for the Inquiry Committee and PAT JOYCE was the only nominee.

One person was needed for the Faculty Distinguished Service Award and TERRY MONSON was the only nominee.

Two people were needed for the Sabbatical Leave Committee and only one person, ANDY STORER, had been nominated. Senator STAN VITTON volunteered to run.

Williams MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to elect the members of the previous three committees by acclamation. The motion PASSED on voice vote with one dissent.

Pat Joyce had indicated that he would only serve on one committee, but he was elected for two committee positions.

Janners MOVED and Williams seconded the motion that if Pat Joyce is still unwilling to serve on both committees, Jim Wood would serve instead on the Conflict of Interest Committee. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**B. [Proposal 2-06](#), Undergraduate Certificates**

Gorman MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to approve Proposal 2-06. There was no discussion.

The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Jambekar MOVED to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:42 pm.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime  
Secretary of the University Senate