

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 432
18 January 2006

Synopsis:

The Senate

- (1) heard that the Board of Control at its 9 December 2005 meeting approved Proposal 2-06, Undergraduate Certificates, Proposal 3-06, Coaching Endorsement Certificate, Proposal 4-06, Minor in Coaching Fundamentals, and Proposal 5-06, Bachelor of Science in Anthropology
 - (2) heard that provost candidate John Hughes would be on campus for a second visit on 20 January
 - (3) heard that Jim Frendeway is chairing the committee for an internal search for a Chief Information Officer
 - (4) heard that faculty/staff evaluation of President Mroz would begin 30 Jan.
 - (5) passed Proposal 6-06, Request for Change in Board of Control Policy 6.4 on Office of Ombuds
 - (6) passed Proposal 7-06, Addition of Coursework Only (No Oral Exam) Master's Degree Plan (revised)
 - (7) heard a presentation on Proposal 8-06, Academic Integrity Policy 2005-2006 Revisions – Pat Gotschalk
 - (8) heard a presentation on Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units, and Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units – Janice Glime
 - (9) heard a presentation on Proposal 11-06, Charter Proposal – Janice Glime
 - (10) introduced Proposal 12-06, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, B.S.
 - (11) introduced Proposal 15-06, Proposal for Bachelor's Degree Title Change
 - (12) introduced Proposal 14-06, Minor in Electrical Engineering
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 432 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 18 January 2006, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were representatives from Civil and Environmental Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Engineering Fundamentals, Auxiliaries, and Academic Services A. Appointed substitutes were Bill Gregg (Geol & Mining Eng & Sci), Barry Solomon (Soc Sci), and Tim Malette (Enrollment Mgmt *et al.*). Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council), Liz Van Heusden (USG), and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Biomedical Engineering, Army/Air Force ROTC, and Academic Services C currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Scott Amos (School of Technology), John Adler (Dept. Biol. Sci.), Marty Smith (DL/S), Jackie Huntoon (Grad School), Pat Gotschalk, (Student Judicial Affairs), Dave Reed (Provost), Kayla Stewart (Daily Mining Gazette), Max Seel (Dean Sciences & Arts), Sarah Green (Chemical Science).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Sloan announced that Shea McGrew is in Texas and will be unable to make a presentation on the Michigan Tech Fund tonight. It will be rescheduled at a later date.

Bruch MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 431

Bruch MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 431 as presented. The motion 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.]**

6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Proposals: President Sloan reported that the Board of Control at its 9 December 2005 meeting approved Proposal 2-06, Undergraduate Certificates, Proposal 3-06 Coaching Endorsement Certificate, Proposal 4-06 Minor in Coaching Fundamentals and Proposal 5-06, Bachelor of Science in Anthropology.

The Provost will attend the state university academic officers' meeting next Friday to obtain their approval of the BS program in Anthropology. Then the program will again be on the Board of Control agenda for final approval.

All the proposals we passed fall semester have been approved at least initially.

Besides the proposals on tonight's agenda, a number of other proposals are being readied for the Senate, including degree proposals in biochemistry, mathematical finance and information technology, bylaws revisions, several professional staff proposals, and minor revisions of tenure procedures.

Provost Search: The sole finalist candidate for Provost, John Hughes of Miami of Ohio University, and his wife Susan, will be on campus Friday for a second visit. No open events are scheduled for him.

President Mroz had asked the Senate to recommend what action he should take in the event of an unsuccessful search. The Senate Executive Committee recommended without dissent that he ask the current committee to continue, with the understanding that any current members who chose to resign would be replaced by the same process they were originally appointed. That is, a member who was originally elected by the Senate would be replaced by another member elected by the Senate. I hope you agree with this recommendation; if not, we can discuss this at the end of this report.

CIO Search: At the first Senate meeting last fall Warren Perger, chair of Blue Ribbon Information Technology Needs Committee (BRITNC) reported to the Senate on that committee's recommendations. The last recommendation to be implemented is the appointment of a Chief Information Officer. A committee chaired by Jim Frendeway with members Steve Carr, Brian Davis, Guy Hembroff, Sue Laajala, Jim Pickens, and Kevin Raber is searching for a CIO. This is an internal search.

Evaluation of the President: The Administrative Policy Committee reports that the web instrument for the evaluation of the university President is almost ready to go. The evaluation will be done basically as it was last academic year. The proposed schedule for evaluation is:

Mon 30 Jan, 8am - Put evaluation survey on line. (Week 4 of semester)

Friday 17 Feb, 5pm - Deadline for submitting evaluation comments. (Week 6)

Wed 22 Mar - Present results to Senate (Week 10), with report to BOC following.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 6-06, Request for Change in Board of Control Policy 6.4 on Office of Ombuds

Nordberg MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve Proposal 6-06. There was no discussion. The motion PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with no opposition.

B. Proposal 7-06, Addition of Coursework Only (No Oral Exam) Master's Degree Plan (revised)

Jambekar MOVED and Amato-Henderson seconded the motion to approve Proposal 7-06.

Senator Amato-Henderson asked if the type of degree would be designated on the transcript. Graduate Dean Huntoon responded that it would be.

Senator Janners asked if each unit developing this degree would need Senate approval. President Sloan responded that Senate approval would not be needed.

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

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 8-06, Academic Integrity Policy 2005-2006 Revisions [Appendix B]– Pat Gotschalk

Gotschalk stated that the current policy only refers to "cheating" but it is intended to cover all student academic integrity issues. All references to "cheating" should be changed to "engaging in academic dishonesty."

There is a series of sanctions, including a warning, grade reduction, special failing grade, expulsion (3rd offense). Gotschalk asked the Senate what their intention is on sanctions for the second offense. She prefers that the policy has sufficient flexibility to allow negotiation with input from the faculty member involved with the case. She stated that instructors hesitate to report a second offense if it means an expulsion or automatic F. The proposal gives more flexibility on the second offense.

Senator Janners questioned the paragraph labelled "University Flexibility," stating that it waffles. Gotschalk stated that the paragraph had been written by the lawyers.

Senator Beck suggested that the hours mentioned in the proposal (48, 72) should be indicated as working days to avoid confusion. He suggested putting examples on the web.

Gregg (Geol & Mining Eng & Sci) reminded the Senate that procedures are usually separated from policy, permitting easier changes to the procedures as we learn from our experiences. Gotschalk indicated that she has no problem with making that separation.

Senator Flynn asked who is meant by "University" in the proposal. Janners responded that it refers to the decision makers. Senator Williams suggested dropping the entire paragraph on University flexibility and added that the term "University" shouldn't refer to a specific group. Gotschalk responded that the Code of Conduct refers to this legal language so that the paragraph could be removed from the proposal.

Williams recommended including specific cases in the proposal. Gotschalk responded that she would welcome a more major revision to the policy.

Gregg suggested that instead of referring to deviating from the policy the flexibility should permit deviation from the procedures.

President Sloan suggested that we could call them guidelines instead of procedures.

Amato-Henderson expressed concern over the wording that "faculty are expected to announce and discuss specific problems of academic dishonesty relevant to their classes. She stated that the word "expected" provides a potential loophole if faculty don't address every possible form of academic dishonesty. A student could argue that because the instructor hadn't addressed a particular form of dishonesty they did not realize it was not allowed. She suggested replacing the word "expected" with "encouraged." Using the word "encouraged" suggests that the faculty member doesn't have to follow what is stated.

Gregg suggested that we could add reference to the procedures in the policy, e.g., language such as "will conduct hearings according to their procedures."

B. Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units – Janice Glime and

C. Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units – Janice Glime

Secretary Glime presented two proposals dealing with the problem of faculty who transfer from one unit to another and who hold academic rank and tenure. Since tenure is not with the unit but with the University, tenure and rank are transferred with the person. The accepting unit, especially the faculty of that unit, are currently not guaranteed any voice in acceptance of the incoming faculty member into the unit. This proposal is an attempt to remedy that problem and will provide a policy that makes it clear that the receiving unit should have a voice and that there will be faculty input.

The first proposal addressing this issue, Proposal 9-06, [Appendix C] deals with policy, and its purpose is to guarantee that the faculty will have a role in the process. The second, Proposal 10-06 [Appendix D], deals with procedures and defines how the faculty will have a role in any such transfers. The departments can put something into their charters dealing with this issue if they choose, but it will be less complex if it is not required since two different units are involved and their charters may not agree with one another. This could result in an impasse that cannot be dealt with without changing charters or making exceptions.

Glime's suggestion is that the departmental Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee is the appropriate body to evaluate the credentials of the transferring faculty member and then make recommendations to the receiving department. The receiving department can then decide what actions should be taken.

The Senate Executive Committee, Provost Reed, and several deans were consulted and their input requested in the development of these proposals. The dean must work with the faculty member who desires the transfer and, if there is any plan to eliminate, consolidate, or create academic units, then the proposal makes it clear what is expected in transferring positions, where a new affiliation might occur, and also deals with any financial considerations which will result from the transfer of an individual. The proposal also provides a procedure for individuals who desire to change departments. Usually this occurs when someone with a joint appointment desires to have only one departmental affiliation. Another reason for changing departments is that, over time, the nature of the unit the faculty member is associated with may change and the interests of the faculty member may become more closely allied with those of another department. If there are any disputes on how to resolve the transfer, then the Provost has the charge of resolving those disputes.

Questions were then called for. Senator Milligan asked about a discrepancy involving the fact that faculty and rank are based in the University. He then pointed out that the proposal indicates that it is the responsibility of the receiving department to provide guidance to the faculty member concerning requirements and expectations for acquiring tenure in that department. Secretary Glime responded that this section deals with a person who is transferring before gaining tenure. Tenure is still a University-level decision; the department only recommends that tenure be granted. It is the department that sets the expectations for gaining tenure. With regards to charters, departments must include something about promotion and tenure.

Senator Helminen asked for clarification of the point that someone making a unilateral transfer could keep their tenure and same level position they currently have, but if they were going to get a promotion or get tenure with transfer then the department needs to be involved. The policy is intended to let people considering transfer from one unit to another know what is expected of them up front so that they can consider all of the facts when deciding to make a transfer.

D. Proposal 11-06, Charter Proposal – Janice Glime

Proposal 11-06 [Appendix E] concerning charters was then discussed. This proposal is designed to address some existing problems. One of the problems is who is included in charters. The issue of who to include should be defined by the individual charters but at a minimum the tenurable faculty must be included as well as all full-time, fixed term lecturers. Other staff and teachers may be included as determined by the individual unit. The unit must clearly state who is included.

There is nothing in the current charter guidelines saying who is responsible for what and there has been a problem for several years where two units have been created but their charters have not been approved. The language does not say the Dean or Provost has to approve the charter so a statement of who actually has to approve the charter needs to be included. The Provost or the Provost acting for the President can be the responsible party to approve charters. There is also nothing in current policy addressing new units and how they get started, when they become eligible for Senate constituency, and when they are required to have a charter. Language has been added stating that initially it will be a simple majority of the academic Senate constituency of the unit and other members as determined by that constituency who will resolve these issues. The charter itself can define a different constituency when it is drafted, but this proposal defines the initial constituency. Six months was suggested as the time frame for the creation of a charter by a new unit. The charter is expected once a unit is formed to provide guidelines for operation.

Dean Seel stated that it is his understanding that a charter defines how a department carries out its business. He wondered why there was discussion as to who is or is not included. Secretary Glime responded that who is included is important to determine who can vote within a unit. Dean Seel then asked who approves the charter? Glime responded that the department approves the charter with the Provost also approving. If the Provost rejects the charter, then it goes back to negotiation.

If a department changes its charter it does not have to come back to the Senate. It only must have a charter before it can have a Senator. Charter approval must go to the Provost. The goal of this part of the proposal is defining how to create the first charter when there aren't any rules. It is up to the department to set up the rules of operation within its charter.

Bill Gregg inquired if what was meant by the term "included" was really the voting membership, and Secretary Glime indicated that yes that is what the term means.

Once a unit develops a charter, it is submitted to the Provost or the President for approval within 60 days. The 60-day requirement is a pocket approval rather than a pocket veto so that an item cannot sit in an office with no action. If no action is indicated on the charter, then the charter is assumed accepted. That is not to say that changes cannot be requested at a later date but it does mean that the charter is operational and that the unit can operate, have a senator, etc. until such time as the approval is worked out. Before the charter is created, the unit chair or dean will appoint a committee to create a draft, and the unit can operate temporarily by using a charter from another unit if desired. Once a charter is developed, if there are disagreements or violations pertaining to the charter, then those disagreements will be settled by the University Grievance Committee. If the grievance is major, then the Senate (the intention was that the University Grievance Committee; the proposal has been corrected to reflect this) will appoint a special committee to settle the dispute.

Some items are already required in charters and others have been added in order to comply with expected union requirements. The department may delegate the responsibility of some of the required elements to the department chair or dean to allow for flexibility but there is a need to make these things clear.

In response to a question from Dean Seel concerning terms of appointments for chairs and deans, Secretary Glime indicated that she had drawn from earlier established policy dealing with charters and had combined the earlier policies into one proposal for ease of reference.

Bill Gregg asked "Why can't a department be established and work on its charter? – that you're not established until you complete your charter." Glime indicated that Provost Reed had indicated that a department should be able to get its charter together before it is considered established. Provost Reed responded that he believes that in most cases, except in circumstances that he finds hard to imagine, a faculty coming in to form a department should be able to work on a charter in advance of its formation. The question becomes how long do you linger without a charter. Glime indicated that it could be a sketchy charter at the beginning but it establishes initial guidelines that can be added to over time.

Bill Gregg agreed that with all of the existing charters to use as models that six months should be enough time for a department to develop its own charter but that departments were functioning perfectly well while initially developing their charters and that it is important to get it right the first time and not have to go through the process of getting it changed.

Senator Beck added that examples deal with mature departments – ones that have existed and have a history, whereas if you have totally new departments without history or precedents to fall back on, this item is addressing these issues.

Glime indicated that a new departments can adopt an existing charter as its initial charter. This will satisfy the requirements and give them rules of operation until they can mature and make better decisions. This builds in the kind of flexibility needed but still makes sure departments have something to operate with.

Under Charter requirements, Bill Gregg suggested that definition of voting membership and procedures to approve new members be moved to the second charter requirement.

Senator Sutter asked for a point of clarification with regard to Charter Requirements on the first page and Charter Contents Required on the back page. They were not the same list which leads to the impression that there are two different sets of requirements. Glime indicated that the first part was taken from the existing charter proposals. Sutter asked if the first part should be part of the background. It was suggested to combine them into one list.

A question was raised about requiring a department to form a charter committee. Glime indicated that the Executive Committee had considered this important, but that this responsibility could be assigned to an existing committee. The goal is to make sure that charters are evaluated and updated regularly.

Provost Reed commented that Promotion and Tenure guidelines require each unit to have a Promotion and Tenure committee of some sort. You can add an item on the required list saying that standards and procedures and periodic review of the charter is necessary so that it is in compliance with University policies. You could set a committee or say it is the department chair's responsibility to make sure that the charter is evaluated annually.

Glime added that one other argument for having a charter committee is that as time changes no one goes back to look at the charter. This was a way to make sure that it was being reviewed and changed.

Bill Gregg indicated that he is not comfortable with the term "length of term." He asked that it be confirmed that it is in the original policy. Glime indicated that she would check on it.

Glime then discussed that a unit gets Senate representation when it is established. Bill Gregg suggested that it would be better to put a time limit on development of a charter. Let them be established even if they borrow a charter and give them six months to finish the charter they want to use.

President Sloan then called an end to formal discussion so that other business could be entertained.

E. Proposal 12-06, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, B.S. [Appendix F]– Amato-Henderson

Amato-Henderson reported that the Curriculum Committee supports this proposal. There is no report from the Finance Committee because no new resources are needed. The proposal is to put a degree name on a program that already exists. The justification is that most schools have a department of biochemistry; naming a degree will give our program visibility.

Sarah Green (Chemistry) stated that she anticipates an increase in the number of students in chemistry in the program. In other schools, it has not been unusual for enrollment to double once a degree program has been named.

John Adler (Biol Sci) stated that only two schools in Michigan lack a named program in biochemistry. Its absence at MTU means students do not get MTU hits on Google searches.

F. Proposal 15-06, Proposal for Bachelor's Degree Title Change [Appendix G] – Amato-Henderson

Amato-Henderson stated that the Curriculum Committee supports this proposal, changing the name of "Bachelor of Science in Engineering Technology, Mechanical Engineering Technology Concentration" to "Bachelor of Science in Industrial Technology."

G. Proposal 14-06, Minor in Electrical Engineering – [Appendix H] Amato-Henderson

Amato-Henderson reported that the Curriculum Committee supports this proposal.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Nordberg MOVED and Malette seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime

Secretary of the University Senate

and

Paige Hackney

Senate Assistant (presentation and discussions of New Business items B, C, & D)