

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 434
15 February 2006

Synopsis:

The Senate

- (1) heard a report from Shea McGrew and Bonnie Gorman on the restructuring of Marketing and Communications.
 - (2) heard that **Proposals 7-06**, Addition of Coursework Only (No Oral Exam) Master's Degree Plan (revised), **14-06**, Minor in Electrical Engineering, and **15-06**, Proposal for a Bachelor's Degree Title Change, have been approved by the Provost and the President.
 - (3) heard that the Administration has approved **Proposal 12-06**, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BS, and that the Board of Control will consider it on 24 February.
 - (4) was reminded that evaluation of the University President must be completed by Friday.
 - (5) heard that the provost search ended unsuccessfully; a new search will commence in the fall with willing members of the search committee continuing; the current Provost will continue until replaced.
 - (6) passed **Proposal 8-06**, Academic Integrity Policy 2005-2006 Proposed Revision.
 - (7) passed **Proposal 16-06**, Proposed Revision of Emergency Submissions.
 - (8) passed **Proposal 17-06**, Exercise Science, B.S.
 - (9) passed **Proposal 18-06**, Department of Physical Education Name Change.
 - (10) passed **Proposal 6-06** as an emergency proposal, approving changes made by the lawyer to the previous Senate proposal on the position of Ombuds.
 - (11) introduced **Proposal 13-06**, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures – Automatic Extension of Probationary Period; **Proposal 20-06**, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures – Early Tenure Clarification; **Proposal 21-06**, Policy Governing Change of Grades; and **Proposal 22-06**, Policy Governing Use of the Term "The University."
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 434 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 15 February 2006, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Don Beck and representatives from Civil and Environmental Engineering and Research and Sponsored Education, KRC, and GS. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council), Liz Van Heusden (USG), and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Biomedical Engineering, Academic Services C, and Auxiliary Enterprises currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Gloria Melton (Dean of Students), Sharron Paris (OSRR), Max Seel (Sci & Arts), Mary Durfee (Provost's office), Bonnie Gorman (Univ. Marketing & Communications), Shea McGrew (Advancement), John Adler (Biol. Sci.), Jackie Huntoon (Grad School), and Dan Freeman (USG).

3. REPORTS: TECH FUND – SHEA MCGREW & BONNIE GORMAN

Bonnie Gorman reported on the four primary operations of University Marketing and Communications: communications design, marketing communications, media relations, and printing and mail services. Communications Design includes web development, publications (e.g. university magazine, research report), and photography and video. She pointed out that a key factor in marketing communication is getting to know the audience. Most students in high school spend 3-5 hours a day on the internet. Maybe we should primarily target the web and not put our efforts into magazine ads. Media relations include university news, both internal and external, including Tech Today, and athletics. Printing and mail services will assist faculty and staff in the preparation of material for mailing.

Gorman pointed out that the challenge marketing faces is shifting from traditional to integrated marketing. It is this integration that has led to much of the restructuring. One consideration is that we need to be consistent; there is a university style guide. Instead of multiple independent messages we need to concentrate on strategic messages. The Student Affairs Office alone sends 35 different communications to prospective students, and that does not include housing or financial information or departmental communications. They have developed a profile for the student and a prospective student can indicate interests on the web. Instead of transactions, we need to build relationships with our students; MTU has always done this.

Recent Initiatives include acting on recommendations of the undergraduate recruitment/marketing report of 2004, including involving alumni in recruiting and building a relationship with community colleges. STAMATS, a marketing and communications firm, has been hired to help. They are providing undergraduate and recruitment materials.

Where are we going from here? Gorman stated that we must re-align our efforts to communicate in ways that support our strategic direction. We must be consistent. Marketing and Communications must shift from being a service provider for the University to being the voice of Michigan Tech. They will meet with chairs to find out what "voice" is coming from departments and evaluate whether we are being effective at our communication goals.

Senator Sutter asked if we are presenting ourselves as Michigan Tech or as Michigan Technological University. Gorman responded that STAMATS had recommended that communications should use Michigan Technological University the first time in communications; after that they can use Michigan Tech.

Sutter asked why we can't download a Michigan Technological University logo. Gorman responded that we probably don't have one.

Senator Jambekar stated that word of mouth is much more important today. Gorman acknowledged that it is.

Senator Flynn stated that Michigan Tech was not among the many schools that sent information to her daughter in response to her PSAT scores. She did, however, receive the MTU Get Smart packet and has received numerous postcards from the Admissions Office. Dean Seel added that this is a 20-year-old complaint. Senator Turnquist added that students are profiled by things like SAT and PSAT scores and the disciplines in which they indicate an interest.

Senator Amato asked what the color code is for the correct MTU yellow. We need a template to use for web sites and other things that use it.

Senator Nordberg stated that the complaint he has heard at other schools is that people can't do anything themselves. They have to apply three months in advance to get someone to prepare things like publications or websites for them. He asked what MTU's future holds in this regard.

Gorman responded that we do not have enough people to do all this. Therefore we need templates to make it easier and more consistent for people to do their own.

Shea McGrew continued the presentation by discussing the reorganization. He listed changes he had observed in his 16 months at MTU. When he came, there was an obsession with the general fund deficit, concern about how the Board would treat the presidential search, speculation about how long Mroz would be President, and concern over people losing jobs. Today there is more optimism. There had been a problem between the Board of Control and the Tech Board, each questioning how to raise more money and whose fault it was that it had not been successful. Now the Board of Control has realized fully that the funding formula has to change. Recent discussions have centered on how to continue the upward trend in research funding, increase tuition revenue by increasing the number of students, and how to manage sustainable fundraising.

The Board of Control, the Tech Fund, and the Administration have not been in synch. The marketing message has been very disjointed. You can't raise big money without a consistent face. We need more money – we don't get the faculty we want and we don't get the students we want.

Our endowment is only \$63 million. Tech has to become more visible. We are known regionally, but we are hardly known nationally. Two years ago we were in the top 50 schools in the New York News and World Report, but not now. We were the only school in the 50 that the average person hasn't heard of.

Collaboration has ensued between the Board of Control, the Administration, and the MTU Fund. The Michigan Tech Board was in charge of fund raising. However, the Board of Control wanted to evaluate President Mroz on his fund-raising success, but Mroz pointed out that he was not the person in charge of fund-raising. Hence, re-organization was essential.

The Tech Fund Board will help to raise money, have an advisory capacity, and help in investing. Advancement will be concerned with development, alumni relations, and marketing and communications. Fund-raising will not be the only objective of the Tech Fund.

McGrew pointed out that he is now a University employee. Development now includes corporate fund raising, foundations, annual giving, planned giving, and strategic functions (previously special events). The Board is being down-sized from 40 to 25.

Fundraising today seeks more aggressive goals. In 2004-05, we raised \$12.6 million – not very good. The goal this year is \$18 million. As of 31 January 2006 we have raised \$14.99 million. The plan for the next five years is to raise \$300 million. We have identified three alumni who could have the potential to give \$30 million. The usual formula is that you need three potential donors for every one actual. Priorities for the campaign include building the endowment, faculty support, and student support.

Senator Gregg stated that he had seen a chart showing what donors want to give to. Scholarships were one of the highest. If we had more donations for scholarships it would permit us to take less from the general fund.

McGrew stated that last year we had given \$11 million in discounted tuition, which was too high. Gregg pointed out that it was the same amount of our budget shortfall.

McGrew stated that 20 years ago facilities would have been the number two choice for donations; now that item is off the list. Instead donors want to support people and programs.

Senator Waddell asked what role international programs play. We have lots of programs such as international exchange, Peace Corps, Engineers without Borders. He asked if these international opportunities could be part of the identity we are trying to communicate.

McGrew responded that we need to enhance that image. He would like to attract gifts from graduates in other countries. Graduate applications this year include 800+ international students and only 100+ U.S. students.

Dean Huntoon stated that if we want to attract research faculty we also need to support graduate students so the research gets done. McGrew agreed, stating that we are also at least \$100,000 behind our peers in start-up funds for new faculty.

Nordberg observed that advancement had moved from a house on campus to Uppco to Hancock and asked where their presence will be now. McGrew responded that they will keep the Hancock office – it is less expensive and is air conditioned.

McGrew closed by asking us to be patient with Bonnie Gorman, but to expect things to happen.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 433

Waddell MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 433. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan reported that the Provost is at the AAAS conference in St. Louis tonight.

Proposal 6-06, Request for Change in Board of Control Policy 6.4 on Office of Ombuds, has been returned to us by the Administration with suggested wording changes by the university attorney, which Sloan ruled as editorial. Our procedures

require us to reconsider it as if it were a new proposal. Hence it is on the agenda to be considered as an emergency submission since if it is approved tonight, it can go to the Board of Control for approval at its meeting next week. Otherwise it will be delayed until the end of the semester.

Proposals 7-06, Addition of Coursework Only (No Oral Exam) Master's Degree Plan (revised), **14-06**, Minor in Electrical Engineering, and **15-06**, Proposal for a Bachelor's Degree Title Change, have been approved by the Provost and the President.

Proposal 12-06, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BS, has been approved by the administration and awaits approval by the Board of Control and by the state academic officers in early April (7 April).

The **Board of Control meeting** next Friday has five proposals from the Senate. They are:

- final approval for the BS in anthropology
- first approval for the BS in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
- first approval for the BS in Exercise Science (assuming approval here tonight)
- approval of the degree title change in technology
- and approval of the new Ombuds policy (assuming approval here tonight)

President Sloan reported the results of the ballots for positions on **University committees**. For the Faculty Review Committee: Shekar Joshi (3 years), Patricia Gotschalk (2 years), Rosalie Kern (1 year), John Lukowski (alternate). For the Faculty Distinguished Service Committee: Shalini Suryanarayana and Beth Smock.

Evaluation of the University President continues this week; please remind your constituents. Results are expected at the Senate meeting on 22 March.

The **search for a new provost** ended unsuccessfully last week due to an inability to reach agreement between Tech and the candidate. Current plans are to resume the search in the fall with those members of the committee who want to continue and replacements for those members who choose to resign. The current provost has agreed to serve until replaced.

7. OLD BUSINESS

Proposal 8-06, Academic Integrity Policy 2005-2006 Proposed Revision. Gotschalk reminded Senators that Proposal 8-06 added an academic integrity censure to cover students not enrolled in a course but involved in facilitation of cheating.

Amato asked what would happen to the F* status. Gotschalk responded that a student awarded an F and given an assignment would get an F* if the assignment was not completed. They had talked about what would happen if that course was repeated and felt that the * should stay with the new grade.

Senator Nitz asked why lower the grade only one level; why not allow for lowering it two levels? Gotschalk responded that a faculty member can still give an F on an assignment, so that might lower the grade before the censure is imposed. Censure would take it down another level.

Gregg asked what would happen if a student gets on national television and states that he cheated his way all the way through MTU. Gotschalk responded that MTU can revoke a degree.

Senator Miskioğlu asked if there is any time limit on imposing a censure. Gotschalk stated that there would be legal limits to what we could do.

Nitz asked if a student had further violations, would these include a censure too. Gotschalk responded that they would. Each violation ratchets up the penalty.

Bruch MOVED and B. Gorman seconded the motion to approve Proposal 8-06. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

Proposal 16-06, Proposed Revision of Emergency Submissions

Williams MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve Proposal 16-06.

Senator Janners stated that her department opposed this proposal. The Senate is a deliberative body and should deliberate proposals and avoid the sense of pressure that might be imposed by an oral vote to consider a proposal as an emergency proposal.

Nordberg asked if someone can still call for a secret ballot. Sloan responded in the affirmative.

Senator Storer stated that there is an open parenthesis at the end of the first paragraph in the background section of the proposal. That was ruled by President Sloan as an editorial correction.

The motion to approve Proposal 16-06 PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with two votes in opposition.

Proposal 17-06, Exercise Science, B.S. H. Gorman MOVED and Jambekar seconded the motion to approve Proposal 17-06. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

Proposal 18-06, Department of Physical Education Name Change

Waddell MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve Proposal 18-06.

Janners stated that the title was inconsistent with the text and she MOVED to amend the proposal to remove the comma after the word "Health" in the department name whenever it appeared in the text of the proposal. Thus the name would be "Department of Exercise Science, Health and Physical Education."

Gregg seconded the motion to amend.

Senator Bruch asked why we should remove the comma from the text instead of adding it to the title. Secretary Glime responded that the intention was for the word "Health" to modify "Education" and to distinguish the program from that of health sciences in the Department of Biological Sciences.

H. Gorman suggested adding "and" after "Science." Dean Seel responded that the two departments would prefer not having two "ands."

Amato suggested flipping the words Physical and Health. Seel responded that there had been considerable discussion with the PE and Bio departments and that this name is consistent with the way other universities have named their departments.

President Sloan ruled the change to be editorial.

The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote of the academic units with no opposition.

The motion to approve the amended Proposal 18-06 PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

8. NEW BUSINESS

President Sloan introduced **Proposal 6-06**, stating that the proposal had been approved by the Senate, but that the lawyers had made changes that clarified the proposal. She considered them to be editorial. According to the Senate constitution, any proposal sent back by the Administration with changes had to be treated as a new proposal. It is desirable to pass this proposal tonight so that it can be taken to the Board of Control at the next meeting on 24 February. Approval is necessary so that the search for a new ombuds officer can continue.

Bruch MOVED and Waddell seconded the motion to consider Proposal 6-06 as an emergency proposal.

Senator Amato asked what changes had been made. Sloan indicated that the term Ombuds had been changed to **Ombuds Officer**. The second paragraph was changed to read "The Ombuds **Officer** shall report to the President, and may recommend policy changes to the President **for consideration**." In the third paragraph the first sentence is modified to read "The ombuds Officer **shall be appointed by the appointing committee which** shall consist of the following..." The last sentence of that paragraph is modified to read "The term of the Ombuds shall continue until his/her resignation or **until terminated** by a two-thirds majority vote..." The last paragraph is modified to read "Release time and resources required to successfully execute the duties of the Ombuds' Office shall be provided by the University **as determined by the President**."

The motion to consider Proposal 6-06 as an emergency proposal PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with no dissent.

Nordberg MOVED and Bruch seconded the motion to approve Proposal 6-06.

Senator Miskioğlu stated that the proposal doesn't say who is eligible to be an ombuds officer. Sloan responded that other schools include staff as eligible. Therefore the committee didn't identify who could be an ombuds officer, but instead identified the committee as the group to make that determination from among the applicants.

Senator Helminen pointed out that there are several editorial changes needed for consistency. In the first paragraph, Ombuds officer should be **Ombuds Officer**. In the third paragraph, "the Ombuds shall continue" should be "the **Ombuds Officer** shall continue."

President Sloan ruled these to be editorial changes.

Proposal 6-06 PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with no opposition.

President Sloan introduced **Proposal 13-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures Automatic Extension of Probationary Period**, to the floor.

Miskioğlu asked if the Union is discussing this issue. Senator Flynn responded that they are only discussing it as a Senate proposal.

Senator Clancey stated that his constituents objected to the word "automatic."

Nitz stated that this proposal is tightly coupled with the next proposal that clarifies what is meant by "early tenure."

Senator Jambekar suggested dropping the word "automatic."

Helminen suggested several editorial changes to 3.1.1. It should read "The probationary period will automatically be extended by one year for each *child*, up to *two*, added to a tenure candidate's immediate family (by birth, adoption or custody) during the probationary period. **Written** notification by the candidate, **his/her chair**, or dean **must be submitted to the Provost prior to November 15 of the final year of the tenure probationary period**."

Dean Seel stated that the second paragraph of the background implies that it is not completely automatic since one can apply early for tenure.

Gregg suggested that it would be better to state in the first sentence that the tenure extension shall become effective **on the addition of each child**.

Durfee (Asst. Provost) pointed out that the intention is to remove the stigma of applying for an extension.

Waddell suggested that we don't need to remove the word automatic if we add "if a written request is provided."

Jambekar stated that there should also be an extension for losing a child. Sloan responded that loss of a child is covered by 3.1.2, Exceptional Extension of the Probationary Period.

Janners asked to whom comments on the proposal should be sent and who initiated the proposal. Sloan responded that the Provost had initiated the idea after talking to a number of groups of women. Sloan would be willing to accept comments.

Amato promised to provide several editorial corrections she had noted.

President Sloan introduced **Proposal 20-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures: Early Tenure Clarification**.

Nitz stated that this proposal fits nicely with the previous one; someone can go up for tenure whenever he/she meets qualifications.

Seel stated that some cases are clear and others are so-so. In granting early tenure, we are making a lifelong commitment with less time to assess a person. He feels the old definition was better.

H. Gorman asked who submitted the proposal. Sloan indicated that it had grown out of the submission for automatic tenure because the requirements for early tenure needed to be clarified and more standard across departments. She added that early tenure is becoming common both here and elsewhere.

H. Gorman responded that if the goal is to reduce the number of early tenure cases, this would increase the number. He questioned if the goal is to state the reality.

Flynn stated that the background provided doesn't clarify the problem that exists with the present policy.

Sloan responded that the present policy requires extraordinary accomplishment.

Seel explained that there should be a strong record in teaching, research, and service. Usually the record is only strong in two of these in early tenure cases.

Secretary Glime explained that the intention of the new proposal was that someone must accomplish in fewer years what was expected by the terminal year. In other words, the number of publications, extent of service, and number of grants would be at the same level expected by the terminal year, while teaching was at least fully satisfactory.

Senator Bruch asked if President Sloan was biased in favor of the proposal. Sloan handed the gavel to Vice President Christianson and apologized for speaking so much while in her role as President of the Senate. She explained that she was aware of the College of Engineering expectations and felt that it was important to clarify the expectations for early tenure.

Gregg suggested that we should add that a candidate for tenure, through extraordinary efforts, must meet the same qualifications as someone in the normal tenure year. People tend to look at the yearly level of productivity rather than the overall picture.

Sloan took the gavel and introduced **Proposal 21-06, Policy Governing Change of Grades**.

Flynn suggested that the proposal should be called the Policy Regarding Repeating Courses.

Janners stated that there are too many "ifs" in the proposal. If there are so many problems, why do it?

Senator Williams stated that this proposal had come from the USG. If a student got a C in a prerequisite course, that student would be ill-prepared to continue in that curriculum. Education majors are required to earn a 2.5 or higher GPA in their major and minor teaching areas. Graduate students must maintain an average of 3.0 or better.

H. Gorman asked if this proposal would apply to graduate students. Huntoon (Dean of Graduate School) stated that as it is written, the answer is yes. The limitation of financial aid is problematic for TA's, GTA's, GRA's, and fellows.

Durfee stated that the proposal had mostly been thought of in relation to undergraduates. One aspect is trying to accommodate the cost concerns of the state auditors. There is also concern about curricula in which a BC average is needed.

Janners pointed out that this BC only refers to the average GPA, not to the individual course. Thus a student should be expected to meet that standard.

Senator Lewandowski asked what is typical at other schools.

Parris (Registrar) stated that it varies greatly. At the University of Michigan, a course can be repeated two times, with no restrictions on grades.

Durfee stated that the reason to allow a repeat was because of courses needed for later courses. She doesn't think the policy introduced in Proposal 21-06 is a good idea.

Senator Storer suggested that if there is limited space a student can only repeat a course if there is enough space.

Dan Freeman (USG) stated that he is especially concerned that if a student gets a C in a course, that student does not have enough foundation for later courses. This is especially important for first-year students who have not yet figured out what it takes to be a successful college student.

Durfee asked why wouldn't students use the learning centers to become more prepared. Freeman responded that they might not yet realize the importance of these.

President Sloan concluded that this issue needs to go back to committee.

President Sloan introduced **Proposal 22-06, Policy Governing Use of the Term "The University."** Secretary Glime pointed out that the Provost had said it is unlikely that the Administration would approve this proposal because "Michigan Technological University" is defined by the state constitution. The Provost and Senate officers had not had time to locate the wording yet.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

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