

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF  
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 437  
5 April 2006

**Synopsis:**

**The Senate**

- (1) heard reports from Mary Durfee on the Honors Institute and AQIP.
  - (2) approved the slate of nominees for presidential appointments to committees and added Brenda Helminen to the Ombuds Search Committee as Senate Representative
  - (3) heard that proposals for adding degrees in biochemistry and molecular biology and in exercise science will be discussed at the state academic officers meeting this Friday
  - (4) approved Proposal 13-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Automatic Extension of Tenure Clock, with modification
  - (5) approved Proposal 20-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Early Tenure, with modification
  - (6) defeated Proposal 21-06, Policy Governing Repeating a Course
  - (7) introduced Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units (Revised)
  - (8) introduced Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units (Revised)
  - (9) introduced Proposal 11-06, Revised Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters as Defined in Senate Proposal 16-92 (Revised)
  - (10) introduced Proposal 25-06, Annual and Provisional Academic Calendars
  - (11) introduced Proposal 26-06, K-Day Recess Date
  - (12) introduced Proposal 27-06, Commitment to International Research, Education, and Service
- 

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

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 437 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 5 April 2006, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Scott Pollins, representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Fine Arts, and Academic Services B. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council), Liz Van Heusden (USG), and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Biomedical Engineering, Academic Services C, and Auxiliaries currently have no elected representatives.

**2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Guests included Kayla Stewart (Daily Mining Gazette), David Reed (Provost), Ellen Horsch (Administration), Dan Adler (Graduate Student Council), Jackie Huntoon (Graduate School), Dennis Lynch (Graduate Faculty Council), and Mary Durfee (Provost's Office).

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

President Sloan requested that the introduction of Proposal 28-06 be added to the agenda.

Senator Nitz MOVED and Jambekar seconded the motion to postpone Proposal 28-06 until the next meeting. Senator Boersma observed that it would require meeting the last week of the semester in an extra meeting to vote on this proposal and that it seemed it was important to try to approve this so it could take effect in the fall.

The motion to postpone the introduction of Proposal 28-06 PASSED on show of hands vote with 11 for and 8 against.

The agenda, as originally presented, was approved on voice vote with no dissent.

**4. HONORS INSTITUTE AND AQIP PRESENTATION – DR. MARY DURFEE**

**Honors Institute** – There were 87 students in the Honors Institute this year. Of these, approximately 37% were female. Twelve states were represented. Most came with AP credits, 57 in one case. Of these 87, 84 have remained. Twenty-six had a 4.0 GPA.

The HI students for fall 2006 have been named the DaVinci class and she estimates there will be about 60 students.

The educational results are encouraging. Two students have applied for REU programs, four for SURF. The group is active in campus activities. They have been encouraged to enter into an honors contract; one has accepted such a contract and several others have started looking into one. There were four honors sections of perspectives, taught by Bill Bulleit, Kim Hoagland, Randy Freisinger, and Dennis Lynch. There are more volunteers for these than there are sections.

The charter requires a faculty honors faculty council. Admissions, First Year Programs, the Registrar, and Durfee have a plan to improve fall 2007 admissions and fall 2006 orientation.

Several things have been identified to help improve the program. A few rooms have been identified for housing honors students. Students would like a room where they can "hang out" with other honors students, especially after the freshmen year when many will be living off campus. They would like to have more social activities together. The students and faculty council are helping with these.

An added benefit is that the honors students seem to be recruiting other students to join the MTU honors program when they graduate from high school.

Durfee stated that a half time director will probably be needed starting in fall 2007 or 2008.

**AQIP** – The four primary projects have been selected and are open for further comment on the AQIP website. The comment time will end 17 April so the projects can be submitted to AQIP.

The topics selected:  
Infusing Energy, Water, and Materials uses into Curriculum and Practice  
Classrooms and Facilities Upgrade Plan  
Improving Diversity of Faculty – training faculty to recruit more diverse faculty, which will enable them to do a better recruiting job in general.  
Comprehensive University Space Inventory Process  
MTU must report to AQIP every year. However, we won't lose our accreditation if we don't do so well.

## 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 436

Janners MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 436 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## 6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

**Proposals** - The Executive Committee has dropped proposal [22-06](#): Policy Governing the Use of the Term "The University" with the concurrence of the proposal's originator.

The Provost reports that he has approved and the President plans to approve Proposal 23-06, MBA degree, to be on the April Board of Control agenda for its first approval.

The Provost reports that he and the President plan to approve Proposal [24-06](#) to Extend Martin Luther King Jr. Day to a Full Day Recess with a paper trail to establish that this proposal permanently changes proposal 21-03, Guidelines for an Academic Calendar of 14 Instructional weeks, and Proposal 1-06, the 2006-2007 calendar.

The Provost will present the proposals on biochemistry and molecular biology and on exercise science, already approved by the Senate, the administration and the Board of Control (for the first time) at the state academic officers meeting this Friday. Assuming approval there, they will be on the April Board agenda for final approval.

The Senate Secretary and President held two meetings with the chairs and deans, at the Provost's request, to discuss proposals involving academic units, 9-06 through 11-06, which we will consider tonight. As these three proposals had suggested changes from the Administration, we have followed the usual procedure which requires us to consider them in the same manner as a newly-submitted proposal.

**Constituency** - The Senate Executive Committee, which is empowered by the bylaws to rule on constituency, approved on 30 March the proposed changes in the staff constituency presented to the Senate at its last meeting by Joanne Polzien, chair of the Professional Staff Committee. Changes in assignments of some staff to voting units are pending.

**Searches - Provost Search** - The provost search has been re-activated. The committee has about a 40% turnover including the representative from Sciences and Arts, whom the Senate must elect. The committee plans to meet later this month with the President and hopes to advertise by early fall.

**CIO Search** - The CIO Search Committee interviewed 7 internal candidates and selected three finalists: As all the candidates have not been notified, their names will be released later, probably tomorrow.

Each candidate will give a public forum next Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday, 10-12 April, in 139 Fisher, starting at 3:00 PM. Each will have 1 hour to address the audience and will field questions for about 40 minutes. Faculty, Staff and Students are strongly encouraged to attend and can provide feedback through an e-mail address to be provided in Tech Today. The search committee will then send the Provost an evaluation of all three candidates.

**Dean of Engineering Search** - A search for the dean of engineering has been started. Each engineering department will select one faculty representative, which will be announced at the next Senate meeting. Plans are for ads in the late summer with interviews in the fall.

**2007-2008 Committees** - All senators for 2007-2008 should send their Senate committee preferences to Paige who will work with the Executive Committee to assemble a list which will be presented to the Senate for approval two weeks from today. This is part of the plan we agreed on to allow committees to get off to more rapid starts.

**Elections** - Senate officer elections will be held two weeks from today. Nominations, including self-nominations, should be sent to chair of the Senate Elections Committee, Sean Clancey (msclance). Both the Secretary and the President will be candidates for re-election. The Vice President is term-limited and hence will not be a candidate for re-election.

## 7. SENATE ELECTIONS

President Sloan presented the slate of nominees as distributed with the agenda (attached). Those not elected will become nominees from which the University President may choose for those committees requiring his appointment.

Brenda Helminen volunteered to serve as the Senate Representative on the Ombuds Search Committee. There were no other changes to the nominations.

## 8. OLD BUSINESS

### A. Proposal 13-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Automatic Extension of Tenure Clock

Waddell MOVED and Lewandowski seconded the motion to approve Proposal 13-06.

Senator Milligan expressed concerns that if an extension of the tenure clock is extended to spouses and a new faculty member already had children, there may be legal issues that the former could get an extension but the latter could not.

Senator Flynn stated that she thought the Senate had agreed to remove the word "automatic" from the proposal. President Sloan stated that she had removed it but apparently the wrong copy had been provided to the Senate.

Senator Flaspohler asked what has happened at other schools that have instituted this policy. Senator Vable read an email from a constituent, indicating that Princeton was the first to institute it, starting last summer. He added that with the present wording (of Proposal 13-06) it hurts if they go up at the regular year (because they would have to have achieved more than would normally be expected if it is treated as early tenure).

Senator Janners stated that proposals 13-06 and 20-06 are intended to be linked. In Proposal 13-06, we need to remove the wording "can apply for early tenure." It should not be considered as early if someone chooses to go up in the normal (6th)

year. President Sloan accepted the change so that at the end of the second paragraph of Background the words "apply for early tenure" would be replaced with "apply in the usual way."

Milligan stated that the purpose of the proposal is so that there would be no questions asked. However, he is concerned that it is unfair if someone has two kids and gets two extra years.

Senator Flaspohler stated that this proposal could help to recruit faculty.

Janners asked if the proposal means if someone asks for an additional year because of adding a child to the family, it will be granted and Sloan's response was "yes."

Senator H. Gorman observed that an untenured faculty member gets a two-year contract. He asked if an extension would mean a person would get an automatic two-year contract.

Provost Reed responded that new faculty members get 2, 4, and 6 year reviews. Tenure occurs at the end of the seventh year. At the end of 2, 4, or 6 years there could be no renewal. It is currently possible for someone with an added child to have a one-year extension, but MTU faculty do not take advantage of it. At most other schools allowing such an extension, about half the women do. About one fourth don't for fear it will be held against them, and about one fourth have never heard of the policy. A much lower percentage apply here and he would like to know why. He has heard that it is fear that it would be held against them.

Vable stated that they may not be using the option because they don't know about it. Reed responded that the untenured faculty seem to know.

Senator Kern stated that if we remove the word automatic in 3.1.1 of the proposal, the tenure period still would be extended without the faculty member asking. She suggested that item ii under 3.1.2 should be added to 3.1.1, requiring that the faculty member had made reasonable progress toward achieving tenure. There was no motion.

Reed added that a person may need more than one extension for extenuating circumstances.

The motion PASSED as modified on voice vote of the faculty with opposition.

### **B. Proposal 20-06, Amendment of Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Early Tenure**

Nitz MOVED and Waddell seconded the motion to approve Proposal 20-06.

Janners stated that there is a different evaluation of extraordinary in different units.

Reed agreed that different units have different interpretations. Some think it means that one must do in five years what would normally be done in six. Others think it means what would normally be done in eight or nine. Sometimes the department and college committees interpret it differently.

Gorman stated that it is important to have time to evaluate a faculty member before giving tenure. If a person comes with experience, does this permit tenure in one or two years? Reed responded that it doesn't open this possibility anymore than the current policy. The tenure clock is not negotiated as part of a new hire contract.

Milligan stated that granting early tenure can provide incentive for very good people to stay. When people go up for early tenure and it is turned down, it creates ill will when others in their sixth year but with less qualifications are given tenure.

Nitz moved and Glime seconded the motion to insert the word cumulative in 5.6 to read "Candidates for tenure must meet the same cumulative standards of performance as candidates in their mandatory years."

The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

The motion to approve Proposal 20-06 PASSED on voice vote with opposition.

### **C. Proposal 21-06, Policy Governing Repeating a Course**

Williams MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to approve Proposal 21-06.

Senator Johnson stated that the Instructional Policy Committee unanimously opposed this proposal. It gives an unfair advantage to students who can afford to retake a course. Students can drop the course by the eighth week to avoid a low grade and can take a course again as an audit if they feel unprepared for subsequent courses. If a student retakes a course, the state is subsidizing the students two times for the same course, so even excluding financial aid does not satisfy the extra cost to the state. The committee's fourth concern is the added potential for grade inflation.

Williams MOVED and Johnson seconded the motion to amend by inserting the word "undergraduate" in front of students to exclude graduate students. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Janners stated that it would be difficult or impossible to keep track of the different tuition rates. She asked what is meant by "in major," "most courses," and "any part."

Williams MOVED and Flynn seconded the motion to strike from the first sentence of the proposal the words "C in most courses or BC or C in courses that are required courses (including cognate courses) for their major (or teaching minor)" and replace it with "B."

The motion to amend FAILED on voice vote.

Gorman asked if anyone could provide a response to the financial question raised by Janners. Senator Malette responded that it would be very difficult to determine cost to each student; he could think of no way to do it.

Senator Artman stated that she didn't believe our billing system could accommodate the situation as proposed. It would probably require revamping the billing system.

Kern stated that the main reason cited by the students was to become better prepared for subsequent courses. However, there are other means to gain the needed understanding.

Van Heusden (USG) stated that she would like to know what other means were available to gain the needed understanding, but even so she still felt the proposal was important.

The motion to approve Proposal 21-06 FAILED on voice vote of the faculty with some support.

## **9. NEW BUSINESS**

The Senate Assistant distributed revised versions of Proposals 9-06, 10-06, and 11-06.

### **A. Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units (Revised)**

Williams suggested removing the word "current" from item 9. The chair accepted it as an editorial change.

Sutter questioned the broader application of the proposal to include untenured faculty and asked if the proposal would permit people denied reappointment to request a transfer. Glime explained that it would not change anything. The proposal is

designed to provide the departments with an opportunity to provide input into the transfer decision, not to protect faculty. The university is only obligated to retain faculty members who have tenure.

Vable suggested that this could be solved by requiring that it be put in the charter. Glime responded that proposal 10-06 (procedures) states that each unit charter may describe the process; if it does not, then it is the responsibility of the unit's promotion, tenure, and reappointment committee.

#### **B. Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units (Revised)**

It was suggested that in item 1, the last sentence be modified to read "A faculty member may not request a transfer due to denial of tenure **or reappointment** in the unit where he/she was hired." The chair accepted it as an editorial change.

#### **C. Proposal 11-06, Revised Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters as Defined in Senate Proposal 16-92 (Revised)**

Glime stated that the chairs and deans wanted to remove items j and k regarding salaries and working conditions from the required list and that the list of suggested items be removed.

Vable stated that the history of charters began with the proposal in 1992. There were eight proposals on shared governance. At that time the faculty voted to change the governance structure from heads to chairs. They defined chairs as being representatives of the faculty; heads are representatives of the administration. This change is consistent with a bottom up governance structure. This change also resulted in the charter proposal. Any department can delegate responsibility to the chair. If the items on salaries and working conditions are taken out, they are gone. He stated that he didn't think the faculty would want the AAUP to negotiate the way salaries and working conditions are determined for everyone. It would be better if the departments did this. Charters are not automatically accepted, so there is still opportunity for chairs to have input and to persuade.

Waddell said that when former Provost Fred Dobney visited the Department of Humanities 14 years ago to talk about department charters, he (Dobney) was asked about the shift in terminology from department heads to department chairs. Waddell said that the consensus in the department was that at many universities, a head was appointed by the dean and represented the administration in the department; whereas a chair was elected by the faculty and represented the faculty to the administration. Several faculty at the time felt that the required shift in terminology from head to chair without a simultaneous shift from appointed to elected departmental administrators was Orwellian. Waddell said that, as best as he could recall, the response was that Michigan Tech had recently experienced an early-retirement program and, hence, the faculty as a whole was rather young and still in need of administrative oversight. He said that 14 years later, faculty looks increasingly like a geriatric ward and, hence, should no longer be in need of such paternalistic oversight. Hence, in the spirit of shared governance, he proposed that departments have the right to define in their charters (a) whether their chairs should be appointed or elected, and (b) whether chairs should be term-limited.

He was reminded that chairs are still defined by the proposal on chairs and that the length of term is also defined by a Senate proposal, but that the number of terms is not defined.

Senator Wood stated that it is up to the chair or head to decide how they will behave. Flynn responded that it is a matter of how they are appointed. Flaspohler asked if that role is handed down from the Administration or is described in the charter. Flynn responded that it is defined in her department's charter.

Sutter stated that Proposal 16-92 had the statement "The faculty of every department develops the charter." It is not in this proposal and he suggests that it be added. President Sloan ruled that it would be considered part of the proposal and will appear with the version to vote on.

Vable stated that Proposal 16-92 listed term limits as an item to be included in the charter.

President Sloan conducted a straw vote to determine the sense of the Senate on the controversial items:

Keeping the "suggested" list – yes, with some opposition

Keeping item j – yes with some opposition

Keeping item k – yes with some opposition

Adding number of terms for chair/school dean to required list – failed

Waddell asked if we should add election or appointment of chairs to the proposal. Sloan responded that it would be a university issue, not a departmental one.

Glime urged Senators to discuss this proposal with their units.

#### **D. Proposal 25-06, Annual and Provisional Academic Calendars**

Johnson stated that the proposal should say one subsequent year, not two. The Provost was unclear about the wording and thought it did not cover enough years that way. He interpreted it to mean the calendar would only be approved one year ahead. Kern stated that she thought the printed wording was correct. This item needs to be clarified before the next meeting.

#### **E. Proposal 26-06, K-Day Recess Date**

Glime asked for clarification; was the intent to change K-day every year or only in those years when school started after Labor Day. Johnson responded that it was intended for all years.

Janners commented that this meant there would be two bad weeks instead of one.

Glime stated that the original semester calendar discussions considered this to put all the disruptions in one week instead of two.

#### **F. Proposal 27-06, Commitment to International Research, Education, and Service**

Waddell stated that this proposal is to broaden the university mission. We were asked to provide feedback to the strategic plan. It commits us to an international community and acknowledges what we do already. He stated that he would like to add a statement at the end of the proposal to create a task force to identify what we could do.

Jambekar stated that this proposal is consistent with the MTU goal to create the future

Gorman stated that this is a great idea to see if the Senate can influence the strategic plan.

Senator Nitz agreed, but questioned why the role of the Senate should be limited to add only one item to the strategic plan – why are we doing this piecemeal?

Waddell stated that Nitz had a great idea, but that is not a reason not to support this proposal. Global poverty and hunger are the biggest problem and there is lots that a technological university can do.

Jambekar stated that MTU should not try to alleviate global poverty; people will ask why not alleviate it in Michigan first.

Waddell responded that MTU could take a leadership role. Unlike some parts of the developing world, there's no place in Michigan where 25% of children die before age 5.

Jambekar responded that it might raise a red flag.

Flynn asked if Waddell was suggesting changing the mission statement.

Waddell responded that we could do that too, but that the proposal is consistent with what MTU has taken on itself.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

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