THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 445
29 November 2006

Synopsis:
The Senate
(1) Heard that the President had approved Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units, as edited; Proposal 6-07, Undergraduate Certificate in International Sustainable Development Engineering; Proposal 7-07, Ph. D. Program in Atmospheric Sciences; and Proposal 8-07, Department Name change for the former Fine Arts Department.
(2) Heard that the President had rejected Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units, due to the inflexibility of the guidelines.
(3) Heard that Proposal 11-06, Charter Proposal, had been rejected at the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee and will be reviewed by a joint task force of chairs/deans and Senators.
(4) Announced a Faculty Forum on Tuesday, 5 December, in 214 EERC to discuss changes in the tenure policy.
(5) Passed Proposal 9-07, Amendment to Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Deletion of Citizenship/Residency Requirement.
(6) Introduced Proposals 10-07, Mid-Term Grade Proposal; Proposal 11-07, Revision of Proposal 14-97 to Reflect Semester Conversion; Proposal 12-07, Scheduling of Evening Exam Proposal; Proposal 13-07, Master of Science in Applied Natural Resource Economics Name Change from the Master of Science in Mineral Economics Degree; Proposal 13-07, Master of Science in Applied Natural Resource Economics Name Change from the Master of Science in Mineral Economics Degree; Proposal 14-07, Health and Physical Education Major, B.S.
(7) Accepted an editorial change to Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 445 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 29 November 2006, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Brenda Helminen and Scott Pollins and representatives from Civil and Environmental Engineering, Computer Science, Fine Arts, SFRES, Academic Services A, Enrollment Management group, and the IT group. Liaisons in attendance were Cailee Pearson (USG), and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Academic Services C, Advancement, and Auxiliaries currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Mark Roberts (SBE), Mike Johnson (OSRR), Debbie Lassila (Academic Human Resources), Jason Carter (Exercise Sci., Health, & PE), Max Seel (Sci & Arts), Liz VanHeusden (USG), and students from the institutions course (Dominic Winkelman, Aaron Gates, Benjamin Thurston, Eric Morgan, Enze Lu, Wei Tang, Chee Ming Lui, Torrin Santy, Thomas Morton, Michelle Murphy, Hanna Bagley, Mike Rood, Michael Heinen, Jason Switzer).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Sloan added agenda item 7F, Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units.

Hohnholt MOVED and Luck 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 appendices].

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 444

Boersma MOVED and Polzien seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 444 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan reported that the Provost is not with us tonight because he is downstate with the victorious Houghton Gremlins girls' basketball team, now in the state semifinals.

Proposals: The administration has taken the following actions on Senate proposals:

Approved Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units: with the deletion of the last phrase of item 2 (according to the procedures as outlined herein for tenured faculty.) We will consider this as new business.

Rejected Proposal 10-06, Guidelines for Transfer of Tenure and Rank Between Academic Units due to inflexibility of these guidelines.

Approved Proposal 6-07: Undergraduate Certificate in International Sustainable Development Engineering

Approved Proposal 7-07: PhD Program in Atmospheric Sciences

Approved Proposal 8-07: Department Name Change from Fine Arts Department

In addition, the Senate Executive Committee on 15 November unanimously recommended that the Administration reject Senate Proposal 11-06 (Charter Proposal) with the understanding that a joint task force of chairs/deans whom the Provost would appoint and Senators (primarily the Senate Administrative Policy Committee) would work together to resolve outstanding issues. Brenda Helminen and Janice Glime are working on a plan for that resolution.

Forum: As earlier announced, the Executive Committee has rescheduled the Faculty Forum on changes to tenure policies for Tuesday, 5 December at 4:30pm. The forum will be held in room 214 of the EERC. The purpose of this meeting is to explain and answer questions about the Senate proposals passed by the Senate last spring (9-06, 13-06 and 20-06) relative to proposed changes in the tenure policy and also Proposal 9-07 concerning the citizenship/residency requirement if passed at the November 29 Senate meeting. All proposals are posted on the Senate website if your constituents would like to view them.

A faculty referendum is tentatively planned to take place before the Christmas break on these proposals.

Please inform your constituents of this forum if it applies to them so that they may plan to attend.

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 9-07, Amendment to Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Procedures: Deletion of Citizenship/Residency Requirement

Nitz MOVED and Jambekar seconded the motion to approve proposal 9-07. There was no discussion. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 10-07, Mid-Term Grade Proposal

Senator Kern presented the proposal [**Appendix B**] from the Instructional Policy Committee. Students (freshmen) feel there is not currently enough time between receipt of mid-term grades and the last drop date for them to talk to teachers, advisors, and parents before making their decision on whether to drop a course. The proposal would move the mid-term grade due date to week 6 instead of week 7.

Senator Boersma asked how the students asked for this. Kern responded that this concern had been transmitted to the committee through Sharron Paris.

B. Proposal 11-07, Revision of Proposal 14-97 to Reflect Semester Conversion.

Kern stated that the purpose of the proposal [**Appendix C**] is to change the language from "quarter" to "term."

Senator Miskioglu asked for clarification on the policy to keep unreturned tests for 30 days beyond the term in which they were given, particularly when that 30 days would end in summer. Kern responded that it would mean 30 days into track A of summer term.

C. Proposal 12-07, Scheduling of Evening Exam Proposal [Appendix D]

Kern presented data showing that far more faculty violated the current policy than the number who scheduled evening exams in the 6-7 time period. For example, in fall semester of 2005, 132 exams were scheduled to occupy a period that included the 6-7 time slot and beyond, whereas only 10 were scheduled within the limit of 6-7. In the spring, only 18 of 123 were scheduled within the limit of 6-7; the remainder used the time slot from 6-7 and beyond.

To further complicate the issue, the number of evening classes has been increasing. The number of students having classes at 7 in spring 2006 was 1358. She stated that the committee had looked at the problem of giving more time for exams but was unable to find any way to extend the protected time period. Currently the 6-7 time slot is protected – no classes are to be scheduled then.

Senator Nitz stated that the current policy means that faculty *should* schedule tests during that time, and that implies they should make every effort to do so. Kern responded that "should" is the point of confusion.

Senator Luck stated that if we force everyone to adhere to the 6-7 time slot, there will be more conflicts with other exams.

Glime stated that there are multiple reasons for evening exams. Not only do they give students more time to take tests, but scheduled classrooms are too crowded for testing. Furthermore, practical examinations take six or more hours to set up, require exclusive use of a laboratory, and must be given to multiple sections; these same rooms are used for 3-hour labs for the same and other courses. Daytime scheduling of practicals would be next to impossible.

Nitz repeated the importance of having the flexibility implied by "should" in the current policy.

Senator Sutter asked how many courses meet after 7 pm. Kern responded that there were 62 fall semester.

Many students are not comfortable approaching the instructor (for whatever reason) about conflicts, which puts the students in an awkward position. Fynewever stated that it wasn't fair to the students to put them in that position.

VanHeusden (USG) expressed concern for students in ROTC. They have an ROTC class 4-6 and another the same day 7-10. Their only chance to eat dinner is 6-7. She opposes the restriction of tests to the 6-7 time.

Luck raised the concern that everyone would try to schedule in the 6-7 time slot in the same week, usually after each 4-week grouping of lectures.

Glime asked how adding more restrictions would solve the problems caused by the current policy. Kern responded that currently many exams occur after 7, but some courses only meet once a week and conflict with the 7pm time.

A student stated that more students will have conflicts if all tests are give 6-7.

Senator Jambekar stated that he had offered an alternative exam at 6 am, but no students were willing to take the exam then.

Senator Gorman asked how many of the exams were actually given at 6-7, even though they were scheduled from 6-7:30. There were no data on that.

Senator Janners asked how many evening exams are actually scheduled then to accommodate multiple sections.

Luck stated chemistry exams are, but that crowding is a major problem. If the test is scheduled for more than an hour, students should be given the additional time off from class.

Senator Boersma stated that students appreciate having more time available, even if a test is designed for only one hour. Kern emphasized that although students and faculty would like more time for exams, the situation remains that going beyond the 6-7 time for evening exams does cause conflicts for an increasing number of students as we have more evening classes.

Senator Johnson stated that if the tests are too long to be done in an hour, then it is the faculty member's responsibility to make shorter tests.

Senator Gotschalk stated that she has found it is usually easier to schedule appointments with students or parents later in the evening.

Glime stated that the major problem with the current policy is that many faculty and students do not know the policy. Students will tell another faculty member that they have to miss class for her test when she has made it clear in class that they are to schedule another time for the test if they have a class at that time.

Senator Fynewever stated that she teaches a lot of evening classes and has many students who need to miss her class for a test. She has found that when students take a test at a different time from their classmates they typically don't do as well.

D. Proposal 13-07, Master of Science in Applied Natural Resource Economics Name Change from the Master of Science in Mineral Economics Degree [Appendix E]

Mark Roberts presented the background for the proposal. The program started in fall of 1983. Since then, it has become less and less aligned with minerals. This is just a name change with no change in coursework. It better reflects what the program is.

Senator Waddell asked if the change has to go to the state. Roberts responded that it would.

Senator Wood asked if natural resources included energy. Roberts responded that it did.

Sutter stated that the degree title reads better without the word "applied" and asked if it was necessary. Roberts responded that most programs involve a lot of theory, but that theirs does not.

President Sloan added that the Provost had talked to SFRES and was assured that they had no problem with the name proposed for the program.

E. Proposal 14-07, Health and Physical Education Major, B.S. [Appendix F]

Jason Carter (Exercise Science) presented the background for the proposal. Its purpose is to distinguish the avenues preferred by their students. There are currently 32 students enrolled in the new exercise science program. Some of these students have no interest in the pre-professional track. The program is rigorous, including a year of physics and a year of chemistry. Some of the other career tracks for these students do not require as much science.

The second concentration in this B.S. is secondary education. This program is similar to that needed for students interested in physical fitness but it has no free electives because of the education requirements. He emphasized that the proposed degree is NOT a jock degree. It is for those students who want to pursue a different set of careers. The health and fitness industry is growing and provides another area where MTU can expand.

Kern commented that the table provided did not make a clear distinction between certificates, concentrations, and degrees. She offered to work with Carter to clarify it.

Sutter asked if there was an accreditation body for the program. Carter responded that accreditation is not required in the College of Science and Arts, but that they may want to seek it in the future. There are several places where they could seek it.

Seel (Dean Sciences and Arts) added that Sciences and Arts programs typically are not accredited in universities. The education program is accredited by the state.

Nitz wondered if it is too early to establish a new program in this department when no one has graduated yet from the first program. Seel responded that there is currently a search for a second faculty member and that the added program would help the university in numbers of students. Adding this degree would benefit both programs.

F. Proposal 9-06, Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units [Appendix G]

President Sloan reported that the Provost had approved Proposal 9-06, but that the words "according to the procedures as outlined herein for tenured faculty" needed to be removed because there were no procedures in the proposal. The words had been left due to an oversight when the procedures were removed and put into a separate proposal. She ruled that the change was editorial, thus negating the need to wait two weeks and vote on the change. There were no objections to the ruling, so Proposal 9-06 stands APPROVED as edited.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

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