

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 459
13 February 2008

Synopsis:

The Senate:

- (1) heard that this year's presidential evaluation will be handled by an outside software company.
 - (2) passed Proposal 13-08, Revision of Proposals 6-60, 11-69, 2-75, 14-94, 25-94, and 11-07 to reflect conversion from quarters to semesters
 - (3) passed Proposal 14-08, Minor in Law and Society
 - (4) passed Proposal 15-08, To Amend the Plan C option for Master of Science Degree Programs
 - (5) elected Michael Gretz to the Graduate Dean Review Committee
 - (6) introduced Proposal 16-08, GFC and Senate Resolution on Graduate Education
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 459 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 13 February 2008, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Madhu Vable, Michele Miller, and Nick Koszykowski and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Cognitive and Learning Sciences, and Academic Services A. Liaisons in attendance were SherAaron Hurt (USG) and Lakshmi Krishna (GSC). Academic Services C and Auxiliaries currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Jackie Huntoon (Dean, Graduate School) and Lesley Lovett-Doust (Provost).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Item #4, Presentation on "Research Initiation Funding," by Lesley Lovett-Doust was removed because some of the needed data are not available yet.

Senator Gorman asked that Item 9a, Proposal 8-08: "Second Baccalaureate Degrees," be postponed because the circulated copy was the wrong one.

Nelson MOVED and L. Davis seconded the motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

4. PRESENTATION: "2008 PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION" presented by Brenda Helminen

Senator Helminen provided a synopsis of the participation in recent presidential evaluations and changes for the next one. The evaluations follow Senate Proposal 42-04.

year	eligible	% partic	# quests	pres stmt	time to complete
2006	806	19.4%	16	15 pp	35 min
2007	884	11.8%	31	27 pp	1 hr
2008	899		14	5 pp	15-20 min

The participation of those who completed the evaluation was a small percentage of those eligible and cannot be considered representative. For those participating, it required 13 work days of effort.

Several reasons were cited for the low participation: Use of Web CT was difficult, the method was not confidential enough, and some felt they were not qualified to evaluate some or all of the questions.

This year there will be several changes: the survey will be shorter – 1 page; the President's statement will be shorter; evaluations will be handled by off-campus software; survey questions will be personalized (avoiding topics like the strategic plan); Senators will be asked to take an active role to get faculty and staff to participate; there will be more communication in Tech Today.

The timeline has been set: An email announcement will go out this week; full participation will amount to 28 workdays; the survey solicitation from vovici.com will arrive on Monday; Tech Today will feature it on Tuesday; Information will go to Senators to ask for help late next week; the survey will close 7 March. Helminen will try to avoid the spam filters.

The bottom line is that the evaluation process is time-consuming, particularly for the committee in charge of preparing and processing it. If the response is small, the numeric data are not meaningful. The committee will evaluate the level of participation this year and make recommendations about the value of doing this yearly.

Senator Smith stated that most corporations get about 80% responses to their evaluations. If participants feel that their evaluations will make a difference, they will participate. We should strive for that level of participation.

Helminen pointed out that the evaluation is confidential but not anonymous. Each person will be given an ID number.

Senator Gregg asked how those eligible would receive their numbers. Helminen responded that they would be sent by email. Gregg suggested that we could send numbers to the departmental Senators and let each person draw from a hat.

Helminen stated that she would be the only person on campus with access to the list of numbers – she must put them in the computer for validation. Gregg suggested that she could destroy the list after entry.

Friedrich stated that the responses go off campus to vovici.com, so no one on campus can see who has entered any response.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 458

Polzien MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 458 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan reported that the forum to hear from the Petitioner and the AAUP had 58 in attendance, most of whom stayed for the entire time. It is now posted on the web and she asked Senators to urge their consultants to view it. There was a balance of the number of questions on both sides.

7. OLD BUSINESS

a. Proposal 13-08, Revision of Proposals 6-60, 11-69, 2-75, 14-94, 25-94, and 11-07 to reflect conversion from quarters to semesters

Nelson MOVED and Veurink seconded the motion to approve Proposal 13-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

b. Proposal 14-08, Minor in Law and Society

Gorman MOVED and Nelson seconded the motion to approve Proposal 14-08.

Gorman pointed out that the social sciences major has a concentration in Law and Society. This proposal opens the opportunity to students outside the major.

The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

c. Proposal 15-08, To Amend the Plan C option for Master of Science Degree Programs

Gorman MOVED and Nelson seconded the motion to approve Proposal 15-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

8. NEW BUSINESS

a. Election for Graduate Dean Review Committee member

Nominees were Robert Johnson (Humanities) and Michael Gretz (Biological Sciences). Michael Gretz received the most votes by clicker vote of academic faculty.

b. Proposal 16-08, GFC and Senate Resolution on Graduate Education, presented by Jackie Huntoon

Huntoon (Dean of the Graduate School) stated that Secretary Glime had contacted her, suggesting that it may be beneficial to have a formal statement of the types of decisions that need only Graduate Faculty Council (GFC) approval and those that need Senate approval. Provost Lovett-Doust, President Sloan, GFC President Nancy Auer, Glime, and Huntoon met to discuss these issues and reached a consensus on whose approval was needed for various items that are usually handled by the Graduate Faculty Council and/or Senate. Thus, this proposal is a joint resolution from the GFC and the Senate Officers.

Huntoon added that the GFC has not had an opportunity yet to discuss or approve the proposal and will not meet again until the first Tuesday in March. Senator Gregg asked if the Senate would wait for the GFC approval. President Sloan responded that it would.

Senator Givens asked if all proposals related to graduate education must go to the GFC first. President Sloan responded that it would be necessary only if they are on the list for the GFC.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm.

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