THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 461
19 March 2008

**Synopsis:**
The Senate
(1)  heard a presentation by Graduate Dean Jackie Huntoon on the history of the Graduate School
(2)  heard a report by Blair Orr on Tech's International Initiatives
(3)  heard that the Board of Control has approved Proposal 7-08 (Theatre and Electronic Media Performance BA) at its meeting last month
(4)  approved Proposal 8-08, Second Baccalaureate Degrees
(5)  approved Proposal 18-08, Electric Power Engineering Certificate
(6)  approved Proposal 19-08, Electric Power Engineering Graduate Certificate
(7)  introduced Proposal 20-08, Amendment to Proposal 42-04:  Evaluation Procedure for the President
(8)  introduced Proposal 21-08, Academic and Provisional Calendars for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011
(9)  introduced Proposal 22-08, revised Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters
(10) introduced Proposal 23-08, Certificate in Geographic Information Systems
(11) introduced Proposal 24-08, Minor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry

**1.  CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
    President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 461 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 19 March 2008, in Room B45 EERC.
    Secretary Glime called roll.  Absent were at-large Senators Brenda Helminen and Nick Koszykowski and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Cognitive and Learning Sciences, Mathematical Sciences, Academic Services A, and the IT, ETS, Facilities group.  Liaison in attendance was Lakshmi Krishna (GSC).  Auxiliaries currently has no elected representatives.

**2.  RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**
    Guests included Dennis Kerwin (VPA), Marshall Logue (Chemistry), Lesley Lovett-Doust (Provost's Office), Blair Orr (SFRES), Craig Waddell (Humanities), Saleha Suleman (Internat. Progs and Services).

**3.  APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
    Nelson MOVED and Veurink seconded the motion to approve the agenda.  The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**4.  HISTORY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL – Presented by Jackie Huntoon**
    Dean Huntoon reviewed the vision and mission of the graduate school is that all graduate students receive a high quality education that prepares them for productive lives in technologically robust multinational settings.
    The goals are to

  1.  Recruit and retain a diverse group of graduate students
  2.  Continuously evaluate and increase the quality and relevance of graduate degree programs at Michigan Tech.
  3.  Facilitate graduate students' involvement in research, scholarship, and creative activities.
  4.  Publicize the achievements of graduate students.
  5.  Encourage interdisciplinary and international research.
  6.  Assist in the acquisition of external support for Michigan Tech graduate students.
  7.  Enhance the quality of graduate student life on and around the Michigan Tech campus by providing professional development opportunities and promoting a sense of community among graduate students.
    The graduate program has existed since 1889, only four years after the founding of the college.  The first graduate student was Edmund Longyear who perfected the diamond drilling technique.  The first Ph. D. was earned in 1934 by Roy Drier, who earned his B.S. from MTU in 1926.  He originated the Honors Convocation as a graduate student.   He later became a faculty member at MTU and helped start the Tech Fund.  Corbin Eddy also completed the Ph. D. in 1934 and later became head of the MTU Metallurgy Department.
    The first female entered graduate school in 1933 but did not earn a degree.  By the mid 1950's there were ten graduate programs.  Today there are 22 Ph. D. programs and 32 M.S. programs.
    A number of MTU graduates have been highly successful.  For example, Kanwal Rekhi received an M.S. in EE in 1969 and became a Silicon Valley entrepreneur.
    California currently predicts a 68% increase in highly skilled jobs within the next five years.  Our graduates need transferable skills such as good communication, the ability to get the job done, and teamwork.
    The graduate program contributes to the undergraduate program in several notable ways.  Funding brings better equipment for use in labs.  Cutting edge ideas and techniques are included in the curriculum.  The faculty are high profile and the lab TA's are highly skilled.  And these graduate students are the faculty of the future, getting valuable training through the faculty role models.
    The university strategic goals include an increase in the number of graduate students to 1250 by 2012.  There are 284 faculty in M.S.-granting units and 254 in Ph.D. granting units (including much overlap).  To meet the goal would require 2.68 M.S. students per faculty member and 1.97 Ph.D. students.  Thus the numbers are not unreasonable.  It is important to increase

the graduation rate.  Our retention is good.  By the time we attain the goal, we should graduate 188 M.S. students per year, assuming three years to completion and 25% attrition.  To attain the goal for the Ph.D., we would need to graduate 60 Ph.D. students per year, assuming five years to completion and a 40% attrition rate (not uncommon throughout the nation).  The number of graduates is at the goal, but we need to grow the numbers enrolled to maintain and improve that graduating number.

The number of student credit hours faculty teach tends to correlate negatively with the number of graduate students in a department.  To attain our goal of numbers in the graduate program, we need more money to reduce the teaching load of faculty and GTA's and we need to increase the external and endowment funding.

To develop our programs, they need to be distinctive and build on our strengths.  They should be interdisciplinary.  And some should be revenue generating.

Across the US enrollment of white non-Hispanic students is decreasing while the proportion of students on temporary visas is increasing and the percentage of females is increasing.  However, the percentage of under-represented US minority students has remained flat.  This is an area in which Tech could really become a leader since given our small size and good retention rates we could potentially be a place that produces a significant number of graduate students drawn from underrepresented groups.

Huntoon pointed out that the undergraduates often do not like having international GTA's.  However, this is an important opportunity for them to learn about the world.  Near the conclusion of her presentation, Huntoon presented the following quotation from New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman: "I think any foreign student who gets a Ph.D. in our country--*in any subject*--should be offered citizenship."

In response, Waddell (Humanities) pointed out that the brain drain from developing to developed countries is a serious and growing problem.  He said that a recent documentary said that there is only one native-born physician in all of Botswana because all of the other native-born physicians have been recruited away by developed countries.

Senator P. Nelson stated that it would be nice to get more US students to come here.

## 5.    TECH'S INTERNATIONAL INITIATIVES – Presented by Blair Orr

Orr reported that he had served as chair of the Presidential Task Force on International Research and Teaching across Campus, appointed by President Mroz in accordance with Senate Proposal 27-06.  A complete copy of the report is attached.

The task force recommended that there could be another language added to our offerings.

The group sent surveys to faculty, alumni, and administrators.  The alumni gave an especially good response and were very pro about international experiences for students.  Others were interviewed.  The task force looked at the best practices elsewhere and suggested areas where we could improve our opportunities.  Students should be encouraged to participate in the study abroad program.  Financial considerations should not be a reason to discourage them.

Concerns identified through the interviews and questionnaires included:
1.  Inadequate access to foreign language instruction
2.  Lack of flexibility in some curricula
3.  Lack of support for developing and participating in international research and curricular activities
4.  Insufficient support (facilities, programs, etc.) for international students and scholars.

To facilitate our students' international experiences, we need staffing increases.  There is currently a decline in US students at MTU and we therefore need growth among international students.  We need to follow the model of interdisciplinary structure and support for international programs, providing more flexibility for students.  And we need more sections in language courses. We might also follow the example of Colby, wherein international students help US students to understand diversity.

The task force suggested the following proposal:  In order to acknowledge the international efforts already underway and to encourage more of the same, Michigan Technological University should include in its revised Strategic Plan a commitment to the international community, and this commitment should become part of the new image being developed by Michigan Tech Marketing and Communications. A Presidential Task Force should be established to explore and promote various means by which research, teaching, and service at Michigan Tech might be better applied to addressing the needs of the global community.

Senator Vable asked if there is a huge cost difference for students who study abroad.  Saleha Suleman responded that there is usually not a significant difference.  In certain exchange programs, students pay MTU tuition.  Vable suggested that it would be good to indicate the cost – some students assume it is too expensive.  Suleman responded that tuition is often cheaper and that there are scholarships to some of the less commonly visited countries.

Senator Boschetto-Sandoval stated that students would like to be able to use their international experience for general education credits.

Orr stated that it would be good for more students to go where there is more of a challenge, not to English-speaking countries.  Doing that says something about the student's personality.  One of the biggest concerns is over course flexibility.

Senator Smith stated that about half the students indicated that they had travelled abroad, but only about 5% had studied abroad.

Senator P. Nelson stated that we might be able to help students by offering access to things like Rosetta Stone software to learn languages.

Senator Donovan asked if the President had seen the report and responded to it.  President Sloan stated that the Senate had to get clearance from the President before Orr could present the report to the Senate, so he has seen it.  However, there has been no response.

Provost Lovett-Doust stated that several of the Tech Talks had dealt with international programs and research.

Boschetto-Sandoval stated that the language faculty are preparing a proposal on language and global studies.

Senator Gotschalk stated that the orientation group is working to implement ways to help new international students, faculty, and staff through orientation.  Orr pointed out that often these students and faculty arrive with an international family that also needs our support.

Waddell commented that most study abroad students go to G8 or G9 countries and suggested that more should explore other countries.  Orr responded that the Pavlis Institute students are doing that and suggested that one of the scholarship

criteria could be that the student go to a non-traditional country. Suleman added that the international staff are developing sites in Asia, Africa, and Malaysia.

Senator Gregg asked what percent of the students who studied abroad had their careers abroad. Orr responded that he didn't know, but that the alumni/alumnae are working with people abroad and travelling abroad as a part of their jobs.

Suleman stated that employers are looking for more international service learning and internships. 3M requires such experience.

## 6.   APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 460

P. Nelson MOVED and Keith seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 460 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## 7.   PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan reported that the Board of Control approved Proposal 7-08 (Theatre and Electronic Media Performance BA) at its meeting last month.

**Elections:** We need academic Senators in: Biological Sciences, Mechanical Engineering, Physics, and Social Sciences. We need staff Senators in Unit 1 (Academic Services A), Unit 4 (Auxiliaries), Unit 5 (Enrollment), and Unit 11 (Research). New officers will be elected at the last Senate meeting (16 April).

**Strengthening the Senate:** The Executive Committee will consider the many comments made on how to strengthen the Senate at its next meeting. There is still time for you to provide your suggestions at senate-discuss-l.

## 8.   OLD BUSINESS

**a.**    Gorman MOVED and Nelson seconded the motion to approve **Proposal 8-08, Second Baccalaureate Degrees**. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

**b.**    Gorman MOVED and Nelson seconded the motion to approve **Proposal 18-08, Electric Power Engineering Certificate**. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

**c.**    Gorman MOVED and Nelson seconded the motion to approve **Proposal 19-08, Electric Power Engineering Graduate Certificate**. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no dissent.

## 9.   NEW BUSINESS

**a.**    **Proposal 20-08, Amendment to Proposal 42-04:  Evaluation Procedure for the President**, presented by Martha Sloan in the absence of Brenda Helminen.

Sloan reported that President Mroz wanted to change the eligible participants to include all non-student employees. He had asked Helminen, chair of the Academic Policy Committee, if that could happen this year, but there was not enough time since the evaluation had already started.

Senator Gorman stated that every year seems like a lot and asked if it wouldn't be okay to do every two years. Sloan responded that when Mroz became President, he wanted it every year. Senator Donovan added that this year the committee went to an off-campus vendor to reduce the fear of someone identifying who the person was who made the comments. The form was also shorter. The number of responses this year was almost triple that of last year.

Gorman stated that if staff were added, we would want to know the category (faculty, professional, staff) of the respondent.

Secretary Glime stated that she had been asked by a former Senate President to state that the unionized staff are not Senate constituents and that therefore the Senate has no jurisdiction that would include asking them to participate in the evaluation. She had raised the concern that these staff have no overall organization of their own to facilitate their participation in any evaluation. Other department members had suggested that they should run it through their union organizations.

Senator Nitz asked if this evaluation was available only on the web. A committee member responded that it was also available by paper if requested.

**b.**    **Proposal 21-08, Academic and Provisional Calendars for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011**

Senator Buche stated that the calendar had met with the established Senate guidelines.

Vable observed that the calendar starts early and commented that a number of schools were starting mid-week. He asked what reasons there were for not doing that here. Glime responded that the possibility had been discussed when we changed the calendar and that it created difficulties for departments that held labs on multiple days that would be split between weeks. Particularly in biology, setups may not survive over the week-end, necessitating considerably more time in setups and materials.

**c.**    **Proposal 22-08, revised Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters, presented by Madhu Vable**

Vable credited Glime and Helminen for much of the work on the present proposal. Glime pointed out that Vable had also contributed much of the draft of 11-06.

Vable stated that the original Charter Proposal 16-92 mandated all academic units must have Charters and suggested items to be included in the Charter. Subsequently, Proposals 23-00 (grievance), 20-02 (emeritus), and 9-05 (sabbatical leave) added required items to guidelines in 16-92.

Problems were discovered in creating charters for new units, charter revisions, and violation of charters. Proposal 11-06 was introduced in Senate 18 January 2006; revisions were presented 1 February 2006. The proposal was adopted by the Senate 1 February 2006. Revisions were requested by the Administration and the proposal was resubmitted to the Senate 5 April 2006 and adopted by the Senate 19 April 2006. Because Deans and Chairs had not reviewed the proposal and had a number of concerns, it was rejected by the Administration 27 November 2006 with a request that a committee be appointed consisting of chairs and deans to work with the Senate Administrative Policy Committee to resolve outstanding issues.

There are two parts in the current proposal:
1. Mechanisms for creating new charters, and for resolving disputes on revisions and violation of charters.
2. Contents of Charter.

The key ideas in mechanisms:
1. The Administration has 60 calendar days to respond to Charter revisions; failure results in "pocket approval"

2. Disputes on revisions/violations of the Charter, if not resolved, would be adjudicated by the Faculty Review Committee.
3. Copies of old and current Charters will be maintained in the Dean's office, Provost's Office, and the Senate web site.

Key Ideas in Contents:
1. Unit policies and procedures must conform to University and Senate policies and procedures
2. Has list of required and optional items.
3. New items are those arising from the mechanisms for addressing creation, revisions and violation of Charters.
4. Required items are those arising from approved University and Senate policies.
5. Optional items are those left over from the original Charter proposal 16-92 that have not become required items.
6. Changes in the items on the required or optional list must be done by separate Senate proposals.

New edited version will be sent to you soon. The part on Chair/school Dean salary will be deleted, among other changes.

Senator Storer asked for clarification that items from m to the end are not specifically required but are in grey areas. Glime responded that Proposal 16-92 requires items of governance, but governance can have a broad definition, leaving some items in these grey areas.

Provost Lovett-Doust suggested that it would be clearer if all the optional items were dropped.

Waddell asked if a department can stipulate that the chair must be elected and that there is a term limit. Vable responded that they can. Glime added that the Administration, prior to hiring our current Provost, has refused to approve any charter that includes term limits. A department could get itself in difficulty if the current chair is term-limited, there is no money for an outside search, and there is no one in the department they consider preferable to the current chair.

Storer stated that the changes in the process were substantive and asked why. Veurink responded that her department had waited for approval for four years because there was no process in place, resulting in their lack of representation on the Senate. Glime added that Charters had not been approved for Engineering Fundamentals or for Biomedical Engineering, resulting in pocket veto, causing her to take the problem to Provost Dave Reed. At that time he charged the Senate to develop an approval process.

Storer questioned the 60-day delay and stated that if the majority approve the Charter, it should be considered approved right away without need for further approval.

Senator Gregg stated that the optional list should be removed. Glime responded that since those items are current policy that was approved by referendum, it was not clear that they could not be removed without another referendum. President Sloan stated that since they were optional items and were only advisory, their removal would not require a referendum. She and Glime agreed to provide a new copy in time to meet the 10-day requirement so that the Senate could vote on the proposal at the next Senate meeting. [Secretary's note: This interpretation was questioned after the meeting by one Senator who has posed the question of reference on the Senate-discuss-l email list.]

**d.    Proposal 23-08, Certificate in Geographic Information Systems – presented by Hugh Gorman**

Gorman pointed out that the certificate was developed by three departments and is an undergraduate certificate.

**e.    Proposal 24-08, Minor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry – presented by Hugh Gorman**


**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.


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