3. Approval of agenda. Hamlin moved approval of the agenda; Storer seconded the motion; it passed unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Presentation: “Research Update” by Dave Reed
Reed was invited to answer questions raised by Greenlee’s presentation on finances at Senate meeting 468 on November 12, 2008. He handed out tables showing total department/school college research expenditures and incentive returns for fiscal years 2008 and 2003 and for expenditures and national ranking by NSF disciplinary classification for fiscal years 2000–2008. Total internal and external research expenditures for 2003 were $30,264,162; for 2008, total internal and external research expenditures were $60,356,544. Total research expenditures (research, instruction, and grants for units) that were also received in 2003 were $14,856,239; in 2008, it had $354,240. In 2003, the College of Engineering had $14,856,239; in 2008, it had $23,506,295. In 2003, the School of Forest Resources and Environmental science had $5,820,302; in 2008, it had $10,500,169. In 2003, the College of Sciences and Arts had $4,377,570; in 2008, it had $10,663,920. In 2003, the School of Technology had $137,162; in 2008, it had $299,869. The right hand side of the table shows the incentive returns by department, school, and college. A fraction of indirect costs are returned to the unit in part to cover the cost of the research conducted. These incentive returns go to deans’ offices as well as to units. These tables are used to calculate the amount returned.

Canae asked what percentage of indirect costs are returned to units. Reed said that in total across the university a little over 50 percent. What’s in the table is just the amount that was returned to the units; it doesn’t include what went to the principal investigators. Miller asked how the internal expenditures are calculated. Reed said there are a lot of pieces that go into that figure; the biggest single piece is faculty time devoted to research— a percentage of their salary is reported as internal expenditures. It also includes cost-shares, start-up packages for faculty, and anything that goes through the Tech Fund and goes to units. Miller asked if we self-report on our expenditures on the NSF report. Reed said yes, we report them to NSF each year, which compiles all the information from the 663 universities last year that got federal money. Miller asked whether her personal report is added in. Reed said payroll tracks the percentage of your salary that goes to research and the percentage that goes to instruction.

The second table shows expenditures in millions of dollars and national rankings by research expenditures by disciplines; NSF reports the rankings by disciplines, not by departments, so some of the listings don’t match up exactly to our departments. The table shows rankings through fiscal year 2007, and expenditures through fiscal year 2008. In science and engineering overall, Michigan Tech ranked 172 among all institutions in 2003 and 163 in 2007; in non-science and engineering, Michigan Tech ranked 222 in fiscal year 2007. In fiscal year 2008, Michigan Tech ranked 156 for non-science and 66 in 2007; in environmental science (SFRES and GEMS), Michigan Tech ranked 72 in 2000 and 59 in 2007 (the 2007 figure includes some other environmental sciences); in business and management, Michigan Tech ranked 132 in 2007. Disciplines in the top 100 in 2007 included bioengineering/biomedical engineering (52), chemical engineering (50), civil engineering (48), electrical engineering (66), mechanical engineering (22), metallurgical engineering and materials (45), and environmental sciences (59), humanities (78), and visual and performing arts (72).

Drelich asked why there are discrepancies for research expenditures for departments between the two tables. Reed explained that the first table shows departments; the second table reports disciplines. Vogler asked where the numbers for environmental science are. Reed said the line for agriculture becomes environmental science in fiscal year 2003.

5. Presentation: “Strategic Planning Process” by Dave Reed
In 2006, the university adopted the current strategic plan, which was used as a working document to prioritize projects at the university and in budgeting. The effort now is not only to have it as a working document, but to have it as a living document, and to go back and review it periodically. Is it still the right thing for the university going forward, or do we need to make minor or major course corrections? The first page of the handout is the timeline. We’ve been working since fall 2008 on reviewing and revising the strategic plan. The academic deans had a major role in this; the executive team took it to a retreat; then both groups met in February 2009; we took the document to the chairs and deans for review; and we took it to a retreat for an informal discussion. The process is: the plan is posted on the web, showing the differences between the old plan and the revised plan; chairs and deans are reviewing it with their units; we’re bringing it to the Senate today; we will meet with the staff council soon; there will be a forum in April; input from other stakeholders (alumni, student groups, graduate students) will be gathered. Comments will be consolidated in May; the board will review that in July and adopt the plan at that meeting if there are no extensive changes in the Goal 2 statement, particularly at the end where “an understanding of the social and cultural contexts of our contemporary world” was added; Bruce Seely said that was instrumental in bringing that discussion to the group. In Goal 3, some things have been added as action items. The goals of people, programs, and scholarship are still the core of the three goals. At the high level there is very little change; at the action level there is a fair amount of editing and change. Reed invited questions about the process.

Luck asked Reed to comment on how 2006 plan worked, what happened as a consequence of the document. Reed said that probably the most visible thing was the Strategic Faculty Hiring initiative. Without a doubt that would not have happened without the priorities set in the strategic plan. We realized and got the board to buy into the idea that the unit-level goals would show up on the dashboard page too when we get that going. Units have the option of including metrics other than those that four that they feel are important to what they do and they want to track. Reed added that if anyone has any more comments, they should submit them on the webpage or to Cathy Banfield and to his office.

6. Approval of minutes from Meeting #473.
Cooper reported a change suggested by Malette in Lehman’s report on enrollment, the sentence about telling students to contact “admissions” if they needed help with finances should be changed to “financial aid.” Malette moved that the minutes as slightly revised be approved; Hamlin seconded the motion; and the motion passed on a voice vote with no dissent.

7. President’s Report.
Proposals
7.09 Repeat Policy, was approved by the administration on March 19, one day after we passed it, with one minor change, replacing “Office of Student Affairs” with “dean of students.”
Provost Search Committee
The committee met for the first time on March 26 and elected its chair, Alex Mayer, and vice-chair, Darrell Radson. Consultant Dr. Robert Lawless of Academic Search was unable to attend due to weather in Texas but should be at the committee’s next meeting on April 16. The committee is reviewing the position description and ad copy and expects to approve these at that meeting.

Elections

www.admin.mtu.edu/usenate/minute/09/474.htm

1/3
8. Old Business: “Senate Resolution on ADVANCE Grant”

This resolution was introduced by Hoagland at the last meeting. She could not attend this meeting, and her alternate Larry Lankton presented the revised resolution. There were people from the ADVANCE program at the meeting who were able to speak to it. Peg Gale and Donna Michealkei. Lankton said that the second paragraph of the resolution is now moot, as the Senate was told that the section was going to be distributed today on Wednesday. He said there is a lot of very substantive content about the grant, particularly the part about external people being assigned to serve on search committees. Setting up and running search committees is a departmental prerogative. It is insulting to departments to imply that they can’t function unless someone comes in from the outside who is going to enable departments to make better decisions and come up with more diverse faculty. It’s as if we’ve been living under a rock since the Civil Rights Act of 1964–65. This is an intrusion into the functioning of a department which was decided upon without departmental input and it shouldn’t happen unless we approve it.

Gale said that an accountability subcommittee chaired by Chris Anderson has been talking about a flow chart that incorporates the Colleagues of Equity and Procedures (CEP). The flow chart is not to use a流 for making decisions, but to determine what the function and charge of the CEP is. Although the deans decided the CEP would be external to the department, Gale and Anderson never thought that. They thought the CEP list would be made up of recommendations from the deans who would ask for volunteers to be trained through the University of Michigan STRIDE program. The committee hasn’t come up with a charge yet, but they’re going to be doing that tomorrow and hopefully finalizing it, but it’s been a process. This is a grant that’s been funded, it’s not a cast-in-stone process. They are still developing the concept of how the CEP and how the chair can choose a CEP and it’s not the intent that the chair should not choose someone from within their unit.

Lankton quoted from a section of the grant that was distributed today that says “we have decided” — not that “we’re considering” or “might implement” or “use the grant to investigate” — “we have decided, based on the experience of the PI in contributing to and implementing an award-winning process used at the University of Windsor, to appoint peer equity assessors.” So the grant itself says that they have decided to do this, which takes away the faculty’s decision making power. Faculty should not be happy with this top-down process.

Michealkei emphasized again that this was a proposal, but now in the implementation that is not the way we are going to do it. At Academic Forum where this was discussed back in February, the question was raised whether the department could pick the person they want, and we said yes; we wouldn’t see anything wrong with that. There was never any intent that the CEP would come in and tell the committee what to do or who to hire. The person was to be a resource, to bring a different perspective and some outside knowledge about other options. Gale added that it’s part of the accountability side about what we can and can’t do at Michigan Tech, and we will be reporting back to NSF on what works and doesn’t work at a technological university.

Lankton said that it’s one thing to say that the department can choose a person, but you’re still saying that the department has to choose a person. I don’t see that there’s been broad faculty input. You’re making us choose somebody that we don’t think is necessary to the process. We should object to the notion that a small group of people have decided that we have a problem and that the way we’re going to fix it is to reach into every single department on campus and fix it the way we think it should be fixed. Gale said this is just a proposal we asked what decision the department was going to make tomorrow. Gale said this is just for three years; we have to evaluate whether or not it will work. We still would like to test something involving a person being on a search committee who could represent other interests than those of the search committee. It was successful at Windsor and didn’t get a lot of push back, but we’re getting a lot of push back on it now. It will be reviewed at the end of the project. It’s a small project, too, not as large as what the University of Windsor is doing. It’s not recruiting something in the same way, in recruiting something in the same way, in recruiting somebody.

Storer said that he was disappointed that this is still a negative resolution. As a Senate if we want to be involved in shared governance we should not just respond to suggestions from above saying yes or no; we should offer constructive ideas to improve programs that are being pursued. He also said that people are greatly underestimating the value of having external members on search committees, which has been in Forestry and the reviews from the search committee members were very positive. Also the second paragraph is a moot point, and we can’t vote on the resolution without removing it. It’s been indicated by people involved in the project that it is being redesigned anyway, so it’s not a useful resolution from that point of view.

Snyder said that the resolution does not say that search committees should not have outside members; the resolution simply says that outside members should not be assigned to departments. There’s a difference between having outside members assigned to search committees and having them trained in diversity so that somebody inside the department can have an influence on the search. That’s another way to achieve the goal of the grant without the imposition of an outside member. And if a department does want to have outside members, that’s fine.

Dewey said he has received a lot of comments from members of the Civil Engineering department that they are in favor of the ADVANCE grant including the outside committee compared to it being compared to it being the committee of having committees in the process. Sloan asked for a vote on the question. Frost asked whether we can vote on this resolution considering that the second paragraph is moot. Sloan said we need an official motion to approve the resolution.

Lankton moved to approve the first paragraph of the resolution and Snyder seconded the motion. The resolution passed by a vote of 12–10.

9. New Business:

a. Proposal 9-09: “Academic Calendar 2010-2011 and 2011-2012” presented by the Instructional Policy Committee

Kern stated that the committee follows all guidelines except for one that is impossible to follow: it has to be followed every fourth or fifth year that we cannot make the last Friday of the Spring semester fall before the 27th of April. The last time this happened there was no problem. The proposal was approved by a voice vote with no dissent.

b. Proposal 10-09: “Management B.S.,” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

c. Proposal 11-09: “Operations and Systems Management B.S.” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

d. Proposal 12-09: “Finance B.S.” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

e. Proposal 13-09 “Marketing B.S.” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

f. Proposal 14-09 “Management Information Systems B.S.” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

g. Proposal 15-09: “Accounting B.S.” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

Kern reported on proposals 10-09 through 15-09 which are all from the School of Business. He stated that he has been privileged to be the chair of a superb curricular policy committee group that have received and approved all major in Liberal Arts. This process is going to be carried out on the web, not the ones that will be voted on on April 19. Drafts with editorial changes will be sent out this Friday. The proposals will be retitled to better reflect their intent to change the names of the programs from “a concentration in” to “a major in.” Another important change is that the implementation date will be changed from Fall 2010 to Fall 2009. It will help the business school out with accreditation and it makes the people who are selling the programs to students happy.

Snyder asked whether he faculty of the School of Business actually looked at the individual proposals and approved them. Kern and Darrell Radson, the dean of the school, said yes.

h. Proposal 16-09: “Double Majors at MTU” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

This proposal was developed by the committee at the request of the registrar to correct what may be a problem of listing on diplomas degrees that we do not offer. The problem arises when the two majors are not the same type: one is a bachelor of science and the other a bachelor of arts. In such cases, the diploma and the record may read “awarded a bachelor of science in Mathematics with an additional major in Liberal Arts. The problem is that we do not offer a BS in Liberal Arts. This proposal stipulates that students who wish to earn double majors in programs that offer different degrees (BS and BA), must instead take the option of earning a double degree. Double majors and dual degrees are handled differently at different universities. There has been only one student so far that this might have affected, and maybe one or two more whom this would affect.

Lankton pointed out that different departments would have different guidelines for double majors and dual degrees: if you get a double major you get only one degree, so the wording on the diploma doesn’t imply that you are getting a second degree of any sort. We grant majors, we grant degrees. He said the problem is a moot point. The point of double majors is to allow students to get credit for the work they’ve done and to encourage them to do diverse things at the university. Cal Poly says “in the event that a student has completed the requirements for two different degrees such as a BA and a BS, the student will be required to declare one major as the degree major in order to determine the degree that will be awarded. The fact that the requirements for another major have been completed will be noted on the transcript.” We’ve been recording them on the transcript, but we also note it on the diploma. Keen said that the question is whether the state auditors would look at a diploma that has BS in Liberal Arts on it as a problem. The proposal is forwarded to the Senate with the approval of the curricular policy committee.

i. Proposal 17-09: “Interdisciplinary Minor in Hydrogen Technology” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

Kern said that this proposal needs further revision, mostly editorial, from the draft that was circulated to the Senate. We will get the approved revised draft out to the Senate by this Friday. The title is likely to be Multidisciplinary Minor in Hydrogen Technology since that is the wording used in the catalog copy. Input from people from Materials Science has been sought and received.
j. Proposal 18-09: "Minor in Leadership for a Technological World" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

President Sloan adjourned the meeting at 7:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted
By Marilyn Cooper

Secretary of the University Senate