

**The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 476
15 April 2009

Synopsis:
The Senate

1. Call to order and roll call. President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 476 to order at 5:41 pm on Wednesday, April 15, 2009, in room B45 EERC. Secretary Cooper called roll. Absent were Senators Vable and Koszykowski and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Civil and Environmental Engineering, the Library, Materials Sciences and Engineering, and Academic Services B. Liaison Anna Pereira (GSC) was also in attendance. Mechanical Engineering–Engineering Mechanics, Academic Services A, and Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment currently have no elected representatives.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Interim Provost), Brad Baltensperger (Chair, Cognitive and Learning Sciences), Robert Keen (Chair, Curricular Policy Committee), Jason Keith (Chemical Engineering), Darrell Radson (School of Business and Economics), Chris Brill (Cognitive and Learning Sciences), Theresa Jacques (Registrar’s Office), Tom Merz (School of Business and Economics), Troy Cogan (USG), and Jimmy Diehl (Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences).

3. Approval of agenda.

Storer **moved** approval of the agenda; Christiansen seconded the motion; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Presentation: “Summary of 2009 Presidential Survey” presented by Gerard Caneba

The same online format for the evaluation was used this year as last year. The survey window was announced in Tech Today and emails. Responses dropped by one-third from last year evenly across all categories. Possible reasons for the drop included that there was no pressing issue this year; last year the issue was the AAUP. Also the time given for responses was longer last year (2 weeks opposed to 10 days). Overall, the response rate was 18 percent. Of faculty, 20 percent responded; 21 percent of staff represented on the Senate responded; and 33 percent of the remaining staff responded. Historically, the response rate has been 12 to 19 percent.

Question 1: How would you rate the President’s performance over the last year? This year the mean was 3.97 on scale of 5; the mean last year was higher. Most responses were in the above average range, and this was consistent across all categories of respondents. Comments on this question addressed changes in benefits/health care, especially that the effect of the changes fall most heavily on the lowest paid employees; the provost position downgrade and problems with the last provost search; concerns about the effect of the economic downturn on Michigan Tech, although the university seems to be well-positioned financially; the president who is perceived as doing a good job in maintaining visibility on campus and a strong executive team, with some concerns.

Question 5: The President maintains an effective senior administrative team. This year the mean was 3.66 on a scale of 5; it was probably lower than last year. Luck asked what was the scale for faculty compared to staff. Caneba said he didn’t have the figures but estimated that the mean was about the same.

Question 6: The President provides effective leadership in addressing compensation issues, working conditions, and career opportunities for faculty and staff. The mean was 3.61, lower than last year.

Question 7: The President clearly communicates University priorities and policies. The mean was 4, lower than last year.

Question 8: The President invites and incorporates input on University priorities and policies from faculty, staff and students. The mean was 3.75, lower than last year.

Question 9: Rate the President’s leadership in addressing diversity issues on campus. The mean was 3.58, but significant numbers of faculty rated the performance as below average or poor.

Question 10: Have you read the University’s strategic plan? Most said yes.

Question 11: Do you feel that you had input to the University’s strategic plan? More said no.

Question 12: Does the University’s strategic plan influence or guide your daily work decisions? The staff said yes; faculty were evenly divided between yes and no.

Comments on the survey focused on the need for an average rating in questions 5 through 8; positive comments about the survey; requests for more focused questions to fit the issues of the times; and a few concerns about confidentiality of the survey.

Caneba thanked the members of the committee (George Dewey, Pat Gotschalk, Larry Lankton, Ranjit Pati, and Brenda Rudiger), Judi Smigowski for putting out the survey, and Brenda Helminen, the 2007–08 committee chair.

Boschetto-Sandoval asked why less time was allotted for the survey this year. Caneba said that the committee felt that going from two weeks to ten days would not make a significant difference in the response rate. Also they wanted to get the data as early as possible to present to the Senate. Last year the report was presented some time in May.

Hamlin noted the comments on the difference between fixed-cost health insurance and the percent salary payback and asked whether this is an issue that could be picked up by the Senate and sent to the benefits committee. Johnson, chair of the benefits committee, said that the committee has talked about this issue but hasn't yet come up with a proposal. Hamlin said that he would like to have it discussed.

5. Approval of Minutes from Meeting #474.

Cooper reported an emendation to the minutes suggested by Storer. In the discussion of Proposal 18-09, Storer's comment in response to Miller's question about whether the minor is to be restricted to Pavlis scholars should read "Storer said that the proposal is not restricted." Hamlin **moved** that the minutes be approved as emended; L. Davis seconded; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

6. President's Report.

Proposals: Proposal 9-09: Academic Calendar for 2010–11 and 2011–12 was approved by the administration on April 7.

Finances: The chair of the Senate Finance committee and the Senate president met with the CFO, vice president for student affairs, vice president for research and the budget director on April 3 to discuss Tech finances, especially as they concern the proposed new residence apartment. All of these except the CFO and budget director will have a conference call on the subject with long-time Board of Control member Ruth Reck tomorrow. The Senate executive committee has discussed university finances several times and has asked the Senate president to include financial concerns in her report to the Board of Control.

Thanks: I thank all of you who have contributed so much to the Senate. You have made my job easier and I hope you will continue to contribute in the future. I wish Rudy Luck the best in working with you for the better future of Michigan Tech.

Cooper thanked Sloan for all of her good work over the past three years. Seel, on behalf of the administration, also thanked Sloan very much.

7. Elections for Senator at Large and University Committees.

Sloan said we were not able to find nominees for all the open positions, but we do have a few more candidates. She announced that Mark Johnson is a nominee for Senator at Large, and she asked for any further nominations. Caneba nominated himself. L. Davis **moved** that the Senate approve the two nominees to fill the two positions; Fick seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Sloan announced that Paul Charlesworth is a candidate for one of the two open positions on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee. There were no other nominations. Hamlin **moved** to approve Charlesworth for one of the positions; Caneba seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Sloan announced that there were four openings (three members and an alternate) on the Faculty Review Committee, a very important committee that reviews grievances after they come out of the unit. Sloan nominated herself to the committee, and Johnson seconded the nomination. Storer nominated himself, and Hamlin seconded the nomination. Caneba nominated himself, and Givens seconded the nomination. Vogler nominated Miller, but she declined. Johnson **moved** to approve Sloan, Storer, and Caneba as members of the committee; Christiansen seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. The three positions have different terms: one ending in 2010, one in 2011, and one in 2012. Snyder **moved** that terms on the committee be filled in descending order from the order of nomination, the person nominated first serving the shortest term, and so on; Hamlin seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with one dissenting vote. Sloan announced that the remaining positions on committees will be filled in the fall.

8. Old Business.

a. Proposal 10-09: A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from "B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Management" to "B.S. in Management" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

b. Proposal 11-09: A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from "B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Operations and Systems Management" to "B.S. in Operations and Systems Management" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

c. Proposal 12-09: A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from "B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Finance" to B.S. in Finance" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

d. Proposal 13-09 A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from "B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Marketing" to "B.S. in Marketing" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

e. Proposal 14-09 A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from “B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Management Information Systems” to B.S. in Management Information Systems” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

f. Proposal 15-09: A Proposal for a Name Change in an Academic Program from “B.S. in Business Administration with a Concentration in Accounting” to “B.S. in Accounting” presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

Keen said that all six of these proposals constitute a name change with no change in required resources, simply designating what are currently concentrations or options as majors, and that they come to the floor with full support of the Curricular Policy Committee. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 10-09; Fick seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 11-09; Fick seconded; the motion passed on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 12-09; Fick seconded; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 13-09; L. Davis seconded; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 14-09; L. Davis seconded; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** the approval of Proposal 15-09; L. Davis seconded; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Dean Radson thanked the Senate and the committee for moving things along quickly.

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

Keen said the proposal is an effort to clean up a possible problem with awarding diplomas for double majors with different degrees (BA and BS), and it is supported by the Curricular Policy Committee. He said that Theresa Jacques from the registrar’s office was present to answer any questions. Storer **moved** approval of Proposition 16-09; L. Davis seconded. Kern asked whether it requires more hours to complete a dual degree compared to a double major. Jacques said that a dual degree requires 32 credits. Vogler asked what a second major is. Snyder explained that a double major does not require any additional hours. Vogler asked about how many students this would affect. Jacques said currently two, who would not be penalized. Kern asked whether the proposal would require a student completing two BS degrees to complete the extra 32 credits. Jacques said no, that students can complete a BS with two majors. Hamlin asked Snyder to repeat his comments from the last meeting on this proposal. Snyder said that he felt the problem was moot as the diploma seems to clearly grant a degree in one field and a second major (not another degree) in another field. Jacques said that we don’t award majors, we award degrees, and that the state does not allow us to award degrees that have not been approved. She said the concern was that we could be audited and found in violation. The number of students it impacts is very minimal. Most of the other Michigan colleges and universities allow either BS or BA in any major, but not ours. Snyder commented that non– Michigan schools vary in how they handle this. For example, Cal Poly only lists the primary major on the diploma and notes second major on the transcript. This would allow those students to do a double major without having to take the extra 32 credits. Lankton said this procedure sounds more reasonable, as it would seem we would want to make it easier for students to complete a double major. Kern said it would be a heavy penalty to require that many additional hours to complete a double major. Lankton said if one degree was listed on the diploma and the additional major on the transcript, they could claim it, and that this would be a better solution to the problem. Keen suggested that the Senate could move to refer the proposal back to committee to accomplish this. Boschetto-Sandoval **moved** the proposal be referred back to the Curricular Policy Committee; Kern seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

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

Keen said that the proposal was redrafted and recirculated and is supported by the Curricular Policy Committee. Snyder **moved** the approval of Proposal 17-09; L. Davis seconded. Luck asked which course would teach about the structure and properties of metal-organic frameworks for the storage of hydrogen. Jason Keith said the fuel cells course covers storage of hydrogen in general, but if there is a specific course Chemistry would like to add to the list of elective courses, it would be welcome. Luck said there is no course that does that. The motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

i. Proposal 19-09: “Ph.D. Program in Applied Cognitive Science and Human Factors and M.S. in Applied Cognitive Science and Human Factors” presented by Senate Officers

Hamlin **moved** approval of Proposal 19-09; Christianson seconded the motion. Keen said the Curricular Policy Committee did not have time to consider this proposal. They have forwarded some of our comments to the proposers, who did not respond because the proposal had already been introduced in the Senate. Baltensperger said he had received the comments from the committee and has made some revisions to address the key concerns: MTU has been replaced by Michigan Tech; the masters degree is noted explicitly in the title of the proposal and described in the proposal; the effective dates have been moved to 2010; a statement on page 8 that a student who failed all sections of the comprehensive exam upon retaking it would be asked to withdraw has been deleted; and a course description for PSY 5910 has been added on page 10.

L. Davis said he met with provost about the question of space for the new program and is now convinced that there is space on campus, but he is still concerned that there are no space costs in the proposal. It is a custom for the University not to hold programs accountable for space costs, but having been on the Finance Committee for 13 years, he feels this is not appropriate as these costs do exist. The Finance Committee is comfortable with the other financial

figures listed in the proposal. He commented that this is a graduate program, and graduate programs don't make money; they have another role to play in the University.

Seel said that the plan is to move this program to the Meese Center; this is an existing building for which the costs of heating, etc., are already covered. We need to apply the same, existing accounting strategies to this program. L. Davis responded that Seel is addressing the equity issue, but financially there will be costs associated with this program. Johnson asked Keen whether the Senate has ever had a proposal for two degrees at once and commented that it's hard to digest the two degrees in one proposal and make a decision on it. Keen replied that usually the masters is proposed first. This proposal is unique, as far as he knows, but the proposers have an argument for starting with the doctoral degree with the masters degree as a safety net. Baltensperger said that his department's preference was simply to have a PhD program, in line with programs at other universities. But the Curricular Policy Committee and the Graduate Faculty Council that we needed to have a back-up if students get a couple years into the program and find they can't or don't want to complete the PhD. He said that they want a PhD program and they don't want to disadvantage students who don't finish a PhD. The Senate strongly urged them to make masters degree explicitly part of the proposal and so they did so. He added that he thinks that Atmospheric Science is an example of a graduate program that doesn't offer a masters degree. Snyder commented that Michigan Tech doesn't give masters as booby prizes. Most PhD programs, he said, don't have required courses, while MS programs do, so in these programs, a PhD student three years into the program would not have fulfilled the requirements for a masters degree. Johnson said that that's what she is concerned about, that the proposal doesn't specify what is required for a masters degree. Baltensperger pointed out the section in the proposal on MS degree requirements that states that "students who wish to terminate their studies after two years may acquire a M.S. degree by completing the core courses and six credits of required research for a 32-credit master's degree." Snyder said that you can't have a back-up masters degree without having a masters degree approved. He also said he didn't see why the two degrees couldn't be proposed in the same document. Luck asked that since they are projecting for new students to begin in 2010, why couldn't the Senate postpone this proposal until fall 2009? Baltensperger said that they've got a core faculty who have been working hard on this. The proposal has already been held up for two years, and he would hate to hold it up over what seem to be procedural and technical issues. Hamlin suggested that the Senate could approve the proposal and amend it next year. Seel said that since the proposal goes to the Board of Control and the state, that would not be a good idea. He said that it was clear in the last meeting that the Senate wanted the masters degree in the title. Storer asks about the status of the new version of the proposal. Sloan ruled that the changes in the proposal are editorial changes. Storer **moved** to approve the amended version of Proposal 19-09; Onder seconded. Snyder proposed striking the words 'en route' in the statement about students who wish to be awarded a master's degree in lieu of the doctorate on page 8; Hamlin seconded the motion; the motion passed on a voice vote with no dissent. Johnson moved that mention of the masters degree be added to the summary section; someone seconded the motion: the motion **passed** on voice vote with no dissent.

L. Davis asked Keen what his committee did and didn't do with this proposal. Keen said they received this proposal last September and were told two weeks later that it was no longer up for consideration, so they dropped it. They received it again on March 11, discussed it very briefly and sent comments to Baltensperger and Seel. The Senate Officers decided to forward the proposal to the Senate. The department of Cognitive Science and Human Factors incorporated changes into the proposal. The Curricular Policy Committee didn't have time to engage in the nitpicking polishing they would normally do, but their major concerns have been addressed. L. Davis asks whether they reviewed the idea of incorporating a masters into this proposal. Keen said the committee thought students might decide to quit at the masters level because the difference in starting salaries between those receiving a masters and those receiving a doctoral degree is so small. L. Davis asks whether the proposal for the masters degree has received enough scrutiny. Keen says the committee was comfortable with offering a masters degree as described. He said that further changes would be editorial; the committee considers this proposal adequate. Storer, also a member of the committee, agreed with this summary. Luck asked Baltensperger why they waited to resubmit the proposal. Baltensperger replied that they didn't know it had been withdrawn. Seel said he resubmitted the proposal as soon as he was aware it was lingering. Hamlin **moved** to call the question; Christianson seconded the motion; the motion to call the question **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Proposal 19-09 **passed** on a voice vote with one dissent.

9. New Business

a. Proposal 20-09: "List of All Academic Programs" presented by the Curricular Policy Committee

Keen said that the only operative part of the proposal is the first page which says that the provost will maintain a list of all programs and update it yearly. The proposal comes from provost's office and registrar's office. The list needs continual updating and there have already been updates to this list. All degrees offered in the past can still be offered even if they are suspended, so the list is helpful in this regard. Comments and questions should go to the Curricular Policy Committee and the provost's office (Helene Hiner). Sloan encouraged all senators to take the proposal back to their departments to check the accuracy of the list of degrees. Hamlin **moved** that this be considered an emergency proposal; Christiansen seconded the motion. Johnson said it would be useful to put all the degree programs listed on the website. Seel said that list is on the website, but it's hard to find. The motion to consider this as an emergency measure **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent. Hamlin **moved** approval of Proposal 20-09; Johnson seconded the motion; the motion **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

10. Adjournment

President Sloan adjourned the meeting at 7:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted
by Marilyn Cooper
Secretary of the University Senate