The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University

Corrected Minutes of Meeting 495
29 September 2010

Synopsis:
The Senate
- Presentation by 2010 Distinguished Teaching Award winner Charles Margraves
- Presentation on issues central to the university's academic mission by Provost Max Seel
- Proposal 1-11, "Parking Policy" was defeated

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 495 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, September 29, 2010. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were Senators from Army/Air Force ROTC, Academic Services B, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment, Advancement, Research, and Student Affairs.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office), William Kennedy (Center for Teaching, Learning and Faculty Development) and Anita Quinn (Human resources).

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

4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 494. Hamlin **moved** approval of the minutes; Snyder **seconded** the motion; there being no changes, Luck declared the minutes stood **approved**.

5. Presentation: "2010 Distinguished Teaching Award Winner" by Dr. Charles Margraves
William Kennedy introduced Dr. Charles Margraves, the winner of the Distinguished Teaching Award. Margraves discussed the wisdom of those who helped him become an effective instructor. He provided a blend of insights ranging from observing experienced teachers to projecting enthusiasm for the subject matter. Margraves provided a few of his own insights, which included establishing positive relationships, being approachable to students and finding good mentors. He made several suggestions regarding the role of the instructor, achieving teaching excellence and successfully running a class. Luck asked why the ME-EM expected Margraves to be an excellent teacher, coming right out of graduate school. Margraves traced his success back to the department chair reducing his initial course load which allowed him the time to seek help from other more experienced professors. Gierke asked how his approach differs between a senior design course and a lecture course. Margraves felt the role in senior design would be analogous to that of a consultant or a guide rather than a teacher. Luck thanked Margraves.

6. Presentation: "Issues for 2010-11 Central to the University's Academic Mission" by Provost Max Seel
Seel started his presentation by noting that the central goal of the university is teaching and research. He quoted Lenora Ashford from the 2009 Academic Affairs Committee Report, '…the philosophical platform for the university operations is academics.' Seel outlined six priorities in service of enhancing the academic mission at Tech: Improving Student Retention and Graduation Rates, Maximizing Campus Space Utilization, Making the Global Vision Real, Taking Costs Out of the Academy/Cost Reduction – Revenue Enhancement, Supporting Faculty Migration to Online and Blended Learning, and Capturing New Professional and Distance Education Markets. He added these items have been identified nationally and as a nationally recognized university it makes sense that Tech should mirror these concerns. Seel detailed each of these six points as they specifically pertain to the university. Moran stated that tightening up admission standards might increase retention rates. Seel noted that the ACT scores of our students are second in the State of Michigan, with the University of Michigan being at the top. Hamlin noted that students who leave Tech have a broad range of GPAs and ACT scores. Seel referenced a study on student retention that showed no correlation between ACT scores and retention rates. Moran asked if the students with lower ACT scores were leaving Tech at the same rate as those students with higher scores. Hamlin stated that a greater percentage of students with lower ACT scores leave. Seel then discussed campus space utilization and the ASPIRE program, which correlates space with costs or revenue. He described the capital outlay priorities which included the Next Generation Energy Complex and the Human Health Research Center. He noted the alignment of these outlays with the strategic faculty hiring initiative (SFHI). Seel then discussed the global vision and the plans being made to realize this vision. He briefly addressed strategies for budgeting and carry-forward in the context of state and other budget tightening. Seel concluded with online and blended learning, adding that continuing and non-traditional education courses are being discussed. Barkdoll asked what factors are motivating the move to online and blended learning. Seel said convenience for on-campus students, making information available to co-op students and training programs down-state. He defined blended learning as online preparation to use classroom time more effectively. Moran recalled prior data showing percentage of academic versus nonacademic expenditures. Seel stated the two biggest factors were financial aid and Institutional Research and Development Funds (IRAD). Moran asked if nonacademic expenditures were still growing relative to academic expenditures. Seel said he is paying attention to that. Gierke asked what we are doing to determine the factors involved in student retention. Seel stated this is being addressed through advising. He added that retention studies from a few years ago focused on academic qualifications and changing majors. Luck added that surveys were given to people who left the university but he did not know the results. Seel said the retention rate is about 80% and may be due to early intervention, advising, and new programs. He added that it is our responsibility to work towards the success of any student we admit. Seel noted academic failure was only one factor. Gierke asked about departmental mentoring plans for new faculty. Seel said all the mentoring plans are being collected and will appear

on the provost website. Caneba asked about ASPIRE and the use of the term sponsored research dollars. Seel said ASPIRE permits a department at Tech to be compared to similar departments at other institutions to get a sense of how space is being used. Luck noted ASPIRE was originally used at the University of Michigan to enhance the use of teaching space. He then thanked the provost for his presentation.

7. Report from the Senate President
Luck noted an image from the 2010 research award winner appears on the senate website. He provided a list of scheduled senate presentations for the 2010-11 academic year. Luck noted that Storer is the Graduate Faculty Council representative from the senate. He pointed out the representatives from the graduate (DePew) and undergraduate student government (Riutta). Luck then requested that the current procedures and policies website be used to find the policies under which the senate currently functions. Luck made it clear that all approved documents are unchanged to avoid the temptation to supersede policies with updated policies, so each will appear in its original form. Luck presented the BOC agenda for the upcoming meeting and provided a brief summary of what he will be discussing. He closed with the comment regarding the uniqueness of the university environment as being defined by those who work for it. Luck cited the emerging risk of administrative centralization where the faculty and staff are informed of decisions, as opposed to participating in the decision-making process.

8. Report from Senate Standing Committees
Barkdoll, Research Policy Committee, has some questions for Provost Seel regarding the start-up task force. Seel added that any executive liaison will come and speak to a given committee or with the full senate if so requested. He added that he will be discussing the task force report at the next senate meeting.

Onder, Elections Committee, said there are multiple nominations for the Athletic Council and the Committee on Academics, Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment (CATPR) has one nominee and requires more.

9. Old Business
Proposal 1-11: "Parking Policy"
Kangas, Institutional Policy Committee, introduced the current status of the proposal. He provided a summary of constituency feedback. The committee concluded an immediate solution was needed. Kangas stated the current action is that all faculty and staff parking lots will be available to all non-student employees. Kangas added that an enforcement officer was hired and fees were raised for parking violations. He added Proposal 1-11 will not be pursued. He concluded by stating that the DPS solution was accepted by the IPC. Hamlin felt we now have time to work on a long-term solution. Luck asked if difficulties in parking still existed since implementation of this new plan. Scarlett asked if towing was discussed. Kangas stated the committee did not discuss that. Scarlett asked Kangas to express some sentiment to the DPS director about towing illegally parked cars. Luck agreed that a long term solution should be explored and wanted to hear if people still had parking problems at the next senate meeting. Snyder inquired about the comments IPC received. Riutta said students are incurring full lots. Luck clarified that such a problem is not due to faculty because faculty are not allowed in commuter or student lots. Caneba commented on the lack of spots in Lot 3 due to the new handicapped spots and he is parking in metered lots at times. Kangas noted this plan is a first step and may not be the last word. Koszykowski asked if some of this problem was caused by the new handicapped spots. Luck defined the criteria to park in the handicapped spot. Soner noted his department felt the current solution would create bigger problems. Onder **moved** to defeat Proposal 1-11, Scarlett **seconded** the motion; it was **defeated** unanimously on a voice vote.

10. New Business
There was no new business.

Adjournment. Hamlin **moved** to adjourn; Storer seconded the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:59pm

Respectfully submitted
by Marty Thompson
Secretary of the University Senate