

**The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 500
19 January 2011

Synopsis:
The Senate

- Presentation: "Change to Centralized Computing Services" by Walt Milligan
- Proposal 7-11 passed

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 500 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, January 19, 2011. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent was Senator Koszykowski and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Academic Services A, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment, Admissions, Advancement, IT, Student Affairs and GSG.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office) and Walt Milligan (Office of Information Technology).

3. Approval of agenda. Hamlin **motioned** to approve the agenda; Clancey **seconded**; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 499. Luck asked if there were any changes; there being none Luck declared the minutes stood **approved**.

5. Presentation: "[Change to Centralized Computing Services](#)" by Walt Milligan

Luck introduced Milligan, Chief Information Officer, who discussed the problems and solutions as campus information technology (IT) services evolve. Hamlin felt a user-support person might be frustrated by not having input in the proposed organizational model. Milligan said the slide referred to the reporting structure and the different areas will be working together and interconnected to avoid such problems. Seel noted governance structures are needed to make the proposed IT model work. Hyslop asked how hardware and software purchasing decisions will be made for student labs. Milligan said those decisions will be made with input from departmental liaisons and IT will give departments what they need. Hamlin asked about the net effect of getting rid of access fees in conjunction with a proposed increase in tuition and fees. Milligan said the change is not revenue neutral; there is a net increase. He made it a point of emphasis to state he is not recreating the central IT systems of the 90's. Onder noted most universities do not follow a fully centralized IT model, but also have departmental support personnel. Milligan cited several universities that have fully centralized IT models. Onder noted that when he was a student, University of Pittsburgh had both central IT and departmental resources to accommodate students. Milligan speculated that the additional IT support staff were paid from indirect costs associated with research. Seigel said her constituency felt that changes are being rushed and they did not get adequate time to provide input. Milligan stated that service was most important and added that Javier Fernandez will assess user responsiveness. Cooper wondered why IT could not take the time needed to make the changes properly and without complications. Milligan said the timeframe was not important because bumps will happen regardless of when the changes are made. Storer noted the impact on employees and wondered what the buy-in was for them. Milligan noted the IT staff was initially nervous, but now are excited about the changes because they better match individual skill sets. Gierke asked under whose auspices the online conferencing falls. Milligan recognized this as an area that needs work. Seel noted the library was part of this solution, and discussions center on the increase in digital media and networked conference rooms. Gierke felt infrastructure was not a problem, but rather the bandwidth capacity and updated software required to use all these services was in question. Milligan said he is aware of these problems. Gierke asked when this would be done. Milligan said the boxes are fluid and the process is evolving. Luck thanked Milligan.

6. Report from the Senate President

Luck listed the recent senate-approved proposals the administration has approved. He noted the presentation made at the December Board of Control (BoC) meeting is available online. We are awaiting the appointment of two new members to the BoC. Luck informed the senate that human resources met with the Administrative Policy Committee (APC) to discuss the mechanism by which proposals relevant to establishing University policies and related procedures will be handled. The Senate Executive also deliberated on this and, additionally, the Senate officers discussed the matter with the Provost. It was decided that all proposals which fall under the domain of University policies and related procedures and are approved by the Senate and the Administration will be sent to HR for them to draft the policy following their established template design. This draft policy will then be returned to the Senate Committee where it originated so that accuracy regarding meaning and intent will be assured. The policy should reference the Senate Proposal of origin in the appendices section. He then thanked the committees for all their hard work.

7. Report from Senate Standing Committees

Kangas, Institutional Planning Committee, said Carl Walker, Inc. won the bid to assess MTU parking. He added that the open lot approach has been working well and the number of tickets has gone down significantly. Onder, Elections Committee, sought nominations from the senators for vice-president.

8. Old Business

Proposal 7-11: "Minor in Fish Biology"

Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, recapped his prior description by noting it required no new courses or costs. The minor was previously listed as an area of concentration. Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

9. New Business

Proposal 8-11: “Proposal to Change Degree Title”, Proposal 9-11: “Proposal to Change Degree Title” and Proposal 10-11: “Proposal to Change Degree Title”

Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, described proposals 8-11, 9-11 and 10-11 and asked they be considered together as they are all changes to degree titles. Luck asked the senators to inform their constituency about these proposals.

Proposal 11-11: “Electrical Engineering Technology – Minor in Data Acquisition and Industrial Control” Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, described the course requirements and electives that constitute this minor. He noted that no new courses are required. Luck stated the proposal was sent to the finance committee. Herbig, Finance Committee, said he has not yet seen the proposal. Luck asked Herbig if the committee could meet and provide their insights to the senate. If additional time was required for the Finance committee to examine the proposal, the Senate would wait until this was completed and not vote on this proposal at the next meeting.

Proposal 12-11: “Modification to Sick Leave Policy in Faculty Handbook”

Luokkanen, Fringe Benefits Committee, characterized the changes in wording as primarily to update the policy to make it consistent with other current policies. She provided several examples where the existing language is in conflict and the appropriate corrections. Hamlin noted that this proposal was initiated by HR so the sick leave policy will be in compliance with other leave policies.

Revised Proposal 6-11: “Proposal to Establish University-wide Procedures to Search for, Hire, and Evaluate the Performance of a Departmental Chair or School Dean”

Caneba, Administrative Policy Committee, detailed the development of this proposal over time and noted several key changes to the search and evaluation of chairs and deans of schools. He noted the flexibility built into this version of the proposal. Caneba proceeded to discuss some of the revisions to voting. Storer asked about the confusing language defining the interim dean of schools. He also noted under dean search, there is no mechanisms for appointment of an interim as defined for department chairs. Storer added the chair search description seems to have inconsistent wording in two different sections. In reference to this, Moran asked whether an open search or internal search was the intent of the committee. Luck said the intent was the type of search was at the discretion of that particular dean. The wording was clarified to give the dean the ability to make a determination regarding a chair search. Moran asked for clarification about the term length and the mandatory search at six years. Luck clarified the means by which the dean would make the decision on the type of search and provided a few scenarios. Moran asked if a search was required if the dean does not seek a new chair. Luck said no. Snyder said the intent is there must be a search at six years and it is not an automatic reappointment for the current chair. Luck affirmed this and noted that this provides a mechanism for other faculty members seeking the chair position to do so. He noted this is not the case for interim chair. Barkdoll asked the procedure for voting on this proposal. Luck noted that the wording clarifications will be made and the intent is to vote on this proposal at the next meeting. Luck espoused this as an improvement over current charter guidelines for chair evaluations and reappointments. He added there was a great deal of input and the proposal is ready to be voted on. Scarlett noted changes can be made. Irwin asked about dean of school search committee composition. Caneba stated that those details could be defined in the departmental document. Moran asked for clarification. Storer gave a scenario in which the dean makes a decision about the chair search at the end of the second term. Snyder cited an example where the approach defined by this proposal would be useful to others seeking the chair position. Moran confirmed there is a mandatory search at the end of two terms. Luck acknowledged the language defining the mandatory search creates a different impression than intended. Moran noted the multiple uses of the word search, which is defined in the same document and implies another action. Luck reiterated that it was only if the dean wanted a search. Scarlett noted the goal was not to add to the workload of departments. Luck sought comments to make final changes to the proposal so it could be distributed and voted on at the next meeting.

Revised Proposal 5-11: “Redefining Departmental Governance”

Scarlett, Academic Policy Committee, noted there were no changes except for item number 8, which he proceeded to describe. This section related to details that individual unit charters can and should address. Storer sought a wording change in section II. Scarlett said the change would be considered. Luck made the change.

10. Adjournment. Hamlin **moved** to adjourn; Clancey **seconded** the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:46pm

Respectfully submitted
by Marty Thompson
Secretary of the University Senate