

**The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 509
21 September 2011

Synopsis:

The Senate

- Presentation of the Carl Walker Report on Parking
- Presentation by Dr. Brian Barkdoll, 2011 Teaching Award Winner

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 509 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, September 21, 2011. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were representatives of Biomedical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Physics, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment, IT and Staff Council.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office), Matthew Inman (Carl Walker, Inc.), Anita Quinn (Human Resources), Jacqueline Huntoon (Graduate School), William Kennedy (CTFLD), Margo Woller-Carter (Graduate Student Government) and Maria Schutte (School of Business).

3. Approval of agenda. Luck asked if there were any changes; there being none Luck declared the agenda stood **approved**.

4. Approval of minutes from Meetings 508. Luck asked if there were any changes; there being none Luck declared the minutes for meeting 508 stood **approved**.

5. Presentation: “Carl Walker Report on Parking”

Rudiger, Institutional Planning Committee, introduced Matthew Inman of Carl Walker, Inc. who presented a draft of their report on parking. Inman discussed the scope, future needs and planning elements of the report. He discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the university's current parking situation and provided a cost-revenue analysis of the current parking system. Bulleit stated that employee parking for a business is a cost of doing business, whereas universities seem to want to charge their employees. Inman responded by discussing parking costs at other universities. Mullins noted that the Colorado School of Mines pays for \$250 for parking but nothing for healthcare, which is giving your employees a perk. He noted that with no raises in three years and none in sight, combined with increases in healthcare and benefit costs, it would be a considerate act for the administration to provide a modest benefit of free parking in light of multiple benefit changes. Mullins asked what snow removal costs. Inman estimated costs for different parking schemes. Luck noted that Carl Walker, Inc. was also hired in 2001, had produced a report based on visiting the campus last Spring which concluded that we needed to hire 6 more people to staff a parking office and buy new parking meters which would add an additional \$300,000 to the parking costs, only raise \$100,000 in revenue, had several months to examine the issue and now the consultant had returned looking for more comments before issuing a final report. Luck inquired as to if the Parking consultant was being paid to providing psychological advice to the campus. Storer asked if the recommendation was to establish parking fees and increase those fees until costs balance. Inman affirmed this and said his initial recommendation was \$120 per permit and escalating the fee until the break-even point. He added that the long-term goal was to generate a surplus from parking fees to establishing a reserve fund for future costs, constructions, etc. Onder noted the parking problem is an allocation and location problem, yet the recommendations do not seem to address this. Inman examined the allocation and recommended a lot specific plan, where a person buys the space. He noted that faculty and staff strongly preferred flexibility rather than being limited to a single lot, whereas students would have lot-specific parking. Caneba asked if we could come up with a smart system for parking. Inman described some new technologies, but noted they all come with undesired and unwanted cost increases. Luck thanked Inman.

6. Presentation: “2011 Michigan Tech Teaching Award Winner - Dr. Brian Barkdoll”

Kennedy introduced Barkdoll, who proceeded to give a brief presentation about the elements of effective teaching. He then proceeded to give a true-false quiz to the senate with insightful and entertaining anecdotes. Barkdoll concluded the informal discussion by asking the senate if we accomplished our learning objectives. Luck thanked Barkdoll.

6. Report from the Senate President

Luck informed the senate of an upcoming Board of Control presentation noting that all presentations are archived on the senate website. He gave a brief overview of the upcoming presentation and asked for input. Luck noted the senate blog contains multiple responses to his request for suggestions on what might make the senate better. He addressed each response. Luck discussed the current list of proposals under consideration or up for committee action. Mullins clarified that Proposal 1-12 was a modification of a proposal from last year. Luck addressed a comment about “fluff” in the senate agenda. He stated that inviting teaching and research awardees is a primary duty of the senate, which is defined by the sums of the reputations of the faculty and staff that comprise our institution. Luck concluded by noting some of the issues being considered by the benefits liaison group, including sick leave and parking fees.

7. Report from Senate Standing Committees

None.

8. Old Business

None.

9. New Business

Proposal 1-12 : “Proposal to Modify Senate Policy 413.1: Accelerated Master’s Programs”

Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, noted this was a modification of last years accelerated masters programs. The key change being to add research degrees to the accelerated master's program. Specific changes include, applying up to three research credits taken in the senior year applicable to the graduate degree, programs may set their own entry standards, so long as certain minimum standards are met and modifies the reporting requirements of the dean of the graduate school. Storer added that students can enroll in the program in their sophomore year. He noted the finance committee had a question regarding how many students this program will impact. Current data indicate that the policy resulted in a revenue loss of \$495K and to compensate for this loss an additional 33 students are needed. The data assumes that each of the 132 Tech students accepted into graduate programs took the 24 credits rather than 30, and did not separate students based on coursework only or research-based degree. Mullins clarified that by expanding the accelerated program to include both research and coursework only options, it would increase the likelihood of getting the additional 33 students. Storer affirmed that presumption. Onder asked about the enrollment numbers for the accelerated option. Storer said the accelerated degrees apply to existing programs already approved by the graduate school and that he was not aware of any that have been approved. Luck asked about the financial impact of students taking the accelerated programs. Storer affirmed that we would need to increase the number of students to approximately 165 to compensate for the revenue loss. Luck asked for enrollment numbers from recent years. Storer said 2010 enrollment of our own undergraduates was down by 16 from the previous year. Mullins felt the added option would increase the likelihood of making up the revenue loss.

Proposal 2-12: “Graduate Appeals of Suspension or Dismissal”

Kampe, Instructional Policy Committee, noted that proposals 2-12 through 4-12 were received from the graduate faculty council and reflect existing procedures that have no formal policy in place. Kampe described how appeals will be implemented and administered.

Proposal 3-12: “Graduate Good Academic Standing and Dismissal”

Kampe, Instructional Policy Committee, said this proposal defines good academic standing for graduate students. Students still need to maintain 3.0 GPA to remain in good standing or be subject to dismissal.

Proposal 4-12: “Graduate Scholastic Standards”

Kampe, Instructional Policy Committee, formalizes into policy existing procedures. This will define the standard that students need a B or better to be in good standing.

Proposal 5-12 : “Graduate Grievances”

Kampe, Instructional Policy Committee, noted this was the only new proposal, in the sense that it does not reflect a formalization of an existing process. He discussed the criteria and how it will be implemented. Luck asked if different departments have their own procedures, then how will handling grievances be standardized. Huntoon said exclusions to this policy would be those existing policies designated for specific issues. Siegel clarified that graduate students must have exhausted other avenues before approaching the graduate school. Barkdoll asked if approved these would be senate policies. Luck clarified that if approved by the senate, these proposals would be formalized into procedures, which is then sent back to the committee for final approval. Scarlett asked if graduate students are not currently covered by a grievance policy. Huntoon said no grievance process exists right now. Seel said the current grievance policies only apply to undergraduates and this new policy addresses situations unique to graduate students. Luck asked how many grievances are filed. Huntoon estimated about five per year. Bulleit noted that Proposal 3-12 allows a student to be on probation for 2 semesters yet one semester to return to good-standing. Huntoon noted the policies reflect existing procedures. She stated that exceptions might be made if the department has a plan in place and the student is making progress. Bulleit noted that was not specifically stated. Herbig noted that the term *'makes good progress'* can be interpreted differently. Huntoon said this proposal leaves in interpretive flexibility to individual programs. Herbig asked if these ideas should be stated specifically, rather than written in such vague terms. Huntoon asked Kampe if we could clarify such terms or provide examples. Kampe said the committee will make some clarifications. Luck noted that the student will still be on probation under the academic suspension and asked how many students fit this category. Huntoon estimated about 15 per year. Luck asked the senate to discuss the new proposals amongst constituents.

10. Adjournment. Onder **moved** to adjourn; Storer **seconded** the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:45pm

Respectfully submitted
by Marty Thompson
Secretary of the University Senate