

**The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 516
15 February 2012

Synopsis:

- Presentation on “Undergraduate Student Government” by Lucia Gregorakis
- Presentation on “Update on AQIP” presented by Associate Provost Christa Walck
- Presentation on Proposal 12-12: “BS in Engineering Management” by Dean Darrell Radson

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 516 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, February 15, 2012. The Senate Secretary Brian Barkdoll called roll. Absent were representatives of Biomedical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Physics, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrich., Advancement, Staff Council, and Graduate Faculty Council.

Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel and Christa Walck (Provost Office), Darrell Radson and Thomas Merz (School of Business and Economics), Keshon Moorehead and Eli Korttuen (Undergraduate Student Government), and Rhianna Williams (Library).

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

3. Approval of minutes from Meetings 515. Luck asked if there were any changes; there being none Luck declared the minutes stood approved.

4. Presentation: “Undergraduate Student Government” by Lucia Gregorakis

Issues were presented. The students decided that Thanksgiving break should be kept the way it is and not shortened. Regarding final exams, the question was raised as to whether or not the Friday of Finals Week was needed if there are not many final exams on that day. It was also suggested that accommodations be made for students having 3 exams on one day. A suggestion was made that mandatory midterm course evaluations be administered to aid teachers in improvement. In regards to the web site ratemyprofessors.com it was thought that it does not truly reflect the teaching quality and, therefore, should not be given much consideration. The idea of having a standard curriculum with a uniform grading scale was brought up to help homogenize all the students’ experiences for each course section. In addition, more grading increments were requested. It was also requested that non-degree courses not have prerequisite courses and be retroactive. Johnson stated that each department had the choice as to whether to require prerequisites or not. Seel stated that there can be a problem if a student changes from non-degree seeking to degree seeking if they have not had the prerequisite courses and that he will investigate. Gregorakis went on to say that there is a drive for student voter registration for the US Presidential Election through various activities. Vable asked how we can combat the negative publicity by ratemyprofessors.com. Gregorakis stated that it is not necessary since students don’t care. Breffle stated that we could publish the existing course evaluations instead. Vable said that they used to be published but that there were privacy concerns but that we could publish by department or without a professor’s name attached. Breffle raised the concern that the ratemyprofessors.com web site had more professors listed than were currently employed at Michigan Tech so it was not accurate. Seel stated that some professors listed were retired. Scarlett asked what grading increments the students had in mind. Gregorakis reemphasized the need for more increments, no matter how it was done. Mullins asked if the students will publish the salary book. The students replied that they were working on it. Seel said that there are state regulations regarding the publishing of salary amounts.

5. Presentation: “Update on AQIP” presented by Associate Provost Christa Walck

Walck gave the URL of AQIP info www.mtu.edu/aqip including the [schedule](#) for when evaluators are here and names of evaluators. All faculty and staff are invited to the open session. She also reviewed a handout entitled “[AQIP 101 for Faculty](#)” that should be used by faculty to familiarize themselves with the Michigan Tech AQIP process for the upcoming accreditation visit. She emphasized that AQIP focuses on processes and improvements and quality feedback changes. She encouraged us to know what assessment you do before the AQIP visit. Luck

asked about the information given by departments on assessment goals and activities. Walck stated that they are not currently on the AQIP web site since they are being reviewed by the Assessment Council, which has building a framework for university assessment and learning goals. Mullins raised concern that mostly community colleges use AQIP. Walck stated that continuous improvement which AQIP requires is better than the former system in which we tended to wait until year 7 in a 10 year cycle to start our self-study. However, after this visit we can consider changing to a different method of accreditation.

6. Reports

a. Senate President

Luck welcomed new senate members Jeremy Goldman and Keat G. Ong from Biomedical Engineering and Shane Sullivan from IT. He then gave an overview of the senate web site and the location of the previously-submitted Board Of Control report submitted already.

b. Senate Standing Committees

The Elections Committee stated that 339 ballots were sent out, out of which one third responded electing Mohan Rao and Zhang-Ping You to the Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee.

c. Provost

No report.

7) Old Business:

a. [Proposal 11-12](#): “Evaluation Procedure for the University Senate” presented by Senator Madhu Vable

Changes are still being made. Will wait until changes are made to vote on it.

b. [Proposal 12-12](#): “BS in Engineering Management” presented by Dean Darrell Radson

Vable proposed changing the language to read: “Currently there is only one similar curriculum focusing on the design and management of engineering systems which is offered though the Bachelor of Science in Engineering program.” Luck stated that it is not that similar and has already been checked. Gierke said that even with the proposed change it will not change the committee’s mind. Luck said that if we list this program, then we will have to list all similar programs. Luck called for a vote on the suggested amended language, which **passed**. Mullins stated that the proposal is not ready because the courses suggested by the Chemical Engineering Department are not included and that some listed courses are not offered anymore. He asked if anyone has checked to see if all proposed courses are still available. Gierke stated that his department’s comments were adopted and that all department chairs had been asked for feedback. Radson said that he had talked to the Dean of Engineering and Associate Dean Bohmann and got suggestions from them, but that it is possible to still add electives. Seel said that changing courses will go through the binder process. Radson said that a liaison to work with departments will be appointed. Irwin expressed concern that there are degrees in Mechanical Engineering Technology and Electrical Engineering Technology and asked if there was overlap with the proposed program. Mullins stated that he talked with Bohmann and he also recommended ABET accreditation for the proposed program. Seel stated that the proposed program is designed for a business focus and that it is good for this purpose. Luck called for a vote and the proposal **passed**.

8) New Business:

a. [Proposal 13-12](#): “Constitution Change”

Luokkanen introduced the proposal describing the redistribution of senators. Kinesiology and Integrative Psychology will be considered academic for senate purposes. Velat expressed concern that athletic coaches were being removed from the senate and asked if they were aware of this fact. Luck stated that post-doctoral associates should not be part of the senate due to their temporary nature and coaches are also temporary so they should be removed. Velat asked if that meant that we should eliminate all short contract people. Luck stated that they were never included. Velat asked if we were setting a bad precedent. Luck stated that he wasn’t sure how many people were involved and that this was not necessarily a precedent for the removal of soft-money people. Further, it gives more representation for other members, but the issue can be discussed. Velat expressed concern that there might be a group of staff that is not represented by the union or the senate. Velat proposed to include coaches in the senate. Luck stated that the proposal is to remove “non-academic” but that might include coaches. Scarlet stated that the coaches should be asked before altering the proposal language. Riehl agreed. Luck stated that the coaches’ representative was already consulted but will be asked to talk about this at the next senate meeting. The question was asked if coaches also teach. Seel replied that coaches are considered 10-20% for teaching. Barr stated that some coaches have been in their position a long time. Velat expressed concern that even if coaches do not express

interest in being represented in the senate, they would be talking for all future coaches. Luck said that he had no objection to reinstating coaches and that it will be discussed at the next meeting at which a vote will be taken.

b. [Proposal 14-12](#): “Minor in Global Business”

Radson stated the purpose was to increase international awareness and competency. Merz gave an overview of the proposed minor stating that their accreditation team looked at international issues. Seigel asked if students can do more or other experiences abroad than the proposed minor requirements. Merz replied in the affirmative. Velat asked if other international experiences outside Michigan Tech also qualified, to which Merz replied not now, but that it can be considered for the future. Radson said that the idea is to get credit for it. Luck asked for comments from the Curricular Policy Committee and Finance Committee but received none.

9. Adjournment.

Onder **moved** to adjourn. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:45pm.

Respectfully submitted

by Brian Barkdoll

Secretary of the University Senate