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This template is meant to assist unit chairs/deans with the periodic review of the qualifications of each of their graduate faculty-eligible members as per Section 1.5.3 “Graduate Faculty Status” of the Faculty Handbook. Completed forms will be reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School and will be used to update the listing of eligible Graduate Faculty.

This review shall take place every 6 years from the start of the member’s eligible status as graduate faculty. To retain the status of Graduate Faculty, the unit chair/dean must circle at least one item in Section 1 and one item in Section 2 related to the faculty member under review.

1. Qualifications of Graduate Faculty. Does the faculty member under review meet one or more of the following criteria? (Circle all that apply.)

   a. Possesses experience and continued interest in the conduct of research.

   b. Has the necessary background for, and a continued interest in, teaching graduate courses.

   c. Has continuing interest in serving as a graduate student advisor.

2. Evidence of Qualifications. Does the faculty member under review meet one or more of the following criteria? (Circle all that apply.)

   a. Is currently involved in research work or graduate instruction or in advising graduate students.

   b. Regularly publishes articles in recognized journals having national distribution or books related to their field of study.

   c. Has earned the terminal degree in his/her field.

Response by reviewee:

Faculty members should indicate in writing below whether or not they concur with the unit chair’s/dean’s review. If the faculty member does not concur, the member should support their argument with reasons, providing relevant evidence.
1.5.3 Graduate Faculty Status

A. Membership

The Graduate Faculty consists of tenured and tenure-track members of the academic faculty holding the rank of ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, or PROFESSOR who have been appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. Tenured and tenure-track faculty who are awarded EMERITUS status upon retirement remain members of the Graduate Faculty.

The Dean of the Graduate School may also grant graduate faculty status to others with an on-going professional relationship with Michigan Tech, including RESEARCH, PART-TIME, VISITING, or ADJUNCT faculty members, LECTURERS and INSTRUCTORS, RESEARCH ENGINEERS, and RESEARCH SCIENTISTS.

Under special circumstances, the graduate dean may appoint individuals with special technical expertise to the Graduate Faculty for a specific term and purpose, such as serving as a member of a student's advisory committee.

Graduate faculty members are eligible to teach graduate courses (5000 level and above), serve as examining members on Masters and PhD committees, and supervise Masters and PhD students.

Persons who are not members of the Graduate Faculty may teach 5000 and 6000 level courses only after obtaining written approval from the Dean of the Graduate School.

B. Qualifications of Graduate Faculty

1. Qualifications expected for graduate faculty appointment:
   a. Experience and continued interest in the conduct of research.
   b. The necessary background for, and a continued interest in, teaching graduate courses.
   c. Continued interest in serving as a graduate student advisor.

2. Evidence of Qualifications
Faculty may meet the qualification requirements if they:

a. Are currently involved in research work or graduate instruction or in advising graduate students.

b. Regularly publish articles in recognized journals having national distribution or books related to their field of study.

c. Have earned the terminal degree in their field.

C. Appointment Procedures

Graduate Faculty appointment and retention decisions are made by the Dean of the Graduate School with recommendations and advice from department chairs, deans of colleges and schools, and the Graduate Faculty Council.

Recommendation for Graduate Faculty status is made in writing by the department chair of the appropriate academic unit or by the dean of the appropriate School. These recommendations are forwarded to the college dean, where appropriate, and then to the Graduate Dean.

D. Review of Graduate Faculty

It is expected that department chairs/school deans will continually review the performance of all individuals holding graduate faculty status in their respective units using criteria outlined in Section B above.

When, in a department chair/school dean's professional judgment, a faculty member holding a graduate faculty appointment is no longer satisfactorily functioning in this capacity, s/he must recommend that the individual in question be removed from graduate faculty status. The Dean of the Graduate School may also initiate the removal process in consultation with the appropriate chair/dean. The Dean of the Graduate School will act on recommendations with the advice and consent of the Graduate Faculty Council.
Prerequisites for graduate students

Background information:
- Prerequisites have not been checked for graduate students for several years
- Prerequisites are included in the course description (in the catalog and online) as background information only; students are expected to police themselves and make sure they are prepared for a course, but that often is not the case
- Academic misconduct cases have increased recently for graduate students, often because students do not have the prerequisite knowledge to be successful in a course
- In the last few years, two different programs (MBA and MEEM) have asked to have the prereqs checked for their students
  - Students in these programs are checked for prerequisites for all of their courses, even undergraduate level courses
  - Students in other majors can take a MEEM course without being checked for prereqs

Additional Information:
- Prerequisites are checked based on student level, not course level
- Departments may also restrict registration in a course by including or excluding by
  - Major
  - College
  - Student level
- When prerequisite checking is turned on, the process checks the prereqs on all courses the student registers for, even if it’s an undergraduate course
- Graduate level courses should have graduate level prerequisites
- Need to decide on what the minimum grade should be for prereqs (B or C?); students can get a prerequisite waiver if they do not have the minimum grade
Update on Graduate Program Review

The Graduate School has been working to take the guidelines for Graduate Program Review (approved by the GFC on October 21, 2010) and update them so that it is clear how they align with the University Learning Goals, University Strategic Plan, and guidance regarding assessment provided to the University by the Higher Learning Commission. This will be helpful for communication with our accreditation authority.

One thing that has become clear (and is not surprising) is that for PhD students, the Qualifying Exam, Proposal Defense, Final Oral Defense, and Dissertation are key elements in the assessment of PhD students.

PhD Student Goals:

1) Disciplinary knowledge (measured by the Qualifying Exam)
2) Ability to design a research project (Proposal Defense)
3) Ability to conduct research (Final Oral Exam and Dissertation)
4) Ability to communicate the results of research orally and in writing (Final Oral Exam and Dissertation)

In addition to these university-wide goals for PhD students there may also be program specific goals.

On the following page you will find some draft rubrics that could be used by faculty (and potentially others) to assess student learning outcomes at the Proposal Defense, Final Oral Defense, and Dissertation stages (prepared by Alex Guth).

We are interested in receiving feedback on these rubrics from the GFC.
Please evaluate the written document on the following criteria, using the attached rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lumina</th>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Comm. fluency</strong></td>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: Quality of language use to communicate meaning and control over errors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Comm. fluency</strong></td>
<td>Organization &amp; Conventions: Clear and consistent organizational pattern and structuring elements including introduction, thesis and main points, conclusion, and transitions; follows formal and informal rules of genre or disciplinary expectations about organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3b: Info Resources</strong></td>
<td>Sources and Evidence: Uses a variety of quality sources and acknowledges different views to support ideas appropriate for discipline and genre of writing (e.g., citation styles); may use data to support observations and draw conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3a: Analytic Inquiry</strong></td>
<td>Proposes Solutions/Models/Hypotheses: Ability to propose and evaluate questions, solutions, models, and/or hypotheses related to a problem or a description of a natural phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1: Specialized Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Content Development: Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop ideas, situate ideas in a disciplinary context, and shape the work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2: Integrative Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Thinking Innovatively: Creating and applying significant ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column1</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Syntax and Mechanics:</strong> Quality of language use to communicate meaning and control over errors</td>
<td>Shows some understanding of writing basics but errors distract from meaning.</td>
<td>Shows understanding of writing basics and conveys meaning although may have noticeable errors.</td>
<td>Shows competent use of writing to clearly convey meaning with few errors.</td>
<td>Shows skillful use of writing to communicate meaning with clarity, fluency, and virtually error-free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization &amp; Conventions:</strong> Clear and consistent organizational pattern and structuring elements including introduction, thesis and main points, conclusion, and transitions; follows formal and informal rules of genre or disciplinary expectations about organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.</td>
<td>Develops unclear or inconsistent organizational pattern; shows little awareness of genre and disciplinary conventions.</td>
<td>Develops organizational pattern unevenly; follows disciplinary or task expectations at a basic level of understanding.</td>
<td>Develops recognizable organizational pattern that structures the whole work; uses disciplinary or task conventions consistently.</td>
<td>Develops organizational pattern that enhances flow and cohesiveness through the whole work; demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of disciplinary or task conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and Evidence:</strong> Uses a variety of quality sources and acknowledges different views to support ideas appropriate for discipline and genre of writing (e.g., citation styles); may use data to support observations and draw conclusions</td>
<td>Demonstrates minimal support for ideas in the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources.</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources.</td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, diverse, and relevant sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposes Solutions/Models/Hypotheses:</strong> Ability to propose and evaluate questions, solutions, models, and/or hypotheses related to a problem or a description of a natural phenomenon.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a basic understanding of the problem or phenomenon, but is unable to provide even a superficial approach to solve the problem, or to understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern discipline—specific frameworks.</td>
<td>As appropriate to the given problem or phenomenon, is able to provide an appropriate solution, model, or hypothesis to solve the problem or understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern disciplinary frameworks. Carries out only superficial or workmanlike solutions, perhaps incorrectly. Is able to pose basic original questions about phenomena.</td>
<td>As appropriate to the given problem or phenomenon, is able to provide an appropriate solution, model, or hypothesis to solve the problem or understand or conceptualize the phenomenon within modern disciplinary frameworks. Carries out correct analysis to solve the problem or evaluate models and/or hypotheses, is able to pose insightful original questions about phenomena.</td>
<td>Proposes one or more solutions, models, or hypotheses indicating a deep understanding of the problem or phenomenon. Carries out correct, detailed solution or discipline—specific analysis to completion, with awareness of limiting factors based on approximations and/or assumptions. Poses insightful original questions about phenomena, and can articulate a reasoned approach for further investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Development:</strong> Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop ideas, situate ideas in a disciplinary context, and shape the work</td>
<td>Demonstrates simplistic development of content in some parts of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate development of ideas and disciplinary context through most of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates compelling ideas and subject development through the whole work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates subject mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking Innovatively:</strong> Creating and applying significant ideas</td>
<td>Reformulates a collection of available ideas.</td>
<td>Experiments with generating a significant or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Creates a significant idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td>Extends a significant idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral Presentation Evaluation (for everyone in attendance at presentation)

Student Name:____________________________

Program:_________________________________

Defense date:______________________________

Student Level: (MS, PhD)

I am a…. (Faculty in program; faculty outside program; committee member; student)

Please evaluate the oral presentation on the following criteria, using the attached rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lumina</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery &amp; Composure</strong>: Posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness; impression of composure and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pattern</strong>: Clear, consistent and recognizable structure (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, use of transitions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aids</strong>: Visible, attractive, and comprehensible visual display materials support major points or themes; appropriate to situation; design and handling add to effectiveness of presentation and speaker’s credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e: Comm. fluency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation of Issues</strong>: Clear and comprehensive communication of issues or problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3d: Quant. fluency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong>: Ability to explain information that is presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3b: Info. Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong>: Critical analysis or synthesis of information from a variety of sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery &amp; Composure:</strong> Posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness; impression of composure and confidence</td>
<td>Detract from the understandability of the presentation or speaker appears uncomfortable</td>
<td>Makes the presentation understandable or speaker appears tentative</td>
<td>Makes the presentation interesting and speaker appears composed</td>
<td>Makes the presentation compelling and speaker appears polished and confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Pattern:</strong> Clear, consistent and recognizable structure (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, use of transitions)</td>
<td>Is not recognizable</td>
<td>Is intermittently recognizable</td>
<td>Is clear and consistent</td>
<td>Enhances the content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Aids:</strong> Visible, attractive, and comprehensible visual display materials support major points or themes; appropriate to situation; design and handling add to effectiveness of presentation and speaker’s credibility</td>
<td>Do not support main points and/or detract from or overwhelm the presentation</td>
<td>Provide basic support for main points with minimal contribution to effectiveness of presentation</td>
<td>Enhance the effectiveness of the presentation</td>
<td>Increase the effectiveness of the presentation, add insight to main points, and augment speaker’s credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of Issues:</strong> Clear and comprehensive communication of issues or problems</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered is stated without clarification or description.</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is communicated.</td>
<td>Idea/Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation:</strong> Ability to explain information that is presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables)</td>
<td>Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means.</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related computations or units.</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms.</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence:</strong> Critical analysis or synthesis of information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>Information is taken from one or a few sources without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop an analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with enough interpretation or evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are possibly subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from a variety of sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal XX-15

(Voting Units: Academic)

“Definition of “Joint” Faculty Appointments”

I. Background

This proposal is to formalize the definition of a term applied to tenured or tenure-track faculty who contribute scholarship in more than one discipline at the University.

This proposal also rectifies the current situation regarding the use of the term “adjunct” at Michigan Tech. At Michigan Tech, the term “adjunct” is currently applied to faculty members who contribute scholarship in more than one discipline at the University but only receive financial compensation from one discipline. This use of the term “adjunct” is not in alignment with the usage of the term at other institutions of higher education.

II. Proposal

The proposed changes are intended to be added to the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook.

II.a. Joint Faculty Appointments

JOINT FACULTY APPOINTMENT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor): Joint faculty appointments are used to acknowledge and support the scholarly contributions that faculty may make in more than one discipline.

All faculty members holding joint appointments must have a primary affiliation within an academic department or school. The primary department or school will be responsible for annual reviews for the faculty member’s reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary consideration. The primary department/school will seek and consider written input from the chair of the department(s) and/or dean of the school(s) hosting the faculty member’s joint appointments.

Joint faculty appointments may or may not be associated with the distribution of salary for a faculty member among two (or potentially more) academic units at Michigan Tech.

Joint faculty appointments are at the same rank (i.e., professor, associate professor, or assistant professor) as a faculty member’s primary appointment.
Joint faculty appointments are possible with non-departmental and interdisciplinary programs as well as with departments or departmental programs.

All requests for joint appointments must be approved by the provost. Requests for joint appointments also need approval from the:

- faculty member’s primary academic department chair or school dean,
- dean of the faculty member’s primary college (if in a college)
- faculty member’s joint-appointment discipline’s department or school (for disciplinary appointments) or the appropriate executive group or director and Graduate Dean for interdisciplinary appointments.
- dean of the faculty member’s joint appointment college (if the joint-appointment discipline is housed in a college)
The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Proposal XX-15

(Voting Units: Academic)

“Modify the Definition of the Term “Adjunct” Faculty”

I. Background

This proposal is to modify the definition of adjunct faculty to bring the usage of this term as it is applied at Michigan Tech into line with how the term “adjunct” is used at other institutions of higher education.

II. Proposal

The proposed changes to the Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook are as shown in the remainder of this document.

II.a. Adjunct Faculty

Current Definition of Adjunct Faculty (from Section 1.5.5, Non-Tenure-Track Academic Rank Definitions, Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook; http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/prov/facbook/ch1/1chap-19.htm)

ADJUNCT (Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor): An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within the academic unit to which the appointment is made. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of academic departments. Ordinarily no remuneration is associated with adjunct appointments, but on the approval of the President, remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent appointments.

Proposed New Definition of Adjunct Faculty (shown with changes from the original tracked)

ADJUNCT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor): An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within an academic unit to which the appointment is made at the University. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of
Ordinarily no remuneration is associated with adjunct appointments, but on the approval of the President, remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent reappointments.

Proposed **New Definition of Adjunct Faculty** (shown with all changes from the original accepted)

**ADJUNCT (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor):** An appointment at this rank is offered to persons not regularly or primarily employed within an academic unit at the University. Such individuals--because of training, experience, credentials, and interest--are invited to participate in the teaching, research, and/or instructional programs of academic departments. Remuneration may be provided for teaching and/or research activities. Appointments shall be for no more than three years with the possibility of subsequent reappointments.