MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 60
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

10 November 1971

(Senate Minute pages: 681-696)

Meeting No. 60 was called to order on Wednesday November 10, 1971 at 7:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room of the Library by President W.E. Barstow.

The roster was checked by the Secretary. Twenty-seven members were present. Absent were: Spain (BL), Vandette (SS), and Williams (CH).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 59 were approved with the following corrections: p. 667, item I, replace "twenty-five" by "twenty-seven" and delete "Meteer (FF)" and "Stebler (AT)"; p. 671, item VIII-B-2 replace the number "16" by the number "18."

Senate President's Report

This report dealt entirely with committee assignments and is included here as Appendix A (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Report on Meetings of the Academic Council and Board of Control

A. Senator Halkola reported on the topics discussed at a recent meeting of the Academic Council. His report is included here as Appendix B (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

B. Senator Weaver reported that he had been unable to attend the latest meeting of the Board of Control because of a class conflict. He stated that he would either make the next one or send a substitute.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy Committee: No Report.

B. Instructional Policy

Chairman Halkola stated that he had no report at this time. He then asked the chair what the procedure was for obtaining student members for committees. During the ensuing discussion, the following points concerning student membership on committees and in the Senate were brought out:

1. The committee chairman shall secure as many student members as he deems necessary (Proposal 10-71).
2. The Student Council may be consulted in the selection of student committee members if the chairman so desires.
3. Pending the results of a recent constitutional amendment ballot by the faculty and formal action by the Board of Control, Proposal 9-71 (Student Representation in the Senate) is not in effect. The Senate has no student members at this time.

During the discussion, President Barstow introduced two students who were present, Karl Johnson and Larry Kraus. He stated that the Student Council had appointed them as observers at Senate meetings.

C. Accommodations

Chairman Doane reported on a recommendation of the committee. The recommendation will be presented as a formal proposal to be discussed at the next Senate meeting. The complete report is included here as Appendix C (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

D. Joint Faculty Association:

Senator Ortner asked who the chairman was as no meetings have been called since the committee was appointed. The Secretary noted that no chairman had been appointed since this was to be a joint committee and it was felt that the members should elect their own chairman. Ortner promised to contact the Faculty Association in order to determine whether there was still a need for such a committee, and if so, who the other members were.
E. ROTC Review: No Report

F. Sick Leave:

Chairman Keeling stated that the committee had been discussing a proposed long-term disability and salary continuation plan and that each Senator should have received a copy of the plan. (It is included here as Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office). He then asked that the chair recognize Mr. E. Koepel, General Manager of Operations, in order that he might answer questions concerning the plan.

During the discussion which followed, the following points were brought out:

1. The current wage-price freeze makes the immediate institution of such a plan unlikely.
2. The short-term cost to the University would be higher than the current plan. However, the long-term costs would be about the same.
3. Payments would be reduced by any amount provided from Workmen's Compensation or from Social Security (with a freeze on the Social Security reduction).
4. The current sick-leave plan, including lump-sum retirement or death payments for accumulated time, is funded entirely from the current budget.
5. The proposed plan would provide much greater benefits for a much smaller group of employees (those who become disabled) since there would be no vesting and, hence, no lump sum settlement upon death or retirement.
6. The only way a current employee could become eligible for such coverage would be if he were to elect to discontinue his coverage under the present plan, thus donating his vested interest to the University.

Several Senators expressed their dissatisfaction with the proposed plan, particularly those features mentioned in items 5 and 6 above. DelliQuadri stated that the original intent was to try to increase the maximum accumulated time from 100 days to some more realistic figure not to change the entire plan. He questioned whether the committee really had the best interests of the faculty in mind. Alexander claimed that the proposed plan would cost the University a great deal less than the current plan and so was not an increased benefit at all. Horvath stated that he felt that current faculty members who elected the new plan would, in effect, be funding the plan with their divested accumulations.

Following the discussion, Keeling stated that he would call another committee meeting to decide whether to formally recommend this plan to the Senate in the form of a proposal.

G. Election Committee:

The deadline for the ballot on Proposal 9-71, Constitutional Amendment to Provide Student Representation, has passed. The committee will tally the results and have a report at the next meeting.

Old Business

Secretary Horvath stated that in answer to a request made at the last meeting, Dr. Smith had agreed to answer questions concerning the so-called "boiler plate" provisions of the Appropriations Bill. President Smith then read the several pertinent articles and answered detailed questions concerning them. The gist of the discussion was that the constitutionality of such requirements as are contained therein was being challenged in court. Until this question is settled, college administrators throughout the State are making cautious attempts to comply at least with the intent or spirit if not the letter of the requirements.

At this point in the meeting Senator DelliQuadri asked why the Promotion Policy Committee had been discharged. He stated that he wanted to know what they were doing. In answer, President Barstow stated that he had not discharged the committee since there was no such Senate Committee but was simply discharging the Senate members of an administrative study committee. He felt that after one year in committee something should be done, and so he had withdrawn the Senate membership and had re-established a Senate committee to propose a viable Promotion Policy. Alexander, in an attempt to verify what had happened, then outlined the process as follows: "The Senate passed a proposal on promotion policy (Proposal 11-70); the Senate and the Administration had a joint committee to resolve alleged differences; the committee could not resolve its differences; the Senate is now proposing another committee. Is that right?"

Barstow: Yes, it is my opinion that it is right. If there is disagreement with this opinion, the Senate has recourse to normal legislative procedures. I reconstituted another committee because I didn't think that the present group was in a position to return a radically revised proposal if that was necessary. I realize this is unilateral. This in my view is the way to resolve this impasse.
New Business and Voluntary Remarks

Upon a call for further business, Vice President Weaver moved that the Senate formally state its appreciation and thanks to Senator Bredekamp for his years of devoted service as President of the Senate. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

R.S. Horvath
Secretary