MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 111
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

12 March 1980

(Senate Minute pages: 1687-1715)

Meeting No. 111 was called to order at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 12, 1980 in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union by Senate President O. David Boutilier.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-seven members or alternates were present. Absent were Lide (HU), Rupley (AROTC), Heckel (AL), Sloan (EE), R.E. Miller (NU), T. Wilkinson (Grad. Student Council), and President Stein.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: Staff member Jim Escamilla operated the recording equipment.

The Minutes of Meeting No. 110 - The Minutes were approved as written.

President's Report

Boutilier presented the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Pintar, asked in relation to item two (2), whether the faculty would have any input into the determination of the common core. Boutilier replied that it is to be expected that they would. As yet, no action has been taken on the establishment of such a core, but the idea is to screen engineering students on the basis of their performance during the freshman year. Such a program is already in existence at several other schools.

It was noted by Johnson that some departments will have enrollment decreases if some may increase both the total enrollment and the engineering school enrollment are maintained. Boutilier replied that there were no planned increases in any departments. However, more applications in areas of declining enrollment (e.g. mathematics) would be accepted. Vice President Gale said that decreases will probably arise from a natural attrition (i.e. fewer applications) in some areas.

Harris asked whether freshmen would still be able to enter on an undeclared status while seeking their permanent curriculum choices. Vice President Gale said that stabilizing enrollment in engineering is a complex problem, in part because of this question. There is no difficulty during the freshman year, but problems are created at the sophomore level when the undeclared students begin to make their choices. He said a study committee will be looking at such issues.

Appendix B (Available by Request from the Senate Office) gives a summary of the U.S. Department of Labor's investigation of complaints filed against the University alleging discrimination on the basis of sex or race.

Report on Meeting of the Academic Council.

Reynolds presented the report which is attached as Appendix C (Available by Request from the Senate Office). There was no discussion.

Reports on Meetings of the Board of Control.

Reynolds presented the report which is attached as Appendix D (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

The optional pay plan issue, a proposal relating to which had been withdrawn at the last Senate meeting, has been resolved as President Stein promised. The amended policy was approved by the Board at their February 21 meeting. The present wording and the background leading to the Board's decision are given in Appendix E (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Eleventh Annual Report to the Faculty - Nelson announced that the report has now been printed and will be distributed in the near future.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy - No Report.

B. Instructional Policy - No Report.


D. Elections Committee

Snyder reported that an election for Senators at large is coming up and that the faculty will be receiving the related material in a couple of weeks.

E. Joint Committee on Relations Between the Senate and Faculty Association
Pintar presented a short report on recent activities of MTU AMCF delegates (Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office). A detailed report by Emily Erickson of the January AMCF meeting is attached as Appendix G (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

F. Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and Development

In a letter from committee chairperson R.K. Miller to Eino Reini, Assistant to the Vice President of Operations and Finance, five hypothetical situations were given in which there is a question of MTU liability insurance coverage of faculty members involved. The letter and Mr. Reini's response are attached as Appendix H (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

It was noted by Reini that while the insurance carrier now makes the decision as to whether or not a claim is fought or settled, the University expects this policy item to be changed effective July 1, 1980.

Several concerns on coverage remain. Are faculty members involved in human subject research covered? What constitutes negligence on the part of a faculty member? Is coverage extended to faculty members who are club advisors if they are elected to that position by the students rather than appointed by the University?

A report by R.K. Miller tabulating responses to a questionnaire on professional development interviews and faculty perception of promotion criteria is attached as Appendix I (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

G. Faculty Handbook - No Report.

H. Faculty Fringe Benefits

Reynolds presented the report. The committee as a whole and Vice President Gale have had two meetings with Vice President Koepel and John Gooch to discuss improvements in the fringe benefit package. No concrete steps toward improvement were taken, with several reasons at play. The budget is not finalized. It is impolitic to consider some issues now (e.g. tuition remission for spouses when enrollment is capped). Despite the committee's lack of success at this time, Reynolds said they did continue to impress upon the administration that fringe benefits could and should be improved.

One area discussed was the possibility of the University paying the employee's social security contribution. There would be a corresponding lowering of salaries but an increase in net pay since the faculty member would pay no income tax on the decrement. This issue is being tested in the courts elsewhere, but if it is legally OK, MTU wants to be one of the first schools to give this benefit.

In summary, Reynolds said the committee discussed: 1) adding dental benefits, 2) increasing retirement benefits to compensate for increases in the social security base, and 3) the possibility of the reduction of fees relating to self-liquidating enterprises. As no action can be taken at this time, they plan to ask for another meeting after the budget has been finalized.

Hauge said that while he was not a proponent of the tuition remission for spouses proposal, he did not see a logical connection between this issue and the capping of enrollment since his understanding was the Legislature's attempt to shunt some downstate students away from MTU to fill in at schools of declining enrollment and that it is unlikely that they intend to shunt spouses downstate for this purpose. Reynolds agreed, but said that the political situation arose from the accounting system that required no distinction be made between spouses and other students.

Alexander asked whether there had been mention of federal guidelines restricting what the University can do? Reynolds replied that it is known that faculty salary increments over the years have been less than those on the work force as a whole. Thus, it is acceptable in some cases for increments to exceed guidelines. The present expected salary increases of 10 percent for next year are in excess of the guidelines (but by only 0.5 percent, as noted by Alexander).

Old Business

In response to a question by Reynolds, Boutilier said the had as yet received no reply on a request for action on Proposal 10-78.

R.K. Miller asked whether the Senate would like to review Proposal 4-76. This proposal arose from a concern about grade inflation and provides that the Registrar shall publish and make available each term of the regular school year, to each faculty member, information on grading practices in various departments, schools, etc. Miller proposed that it might be sufficient to make a single copy available to each department. However, most Senate members said that they find individual copies of value to them.

New Business

A. Proposal 6-80, Sharing of AMCF Membership Costs Between Michigan Technological University and the MTU Faculty Association

BACKGROUND:

The committee met with President Stein on January 10, 1980 to discuss Michigan Tech's membership in the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties (AMCF). There was mutual agreement that membership
in AMCF could be beneficial to Michigan Tech. AMCF has some input into the legislative and executive branches on matters affecting higher education, particularly the funding models. There is also a valuable interchange of ideas with the faculty from other Michigan universities. There was also an understanding that MTU’s AMCF delegates would be working for and not against Michigan Tech's interests.

The financing of Michigan Tech membership in AMCF was also discussed. Currently, the costs are paid by the MTU Faculty Association. Membership dues are $150 and travel expenses are approximately $200 per meeting (3-4 meetings per year). Up until now the delegates have been able to attend only one or two meetings per year because of the cost and the timing of the meetings. The University will be willing to pay 50 percent of the AMCF costs up to $500 if the Faculty show their support for this. The MTU Faculty Association Council endorsed this proposal at its meeting on January 14, 1980 provided that the AMCF delegate(s) must obtain approval in advance from the Faculty Association Council in order to have travel expenses paid.

**PROPOSAL:**

1. The cost of the membership dues for the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties (AMCF) and of the travel expenses for the MTU delegate(s) to attend AMCF meetings shall be shared equally by the University and by the MTU Faculty Association.

2. The University's share of these costs shall not exceed $500 per year.

3. The MTU AMCF delegate(s) shall not be reimbursed for travel expenses to attend an AMCF meeting unless authorized in advance by the MTU Faculty Association Council.

Pintar moved and it was seconded that the proposal be adopted.

An editorial change was made, incorporated into the proposal statement above, so that the proposal reads: The University's share of these costs shall not exceed $500 per year.

**B. Evening Exams/Extended Day Conflicts**

Pintar said that it has come to his attention that there have been some conflicts between evening exams and extended day classes and also between different evening exams that have occurred because of "irregular" evening exams. He asked that the Instructional Policy Committee adopt a policy for enforcement of the evening exam rule and to consider what recourse there is when a student misses an exam because of such a conflict and is denied a make-up.

Tampas said that procedures have already been established for contending with such problems. Whenever a student is following published guidelines and finds that an instructor is not complying with those guidelines, then that student may take his/her case to either the Dean of Students or to the Ombudsman, who will intercede on that student's behalf and try to negotiate a settlement.

**C. Tenure Committee Election**

The University Tenure Committee will suffer two vacancies in August 1980 - one by expiration of term and one by resignation. The Senate Election Committee was given the charge of conducting an election to fill the two vacancies.

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.