

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 207

5 January 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) received Proposal 8-94 and heard a presentation about it;
 - (2) corrected and approved minutes of Meeting 202;
 - (3) learned that Proposal 16-92 had been transmitted to the Provost;
 - (4) heard a presentation on the new environmental sciences building;
 - (5) selected Marilyn Cooper as Senate representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee;
 - (6) selected Chuck Nelson as temporary appointee to the Sabbatical Leave Search Committee;
 - (7) discussed the administrative rejection of Proposal 4-94.
-

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm on Wednesday, 5 January 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 29 senators or alternates were present. Duane Thayer was present as the representative of Metallurgy & Materials Engineering. Senators or alternate representatives from AF ROTC, IMP, IWR and KRC were absent. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, and Staff Council.

III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were F. Dobney (Provost), Wm. McGarry (Treasurer & CFO), S. Lee (Vice-Provost) and Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed letting the building presentation be a floating item because of Predebon's late arrival. He also proposed moving the discussion of Proposal 8-94. Bornhorst asked for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Bornhorst asked for objections to the proposed adjustments. There were no objections, and Bornhorst declared the agenda approved as adjusted.

V. New Business (Part 1 of 2)

A. Proposal 8-94. Copies of Proposal 8-94, Graduate and Teaching Assistantships: Creation, Funding and Allocation [Appendix B of these minutes] were distributed to the Senate. Bornhorst introduced Vice-Provost & Dean of the Graduate School Lee for a presentation on the proposal.

Lee said that currently there were 126 GTAs in the university which were allocated to departments by his office. Few departments were happy with the allocation. A Graduate Council subcommittee had produced the proposal to change the method of allocating GTAs.

GTAs would be divided into two categories, GAs and TAs. Departments using GTAs principally to fill teaching needs would receive funding for TAs from the Provost by way of the deans. The primary function of GAs would also be teaching; however, they would be allocated to promote research.

Leifer asked if a GA was a more advanced student than a TA. Lee replied that this was not necessarily so; they would be allocated to departments to give strongly research-oriented faculty more time to do their research. Funding for GAs would be distributed by the Graduate Dean, with the advice of the Graduate Council. Lee said that the Graduate Council was also asking for an increase in support for 85 additional graduate students, with 50 TAs and 35 GAs. The rationale for these numbers was given in the statement accompanying the proposal; these numbers should be sufficient for a stable undergraduate population.

Bornhorst said the proposal had been put into Senate proposal format by cutting and pasting the subcommittee report. The budgetary components had been isolated from the section of the report dealing with the policy of separating GAs from TAs. Bornhorst called for questions.

Leifer asked for further explanation of the distinction between GAs and TAs. He said he doubted whether an entering graduate student could be used to relieve a researcher by teaching an advanced course in quantum mechanics, for example. Lee said that a GA might be sufficiently qualified to teach an advanced course. However, the plan calls for GAs to be requested and to be assigned to relieve the total teaching contact of faculty. Requests for GAs would be justified on the basis of proposals to promote growth of departmental research programs.

Glime asked if GAs would necessarily teach, or if they could maintain equipment or perform other faculty duties. Lee said that the proposed primary function of the GA would be teaching, but that they might be used for grading, lab instruction, and other current GTA functions. Requests for GAs for assignments other than teaching would have to contain justification.

Little (GSC liaison) referred to the statement in the proposal that departments would not need to hire graduate students to meet their teaching obligations if the proposal were adopted. He asked whether the university had any idea of the number of TAs that were required for this, and whether funds were available to support this number. Lee said that the subcommittee had produced an estimate of a reasonable number of GAs plus TAs to accomplish this goal. The subcommittee had planned for the additional 85 positions to be implemented over a 3-year period.

Mullins asked whether GTAs currently are figured into the calculation of full time equivalent faculty, and whether the proposed plan would change the calculations for a department. Lee said he did not know whether GTAs were included in these calculations, but that determinations of departmental teaching loads would be part of the negotiations between departments, deans and the provost. Mullins said he thought that GTAs were part of departmental teaching staff for purposes of calculating teaching loads, and asked whether the division between GAs and TAs would affect the calculation of the departmental loads. Lee said that if the proposal were adopted, TA allocation would not be part of his responsibilities.

Boutilier asked who would assign additional graduate students to meet heavy teaching loads in service departments if the deans failed to provide sufficient numbers. Lee said this would not be his problem under the proposal. Dobney said that it would be the deans responsibility to meet the requirements; if sufficient graduate students could not be obtained, hiring part-time faculty with the funds would be an option.

Leifer asked how many total GAs and TAs were called for in the proposal, beyond the current 126 GTAs. Lee said that the same

number was planned for next year, with 52 of the 126 to be converted into GAs, and the remaining 74 to be TAs. Over three years, numbers of TAs would be increased by 50 and GAs by 35.

Jobst said the proposal's background statement indicated the 85 new positions were to be obtained for 93-94. Bornhorst said that the subcommittee report had called for the new positions next year, but a memo of implementation from Lee to Dobney had called for funding the new positions over a 3-year period.

Brokaw said that the proposal as written did not include the numbers, but was a plan for dividing GAs and TAs. Senate approval was requested only for the division, not the funding. Bornhorst said that Brokaw was correct.

Roblee said the proposal would increase the role of graduate students in classrooms, and that while support of graduate and research programs is important, a major goal of the university is

Page 4169 Minutes of Senate Meeting 207 5 Jan 1994

a quality undergraduate education. Roblee said he could not accept the idea that graduate assistants provided the same quality of classroom education as faculty. Heuvers replied that GTAs with MS degrees working toward PhDs would be equivalent to faculty with the rank of instructor, and that quality of classroom instruction does not necessarily decrease with the use of GTAs.

Bornhorst asked for an end to the discussion of the proposal, and stated that senators should obtain the input of their constituencies because the proposal would be on the agenda of the next Senate meeting. Lee asked that a decision on the proposal not be delayed more than two weeks, because departments need to know the numbers of assistantships they could expect for next year. Bornhorst thanked Lee for his presentation.

VI. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst referred to the minutes of Meeting 202 attached to the agenda sent to senators, and called for corrections. Beck, Hubbard and Grzelak noted several typographical errors.

Jobst asked about the fate of corrections. Bornhorst said that the corrections would be made to copies maintained in the Senate office and in the University Archives, and that corrected copies would be sent to the offices of the President, Provost, and Board of Control. Keen said that corrected versions eventually would be maintained somewhere on the university computer network.

Heyman MOVED to approve the corrected minutes; Grzelak seconded. Bornhorst asked for objections to the motion. There were none, and Bornhorst declared the minutes to be approved.

VII. Report of Senate President

1. Proposal 16-92, Departmental Governance, has been forwarded to the administration for their action [Appendix C of these minutes].
2. All memos of transmission of Senate proposals will be put into the minutes. The new constitution requires the administration to approve or reject proposals within three months; recording the date of submittal is therefore important. The memos of administrative responses to the proposals will also be entered into the minutes to provide a complete record of action on proposals.
3. The Provost has set up a committee to recruit persons to attend the Bryn Mawr Summer Institute for Women.
4. The Senate officers and the Provost had a long discussion on January 4 concerning the current process for changing courses. The current procedure requires the Provost's assistant to

check each submitted course change. Over 250 changes were submitted this year. There are occasional problems with submissions. This year one proposal indicated no other departments were affected by the change, but in fact five were affected. Also, it is not necessary to indicate whether general education requirements are affected by any change. The current process, which requires one person to be knowledgeable about all curricula on campus, clearly needs revamping. The provost is open to suggestions for change, and has asked that a new process be developed.

The Curricular Policy Committee has been asked to address the problem and to come up with a new procedure for course changes. The provost and his assistant should be consulted about the problem.

5. The Senate officers and the Provost had a discussion on December 14 concerning the relationship between the Graduate Council and the Senate. The discussion will be continued. However, any policy proposals from the Graduate Council will pass through the Senate.

Bornhorst opened the floor to questions. Arici asked whether the Course Change Committee still existed to address course change problems. Bornhorst said that in the past the Course Change Committee had carefully reviewed all the proposed course changes. The work load of the committee members was huge, with perhaps 600 course changes per year. Provost Whitten had consolidated the review process in his office, using the Course Change Committee only for resolution of problems.

Bornhorst said a new procedure was needed to ensure that proposed course changes were checked properly. The problems of sloppy reviewing can become apparent, for example, when students try to register for required but non-existent courses.

VIII. Reports from Committees (Part 1 of 2)

A. Curriculum Committee. Committee Chair Grimm reported that the Committee had met, and had elected himself chair. The request by Mathematical Sciences for establishing a new MS option in discrete mathematics had been approved and would be sent to the Senate floor for approval.

The Committee had reviewed a request for a new course in community help activity, and decided that the course proposal should be developed by the individual department that would be responsible for the course. The request by Bornhorst for a proposal to alter procedures for reviewing course changes had been deferred to a later meeting.

B. Finance Committee. Committee Chair Pickens distributed three handouts [Appendices D, E, and F of these minutes], and reviewed recent committee activities.

The Committee had attracted a lot of interest and volunteer members. Three subcommittees had been formed: Fringe Benefits with L. Leifer as chair, Financial Management & Investment with J. Gale as chair, and Budget Oversight with E. Carlson as chair.

Pickens said that a year ago the Senate had proposed implementing three separate fringe benefit packages for retiring faculty: health coverage for TIAA-CREF participants, a lump-sum payment, and paid-up life insurance. The first had been accepted by the administration; the other two were not accepted.

Pickens asked CFO McGarry to elaborate on FAS (financial accounting standards) for funding retirement programs. McGarry said that the FAS arose out of problems of funding retirement on a pay-as-you-go basis; FAS is a way of making sure the funds exist if the corporation should go out of business or be sold, and of requiring corporations to recognize financial liability for funding retirement plans. The plans must be funded over a defined period

of time. The university has to be sure the funds will be available when current personnel retire to support the retirement health care benefits.

Pickens said fringe benefit rates had been about 25 percent of salary; at MTU the rate was now 38 percent. Pickens referred to page 4 of the handout [Appendix D of these minutes] comparing fringe benefit rates at Michigan universities. Uniform fringe benefit rates for all faculty was unique to MTU.

Pickens noted that MTU was setting aside money to fund health benefits for TIAA-CREF retirees, although the amount set aside was less than FAS guidelines. He referred to p.5 of the handout, noting that the benefit would amount to about 17 percent of salary in a few years. MPSERs contributions increased from 12 to 14.4 percent this year; rumors say 18 or 20 percent next year. The increase is state mandated and is driven by health care costs.

Pickens said that the provost was providing health care coverage on an individual basis for persons who would have fallen under Senate Proposal 2-94. The Finance Committee would take up the issue at its next meeting. Pickens said that the health care benefit was a significant increase in total faculty compensation.

Pickens introduced Leifer for a presentation from the Fringe Benefit subcommittee. Leifer said the subcommittee had worked long and hard for all MTU employees. He acknowledged past and present subcommittee members [Appendix E of these minutes]. Leifer reviewed a list of 14 projects of the subcommittee, noting that only 4 of the 14 were retirement benefits. In discussing item #10, a proposal to increase current TIAA-CREF contributions, Leifer referred to pages photocopied [Appendix F of these minutes] from NMU's contract booklet; he noted their TIAA-CREF contributions were higher than MTU's. Item #14, the flexible

Page 4170 Minutes of Senate Meeting 207 5 Jan 1994

spending account, is to allow pre-tax deductions from salaries to support medical, child-care, and similar allowable expenses.

Leifer referred to the Exhibits distributed in the meeting of 6 October 1993 [Appendix D of these minutes] for supplemental health and disability benefits, and noted that they followed FAS requirements. Leifer said that numbers for funding the retirement life insurance plan [Appendix D of these minutes] were scary only by comparison. The university had hired 25 new faculty over the past year at a cost of about \$3M. The proposed benefits package was about half of this amount, was affordable, and would not bankrupt the university. Leifer said the package would take care of people who have stuck with the university through hard times.

Leifer said a good benefits package would allow the university (1) to plan its program development, (2) to attract good faculty, (3) to permit dedicated employees to retire with dignity, and (4) to do the right thing.

Bornhorst asked about the status of the two passed proposals for life insurance and annuity supplement. Pickens said Dobney had told the Finance Committee that the proposals would not be fundable at this time; Leifer was studying them to find ways to make them more affordable. Because the proposals had been passed, the Committee needed to know whether the proposals should be brought to the Senate again, perhaps in modified form, or whether they should be left with the administration.

Provost Dobney said he was willing to add the proposals to the list of requests for available funds. They would be put in with items such as deficit reduction, deferred maintenance, etc. He would ask the Senate Financial Committee for advice on priorities. Bornhorst recommended that the Finance Committee return to the next

meeting prepared to discuss priorities in the benefits package.

Roblee asked McGarry about the funding of the current MPSERs retirement payment. McGarry said that last year the departments with retirees funded the 2 percent retirement arrangement out of their own budgets, but the \$124K balance-due for building of reserves came from university's central fringe benefits account. The payment this year will come entirely from the central account. The program had been successful, but some departments had been hurt financially because they had no reserves to replace the funds taken from them.

IX. Presentation on the New Building

Bornhorst said that at the previous meeting questions had been raised about the new environmental sciences building. He introduced the chair of the building planning committee, Bill Predebon, for a presentation on the building.

Predebon said that the committee, named the MTU Initiative for the Environment, had begun to meet during the summer. The committee had to define the focus of the environmental initiative before determining who would occupy the building. The focus was defined as "teaching, research and service for a sustainable future". The Initiative had split up, with part working on interdisciplinary teaching and research planning. The other part became the Building Working Group with Predebon as chair.

The Group had discussed many models of occupancy, finally deciding on biology, geology, environmental engineering and forestry, with commons areas for interdisciplinary research. The President and Provost had offered few constraints, except that space vacated by the units should be maximized. The building would have about 86,000 assignable sq ft. The occupying units had requested 260,000. After discussion, Forestry had agreed to pull out if an addition were added to their present building.

Current plans called for the new building to consist of research facilities with a wing for teaching. Vacated space would total 32,000 sq ft, with 14,000 in ME-EM, 13,000 in Chemistry, and 5,000 in Dillman. The units would continue to occupy some space in ME-EM, Dillman, and a small amount in Chemistry. Several plans were examined for connecting the new building with existing buildings. Current plans favored connections with Dillman and M&M, and included two lecture facilities for 250 and 150 students.

Blumhardt, Predebon, and Tahtinen had met with the MI Dept of Management and Budget. As part of the \$60M package, the state had supported constructing the new building, adding to the Forestry Building, and renovating Chemistry, ME-EM and Dillman. \$30M would be supported by the State; MTU would have to raise the other \$30M, which would be mostly for equipment.

Leifer asked about the source of the other \$30M. Predebon said it would not come from the university's general fund, and that Tahtinen was putting together a \$20M federal package for research equipment. Research related to the Environmental Initiative would count toward the \$30M. The state would allow the amount to be accumulated through 1998.

Beck asked whether vacated space would benefit departments not in the environmental program. He said issues of space are critical, and asked who would decide who gets the 5000 sq ft being vacated in Dillman. He asked that the decision process be more open. Predebon said that the issue of vacated space had been emphasized by President Tompkins and the 32,000 sq ft of vacated space would be made available to departments that need it. Predebon said assigning vacated space was not his group's responsibility. Dobney said that none of the space would be reallocated without input from the Space Committee, chaired by Joe Galetto.

Heyman said that the division of vacated space among three buildings would not appear to open up large amounts of space usable by other departments. Predebon said that the committee consciously

tried to maximize the amount of vacated space.

Glime expressed concern about locating major teaching functions of biology on the 11th floor of ME-EM, while faculty offices would be located in another building. Predebon said that the biology committee members had been informed about the plan.

Bornhorst thanked Predebon for his presentation, and said that the time for adjournment was nearing. He asked for objections to altering the agenda to dispose quickly of two items of Old and New Business. There were no objections.

X. Old Business (Part 1 of 2)

A. Representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee. Bornhorst said that Murthy had resigned as Senate representative to the Search Committee for a new dean of the Business School. He said Marilyn Cooper, who had been the other nominee considered by the Senate, had agreed to serve. Jobst MOVED that Cooper be selected as the Senate representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for discussion; there was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

XI. New Business (Part 2 of 2)

B. Temporary Appointment to Sabbatical Leave Committee. Bornhorst said President Tompkins had asked the Senate to appoint a temporary replacement on the Sabbatical Leave Committee for Frank Monasa, who had passed away recently. Monasa's 5-year term was to end July 1, 1994. The position will be filled in the course of the usual elections in the spring. Bornhorst said that the Senate last year had submitted three nominees to the President last spring. Chuck Nelson had not been selected then. Bornhorst said that Nelson had agreed to serve out the remainder of the term. Grzelak MOVED that the Senate submit Nelson's name to the President as a replacement for Monasa. Leifer seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. Jobst said that the Senate should be aware that the selection of Nelson would result in two faculty members from the Humanities Department serving on the committee. There was no further discussion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

XII. Reports from Committees (Part 2 of 2)

C. Steering Committee on Academic Faculty Handbook. Bornhorst distributed a page of information [Appendix G of these minutes] on charges and membership of the task forces working on

Page 4171 Minutes of Senate Meeting 207 5 Jan 1994

revision of the Handbook. Bornhorst said the task forces were to write draft policies which would go to appropriate Senate standing committees for consideration. Members of task forces who were also Senate committee members were responsible for keeping the Senate committees informed of task force progress. Bornhorst said that the Steering Committee would only monitor progress, and would not be involved in the approval process. Draft revisions of policies from the task forces were to be in the hands of the Senate committees by mid-March, and the Senate should be able to vote on the new policies before the end of the Spring quarter. Bornhorst said that membership of the task forces was balanced among departments, disciplines, personalities, and interests. He added that questions could be addressed to himself, Keen, Bulleit, or Steering Committee Chair Ott.

XIII. Old Business (Part 2 of 2)

B. Proposal 4-94, Suspension of 3-Year-&-Out Policy. Bornhorst

referred to the memo from Provost Dobney attached to the agenda [Appendix H of these minutes], and offered Dobney the floor for any further comments. Dobney said the Senate should inform concerned constituents that the policy allowed for exceptions. Dobney said that he would approve exceptions only on the recommendations of chairs and deans, and that those employees for whom the dean would not request an exception probably would not have been reappointed anyhow.

Bornhorst said that a careful reading of the memo would indicate that it is a rejection of Proposal 4-94. He declared the floor open for discussion and suggestions on what the next Senate action should be with regard to this proposal. Glime said that the memo did not really reject the proposal, but was another method of implementing it without having to go to the Board. Bornhorst said that the memo in fact was a rejection; the policy was not suspended. Bulleit said that the proposal was an interim solution, and the provost's memo was also an interim solution.

Leifer said that if a person has a 3-year appointment and is reappointed twice, the person has de facto tenure. Failure to reappoint such a person invites censure by the AAUP. Leifer suggested calling these positions teaching associates or lab supervisors rather than temporary assistant professors or other academic rank. Dobney replied that temporary appointments are for one year only, that reappointments are for one year only, and that the appointments are for positions as lecturers, not for professorial rank. The revision of the faculty handbook should clarify the distinction between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. The university's lawyers had offered opinions that the letters of tender of a temporary position make it clear that the time is not counted toward tenure.

Sewell said the Presidential Commission on Women had concerns that numbers of persons were insecure in their jobs, and did not know where they stood. She said the memo was clearly a rejection, and that the request to inform constituents was likely to lead to inconsistency in retaining temporary personnel. The studies of the Commission had found unbelievable inconsistencies between departments on campus.

XIV. Adjournment

Bornhorst said that senators should bring the attachments to the agenda to next meeting of the Senate. Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Arici MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Huang seconded the motion. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Secretary of the University Senate