

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 210
16 February 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) corrected and approved minutes of Meetings 207 and 208;
 - (2) learned Proposals 8-94 and 9-94 had been approved by the administration;
 - (3) learned the administration had followed the Senate's recommendation on Proposal 4-94;
 - (4) approved Proposal 11-94 Revision of Faculty Handbook;
 - (5) approved an administrative proviso for the acceptance of Proposal 16-92 Departmental Governance;
 - (6) established an ad hoc Charter Committee;
 - (7) discussed budget priorities.
-

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:33 pm on Wednesday, 16 February 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 32 senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternate representatives from AF ROTC and Metallurgy were absent. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, USG and Staff Council. The GSC liaison reported that former liaison Little had been replaced.

III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

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

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed adding a report from the Instructional Policy Committee. Bornhorst asked for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Leifer moved to approve the adjusted agenda, and Heyman seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the motion. There were no objections, and Bornhorst declared the agenda approved as adjusted.

V. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst called for corrections to the Minutes of Meeting 207 attached to the agenda sent to senators. Arici and Hubbard discussed the meaning of a statement of Vice-Provost Lee. Hubbard MOVED to approve the minutes as submitted and Glime seconded. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for corrections to the Minutes of Meeting 208 also attached to the agenda sent to senators. Corrections were noted by Glime, Hubbard, Heuvers and Galetto. Mroz MOVED to approve the minutes as corrected; Jobst seconded. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

VI. Report of Senate President

1. Proposal 8-94 Teaching and Graduate Assistantships: Creation,

Funding and Allocation, was approved on February 7 by President Tompkins [Appendix B of these minutes]. The Policy will be implemented effective Fall quarter 1994.

2. Proposal 9-94 New Option in Discrete Mathematics for the M.S. Degree in Mathematical Sciences, was submitted to the Provost on February 3. It was approved by President Tompkins on February 7 [Appendix C of these minutes].
3. The administration has followed the Senate's recommendation in acting on Proposal 4-94 Suspension of 3-year-&-out Policy. A letter explaining procedures for requesting exceptions to the policy has been sent to all affected persons [Appendix D of these minutes].
(Bornhorst called for questions. There were none, and Bornhorst declared Proposal 4-94 completed.)
4. Provost Dobney, CFO McGarry, Jim Pickens (Chair, Senate Finance Committee), Les Leifer (Chair, Senate Subcommittee on Fringe Benefits), Darrell Smith, Eunice Carlson (Chair, Senate Subcommittee on Budget Oversight) and Bornhorst (as facilitator/observer) met on February 10 to discuss retirement benefits. Provost Dobney agreed to consider approving Proposal 2-94. The Provost also agreed to consider a group life insurance plan for retirees if the retiree pays the premium. The Provost said that the lump sum severance plan was not acceptable now or in the future; however, he did agree to work with the Senate to develop a phased retirement plan for faculty.
5. The Senate officers met with Provost Dobney on February 15 and discussed the issues of fringe benefits, departmental governance, and budget priorities. Jim Cross of Longwood College has accepted the offer to be Director of Information Technology.
6. The Senate office is now electronic. With thanks to the Provost's office, the Senate office now has a computer attached to the campus network.

The Senate email address is . Marilyn Hay, Senate Assistant, may be contacted directly at . The Senate office will attempt to distribute the next agenda by email. All senators and alternates will continue to get a paper copy.

Bornhorst opened the floor to questions on his report. There were none.

VII. Reports from Committees

A. Steering Committee on Academic Faculty Handbook. Bornhorst reported that the Committee tentatively has decided that "academic" is redundant and inappropriate; the new handbook would be better titled "Faculty Handbook". The Committee has nearly completed its initial review, and has sent sections to appropriate groups for review before Senate action. Bornhorst said that the section on Student Integrity and Honesty has been sent to the Instructional Policy Committee. He stated that Senate committees working on handbook revision should proceed promptly.

Bornhorst asked for Senate input on the handling of informational, non-policy sections of the handbook, including sections on the Credit Union, how to get i.d's, etc. He suggested that the Senate wait to review or approve the non-policy sections until the final draft of the handbook.

Grzelak commented that in the past there were several different classifications of faculty, which might explain the use of "Academic Faculty" in the title. He asked how many different kinds of faculty would be defined in the new handbook. Provost Dobney commented that the handbook is intended to cover both research and instructional faculty; a definition of faculty will be in the handbook. Heuvers asked if professional staff were to be included in the handbook. Bornhorst replied they would not be included.

Mroz asked if non-policy sections needed to be in the handbook. Bornhorst responded that the non-policy sections were left in the handbook because it's something given to new faculty before they even get on campus. Heuvers suggested that the handbook be placed in a public file on-line so senators can make suggestions or comments as the handbook is developed. Keen responded that the Senate Gopher system should be ready in a couple of weeks, and the handbook could be included.

Bornhorst said that since there were no objections, the informational items would wait until the end of the revision process before being reviewed by the Senate.

Page 4257 Minutes of Senate Meeting 210 16 Feb 1994

B. Institutional Planning Committee. Committee Chair Mullins said that most of the Committee items would be covered under New Business. The Committee will soon make recommendations on a campus building smoking policy. The Code of Ethics section of the Faculty Handbook will be discussed at the Committee's next meeting. The Committee has also been asked to supply a Senate representative for the Wellness Committee; Mullins called for volunteers.

Tuition Policy at Michigan Tech has been the principal item of Committee business, including issues of tiered tuition and the Exceptional Student Tuition Program. The Exceptional Student Tuition Program will be considered under New Business.

Bornhorst called for questions; there were none.

C. Finance Committee. Committee Chair Pickens said that the Committee recently had a lively discussion about the meeting mentioned in the president's report. The Committee had voted to bring to the Senate floor those fringe benefit proposals not likely to receive administrative approval. A timeframe for this had not been decided.

Leifer said the Committee does want to move forward with Proposal 2-94 Supplemental Health Care Program. Bringing it to the floor now would allow the proposal to be included in this year's budget. Dobney commented that he was not opposed to having Proposal 2-94 and the retirement-related proposals brought to him separately. Proposal 2-94 has some possibility of being funded in the current regular budgeting process. The timing is not critical on the other two proposals that the Committee insists on bringing forward; they will not fit into the budget process because they are not affordable.

Grzelak asked whether the proposal for a lump sum retirement payment differed from the proposal for a 2% annuity at retirement. Bornhorst responded that these were two versions of the same proposal, neither of which were acceptable to the administration.

Bornhorst opened the floor to further questions. There were none.

D. Instructional Policy Committee. Committee Chair Heuvers distributed copies of a memo from Fynewever [Appendix E of these minutes] about shifting the evening exam times, and a memo from Oulette [Appendix F of these minutes] regarding grade summaries required by Proposal 4-76. Heuvers asked senators to provide him with feedback from the departments on these issues.

Heuvers said that the Committee will probably recommend that Proposal 4-76 be dropped unless favorable comments are received.

Heuvers stated that Rick DeVisch, the USG liaison, has requested all Senators to send the Committee information about accreditation required in each of the academic degree departments. DeVisch said that the information will be used in a study of

academic calendars and how requirements are met at other schools.

Leifer asked in which quarter the Athletic Department wanted to begin the new times for evening exams. Fynewever said that the policy should be changed before the Fall quarter. Bornhorst said he hoped a new final exam and evening exam policy could be brought to the Senate before the end of the year.

Bornhorst opened the floor to further questions. There were none.

VIII. Old Business (Part 1 of 2 parts)

A. Proposal 11-94 Revision of Faculty Handbook. Bornhorst noted that the proposal was attached to the agenda, and that copies of the proposal had been distributed at the previous meeting [Minutes, p.4226].

Bornhorst said that 11-94 is the first proposal involving the new Faculty Handbook, and that it would set up the framework for future revisions of the Handbook. The last sentence in the proposal is designed to insure that unilateral changes in the Faculty Handbook cannot be made in the future.

Heyman MOVED that Proposal 11-94 be approved. Grzelak seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the voting units stated on the proposal. There were none. Bornhorst declared the voting units would stand as given, and opened the floor for discussion of Proposal 11-94.

Sewell said that she had never seen the Faculty Handbook but assumed that there were some issues such as a Code of Ethics that involved professional staff as well as faculty. She asked if it was appropriate that a section for professional staff be included in the Handbook. Heuvers stated that he thought it might be appropriate since the Senate does have professional representation.

Bornhorst said that inclusion of professional staff issues would complicate the Faculty Handbook greatly, and he suggested that a separate handbook for professional staff might be appropriate. Dobney said that the waters would be muddied considerably if Senate representation were the criterion for being included in the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Handbook should be for faculty. If something similar is needed for professional staff or for staff in general, it might be developed with Human Resources. Heuvers said the Senate could look at the matter also because the Senate does have professional staff representation.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. Proposal 11-94 PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

B. Proposal 16-92 Departmental Governance. Bornhorst said that departmental governance was one of the most important to be addressed by the Senate this year, and made the following statement:

"It was apparent soon after approval and before formal submission to the administration that technical difficulties existed with the proposal. Upon presentation to the Deans & Directors and to the Academic Forum (consisting of the Department Heads/Chairs and some Deans and Directors) by the Provost, more technical difficulties were apparent.

"Thus, I entered discussions with Provost Dobney using three guiding principles: (1) the philosophical intent of Proposal 16-92 on Departmental Governance must be maintained; (2) the proposal could be strengthened but could not be weakened; and, (3) administration concerns needed to be addressed in the framework of shared governance. The Provost and I met privately on several occasions and agreed to a possible amendment for the proposal. The Provost asked that I assemble a group of senators to attend the Academic Forum to hear the administration concerns. Don Beck, Bill Bulleit, Janice Glime, Davis Hubbard, Glen Mroz and myself attended the Academic Forum on Tuesday, February 8th, last week. At that time the Provost put forward the potential amendment as part of the

discussion. The amendment satisfied the administration concerns.

"On February 15, 1994, President Tompkins approved Senate Proposal 16-92 with the proviso that Departmental Charters will be considered as though they are Senate proposals which, by definition in the Senate constitution, require approval of the President.

"I believe that (1) the philosophical intent of Proposal 16-92 is maintained; (2) the proposal is strengthened by making Departmental Charters official university policy and accepted by the administration; and, (3) administration concerns are addressed. I can assure you that the entire process was in the spirit of shared governance.

"I recommend that the Senate accept the proviso. If an impasse occurs between a department and the administration the charter can be brought forward to the Senate as a proposal. The Senate can then mediate and, if it so chooses, can send forward the charter to the administration as a Senate Proposal. If then rejected by the administration, we can then send it forward to the Board of Control under our constitutional authority since it would fall under List A. I think a system of checks and balances exists as it should in shared governance."

Bornhorst distributed copies of a memo [Appendix G of these minutes] from the Provost to the President recommending

Page 4258 Minutes of Senate Meeting 210 16 Feb 1994

acceptance of Proposal 16-92.

Bornhorst called for discussion. Bradley asked if the proposal applied to the research institutes. Bornhorst said that this was unclear. McKimpson said that the proposal did cover the institutes, but that some parts of the guidelines clearly did not apply to the institutes. The institutes were expected to write charters, but these might look very different from charters from academic departments. Bornhorst said that the ROTC departments were in the same situation.

Leifer noted that "though" was misspelled in the memo. Bornhorst asked for a motion to accept the proviso as stated in the memo.

Mroz MOVED that the Senate accept the proviso regarding Proposal 16-92 given in the memo from the provost and approved by President Tompkins. Beck seconded the motion. Bornhorst recommended that the motion be voted upon by the full Senate, and called for objections to the recommendation. There were no objections. Bornhorst called for discussion of the motion.

Bradley asked whether the guidelines formed part of the proposal. Mullins said that the guidelines only accompanied the proposal, and were not part of it. Bornhorst said that only the proposal had been accepted, not the guidelines.

Heuvers said that the proviso is consistent with the proposal and even strengthens it. Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to accept the proviso PASSED 27-0 in a show-of-hands vote.

Bornhorst distributed copies [Appendix H of these minutes] of the transmittal memo for Proposal 16-92 from himself to the Provost, and asked the Senate to particularly note the fifth paragraph with the statement that "The Senate will interpret 'adoption' to be any assenting Board action." Bornhorst said current plans are for the Departmental Governance Proposal to be presented on March 18 to the Board of Control. Bornhorst is to make the presentation as an agenda item for information and discussion. Lack of objection by the Board of Control will be interpreted as assenting action and thus adoption.

Beck noted that the date on the memo should be 1994, not 1993.

Leifer asked why Bornhorst had taken this approach to Board approval. Bornhorst said that it was a question of the Board micro-managing the university; adoption of the proposal should be done at the level of the administration. Leifer asked why the Board was involved. Bornhorst replied that the requirement for Board approval was in the text of the proposal.

Bornhorst summarized parts of a email message from D. Beck, written after the meeting with the Academic Forum. "The Senate must make sure that a real improvement in university governance emerges from the proposal. (1) Each senator should make it their job to be current about their unit's progress towards writing a charter, and should be prepared to act as a goad. Periodically each senator should report back to the appropriate Senate committee as to their unit's progress. (2) The Senate should provide information flow to the departmental charter committees; specifically, sample charters collected from outside sources should be made available. (3) The Senate should stimulate interaction of charter committees, particularly those within a college, to come up with good, reasonably uniform charters. Thus, I recommend that the Senate create a new standing committee called the Charter Committee. Its responsibility will be 'requirements and criteria for unit charters for each academic degree-granting department or course-offering unit'. This is directly out of the constitution, but is yet to be assigned to any other standing committee."

Bornhorst said that charters were the only "A-list" responsibility that had no designated committee. He called for a motion to establish a standing Charter Committee.

Heuvers MOVED that the Senate establish a standing Charter Committee to have responsibility for the requirements and criteria for unit charters for each academic degree-granting department or course-offering unit. Huang and Beck seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Bulleit asked why the committee had to be a standing committee, because its work would be concluded at the end of a year. Bornhorst replied that unit charters can be revised at any time. Heuvers said that the committee might mediate disputes that arise during charter writing. Brokaw said that a big workload would exist only initially. The duties might be given to another committee to avoid proliferating committees. Bornhorst said that the committee might wish also to consider college governance, which remains from the old faculty governance list of issues. Mullins said that forming an ad hoc committee would be a better solution than giving the problem to a current committee. Bulleit said that an ad hoc committee would be preferable for the first year; the followup work of altering charters could be assigned to a current standing committee.

Bulleit MOVED to amend the motion to establish the Charter Committee as an ad hoc committee. Mullins seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion on the amendment. There was none. The motion to amend PASSED with no dissent in a voice vote.

The motion to establish an ad hoc committee PASSED with no dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst recommended the committee members: Beck (interim chair), Bulleit, Glime, Mroz, and Hubbard. Bulleit asked to be removed based on his chairing the Academic Policy Committee. Bornhorst said the membership of the committee could be discussed at a later date; the committee would have no work until after March 18th.

Bornhorst asked for a motion to alter the agenda to consider next Proposal 14-94, an item of New Business. Heuvers MOVED to consider Proposal 14-94 as the next item of business. Sewell seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the motion. There were none, and the motion was declared approved.

IX. New Business

A. Proposal 14-94 Recommendation on ESTR. Bornhorst distributed copies of Proposal 14-94 [Appendix I of these minutes] and copies of background material [Appendix J of these minutes]. Bornhorst introduced Tim Malette to discuss Proposal 14-94 Recommendation on Exceptional Student Tuition Rates.

Malette said that about a year ago the Provost had asked him to set up an administrative committee to review tuition policies and rates. The Exceptional Student Tuition Rate program seemed to be a policy that could be examined separately, and was examined first. Malette reviewed the development of the policy and described the increase in enrollment from the states affected by the ESTR program [Appendix J, p.1-3]. He then described the current numbers of participants in the program, both for specific states, and for alumni children [Appendix J, p.4-5].

Heyman noted that numbers of nonresident alumni children have little impact on the program. Leifer asked whether the data were confined to undergraduates. Malette said it included all students. Heuvers asked if the support were extended for the full four years. Malette responded that there is currently no limit to the number of years.

Malette said the proposed changes in the program were developed by an administrative committee, and sent to the Provost. The Provost forwarded the recommendations to the Institutional Planning Committee for Senate input. Malette said that Senators and others should send their comments and recommendations to the Senate Institutional Planning Committee.

Malette reviewed the provisions of Proposal 14-94. For Item 2 [Appendix I], Malette said that Student Marketing and Admissions are recommending the starting date be 1996 so there is time to communicate to other states the changes in the policy. The rationale for requiring a 2.50 CGPA (item 3a) is that this is the minimum now for scholarship support.

Heuvers asked whether the reason for eliminating the requirement for a 3.25 CGPA (item 3c) was to admit more of these students. Malette replied that it was to avert problems with students out of state students who enroll expecting easily to earn

a 3.25. Heuvers asked about some provision for students that might obtain the 3.25. Malette responded that those students would continue at the non-resident rate; however, the scholarship committee would look closely at those students who do well. Mullins said that the Institutional Planning Committee had discussed the possibility of students loading up on easy courses for the first two quarters to bump up their CGPA to qualify for the program. Heuvers asked if this had been a problem in the past. Malette replied that some students had very unusual class schedules. Mullins said it was worth several thousand dollars to the student.

Arici asked why these students are given five years to graduate if they are exceptional. Malette responded that given the average number of terms for graduation, five seemed more appropriate than four. It also avoided problems of appeals, exceptions and requests. Arici said it sent a wrong message, by saying that we have a four year program but expect graduation to take longer. Malette said there had been no complaints like this when financial aid was terminated, but the point may be true.

Brokaw asked why the program was restricted to specific states. Malette said that removing this restriction was being considered as a possibility. Glime asked if the state funding formula depends

on a student being a Michigan resident. Dobney replied that it did not. Grzelak asked if other schools had similar programs. Malette responded that other schools have added these programs, but not too many. The program is not reciprocal, because nothing is exchanged with another state or school.

Heyman asked whether any studies had shown that eliminating this program might reduce out-of-state enrollment. The charts seem to indicate that overall out-of-state enrollments had increased, not just from the ESTR states. Malette replied that the international enrollment had increased significantly. However, students do enroll paying the non-resident rate, and that group is about the same size as before the program began. Heyman asked if Enrollment Management assumed that MTU could not make up for lost students if this program was terminated, by obtaining more students from Michigan. Malette said it would be difficult to make up the number from Michigan. Galetto commented that the question is also maintaining quality of the students.

Sewell said that part of the increase was attributable to basing an admissions counselor in Wisconsin. Enrollments from Minnesota did not increase until there was an admissions counselor based there. Galetto stated that the admissions office has visitation in those states, but not a counselor based there. Malette said that there was a direct mailing to schools in Wisconsin and Minnesota when the program first started, but not to Illinois and Ontario when these were added. Malette said there was great potential to increase the number of students if we wanted to do that.

Mroz asked if the ESTR is automatic if the student meets the standards. Malette said it was. Mroz asked if the students were still eligible for need-based aid beyond the ESTR program. Malette said they were.

Boutilier stated that other schools used to have similar programs in the 70s. Galetto said that Lake Superior State has a program with Ontario, and Eastern Michigan has a program with Ohio; other institutions have similar programs.

Heyman asked if the two committees had looked at the ESTR in a strategic way. For example, emphasizing the program to sell it more widely to make up for the expected decline of 150 students, versus thinking that MTU is already overloaded in terms of numbers of undergraduates per faculty member and that more people should not be encouraged to enroll? Malette said that there was potential for more students from other states, with the most enrollment from the closest states. Some enrollment growth is expected from marketing in those areas.

Heyman asked if marketing is planned in those areas. Galetto said there was definite marketing potential in the program. Students in the ESTR Program could be recruited into undersubscribed programs at MTU. Heuvers said the ESTR Program was an excellent way to improve and maintain the quality of the university.

Dobney said the need to change the current program is the political perception in Lansing that too many out-of-state students may be attending at the in-state rate, so that Michigan taxpayers are subsidizing these students. The proposal is a statement that not all non-resident students should pay non-resident tuition, that a lower rate should be offered to encourage these qualified students to come, but will still differentiate them from Michigan residents. The proposal is politically advisable, and will still attract top students. The university's location requires hard work to attract good students. The proposal also works to help MTU become more than just a regional university.

Jobst said he supported opening the program to any other states. Mroz asked if the proposed ESTR of \$4,344 is competitive with in-state tuition of universities in the program states. Galetto responded that it probably was better than competitive, but

it should be looked at closer. Mullins said that it was comparable to the in-state tuition at the Univ of Michigan.

Bornhorst said that the proposal would be voted on at the next meeting. The proposal is a recommendation only, not requiring administrative action. It provides additional support for an administrative request to the Board to change Board policy. Malette said that related topics were listed on the last page of the handout [Appendix J, p.8), and asked that comments on these be sent to the Institutional Planning Committee.

X. Old Business (Part 2 of 2 parts)

C. Discussion of Budget Priorities. Bornhorst said that the Senate officers and Provost had agreed that a Senate discussion of budget priorities would be useful at the scale discussed by Heyman and Roblee at the previous meeting. Bornhorst read excerpts from a newspaper article provided by the Provost from the Western Michigan News [Appendix K of these minutes]. Bornhorst noted that Carnegie status can be important in formula funding, so that there is some political logic behind having improved graduate enrollment at MTU. Vice-President Tahtinen has emphasized that MTU has high-cost engineering and science programs compared to the lower cost programs at Western Michigan, doctoral programs, etc.

Bornhorst opened the floor for discussion, and asked first for ideas about whether the discussion should be general or be directed toward specific recommendations.

Heyman stated that the highest priority should be adding new faculty, particularly junior faculty. This is important for support of both the undergraduate and the graduate levels because faculty advise those students and do the research projects that support students. In terms of research funding hiring younger faculty is the best long-term investment.

Beck said that support for newly-hired faculty must be funded. Faculty could be doing more if they were better supported. Funds in addition to salary should be set aside to assure the new person can be efficient. Dobney asked whether Beck was talking about RAs or equipment or laboratories. Beck replied that he was talking about the whole mix of necessary support. Different things come up at different times. Mullins said that support was how good faculty are attracted.

Mullins said that investing in faculty and having the means to attract them well is the key to everything. Bornhorst asked Mullins if he felt new faculty were more important than more TAs, etc. Mullins said that this was his view.

Grzelak said that faculty were needed to supervise graduate students. Graduate students cannot be simply added, with the expectation that faculty can pick them all up. Just one graduate student requires a lot of faculty time. More faculty are needed before more graduate students are accepted.

Irish said that parents of students in research universities are increasingly concerned about contact with good, full-time faculty as opposed to a lot of contact with graduate students. An

investment in good, junior faculty would be a strong investment for the future. DeVisch said that as an undergraduate, he thought additional junior faculty would take some of the load off the research faculty. Some research faculty have little time to spend with undergraduate students. Class size would also be reduced with more faculty.

Heyman said that his statement had been based on the subdivision of a very small pool of money. Hiring of junior

faculty should be the first priority. While increased support for graduate students would be ideal, the cutting edge in graduate support comes from younger faculty. Heuvers said that senior faculty are needed to help the junior faculty develop. Heyman said he was skeptical of a strategy based on buying research superstars. It can be successful but also can lead to some spectacular failures.

Grzelak said that increased numbers of faculty would benefit undergraduates. The graduate program has grown despite a constant faculty number by increasing class sizes. Increasing faculty numbers would allow class sizes to decline to more reasonable levels. Bulleit said that increasing faculty numbers was necessary, but that new faculty should go into already strong programs, and not into increasing new programs.

Galetto said that the biggest concern of students on this campus is availability of classes and courses. Faculty must be added both in research and teaching side to get some type of balance. Undergraduates have problems getting courses they need and want; they have problems getting through programs in four years.

Heuvers said that another drastic need is classroom space. Galetto said there would be problems with office space for new faculty. Glime said that different departments might have different priorities; in some departments increased graduate support would provide for a critical mass of graduate students and it also provide for undergraduates by increasing lab sections.

Mullins responded that buying a lot of graduate students is fairly expensive. If the right faculty members are brought in, however, they will support these graduate students. Instead of being an economic drag the graduate students would add a net benefit in terms of the amount of money returned to the university. Graduate students should not be supported in preference to hiring new faculty.

Arici asked about the source of the \$500K for the 20 new graduate fellowships announced by Vice-Provost Lee. Dobney replied that the fellowships had been budgeted already. They either were fellowships that had not yet been provided to anyone or they were fellowships vacated by graduating students. Beck said that the program might result in a shifting of funds with no net increase in graduate students. Dobney said that the program is intended to increase graduation rates of PhDs, not to increase graduate enrollment. The goal is to reach Doctoral I status before having a lot of PhD students becomes a political liability.

Heyman said that the budget requests [Appendix L of these minutes] shows \$375K for graduate program development, and asked if this could be made more specific. Dobney replied that Vice-Provost Lee had provided a proposal for invigorating research with requests for funding which amounted to \$375K. Heyman asked if these funds were different from the Research Excellence Fund, and Dobney replied that they were.

Beck said that too much time is spent going to committee meetings, and that funds for CAs (committee assistants) are needed. Bulleit said there has been a lot of seed money provided for research, but much of it has been wasted for lack of time for follow up. More faculty may also solve the problem.

Dobney said that the cost of shared governance is attending more committee meetings. Beck replied that he based his proposal on experiences prior to this year, and that one can only imagine what will happen after this year. Dobney said that a return to autocracy was always an option, but was not his preference.

Glime asked Dobney to comment on the TQE budget. Dobney replied that the current budget is in the base budget, and includes only one person's salary and some funds for training, travel, etc. McGarry said some one-time funding had been allocated for 3M participation was being brought back into the reallocation pool.

Leifer said that he had listened patiently to the comments, that money could be spent on a lot of things, and that it was important to learn about management. From other universities' budgets one could learn how they have money available for good salary raises, good benefits, and modest graduate programs. Fancy names like Carnegie I and Doctoral I create problems, and competing with heavily-endowed universities is not possible. Leifer said that during his tenure at MTU, enrollment had not doubled from 3700, but that the number of administrators had increased exponentially. Responsible ways of conducting a graduate program include GTAs to meet teaching needs, and GRAs supported by external funds. Developing a graduate program otherwise, without a \$500M endowment, is questionable. It is important to do well the things we can afford to do.

Heyman asked Leifer to be more specific about administrative waste. Leifer noted some problems with administrative perceptions of retirement benefit proposals, but noted that the administration had gone on "retreats" to fancy resort areas. He stated that "we are suffering financially" statements should include administrators. Shared governance should include shared hard times.

Bornhorst said it was clear from Leifer's statement that retirement programs needed to be considered on the list of priorities. Leifer said that good raises and good benefits should also be there. Heyman said that vehicle allowances and retreats probably had little impact on the overall budget, but they did detract from the legitimacy of the budgeting process. Filer said that some of the other schools did support their faculty well, but there were often news items about their faculty cutbacks.

Mullins said that the endowment was small, and needed to be emphasized in budgeting. Heuvers said that he had not seen any notice of MTU's endowments in a recent listing by the Chronicle of Higher Education. McGarry said that MTU should have been listed. The value of the endowment that predates the Michigan Tech Fund is \$1.4M; the Fund value is about \$25M, and earned 19 percent last year.

Sewell asked whether the discussion should be general or specific about the budget. Bornhorst said that it should be kept above the level of departments and colleges to avoid conflicts of interest. He noted that salary had not been mentioned, perhaps because the Provost was on record as favoring salary increases. Dobney said that salary increase was his highest priority.

Sewell asked whether the topic of "Best Buy" was reviewed regularly. Dobney said that the classification was a two-edged sword, and this was recognized by the administration.

XI. Adjournment

Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Heyman MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Many senators seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote. Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:29 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Secretary of the University Senate

.