

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 212

23 March 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) corrected and approved minutes of Meeting 211;
- (2) learned that the administration had formally rejected Proposal 1-92 Parts B & C;
- (3) learned that Proposal 16-92 had been approved by the Board of Control;
- (4) learned that there were correctable administrative problems with implementing Proposal 8-94 Creation, Funding & Allocation of GAs & RAs;
- (5) approved Proposal 12-94 Plant Sciences Option;
- (6) amended and approved Proposal 14-94 Recommendation on ESTR Program;
- (7) revised Section B.2 of the Bylaws to include the Fine Arts Dept;
- (8) received a retirement benefits proposal from the administration;
- (9) received Proposal 16-94 Smoke-Free Campus.

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm on Wednesday, 23 March 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 28 senators or alternates were present. Present as non-elected representatives: J. Pilling for Metallurgy, S. Gruenberg for KRC, and G. Neumann for Non-Academic Group 3. Senators or alternate representatives from AF ROTC, and IMP were absent. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, USG, GSC and Staff Council.

III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were E. Carlson (BL), I. Cheney (Human Resources), F. Dobney (Exec. VP & Provost), M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), G. Lewis (MA), and D. Reed (FR).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed adding reports from the Affirmative Action Officer Search Committee and the Faculty Handbook Steering Committee. He asked for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Vanek MOVED to approve the 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 noted that the minutes of Meeting 211 were delayed in being circulated to senators, and asked for requests to defer corrections. There were none, and Bornhorst called for correc-

tions. Grzelak noted several typographical errors. Arici MOVED to approve the corrected minutes. Grzelak seconded the motion, which PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

VI. Report of Senate President

1. On March 15, a lunch discussion with President Tompkins covered topics including shared governance.
2. On March 22 the administration sent to the Senate a formal rejection of Senate Proposal 1-92, Parts B and C [Appendix B of these minutes]. Action on this proposal is now finished.
3. On March 22, Provost Dobney, D. Lassila (Provost's Office), E. Horsch (Human Resources), I. Cheney (Human Resources), M. Abbott (Finance Office), J. Pickens (FR), L. Leifer (CH), D. Thayer (MY), E. Carlson (BL), and Bornhorst met to discuss an optional retirement furlough. Results of the meeting will be covered in New Business.
4. A memo from Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School Lee [Appendix C of these minutes] describes changes in the make-up of the Graduate Council. The council will be made up of one representative from each graduate degree-granting program plus an ex officio member from the Senate. The memo also notes that the Council's role is that of an advisory body to the Graduate Dean, and not a policy-making body.
5. Dean of the Graduate School Lee has allocated 20 GA positions [Appendix D of these minutes].
6. On March 22 the Senate officers met with the Provost and discussed departmental governance, GA/TAs, fringe benefits, draft policy on administrator evaluation, conflict of interest, co-ordination of wellness programs, and the need for a Professional Staff Handbook.
7. A proposal has been received for a non-departmental PhD program in computational science and engineering as a new option of the existing PhD in Engineering. The proposal will go to the Curricular Policy Committee for review.
8. The Provost has discharged the Space Committee. A new Space Committee has been created with membership of the Chief Financial Officer (chair), Provost, Dean of Engineering, Dean of S&A, Dir of Facilities Mgt, Dir of Enrollment Mgt, and the Senate President as the Senate representative.

(Bornhorst asked for objections to his serving as the Senate representative. There were none. Leifer asked what would be the Committee's function. Dobney said that the Committee would evaluate use of space, reassign space, and recommend the assignment of new space.)

Bornhorst opened the floor to questions on his report. There were no questions.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Affirmative Action Officer Search Committee. Bornhorst noted that the Senate had two representatives on the Committee: S. Beske-Diehl (GE) and G. Lewis (MA). Bornhorst introduced Lewis for the report. Lewis distributed a job description for the position of Affirmative Action Officer [Appendix E of these minutes], and noted that it contained some changes from the position description that had been distributed to senators earlier in the week. Lewis said that questions, comments and suggestions should be sent to himself or to Beske-Diehl.

Arici asked who the current AAO was. Lewis replied that S. Kauppi is serving as interim AAO. Glime asked whether legal counsel would be available for the office, and if this were part of the position description. Lewis said that if the hired person were a lawyer, there would be no need for another lawyer. If the person were not a lawyer, the Committee now thinks that a list of local lawyers would be available to the AAO. Sewell commented that another option was for MTU to have a lawyer available. Heuvers

said that S. Kauppi had agreed to serve for only one year.

B. Board of Control Relations Committee. As Committee Chair, Bornhorst reported that in the morning sessions of the March 18 meeting of the Board, B. Seely had reported on development of a conflict of interest policy. Bornhorst said his own presentation on departmental governance had followed Seely's.

In the afternoon session the Board acted on a draft budget, minor degree title changes, approval of an external auditor. The Senate was credited by CFO McGarry for its involvement in financial issues.

Bornhorst called for questions. There were none.

C. Research Policy Committee. Bornhorst introduced Committee member D. Reed (FR), who reported in the absence of Committee Chair McKimpson. Reed said that he would report on fringe

Page 4350 Minutes of Senate Meeting 212 23 Mar 1994

benefit rates charged by the university on externally funded grants, and that he had served as chair of the subcommittee examining the rates (Appendix F of these minutes).

Reed said these rates affect MTU in competition for funds, and in the budgeting of grant monies. The committee assumed that rates should reflect actual benefits received by employees. Particular issues were (1) appropriate summer rates for 9-mo faculty, rates for 9-mo faculty and grad students in research institutes, and rates for research staff housed in academic departments; (2) refusal of sponsoring agencies to fund tuition remission as a fringe benefit for grad students; (3) policy implications of the rates' impact on ability of MTU to reach research goals.

Reed said that the subcommittee had discussed the problems with CFO McGarry and with Vice-Provost for Research Lee. Some adjustments: 9-mo faculty summer rates will be reduced from 38% to 25%; there will be a move to position-based rates in January 1995; grad student fringe benefits may be cost shared by the university rather than departments, on a individual-case basis.

Arici asked about the meaning of position-based rates. Reed replied that currently grad students rates in research institutes are 46%, and 38% in academic departments. Position-based rates would be uniform.

Beck said that the benefits that were paid for with the 25% should be more widely publicized, and asked what the faculty got for the 25% rate in the summer. Cheney replied that it covered TIAA/CREF, some Social Security, increased life insurance, and workers compensation.

Bornhorst thanked Reed for his presentation.

D. Faculty Handbook Steering Committee. Bornhorst reported the Committee continued to hold weekly meetings. Some of the text had been assembled, and more policy statements had been sent to Senate committees. The revision process obviously will continue through the Fall Quarter, although several policies may be reviewed before the end of Spring Quarter. The Committee has also discussed the need for a Professional Staff Handbook, and would support the concept of its development.

VIII. Old Business

A. Proposal 16-92 Departmental Governance. Bornhorst said the Board of Control had discussed departmental governance at its meeting on March 18. Bornhorst said that he and the other Senators attending the meeting thought the Board's feedback was positive.

Accordingly, their actions were assenting actions; thus, according to the agreement between the Provost and the Senate President, the proposal has been accepted by the Board. Bornhorst asked Dobney to comment on the issue.

Dobney said that he had discussed the issue of departmental governance with a subcommittee of the Board prior to the meeting. They appeared to support departmental governance, with the proviso that had been attached concerning presidential approval of the charters.

Bornhorst asked for objections to considering the proposal finalized. There were none, and Bornhorst declared that Proposal 16-92 was finalized and approved.

Beck said that President Tompkins had told the Board that the first few charters would be examined carefully. Hubbard asked about the time-line for writing charters. Bornhorst said that the Senate officers had discussed this with the Provost on March 22. The logical deadline for charter completion was the end of Spring Quarter of the next academic year, including presidential review. Mroz asked whether the deadline included Presidential approval. Bornhorst said that it should at least be in the President's hands by that time.

Filer asked how departments would be notified. Beck said the ad hoc Committee on Charters would notify departments. Bornhorst noted that the proposal was now university policy, and the administration should help with the establishment of charters. A list of charter requirements should be sent to the departments.

B. Proposal 8-94 GAs & TAs. Bornhorst said that some problems had arisen in allocating GAs and TAs this first year, and asked Dobney for comments. Dobney said that the policy had been put in place late in the year, and that the distribution of the TAs had been put in the Deans' hands. The distribution of GAs had taken place before that of TAs. Distribution of TAs by the deans based on knowledge of GA distribution defeats the policy's distinction between GAs and TAs. Dobney said this was an administrative problem, and a procedure would be developed for the next year to assure that TAs would be allocated before GAs are announced.

Leifer said that the original discussions in the Senate included estimates of 126 GTAs which were to be apportioned as 74 TAs and 52 GAs. Bornhorst said that the number of 126 was correct, but the 74/52 apportioning was only the recommendation of the Graduate Council subcommittee. Leifer asked what the final distribution was. Dobney said it was 133 TAs and 20 GAs. Leifer inquired about the funding of the increased total number. Dobney said that, as announced previously, 16 new GAs had been derived from reallocating money within the administration. Eleven other positions had been temporarily funded for at least two years, and their funding had been formalized, giving the total of 27 additional positions.

Leifer asked whether the number would be frozen at that level, because the Senate had not voted for any funding recommendations. Bornhorst said that the Senate vote had covered only the concept of GAs and TAs.

Bornhorst asked for further comments. There were none.

C. Proposal 12-94 Plant Sciences Option for the BS in Biological Sciences. Glime MOVED to approve Proposal 12-94 (Minutes, p.4301). Bulleit seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. Arici said that he served on the Curriculum Committee, and that the proposal was excellent. Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

D. Proposal 14-94 Recommendation on ESTR. Bornhorst said that discussion of this proposal had been halted when the previous meeting had been adjourned. Mroz MOVED to take up consideration

of the proposal. Grzelak seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none, and the motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Grzelak noted that the proposal would include the children of alumni who are MTU graduates. He asked whether this would include the children of persons who attended Michigan Tech but did not graduate. Dobney noted that Dr. Ken Rowe, a member of the Board of Control, had attended MTU but had not graduated before going on to medical school, and yet considered himself an alumnus. Neumann said that there was a possibility of persons paying for one credit and qualifying their children for the program.

Mroz said that opening the program to more than the adjacent states would allow the university to think beyond regional boundaries.

Leifer said that the issue of the 1-credit person was weird in the extreme, and could be discounted. Grzelak said the problem might arise with persons having children of college age; taking one credit would make their children eligible. Boutilier said that she knew two persons who took courses only as local high-school students, and who get alumni mail now. She said she did not know where to make the cut-off, but it seemed inappropriate to allow a person to take one course in order to qualify for a large reduction in fees.

Brokaw said that there was little cost to the university of allowing the children of non-graduating persons to qualify. The downside was minimal. Mullins said that the percentage of students qualifying for the ESTR program as children of alumni was small.

Page 4351 Minutes of Senate Meeting 212 23 Mar 1994

Pilling asked whether the in/out-of-state distinction might be dropped in favor of a flat rate for tuition. Mullins said the Michigan legislature would not like the idea.

Sewell asked whether more staff would have to be hired for marketing and mailing if the program were expanded to all 50 states. Neumann said that a larger budget would be necessary to promote the program in all 50 states. Bornhorst asked if a larger budget would be needed if the expansion were not promoted. Neumann said that there was not much value in expanding the program if it were not promoted.

Mullins said that the committee's deliberations favored the current regional limits, because most of the students came from adjoining states. The expansion to include all 50 states or all the NAFTA countries was disingenuous. Beck said his impression was that recruiters could be put into the contiguous states, and that additional costs would be incurred only if there was recruiting in the added states. Enrollments from the other states would be minimal unless alumni were used as recruiters.

Leifer said that administrators might be used as recruiters when they go out with the dog-&-pony shows for alumni. Sewell said that the administrators going to alumni functions were not trained to do recruiting, and that the admissions and financial aid offices are understaffed and overworked.

Mroz MOVED to amend the proposal by extending the affected area to all 50 states and the Canadian provinces. Diebel seconded the motion.

Sewell said that information on the cost of the extension was needed; there had to be some increase in the administrative workload. She asked also whether the extension should be made if the program were to be only minimal. Mullins said that if one were to have a program, then one should be serious about it.

Heuvers said that the committee should examine the extension

if the amendment was serious. Mroz said that the current program was disingenuous; for example, Chicago was targeted currently, but not Carbondale or the St. Louis area. Neumann said that posters were sent every year to all the high schools in the contiguous states affected by the current program. The marketing effort includes not only recruiters, but phone and mail contacts also. Diebel said that informal contacts were not a cost, and that recruiting can be done on an ad hoc basis. Bulleit said that the extension need not alter the current recruiting practices, and that the extension could evolve slowly, taking advantage of opportunities as they arise.

Glime said that the rating of Michigan Tech as a Best Buy in the media would act as publicity for the program, and help to recruit good students. Grzelak said the extension should be approached a little at a time, rather than the whole country at once. Heuvers said that the program could be inserted into statements in publications like Peterson's Guides.

Bulleit asked whether the extension would cause political problems in Lansing. Dobney replied that it may cause difficulties, both in Lansing and with the Board of Control. However, this would not be known until the extension was proposed. Mullins said that the current proposal involves the addition of two more states, so the program has been evolving.

Leifer said that an intelligent inquiry needed to be based on the costs involved, and MOVED to send the amendment back to committee for an estimate of the cost of extension. Heuvers seconded the motion. Boutilier noted the new restrictions on student performance, and said that the proposed extension does not mention recruiting.

Bornhorst called for further discussion of the motion to send the amendment to committee. There was none. The motion FAILED in a voice vote. Bornhorst called for further discussion of the amendment.

Bulleit said that Leifer's point was valid, and that it might be better to consider only the possibility of an extension. Neumann said that the objective of the extension should be considered. It might cause the university to lose money by allowing a tuition reduction to students in AZ or CA who already are planning to come. Neumann noted that the proposal also would decrease the amount of awards and affect abilities to recruit from WI and MN.

Brokaw said that the proposal was purely advisory, and that if the administrative and political costs are low, then the extension should be favored. As opportunities for recruiting extension arise, they can be met with administrative decisions. Bornhorst said that the administration can add or subtract recruiting effort as it thinks appropriate.

Bornhorst called for further discussion of the amendment. There was none. The amendment PASSED 17-7 in a show-of-hands vote.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the amended proposal. There was none. The motion to approve PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 27-2 with 1 abstention.

IX. New Business

A. Elections. Bornhorst said that it was time to consider the election of new senators and alternates as well as members of various university committees. As a first step according to the constitution, Section B of the By-Laws had to be updated. Bornhorst noted that the only change needed was the addition of the Fine Arts Dept to the list of other Course-Offering Units, making the number n=6.

Heuvers MOVED to add the Fine Arts Dept to Section B.2 of the Bylaws. Mroz seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED with no dissent in

a voice vote.

Bornhorst distributed a memo [Appendix G of these minutes] and summarized the timing of election events.

B. New Fringe Benefits Options from the Administration. Bornhorst noted that there had been several recent meetings concerning retirement benefits, and introduced Provost Dobney for the administration's response.

Dobney distributed copies of a memo to Bornhorst [Appendix H of these minutes], stating that it summarized his comments from the previous meeting on the subject of Senate Proposal 1-92, with some added information. He also distributed copies of a draft proposed retirement furlough program [Appendix I of these minutes], along with copies of a list of changes to that draft [Appendix J of these minutes].

Dobney summarized the proposed policy, saying that the only way retirement can be enhanced currently is with a program that does not require pre-funding. Dobney said the program provides a final year off with half pay for those with at least 78 points, and that the other sabbatical options would also be allowed. The furlough benefit would be funded like sabbaticals, with the faculty picking up the extra workload. The furlough would have to be agreed to by heads/chairs and deans. Dobney summarized the recent changes [Appendix J] in the proposed policy, noting that they were written in response to recent meetings with faculty groups.

Roblee asked whether the program would work for the MPSERS retirees, because their retirement benefit is based on the last year's salary. Cheney said that the MPSERS benefit is based on the best salary for the last 3 or 5 years before retirement, so the proposed program would not adversely affect this group.

Sewell asked whether professional staff would be covered under the proposal. Dobney said that it would not, because it was funded like a sabbatical.

Mroz asked whether each dean and department had to approve the program separately. Dobney said they would have to approve it separately, under the current language of the proposal. He added that these administrators would probably go along with the proposal under the pressure of Senate approval.

Beck said that faculty have no input into the sabbatical leave process at the departmental level; they have to share the workload, but do not share in the decision. Dobney suggested that this process might go into departmental charters.

Leifer said that when the meeting with the Fringe Benefit Subcommittee was called, he had been the only member contacted. He said that the proposal was being seen for the first time, and suggested that it be sent to the Fringe Benefit Subcommittee, to the Budget Oversight Subcommittee, and to the Finance Committee for study, discussion, and reporting of recommendations. Leifer said that the presentation of a plan without options is not shared governance.

Bornhorst said that when the proposal is forwarded officially by the administration to the Senate officers, a meeting of the Executive Committee would be convened to decide the disposition of the proposal, as indicated under the constitution.

Dobney said that the proposal had been heavily modified by the input of 7 faculty members, and that the plan was not being presented as a "take-it-or-else" proposal. Leifer asked whether it was a discussion document. Dobney said that it was a proposal from the Provost to the Senate, but it was not a Senate proposal.

Carlson asked whether the death-during-furlough paragraph might be rewritten to specify beneficiaries, rather than spouses. Cheney suggested that the wording might specify spouse or dependent children. Carlson said that there were other situations than spouses and dependent children to be considered.

Bornhorst asked if a new version could be submitted to include the wording allowing for the other sabbatical options. Dobney said that he would provide a new version.

Leifer asked about a proposal for phased retirement. Dobney replied that phased retirement was not in the current proposal, but that it was a topic for future discussion. Carlson said that the effect of the proposed 78 points was to drop the retirement age by a year. Grzelak said that the memo to Bornhorst [Appendix H] overstated the value of the average faculty TIAA/CREF account. He suggested that TIAA be contacted to provide more accurate actuarial numbers.

Bornhorst called for further questions. There were none.

C. Proposal 16-94 Smoke-Free Campus. Bornhorst asked Mullins to provide background for Proposal 16-94 [Appendix K of these minutes] which had been circulated with the agenda.

Mullins said the proposal was the result of discussion of current smoking policies in various buildings, prompted by memos from Neimi to Dobney. Two key documents had been considered in the committee. One was "On the Air: A Guide to Creating a Smoke-Free Workplace" by the American Lung Association; the other was "Smoke-Free Campus" from the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. A copy of the N Mich Univ smoking policy was also considered.

Mullins said that the committee had considered three options. (1) Do nothing, and continue to allow each building to establish its own policy. (2) Prohibit all smoking in all campus buildings. (3) Provide separate designated smoking areas in all major buildings with separate ventilation systems. The committee attempted to coordinate with staff council, but they had no real mechanism for considering any proposals.

Mullins said that the recommendation in Proposal 16-94 is similar to the policy instituted last year at NMU. This is most like the third option considered above, with smoking allowed in areas ventilated separately. Residence halls were included because the exposure to smoke is greater there. The advertising and sale of smoking materials is forbidden to avoid being hypocritical. The Sept 1 startup date is arbitrary.

Roblee asked what the installation of separate ventilation might cost. Mullins said it apparently had cost \$50,000 in the administration building. Keen asked whether the smoking ban extended to married student housing. Mullins said it did not if they had separate ventilation.

Sewell asked whether chewing tobacco had been considered. Heuvers asked whether the policy applied to recruiters on campus. Mullins said that they would be included. Diebel asked whether all advertizing coming into the library would have to be censored. Mullins said that the advertizing ban extended to items like MTU logos on ash trays.

Mroz asked whether smokers could demand areas with separate ventilation. Mullins said that the policy was modeled on NMU's policy, and that an inquiry to them might be useful. Fynewever said that entry areas should be specifically included in the ban.

Gruenberg asked whether the grounds, or only buildings were included. He said that the ban on advertizing was protecting people not from the activities of other people, but from themselves. Bornhorst called for further comments. There were none.

X. Adjournment

Bornhorst said that senators should bring the agenda attachment

to the next meeting of the Senate. Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Leifer MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Arici seconded the motion. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:26 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Secretary of the University Senate

.