

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 228

18 January 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard a lengthy report on the University budget from Provost Dobney.
- (2) Learned the progress on establishing the Administrative Evaluation Commission.
- (3) Requested a response from the Provost on Proposal 7-95: Modification of the Grading System
- (4) Formally approved the amended Proposal 12-95: Search Procedures for Deans and University Administrators.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, January 18, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from Chemical Engineering, both ROTC units, IWR, and NaGrp 2. Brian Whitman, from the Graduate Student Association, attended as a liaison.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Dave Ouillette (Registrar's Office), Francis Otuonye (Mining), Eric Obermeyer (Grad student, ME-EM), Duane Thayer (Metallurgy), Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office), Bill McGarry (Chief Financial Officer), Jim Lutzke ((Tech Topics), Kris Lipman (MTU Lode), Jim Pickens (Forestry), and F. Dobney (Provost).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

Bornhorst's adjustments were to sections 6 and 7. Strike "6. B. Finance Committee" and under "7." add an "A. Proposal 7-95: Modification of the Grading System," change the current "A. Proposal 4-95 to "C" and items "C" and "D" to "D" and "E" respectively. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Mroz MOVED to approve the agenda adjustments; with Irish's second. With no discussion and no objections, Bornhorst declared the agenda adjustments approved: the Motion CARRIED.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting 226

There was no discussion. Irish MOVED with Vanek's second to approve the Minutes of Meeting 226. On a voice vote with no dissent, the motion CARRIED.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. PROPOSALS SENT TO THE ADMINISTRATION

- 1. 6-95: Policy on Discrimination and Harassment [Appendix B.]
- 2. 11-95: Membership for University General Education Committee [Appendix C.]
- 3. 15-95: Statement on Professional Ethics [Appendix D.]

B. PROVOST MEETING

Bornhorst said that at a meeting with the Provost on 1/16/95 the Senate Officers discussed proposals in progress and other issues of possible

Senate concern. Bornhorst also said the Provost agreed to return to the Senate on February 8 to discuss the Strategic Plan and the Budget following the January 27 BoC meeting.

C. BOARD OF CONTROL MEETING

Bornhorst said he would attend the January 27th BoC meeting in Novi and told the Senate to inform him of any issues he should cover in his presentation.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

A. UNIVERSITY BUDGET

Provost Dobney began his discussion by stating that a budget helps him identify and set priorities for University goals so that he may allocate funds appropriately. Some, he noted, have complained that the budget is generated from top down, but all University units have had ample opportunity to offer feedback.

Dobney said that initially, his office, after consulting the University Long Range Plan and then conferring with the University community, has developed eight goals. He pointed out that the eight are not listed by priority because the equality of goals shows the importance of all segments of the University.

From year to year, however, Tech does set priorities, Dobney said, as conditions change. He then showed a series of transparencies identifying the eight goal areas and Tech's current strengths and weaknesses in each [Appendix E].

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Among the current strengths are the low faculty to student ratio, which has occurred because the Administration has made major investments in instructional staff, even during a time when enrollment has been declining. Of the weaknesses, Dobney identified the decline in enrollment, the failure to produce student diversity, the lack of good methods for assessment of instruction, and the lack of accreditation for the Business School. A final weakness is the inadequate residential life for students.

FACULTY

Among the strengths are the addition of 36 new faculty lines, the diversity of faculty, and the shared University governance. Of the weaknesses, Dobney pointed out the faculty pay, which, according to the Oklahoma State University survey, is below the national average by 8% for Assistant Professors, 10% for Associate Professors, and 11% for Full Professors. Tech has also made only a marginal increase in minority faculty.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Dobney called the Senate's attention to the strengths in this area, the two new graduate programs (a PhD in Computer Science, and an MS in Industrial Archeology). The weaknesses are the heavy reliance on state support for GTAs, the lack of space for growth, and the lack of a review system. Leifer referred to the administration's goal of 1400 grad students. Leifer said the University cannot afford internal funding for even 1000 grad students.

Provost Dobney was then asked about the apparent underuse of space in the new M&M Building. The Dean of Engineering is looking at the space there, he replied. Dobney also pointed out that tenants do not want to completely fill a new building; they should have room for growth.

Of the strengths here Dobney pointed to the growth in sponsored research and the appointment of Michigan Tech as the home for the Industrial Archeology Journal. Among the weaknesses are the fragmented approaches to research, the shortage of lab space, and the low number of block grants we have generated.

STAFF

The strengths include the number of TQE teams, the Sick Leave Pool, and the revitalized Wellness Program. He also cited the decreasing University bureaucracy (a decline from 11% to 7.5% for institutional support). The weaknesses include the decline in the numbers of academic support staff in comparison with the increase in faculty, and the failure to pay competitive staff salaries.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Dobney mentioned the new Banner computer system as a strength, as well as the Library Automation, which should begin soon. The weaknesses include the Library holdings, and the campus computing facilities.

PHYSICAL PLANT

Efficient operation is the first strength the Provost mentioned, along with the planning for the new buildings: the ESE, the Forestry Addition, and the Fine Arts Center. The weaknesses are the delay in Tech's ability to start on the Forestry addition, the lack of space in the Van Pelt Library, and the outdated science facilities.

RESOURCE ACQUISITION

Dobney focused primarily on weaknesses here, mentioning the decline in state aid, the costs of Tech retirement system, and the decline in funding caused by the lower student enrollment.

BUDGET PRIORITIES

Dobney listed them as

- > Salary Parity by 1998,
- > Library Materials Acquisition,
- > Computer Support,
- > Business School Accreditation,
- > Funds for the Planning of the New ESE building,
- > Student Enrollment Gains,
- > Improvement of Student Life, and
- > Academic Infrastructure Support.

1995-1996 BUDGET PREMISES

Dobney said the University expects a tuition loss of \$500,000, resulting from the additional decline of 70 students next year; and this number of students, he added, may be even larger. Dobney proposed a tuition increase of 5%, and a grad student increase of 25 people.

The State may offer an increase of 6%, but this is optimistic.

Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) is estimated to increase at upwards of 10%, with Auxiliary Enterprises producing \$3.6 million, and a lab fee ceiling of around 5%. Lab fees, of course, are a "pass-through," going directly to the sponsoring departments.

At this point Heyman mentioned the need to examine whether the money on retention is well spent.

EXPENDITURES

Dobney said financial aid would only go up for GTAs by the amount of tuition increases.

The 1% realignment will continue. Sciences and Arts have used the Dean's discretionary moneys, but that's no longer possible: now the Dean must pass along this to the Departments, as the system is supposed to work.

Dobney talked at length about this controversial system. He asked the Senate how else to realign funding, moving moneys from low-need programs to emerging areas. He mentioned the system used by his

predecessor, in which the Provost absorbed all positions which opened during the year, including retirements. In this method the Provost makes the choices of where to take back, but the current method allows the Deans and Chairs to make these decisions. Other methods are to eliminate University programs, but he showed a table indicating that Tech's number of degree programs (35) are already much smaller than those in other state schools (55 is the next smallest). Another possibility is a further reduction in staff, but this has already occurred over the past several years, and it can't be cut any more. Finally, the University could consider a Full Funding Budget, in which each department supplies a certain percentage of faculty salaries--from grants, research, etc.

Bulleit argued that the 1% realignment will eventually hit teaching faculty since researchers bringing in grant moneys are not going to be cut. Dobney said that the Deans need not take the 1% from all departments evenly. A senator asked where the 1% would be going, and Dobney said to the priorities already discussed. Bornhorst asked about the 1% from last year, which came to about \$500,000 the Administration received. Dobney said it paid for new positions in ME, EE, BS, and FA. Bornhorst pointed out that some funds that ended up with faculty also came from staff reductions.

Whitt argued that each department's enrollment would be used to indicate how much a cut they would have to take. No, Dobney said, it's Productivity, and he cited Forestry as a department with low enrollment but high productivity in terms of research and grants. Whitt continued: The temporary popularity of a program is a bad way to determine cuts. Dobney said that the administration never based any major decisions on the numbers from only one year.

The Provost said that other methods are available for returning funding from the departments to the Provost, such as his office absorbing all faculty lines that come vacant because of retirement or resignation. Beck said departments might then pass all their faculty through to tenure and thus shield themselves from cuts. Dobney admitted that the method could provoke countervailing pressures, but he said the University has absorbed the 1% for the past two years without major discomfort: "Doesn't that indicate," he asked rhetorically, "that we had some fat?" Bulleit countered, however, with the analogy of chipping away parts of a column holding up a building.

Beck said the Administration should request more information from the bottom, and he cited improvements to Fisher. The University replaced all the blinds in the building instead of installing what was needed: new storm windows. The idea for the changes in the health plan, he continued, also came from below.

BUDGET

Dobney said that the University, to achieve salary parity, needed to raise salaries 3% over inflation for the next several years, but it just can't be done. He said he hoped the retirement system funding method might be modified. Currently it requires large sums be set aside for future costs. He argued that paying costs as they arose would be better.

Whitt asked about legal fees the University pays, and Debbie Lassila replied that these have dropped \$100,000 from last year: from \$350,000 to \$250,000. The savings went to GTA funding, the Senate learned.

Heyman asked about a breakdown of lump sum budget figures. Whitt argued for the 1% to go to the Library. Dobney said that the University hopes to decrease the rise of medical costs, but we will probably only break even with the new system.

Glime argued for adding the fringe benefits to the salary statements when comparing Tech salaries with other schools. Bradley said the low cost of living in the UP might also be figured in, but Dobney said not

everything in this area was cheaper. Beck suggested a University shop, which could be shared by the entire school. Dobney said he will also get input from the BoC at the next meeting. The state is doing well financially, Dobney said, but the governor wants to return tax moneys rather than distribute them to those dependent on the state for funding.

6. B. COMMITTEE REPORTS (CONT.)

C. ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION COMMISSION

Bornhorst identified several items of interest regarding the evaluation of the administration: (1) Ballots for commission members are now being counted, and results should be available at the next Senate meeting; (2) The guidelines for completing the evaluation identified September [1994] as the date to begin, but the time frame required for this process was overly optimistic. Commission candidates, for example, were not immediately forthcoming. (3) The original completion date was set at March 1995, but now, Bornhorst asked, what date should be set for the commission being assembled to begin its work and be expected to finish? (4) Another element is finding an outsider, but what is the role for such an individual? Should this person be involved in all aspects? Bornhorst then introduced Steve Vanek, chair of the Administrative Policy Committee, who has been working on finding a candidate.

Vanek said Linda Belote is the committee's nominee. Belote, former MTU Social Science faculty member and then Dean of Students, now has the same [Dean] position at the U of MN-Duluth. Her travel costs should be relatively modest. Vilmann MOVED, with Whitt's second, to close the nominations. In the discussion, Bornhorst asked if the Senate had other nominees, and, when none was forthcoming, asked if anyone objected to voting only once--not only to close the nominations but also, since she is the only nominee, on the acceptance of Dr. Belote. There were none. On a voice vote, the motion CARRIED, and the Senate accepted Linda Belote as the outside individual on the commission.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 7-95: A/B GRADING METHOD

Bornhorst asked the Provost to reconsider this proposal and return with a response. The Senate's option is to take it to the BoC, but they would rather avoid such an action.

Leifer asked why the Provost had denied it previously. Bornhorst said "cost."

B. AMENDMENT TO PROPOSAL 12-95: SEARCH PROCEDURES FOR DEANS AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS

[Appendix F.] Bornhorst reminded the Senate that this proposal had passed previously, but the proposal had included unresolved, substantive, editorial changes, and thus the Senate must approve the changes. Keen MOVED, with Grimm's second, to approve the amendments to Proposal 12-95. There was no discussion, and on a voice vote the motion CARRIED without dissent.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Huang MOVED and Keen seconded to adjourn. Motion CARRIED. Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by

Jack Jobst

Secretary of the University Senate