

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 230
February 8, 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard a report from President Tompkins on his meeting with the Governor regarding next year's University budget.
- (2) Heard a proposal from Senate President Bornhorst on adding non-union staff to the Senate's constituency.
- (3) Heard a report from Vice President Dobney on the University's Strategic Plan.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, February 8, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from Math and AFROTC. Liaisons represented were Jim Cross (CTS), Brian Whitman (Grad Students) and Aaron Dufrane (USG).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included J. Gale (SBEA), E. Horsch (Human Resources), E. Obermeyer (Grad Student, ME-EM), D. Lassila (Provost's Office), F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President), M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), and C. Tompkins (President).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst made several agenda adjustments: After item "3" add a new item "4. Report from President Tompkins" and adjust subsequent numbers to reflect this addition. To "New Business" insert a "C. Proposal 22-95: Revision of Senate Bylaws" and move this to "Committee Business/Reports-A. Executive Committee," where it will be discussed since Proposal 22-95 came from this committee. Also under "New Business" add a final item: "E. Proposal 25-95: Comprehensive Tuition Plan," followed by "Announcements" then "Adjournment." [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Bornhorst asked if there were any further agenda adjustments. There were none. Carstens MOVED to approve the agenda adjustments; Malette seconded. Since there was no discussion, and no one from the floor offered any further adjustments, Bornhorst said he would consider the adjustments approved if no one objected. There were none, and Bornhorst declared the agenda approved as adjusted.

4. REPORT FROM PRESIDENT TOMPKINS

President Tompkins began by distributing a report based on the meeting between Presidents of Michigan state universities and the governor [Appendix B]. He then read a personal statement he gave to the governor, requesting a 2-3 point increase in state appropriations over inflation to help recover from the state's lean years of college financing.

President Tompkins said the governor would be releasing his budget on February 9, and it would probably contain only a 3% increase for most schools, but with extra, supplementary funding for some state schools: Grand Valley, \$100,000; Western, \$200,000; MSU, \$300,000; and CMU, \$500,000.

Tompkins also said the governor announced he was withholding board appointments until he determined if they supported charter schools: "I want

you to compete with public schools," the governor said. The governor also indicated his disdain for college remedial programs, arguing that K-12 schools must "shape up" and produce graduates with these skills. The meeting with the governor lasted eighty minutes.

President Tompkins said he and the presidents of the other four doctoral-granting schools (Western, MSU, U of M, Wayne State), in a precedent-setting meeting, will meet with legislators to present their side of the appropriations issue. Tompkins said the legislators are relatively independent minded, and they won't necessarily agree with the governor's view on the budget. Tompkins was also heartened by the news that our State Senator Koivisto has been placed on the appropriations committee, as has our representative, Tesanovich. Koivisto, Tompkins said, will argue for a 6% increase.

Tompkins also discussed the ramifications of Senate Bill 237, which, if passed, will allow a tax deduction for Michigan taxpayers who send their children to state schools which have kept their tuition to the rate of inflation. Thus if Tech raises tuition above 3%, parents of children at Tech will be punished.

Carstens asked about the funding for Charter Schools, and Tompkins replied that the state payment would match the amount currently allotted, per pupil, for that particular geographical area. He also said that CMU had been given a state bonus appropriation, and that school has taken the lead in establishing charter schools. The function of CMU, however, is more in line with K-12 education. Tech's overall objective in the state system, on the other hand, is not consistent with the charter concept, and we will probably not get involved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting 228

Beck referred to a paragraph on page 4892 which discussed the 1995-1996 Budget premises. He suggested adding the word "increase" in the first two sentences. Italics indicate the added material in the adjusted passage, which follows.

"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%."

Heyman suggested revisions to the same section of the Minutes but in the subsequent paragraph. The early draft reads "At this point Heyman mentioned the need to place scholarship funding in areas where more students are needed." The revised paragraph will read "At this point Heyman mentioned the need to examine whether the money on retention is well spent."

Beck called attention to a paragraph on the second column of the same page, beginning "Beck said a department might pass all faculty through to tenure and thus shield themselves from cuts." Important context is missing here, Beck said. The adjusted paragraph reads:

"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...."

Grimm MOVED, with Heyman's second to approve the adjusted minutes for Meeting 228. The minutes were approved on a voice vote without dissent.

Meeting 229

Leifer called attention to several items. First, on page 4924 under the heading "Finance Committee Response to Environmental Science Building" the paragraph which begins "Leifer complained that the Administration

frequently offers misleading numbers..." Leifer said "stated" would be more accurate than "complained."

Second, Leifer asked for a clarification of his point regarding funding for future building projects. The administration had offered a ten plus year timetable of projects which did not include the Environmental Building and the Forestry addition, and the costs were projected at \$105 million. The Administration had said they hoped to receive \$95 million from the state, thus leaving a balance of \$10 million, assuming no overruns. Leifer asked rhetorically what would happen if the state does not produce that amount, and even if they do, how will the University produce the extra funding?

Third, Leifer referred to the administration's goal of 1400 grad students. Leifer said the University cannot afford internal funding for even 1000 grad students."

Finally, Leifer asked for more detail in the section of Minutes for 229 which discussed the Conflict of Interest proposal (page 4924). Leifer focused on a hypothetical textbook written by and used in a course by Senate Vice President Glime. "Even if she enrolled several hundred students in the class, Leifer said at the meeting, "she might make a hundred dollars in royalties. How," Leifer asked, "does that compare to the Conflict of Interest occasioned by a University attorney deciding on whether Tech should continue with a lawsuit, thus assisting that same attorney in generating hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees for himself?"

Grimm, with Huang's second, MOVED to accept the adjusted minutes. Bradley said he would like to see the changes first, but Whitt pointed out that they would appear in the next set of minutes. With no further discussion, on a voice vote without dissent, the motion CARRIED to accept the minutes from meeting 229, as adjusted.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. PROPOSALS APPROVED BY PRESIDENT TOMPKINS

1. Proposal 6-95: Policy on Discrimination and Harassment. This will go to the Board of Control (BoC) [Appendix C].
2. Proposal 11-95: Membership on University General Education Committee [Appendix D].
3. Proposal 15-95: Statement on Professional Ethics [Appendix E].

B. RESPONSES FROM ADMINISTRATION ON OTHER PROPOSALS

1. Proposal 10-95: Recommendation on Disciplinary/Discharge Policy [Appendix F].
2. Proposal 16-92: Departmental Charters. Bornhorst read a statement from Dobney stating that as yet none has been submitted. [Appendix G].

B. SENATE OFFICERS' MEETING WITH PROVOST DOBNEY ON FEBRUARY 6

At this meeting between Senate officers and the Provost, the group discussed

1. Proposal status (listed above) and those passed by the Senate but not yet approved by the Administration.
2. Upcoming forum on Due Process. This will be cosponsored by the Academic Women's Caucus and the AAUP.
3. Promotion of Assistant Professors with tenure to Associate Professors with tenure.

C. COMMITTEE ON PRIVACY AND ETHICS IN COMPUTING

This is co-sponsored between Bornhorst and Dobney. Reports will be forthcoming when appropriate.

D. COMPUTER EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dave Reed is the Senate representative. The committee has been actively discussing a high speed computing business plan. Reed will report to the Senate on this in the future.

E. COLLEGE OF SCIENCES AND ARTS DEAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Senate representative, Gary Campbell, has been elected chair, as

reported in Tech Topics. Bornhorst will ask Campbell to report to the Senate on the evaluation process for Deans. As Deans will continue to be evaluated, perhaps the Senate may wish to form the guidelines to make this process easier in the future.

F. SPRING ELECTIONS TIME TABLE

Senate Assistant Meyers distributed copies of the timetable [Appendix H].

G. PROPOSALS SENT TO THE ADMINISTRATION

1. Proposal 1-95: Changes to the University Sabbatical Leave Policy [Appendix I].
2. Proposal 4-95: Definition of Academic Appointments [Appendix J].
3. Proposal 17-95: Certificate in Mine Environmental Engineering [Appendix K].

H. 1995-96 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

This will be attached to the next mailing that goes to Senators and Alternates.

I. TIAA/CREF MATCHING FUNDS CONTRIBUTION

The Senate President asked Provost Dobney to describe such a plan. Dobney said that the guidelines for retiring with TIAA/CREF at one's same rate of pay is 15%. Currently the University offers a little over 10%, and raising this to 15% is not fiscally possible, but Dobney suggested that faculty might wish to consider adding 2% on their own, which would then be matched by the Administration, raising the rate to 14%, which is at least close to the guideline. For this issue to be considered in the next budget cycle, however, it must be raised now.

Leifer said that he had discussed this last summer with the Provost, and his counteroffer was a system whereby someone who would retire within the next few years would get an adjusted amount based on time in service, as opposed to someone just beginning to save towards retirement. President Tompkins would not support this plan.

Page 4937 Minutes of Senate Meeting 230 8 Feb 1995

Dobney said the University cannot afford lump sums for imminent retirees. In fact, he said, the University might not be able to offer an added 2% during one year, but instead would increase retirements by one percent each year for two years. Dobney said each retirement percentage point costs the University about \$250,000. Roblee asked about those in the MPSERS plan. Leifer said his particular plan included more than TIAA/CREF; it offered "equity across the board."

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Bornhorst read a statement [Appendix L] in support of a new Proposal, 22-95: Revision of Senate Bylaws. Following this, Senate Assistant Meyers distributed copies of the statement and the proposal.

Beck asked why the entire Senate constituency could not vote on the plan rather than just the Senate. Bornhorst said that he felt an informed decision by the elected representatives of the constituency was better than an uninformed referendum. Beck said the next meeting on March 8 would be too soon for a vote on this issue, and Bornhorst agreed. Bornhorst also pointed out that the Senate, to approve the plan, would have to agree by a 2/3 vote.

Diebel asked about the placement for a staff person, say from Biology. Bornhorst said that such a person would "move" as far as the Senate constituency is concerned, to "Academic Services, non Engineering."

Whitt asked why the Senate officers promoted this plan as a "package" deal, and Bornhorst said the plan contains trade-offs, which allow for fairness. This fairness would be lost if some parts were removed.

Bornhorst gave as an example the requirement that At-Large Senators be from academic units. "Without that stipulation, Bornhorst said, the academic units would not be in the majority.

B. BOARD OF CONTROL (BoC) RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Bornhorst described his meeting with the BoC in Novi, MI. There was no quorum because some members could not come, and the governor has not appointed replacements for those whose terms have expired. For those who did attend, the Provost presented the budget, and Bornhorst reported on the issues recently discussed in the Senate, including the Three Year and Out Policy, which was mentioned in light of the new faculty ranks. Bornhorst also discussed other Senate issues: Discrimination and Harassment, Martin Luther King Day recess, the Search Procedures for Deans/Administrators, and Bonding for New Buildings. Bornhorst said he expressed the Senate's wishes for input at an earlier date on capital outlay issues.

Whitt asked how the Board responded on the Three Year and Out policy. Bornhorst said one member, after the meeting, expressed support on the Senate's view of eliminating this rule.

Arici asked for a clarification on the Charter Schools issue and the Board. Dobney said that the governor will appoint two new board members, and they will join one current member, who supports it. These three will not constitute a majority of the Board.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION COMMISSION

Bornhorst announced that Terry Monson, who has been appointed an administrator in the Business School, will be replaced on the Commission by Tom Merz unless there were objections; there were none. Regarding the chair person for this commission, who is supposed to be the Senate representative, Bornhorst asked the Senate to allow him to appoint someone as the chair. Heyman MOVED to allow this, with Carstens second. No further discussion ensued, and the motion CARRIED on a voice vote with dissent.

D. STRATEGIC PLAN

Dobney showed the Senate a large number of transparencies [Appendix M] illustrating input and final results on the Strategic Planning. He also distributed current draft copies of the plan [Appendix N].

Dobney began by discussing several suggestions by Undergraduate Student Government (USG) regarding the Strategic Plan, and why they were declined. For example, the USG supported the Provost on minority hiring, but their version did not include specific numbers. The original goal stated "To increase the number of women and under-represented minority faculty, and develop strategies to insure their success." USG recommend this be changed to "...develop strategies to encourage the success of women and under-represented faculty." Glime said the state's major employer, the auto industry, will refuse to consider Tech grads if they lack work experience with under-represented groups.

The USG also supported the University's view of the graduate program, but not at the cost of the undergrad. They furthermore supported funding for grad students from external sources. The Provost said that probably the University will indeed use external support, but the University must remain flexible in dealing with this issue. He then pointed out that internal versus external funding is not always easy to determine, and he asked, as an example, to which category one would ascribe funds from an REF [Research Excellence Fund]. Leifer said the answer depends on whether the funds first go into the state-supplied general fund or not.

With respect to tuition and fees, the USG suggested a change to "hold [increases] to the rate of consumer inflation." The provost replied that if this was done, Tech would never make headway on salary parity.

The USG also offered original goals rather than modifications of those generated by the University, such as on faculty tenure. Their suggestion to "Terminate ineffective faculty" might be revised, Dobney said, to "Don't tenure faculty with poor instructional skills and poor performance

evaluations," but this, he pointed out, is done already. The goals, he said finally, should be stated in a positive tone, and thus he found no need to include this particular goal.

Beck asked about what percentage of University costs are generated by student fees. Dobney replied that it was much lower than other state schools.

Dobney concluded by reminding the Senate that earlier in the evening he reported that no department had yet submitted a charter, but he was wrong. Fine Arts just turned in their materials.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senator Irish reminded the Senate of the Jazz performances set for the weekend of February 10-11.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Leifer MOVED to adjourn, and Miner seconded. Without discussion, the motion CARRIED on a voice vote. Bornhorst declared meeting number 230 adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate

.