

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 231
8 March 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard a report from President Tompkins on his presentation to the House State Appropriations Committee, and the impact of Bill 237.
- (2) Sent to committee the calendar for the 1995-96 academic year.
- (3) Established a simple majority as necessary for approving revisions of formerly-passed proposals.
- (4) Passed Proposal 20-95, revision of 19-94: Policy on Class Attendance.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent was a representative from Chemical Engineering. Liaisons present included Brian Whitman (Graduate Student Association), Aaron Dufrane (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Curt Tompkins (President of the University), Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Linda Ott (CS), Dave Ouillette (Registrar's Office), Erik Obermeyer (MTU Lode), F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President), and M. Goodrich (Tech Topics).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst made several agenda adjustments: Move "6A. Legislative Report--President Tompkins" to immediately after the Agenda Adjustments; after "B. Faculty Handbook Steering Committee" add "Scientific Misconduct Inquiry Committee," and under "7. Old Business" move "A. Proposal 13-95" to the end of the list, adjusting the letter designations of the other proposals upward. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Vanek MOVED to approve the agenda adjustments, with Mroz's second. No discussion. On a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

6.A. LEGISLATIVE REPORT - PRESIDENT TOMPKINS

[Section moved by agenda adjustment.]

President Tompkins distributed two packets of materials [Appendix B] relating to his presentation before the State Appropriations Committee of the House at the State Capitol. He called the Senate's attention to the graphics in the handouts, which supported his request for a higher budget increase. Tompkins said the House would probably ratify the Governor's budget allotment of 3%, while the state senate, he believes, may vote for an across the board allotment of 6%.

Tompkins discussed the implications of Senate Bill 237, which prevents state-supported colleges and universities from raising tuition beyond the Consumer Price Index (2.7% this year). The bill would run in perpetuity. It is presently on the governor's desk, awaiting his signature.

Heyman asked about appointments to fill vacancies on the Board of Control (BoC), and President Tompkins deferred to Provost Dobney, who said he had learned that the names would not be released until the end of the

month.

Tech was not identified in the graphics among the state's "Research Universities" and Tompkins explained that the State organized the presentations by each school's Carnegie rating, beginning with those identified as Doctoral I. Tech was included with Western, although Tech produces more research doctorates than the Kalamazoo school. Dobney pointed out that Tech is moving towards the Doctoral I ranking, "with fifteen PhD's so far this year." Tompkins said Tech should reach this Research University goal around 2003.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting 230

All amendments focused on page 5010. Whitt pointed to section 7.B which mentions her question for Bornhorst on how the BoC responded to his presentation, rather than how the BoC responded to the Three Year and Out policy, which is what the minutes indicate. Leifer suggested inserting "TIAA/CREF" at the end of section 6, which should read "Dobney said each TIAA/CREF retirement percentage point costs the University about \$250,000." Beck corrected the meaning of his question to the Provost in the next to last paragraph under 7.D, to read "Beck asked what percentage of graduate students are foreign, and how this number compared to other schools."

Carstens MOVED to approve the minutes of Meeting 230, as amended. Arici seconded. On a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. PROPOSALS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

1. Proposal 7-95: Amendment of Proposal 86-5 (Grading System Changes) [Appendix C].
2. Proposal 17-95: Certificate in Mining and Environmental Engineering. [Appendix D].

B. OTHER ACTIVITIES

1. Proposal 21-95. The Institutional Planning Committee has withdrawn this proposal for further work [Appendix E].
2. Bornhorst reminded the Senate that nominees were needed for the spring election of At-Large Senators.
3. Bornhorst identified several BoC agenda items which might be of interest to the Senate, including the discussion of several proposals passed by the Senate, including Emeritus Definition and an additional bereavement leave added to fringe benefits.
4. Bornhorst described his recent meeting with President Tompkins and their discussion of several topics, including the imminent retirement of Ron Helman and the process for his replacement with a "Senior Vice president for Advancement," which would involve representatives from faculty, students, and the Alumni Board. Bornhorst asked if there were any objections to the President's proposed search committee. There were none, although Glime suggested that careful consideration be given to the availability of members for meetings. She also asked for a definition of "senior," and Dobney said it's a way of distinguishing between vice presidents. Beck said the position is one of the most critical for Tech, especially in light of the tuition freeze.

Bornhorst discussed the meeting of the Senate officers with Provost Dobney, when the group discussed a possible Capital Outlays Committee, Ranking Definitions, and the budget.

Finally, Bornhorst said he was calling a special Senate meeting next Wednesday, March 15, which would use an agenda committed solely to "Old Business," that is, the proposals on the current agenda, for which there will not be time tonight. He said this method should expedite proposal discussion. He also recommended that, in the future, agendas of special meetings should not follow the regular format.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

B. REPORT ON FACULTY HANDBOOK STEERING COMMITTEE

Linda Ott, as chairperson, reported that the committee has debated two separate handbooks-one for tenure-track, and another for non tenure-track

faculty. She offered pros and cons for the two handbooks; the Senate will decide this question. Heyman asked if overlap wouldn't occur, and Ott agreed. Beck asked if this process would not lengthen publication deadlines, and she said it would not; all should be completed this summer. Glime pointed out that different handbooks would disallow groups from knowing the rights and duties of the others. Ott said both would be on-line, and thus available to anyone. Bradley asked if these two are the total number of handbooks, and Lassila said no, there will also be a handbook for professional staff.

C. SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT COMMITTEE

Bornhorst reminded the Senate that last year the Senate passed a policy establishing a standing committee, but it has never been formed. An issue is now at hand, and a committee must be formed. He recommended that Vice President Glime, with the assistance of Secretary Jobst and Senator Bulleit form a list of potential committee members, from which Glime would appoint three members plus an alternate until fall term. A new committee member would be selected for next fall. Heyman MOVED to accept this plan, and Mroz seconded. There was no discussion, and the motion CARRIED without dissent.

D. STRATEGIC PLAN

Provost Dobney displayed a packet of transparencies [Appendix F] illustrating several possible budget scenarios. All ended with deficits. Dobney said that Auxiliary Enterprises could again provide some extra support, but this method was increasingly problematic. Salary increases, he said, would take virtually all extra moneys, leaving nothing for special projects.

Dobney pointed out that the State will allow increases up to the Consumer Price Index, but health care costs will increase beyond that, to 4.9%, and Library acquisition will be up 10%.

Options include raising non-resident tuition, increasing enrollment, decreasing financial aid, and raising outside funds, say from donors. Obermeyer asked why the transparencies did not reflect the tuition percentage increases from the past several years, and he recited them. Lassila said that it took a 2% tuition increase to equal a 1% raise from the State. Dobney reminded the Senate that the total University budget is about \$74 million, and the percentages being discussed, on State Appropriations and Tuition, are only on a fraction of this total.

Mroz asked whether Bill 237 could be ignored, and Dobney said that doing so would penalize parents of Tech students several hundred dollars in tax rebates.

E. ACADEMIC TENURE COMMITTEE

Bornhorst read a list of new tenure committee members: Mark Plichta and Bruce Seely, with alternates Willie Melton and Neil Hutzler.

F. HEALTH CARE UPDATE

Ellen Horsch reported that the Benefits Committee recommended that the University sign an agreement with Wausau Insurance as of May 1. They selected this date so the committee had time in April to put on forums and information sessions for employees.

Carstens asked if costs would increase for employees seeking local health care, and Horsch said they would not as long as the employee sought participating providers in the PPO plan. Roblee asked how long the agreement would last with Wausau, and Horsch said three years.

G. ADMINISTRATION EVALUATION COMMISSION

Bornhorst reminded the Senate that they had previously given him the power to appoint a chair. Paul Nelson has agreed to assume this responsibility.

H. 1995-96 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

[Appendix G.] Leifer pointed out that the calendar identifies Christmas break beginning at 10 pm on Friday, December 22, a late date, especially considering travel required by most Tech students.

Sloan said she has concerns for the safety of students rushing to get home, and pointing out that Tech would resume on January 8. Pre-Christmas vacation is preferable, she said, to post-Christmas days off. Roblee said this calendar was trying to avoid breaking up the weeks for vacation. Students leave early otherwise, he said. Keen asked why the calendar did not go to the appropriate committee. Leifer suggested that vacation begin on December 15, with students returning on January 3. Irish said changes in the calendar could adversely affect the Cultural Arts Calendar, which contains important events at that time of year.

Glime said that split weeks worked well this year, but Pletka said his lab classes had to be canceled for the entire week before Christmas because the subject matter could not be covered in less than two sessions.

Roblee MOVED to accept the calendar as is. Carstens seconded. Bornhorst explained that if this motion failed, the calendar would be sent to the Instructional Policy Committee for review. Grimm asked why Martin Luther King, Jr. Day was not included in the calendar, and Dobney said the issue has yet to reach the BoC. On a voice vote the issue was too close, so Bornhorst called for a roll call: 12 yes, 20 no, the motion FAILED, and the calendar goes to the Instructional Policy committee for review.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 20-95, REVISION OF PROPOSAL 19-94: POLICY ON CLASS ATTENDANCE

1. Voting on Revisions of Previously-Passed Proposals

Bornhorst announced that his reading of Robert's Rules of Order stipulated that a 2/3 vote was required for any revision of previously-passed proposals, and he asked for a motion so the Senate could set a precedent on this issue. Carstens MOVED, with Arici's second, to establish the 2/3 rule.

Keen said his reading of Robert's Rules indicate that a simple majority is sufficient for everything except emergency proposals, that is, items not published in the agenda. These require a 2/3 vote to be considered. Discussion ended, and the proposal to require a 2/3 vote on revision of proposals FAILED on a voice vote. Henceforth, passing proposal revisions will require only a simple majority.

2. Proposal 20-95

[Appendix H.] Bornhorst asked for any objections to the voting units; there were none. Sloan MOVED, with Filer's second to approve Proposal 20-95. Keen explained that the request for this revision came from students attending the recent University-sponsored job fair in Minneapolis. They were penalized for participating in the fair. The discussion ended, and, on a voice vote of academic degree-granting units, the motion to accept 20-95 CARRIED without dissent.

B. PROPOSAL 22-95: REVISION OF SENATE BYLAWS

[Appendix I.] Bornhorst said this issue did not yet require a motion, and he instead would like to hear preliminary discussion. Beck asked for an explanation of how passage of this proposal would work, considering that two groups-the Senate, and the Professional Staff, must accept it. Bornhorst explained that the Senate must first pass the proposal to show that they wish to allow the Staff to join the Senate; then the Professional Staff would vote on whether they indeed wished to join. Adding Professional Staff to the Senate would require approval by both groups.

Bradley asked if Staff Council was informed of this proposal beforehand, and Bornhorst explained that the Council leadership had participated in several general discussions relating to the proposal, but the Senate Executive Committee agreed with Senate officers that leaking parts of the proposal, before the complete package was published, would lead to rumor and confusion.

Bradley asked for examples of the Council's response, and Soldan said the issue was polarizing. Many were supportive, while others were concerned about the implications. Some staff, he continued, are intimidated by the Senate: its location with the bright lights, television cameras, and "professional talkers." The council is more low key, making it easier for members to participate.

Bornhorst said that when he distributed the proposal he realized the proposal would potentially anger everyone at once, but that was preferable to taking sides with one group knowing before the other. Bradley said the procedure was awkward, but Dobney said in controversial issues someone is always going to be upset because he or she wasn't consulted.

Beck said the current Senate workload is heavy, and he expressed concern that more constituents would add significantly to this problem. He mentioned the United Nations, which has many constituents, talk by a lot of people, but little work that seems to get done. "Let's wait a year," he suggested, "and see if the workload goes down."

Roblee said one reason for the heavy workload is the shared governance of the University, which is what the faculty wished. Soldan said the workload may increase, "but so would the number of workers." Beck reminded the Senate that the meetings would still last only two hours. Miner asked whether the Senate would be willing to spend time on staff issues. Bornhorst said approval of the proposal would mean that the Senate may wish to form a new standing committee to deal with staff issues. Steve asked if a forum would be organized to discuss the issue with the people involved. Bornhorst said if the proposal passed the Senate he thought a forum would be useful.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Leifer MOVED, with Malette's second, to adjourn. Motion CARRIED.

Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate