

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 233
22 March 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Tabled Proposal 1-95: Sabbatical Leave Policy until completion of a survey by the Provost.
- (2) Accepted the Administration's changes in Proposal 4-95: Definition of Academic Appointments.
- (3) Rejected Proposal 25-95, thus keeping intact the current tuition/credit hour system.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:31 pm on Wednesday, March 22, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were At-Large Senator Filer, representatives from Army and AF ROTC, and NAGrp 1. Liaisons in attendance were Jim Cross (CTS), Brian Whitman (Grad Student Association), Aaron Dufrane (USG), and Kelly McLean (Staff Council). John Pilling substituted for the regular senator/alternate in Metallurgy.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Tim Malette (Financial Aid), Cliff Anderson (Institutional Analysis), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Bill McGarry (CFO), Gary Neumann (Student Marketing), M. Mullins (Chemical Engineering), Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office) and F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst had only one adjustment: delete "6.B. Report from the Finance Committee." He asked for changes from the floor, and Keen asked to use the spot given up by Finance for a report from the Instructional Policy Committee on a survey of the 1995-96 Academic Calendar. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Grimm MOVED to approve the agenda adjustments; McKimpson seconded. President Bornhorst said that if there were no objection to the agenda, it would stand approved. There were none. Motion CARRIED.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MEETING 231

There were no changes, and Vanek MOVED to accept the Minutes as written, with Carstens' second. On a voice vote the motion CARRIED.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT INQUIRY COMMITTEE

Bornhorst said that the Senate in the fall must elect committee members whose three year terms will be staggered.

B. PROPOSALS SENT TO PROVOST

- 1. Proposal 19-95: Ph. D. Program in Geological Engrn.
 - 2. Proposal 20-95: Policy on Class Attendance.
 - 3. Proposal 26-95: Undergraduate Academic Progress.
 - 4. Proposal 28-95: Faculty Handbook Recommendation.
- [Appendices B - E].

C. PROPOSALS APPROVED BY PRESIDENT TOMPKINS

Proposal 12-95: Search Procedures for Deans and Administrators [Appendix F].

Bornhorst read a memo he had written to President Tompkins regarding the Senior Vice President position [Appendix G].

D. OTHER ACTIVITIES

Bornhorst said he had received from the College of Sciences and Arts a proposal for a new Education Department, which he sent to the Curricular Policy Committee [Appendix H]. He also reported on the Administrative Evaluation Committee, saying that members of the commission had begun receiving materials for their work [Appendix I].

Bornhorst reported on a meeting between the Senate officers and Provost Dobney, at which they discussed several issues: Possible members in a proposed Strategic Planning Council; the recently Senate-passed Academic Freedom Statement, which no longer contains a reference to students' rights, but which should be reinserted, argued Provost Dobney; and a proposed meeting between Senate officers and leaders with the University attorney.

Whitt asked why a group would be meeting with the University attorney, arguing that he should not be offering recommendations on proposals before the Senate. Bornhorst answered that his input could avoid confrontations between the Senate and the BoC since the latter would assuredly ask the attorney's advice about the wording of certain proposals. Minor wording problems, Bornhorst said, would thus be avoided. Whitt said she was worried about the stage at which the attorney entered the process. Others argued for the usefulness of the attorney's input.

Bornhorst mentioned the forthcoming Senate elections, specifically the guideline that At-Large Senators need five signatures for nomination. He recommended ending this restriction and requiring only a Senator's signature. Brokaw MOVED with Heyman's second to require only consent of a Senate constituent to run. McKimpson asked if the Bylaws indicated who might run for Senator At-Large, and Keen said anyone could, although the individual's unit would determine the scope of the person's voting responsibilities. The motion CARRIED with dissent on a voice vote.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Bornhorst reported on his meeting with the BoC and its approval of two proposals: Discrimination and Harassment, and the Change in Grading Policy.

Keen reported on a survey from the Instructional Policy Committee to University Departments for next year's academic calendar. The majority preferred end of week break: December 22. Jobst asked about votes for the week before Christmas, and Keen said the committee rejected this because of the disruption it would cause for Music and other Christmas activities. Keen said USG had voted 22 to 8 for a midweek break.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 1-95: SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY

Bornhorst said the Administration, for the most part, approved the proposal except for the changes in compensation, and attached to the agenda are copies of the memo from Provost Dobney [Appendix J]. Dobney said the feedback from Deans and Department Heads indicated that the original proposal would place departments in a financial squeeze to replace absent

teaching staff. Mullins then distributed his own memo [Appendix K], which Bornhorst had previously submitted to the Provost with the proposal for administrative approval. Mullins argued that Tech offered faculty only the financial minimum, and although faculty are probably declining sabbatical opportunities for many reasons, money was probably one.

Bornhorst outlined the Senate's options: let the BoC decide, or accept the Administration's changed proposal. Roblee identified a third: rescind the proposal. Beck asked the Senate for a show of hands on whether they might not take a full-year sabbatical because of money; six people responded. Beck then asked for a show of hands on a rejection of sabbaticals for other reasons, and seven people responded. Dobney said he would survey the faculty in the next month to determine what reasons existed for the low number of sabbaticals. Pilling suggested the possibility of a sabbatical after three years.

Beck said that he was not surprised at his department's reaction. While he was struggling on sabbatical to pay for separate housing, the half of his salary remaining with the department would pay for a post-doc candidate, whom his department could work "like a slave." Dobney said statistics do not show that finances are the key to increasing sabbaticals, and before he can make such a case before the BoC, he must have proof. Mullins asked how else faculty might be motivated.

Reed raised the question of another change in the Administration's version of the proposal: a March 15 cut off date for sabbatical applications. Dobney said this came from the Engineering Council, and Grimm said this early date was needed to allow departments adequate time for finding substitute teaching staff. He suggested the date be tried for a year. Roblee said faculty often need the spring to make final arrangements. Dobney said the end of April would be OK with him. Pilling MOVED, with Roblee's second, to withdraw the proposal. Bulleit, however, said he preferred the new proposal with the old financial arrangements. Mullins said some room must exist for compromise between the two versions of the proposal. Discussion ended, and on a voice vote, the motion to withdraw the proposal FAILED.

Arici MOVED to table the proposal until the Provost's survey provides data. Leifer seconded. Discussion did not continue, and on a voice vote, the motion CARRIED without dissent. Dobney said Mullins would proof the survey instrument.

B. PROPOSAL 4-95: DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Grimm MOVED, with Bulleit's second, to accept the changes offered by the Administration, with the exception of a part of the Adjunct definition, as agreed to by the Provost [Appendix L]. No further discussion, and on a voice vote the motion carried without dissent.

C. PROPOSAL 25-95: RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE TUITION COMMITTEE

[Appendix M]. Bornhorst said USG had requested the Senate to table this proposal until the USG had an opportunity to offer their own plan. Heyman said the Senate's vote was merely a recommendation, and the USG should present their case to the Provost. Heyman MOVED, with Jobst' second, to approve this proposal.

Dobney said grad students take fewer credits than undergrad, and thus they pay much less in tuition, although they are still full-time. Arici asked why Tech should raise tuition for grad students if a major goal is to increase their numbers. Beck then raised the issue of how the University charges grant support for grad students. Since overhead is figured on, among other things, tuition, this proposal would effectively raise the Research Grant costs for supporting grad students. McGarry said that there were no plans for removing overhead charges based on tuition. Dobney said if the tuition hike was accepted, he would be willing to consider problems with overhead charges. The arguments against overhead are good, he admitted, but tuition should still be raised.

Arici called attention to Section 2.0 of the proposal, which requires supplementary charges for students taking higher than 17 credits. He said this penalizes bright students. Heyman said these bright students were also in his classes, and they are failing because they enroll in more courses than they can handle. They eventually drop, but before then, their enrollment produces "ghost seats." Dufrane argued that Tech is ostensibly a four year school, but he cannot finish in that time by taking only seventeen credits per term. He agreed with the problem of "ghost seats," but said this proposal was not the answer. Keen said the University should

change to a cost per credit hour. Currently, students working their way through school by taking twelve credits per term pay the same as those taking seventeen, he said.

Whitman said the cap at 17 credits may discourage students from enrolling in music courses. McGarry said Northern Michigan University is considering a move in the opposite direction: from a pay per credit to a flat rate, like Tech's, and they would gain \$1 million in tuition. If Tech switched, he continued, we would lose that million in tuition. Malette said the goal of his committee was to keep the proposed change tuition "neutral"; that is, tuition would not increase.

Bornhorst suggested that the proposal should go to a Senate committee, and Glime suggested Instructional Policy. Heyman argued for the proposal to be voted on. Irish MOVED to exempt Fine Arts course enrollment from the 17 credit ceiling, and Heyman seconded.

VOTING UNITS: Roblee MOVED, with a second from Heyman for a vote from the full Senate on this proposal; on a voice vote the motion allowing the full Senate to vote CARRIED.

Bornhorst then took the full Senate to a vote on allowing Fine Arts enrollment an exemption. On a role call vote, the motion FAILED 16 to 10, with three abstentions.

Bornhorst then took the full Senate to a vote on Proposal 25-95, and in a role call vote, the motion FAILED, 19 to 9, with one abstention. The Senate agreed to remain with the current tuition system.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate