

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 249
24 January 1996

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) established an ad hoc committee to investigate the University policies and procedures for hiring individuals into tenure-track appointments, particularly when the University is already hiring a spouse.
- (2) heard a report from Joe Galetto on enrollment projections and requested a presentation on recruitment budget comparisons to other institutions.
- (3) approved Proposal 12-96 to limit K-Day choices to Tuesday or Thursday.
- (4) approved Proposal 9-96 to clarify the constituency.
- (5) rejected Proposal 8-96 to define routing of Senate proposals.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 24 January 1996, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Robert Filer and representatives from ME-EM and Information Technology.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Joe Galetto (Enrollment Management), Nancy Rehling (Admissions), Gary Neumann (Student Marketing), James Dietrick (USG), and Gordon Erdelean (USG).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mroz MOVED and Caspary seconded the motion to accept the agenda. The motion PASSED by voice vote with no dissent. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 248

Senator Caspary asked that the word "faculty" be changed to "Senate" on page 6030 B., column 2, to read "the resolution would mean that the Senate join Staff Council in supporting a 3% salary increase as the highest budget priority."

Caspary MOVED and McKimpson seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion PASSED by voice vote with no dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

The Senate resolution regarding salary adjustments was transmitted to President Tompkins, Provost Dobney, Vice President Tahtinen, and Chief Financial Officer McGarry and will be a part of President Bornhorst's report to the Board of Control on Friday. [Appendix B]

President Tompkins hosted a Charter School Workshop on 15 January 1996. The morning after the Senate meeting on 10 January (11 January), President Bornhorst went to President Tompkins' office to request a presenter who is obviously against charter schools. Vice President Walck contacted MEA, NEA, and AFT for suggestions of persons who might be able to speak in opposition to charter schools but was unable to get any suggestions. President Tompkins had invited local MEA representative Skoglund to attend as well as many area superintendents, and many of these posed questions from the audience. The panelists

dealt with both sides of the issue, and many tough questions were asked by the audience, causing a reasonably broad view to emerge. The MTU administration has defined guidelines for an MTU charter [Appendix C] and President Tompkins has publicly stated that MTU would only support an outstanding proposal for a charter school. Our criteria seem to be far more stringent than those of other schools.

Discussion ensued on whether to invite President Tompkins to the Senate to talk about the charter schools. Senators Brokaw and Mroz questioned the value of inviting him, questioning what our purpose would be. Senator Thayer stated that Tompkins had said we wouldn't do it if it would cost the university money. Senator Lutzke stated that tapes of the workshop are available in the President's office. Senator Fynewever stated that we need to know the role the Senate will play if MTU is involved in setting up a charter school. Senator Thayer questioned why we are pursuing charter schools and Bornhorst explained that it was political because the governor wanted it and selected Board members who were supportive. Senator Whitt stated that the Senate may be considered too late in the process after many decisions have been made. Secretary Glime, who attended the workshop, stated that the President has indicated that MTU will need to develop guidelines to review the proposals that do arrive. Senator Brokaw stated that if it is true that guidelines will be drawn up, the Senate should know their involvement in the process and decision making. Senator Pegg asked whether the Senate would only get involved if MTU goes ahead with charter schools and Brokaw responded that the Senate should be involved in the choice to go forward. Senator Keen read from the Senate Constitution regarding the role of the Academic-Degree-Granting Departments in establishing schools, colleges, etc, and interpreted that we clearly have a constitutional obligation to be involved in decisions regarding charter schools. President Bornhorst stated that the Board of Control has stated that we will go ahead with charter schools. Senator Whitt stated that even so the Senate does not have to agree with the decision and that if we provide well-documented concerns and ideas we might be able to influence the Board. Senator Lutzke reminded the Senate that six of the eight Board members were appointed by Governor Engler only after being questioned about their position on charter schools. Bornhorst said that the officers would pursue our role, perhaps with a proposal at an upcoming meeting.

Page 6092 Minutes of Senate Meeting 249 24 Jan 1996

In October 1994 President Bornhorst, at the request of two faculty, asked the Instructional Policy Committee to investigate the issue of inappropriate student behavior. He has accepted their report, which recommends no new policies but increased education of students and faculty through the Dean of Students Office and the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development. [Appendix D]

Based on the discussion at Meeting 247 and in consultation with the other officers, President Bornhorst prepared a charge memo for the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance. [Appendix E] The Committee has been asked to report to the Senate by 8 May 1996. Senator Pegg inquired whether the charge was limited to the items listed, to which Bornhorst indicated it was not, and whether the MTU Senate was considered a legislative body, to which Bornhorst explained it was, but that not all universities would have the same kind of structure.

The Provost and Senate Officers met on 22 January 1996 to discuss the status of proposals and various issues. The Provost asked for feedback of the handling of the weather advisory/closing. Please forward comments on the recent closing to the Provost.

President Bornhorst announced the 1996 Upper Midwest Faculty Forum.

President Bornhorst informed the Senate that the officers are concerned about the recent hiring of the spouse of the new Senior Vice

President for Advancement to occupy a tenure-track position in Fine Arts. Bornhorst recommended that the Officers appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the university policy and procedures for hiring individuals into tenure-track appointments and make recommendations to the Senate. This committee will draw from a variety of constituents on campus and not be restricted to senators.

Thayer MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to form an ad hoc committee to investigate the University policies and procedures for hiring individuals into tenure-track appointments, particularly when the University is already hiring a spouse. The motion PASSED by voice vote with no dissent.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Joe Galetto reported on the 1996-97 Enrollment Projections. [Appendix F] The projection for next year is higher than the lowest year in recent history, partly because the graduate enrollment is becoming a bigger percentage of our total enrollment. We have grown from 365 graduate students in 1985 to 681 in 1995. However, projections indicate that Michigan Public School graduates will not surpass the 1988-89 numbers until 2005, and numbers were even higher prior to 1988. The secondary market (Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois) has been somewhat more steady, but they provide only a small percentage of our students. Both the national and Michigan interest in engineering is dropping (-.84% in Michigan, -1.12% nationally), accounting for essentially all of our drop in enrollment. One way to increase our enrollment is to increase our yield, i.e., the ratio of enrolled out of those accepted. The national average has dropped from 50% in 1988 to 44% in 1992 (and has changed little since), whereas at MTU it has dropped from 50.5% to 48% and appears to be about the same for 1995. Another way to increase the total enrollment is to increase retention. MTU retention from the entering freshman to the sophomore year has been 83-87% in recent years, with 83% in the past year. This is high compared to national averages.

In 1995 MTU increased enrollment by 85 mostly through freshman and transfer students. The projection based on enrollment to date is that we will not bring in as many students as last year. Furthermore, fewer students will return due to a graduating class that is larger than the class to follow it. Student callers will talk to accepted students in an attempt to increase yield. Financial aid is being used in ways to optimize the number of students it attracts. Even with a projected increase of 34 graduate students (to 725), Galetto projects a drop of 148 students. Our yield is higher than at most universities (where it averages about 30%).

Senator Whitt asked why we are only a regional school when we have such an excellent reputation for undergraduate education in engineering and are a best buy. Senator Lutzke replied that 75% of all students stay within 250 miles of home to go to school. Senator Whitt asked where the students are going instead of engineering. Nancy Rehling (Enrollment Management) reported that they are going to health careers and some to business. Senator Heyman asked about Eric Obermeyer's claim that our high enrollment standards are responsible for keeping out the engineering students. Galetto responded that the enrollment standards have been set back to where they were, but that students often do not respond to the decrease right away because they know people who were rejected under the higher standards. Lutzke added that some students are not comfortable in this environment; however, if we can get them to the campus, they are usually impressed and that increases chances that they will enroll.

Senator Tyrell asked how our recruitment budget compares to other schools. Rehling responded that MTU purchased 20,000 ACT scores and names whereas Northern purchases 40,000-150,000 each year. MTU has been a gatekeeper in the past, serving only to screen applications; now they need to be aggressive and recruit. Senator Shonnard asked if MTU uses the World Wide Web for recruiting and Galetto responded that we do; counselors are informed about it and it is described in the high school newsletters. Senator Leifer asked what yield we get from our summer

programs and Galetto stated that we have not used that data base well in the past but that we are now set up to start using it. One problem is that the program has down-sized and we get 350-400 applications for women in engineering but only accept 100. Those not accepted interpret this to mean they would not be accepted into our undergraduate program. Instead Galetto suggested we need to be more aggressive

Page 6093 Minutes of Senate Meeting 249 24 Jan 1996

with those who were rejected by explaining our size limits and encouraging them by waiving the application fee for admission as a student.

Senator Sloan asked what the budget priorities are for recruiting. Rehling responded that first we need to reach younger students, including use of more ACT searches. Second we need to develop an effective alumni network; alumni are willing to help, but have not been organized to do so. Third, we need a bigger publication budget. Senator Beck asked if there were any long-term contingency plans in the event of government cutbacks in loans, etc. Galetto stated that they were aware of potential cutbacks but have not set out any plan. Beck responded that they need to set out scenarios and how they will respond to each. Senator Mroz asked how far behind other schools we are in funding for recruiting and Galetto responded that he could get those numbers. Whitt stated that we need to invite Galetto back to address comparisons. Vice President Walck asked if recruiters are pursuing non-engineering more vigorously and Galetto responded that some departments like Biological Sciences are phoning all accepted students to encourage them to enroll. President Bornhorst stated that the Senate would invite Galetto back to talk about comparison data.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 12-96: Academic Calendar: K-Day [See minutes, page 6054, for a copy of this proposal.]

Keen MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to approve Proposal 12-96. There was no discussion. Suggested voting units were academic-degree-granting departments. Senator Gruenberg stated that the entire Senate should vote because it is a holiday that affects all employees. Pegg MOVED and Greuer seconded the motion to expand the vote to the full senate. The motion to expand the vote PASSED on voice vote with dissent. There was still no discussion; the motion to accept Proposal 12-96 PASSED by voice vote with no dissent.

B. Proposal 9-96: Revision of Senate Bylaws [See minutes, page 5994, for a copy of this proposal.]

Discussion opened on Proposal 9-96 (to clarify constituency). Senator Thayer stated that guidelines for non-faculty seemed clear and asked why we could not simplify the faculty statement to include only tenured and tenure-track faculty and full-time 9-month faculty as constituents. Bornhorst explained that the definition of full time is not clear or consistent throughout the University. Senator Flynn asked about non-tenure track faculty. Senator Pegg stated that a large number of people in the Humanities Department want half-time faculty to be constituents; he favors guidelines that cover everybody; there need to be clear guidelines for accepting persons who petition for membership. Bornhorst stated it was his opinion that that there must be extenuating circumstances to let additional persons in, e.g. someone who has worked here for 15 years and expects to continue. Rather than setting the cutoff at full-time, Bornhorst stated that another possible cutoff could be 3/4 time, 9 months, since the University policy is to provide fringe benefits for 3/4 appointments. Persons with a 50% appointment could be here today and gone tomorrow. Senator Heyman pointed out that instructors would be constantly popping in and out of the constituency.

Bornhorst reminded the Senate that we had eliminated the part-time titles and did not recognize at that time the implications, such as including some grad students among constituents when given a one term Instructor title; therefore the proposal defines constituency based on hours worked. Senator Leifer pointed out that if someone works 3/4 time for 9 months it is the same as working 9/16 for 12 months. Senator Mroz stated that 40 hours per week of summer added to 20 hours per week in the academic year would be 3/4 and could qualify some graduate students. Thayer restated the intent to include only those with a long-term commitment to the university.

Heyman MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to approve Proposal 9-96. Suggested voting units were the full Senate; there were no objections. Keen MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to adopt the published amendment as a replacement for Proposal 9-96. [Appendix G] The motion to replace PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Senator Pegg asked how often the constituency list was updated and stated that people pop in and out quarterly. Bornhorst stated that the list is updated every pay period for staff and once a term for faculty, but that the list is always updated before a referendum vote. Senator Kitalong asked if someone appointed for 3/4 time for 9 months receives benefits and Bornhorst answered yes. Thayer stated that if staff who are 3/4 time for 9 months are given university benefits like full-time employees, that group should be constituents; temporary people should not. Keen stated that Biological Sciences has two long-term employees who are not tenure-track. Leifer concurred that we need to exclude temporaries; we can handle long-term non-tenure track persons as exceptions. Bornhorst stated that the Senate would spend too much time deciding on constituents each year. Senator Brokaw stated that persons with a one-year appointment sometimes have as much long-term commitment as some tenured persons. Bornhorst stated that we can write guidelines to cover appeals, but keep them out of the Bylaws. Senator McKimpson asked if including 3/4 time persons would eliminate most of the petitions and Bornhorst responded that the number of petitions would probably be small. Senator Reed asked for clarification on the meaning of petitioning to the Executive Committee and Bornhorst responded that the Executive Committee would review the petition and recommend action to the floor of the Senate. Sandberg called for the question. There was no second. There was no further discussion. Proposal 9-96 PASSED as amended on voice vote with no dissent.

C. Proposal 8-96: Revision of Senate Bylaws [See minutes, page 5859, for a copy of this proposal.]

Keen MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to accept Proposal 8-96 (to define path of proposals).

Concern had been expressed that this proposal was overly prescriptive. Suggested voting units were the full senate. There were no objections. The motion to accept Proposal 8-96 FAILED on voice vote with no affirmative votes.

D. Proposal 11-96: Conflict of Interest Procedures [See minutes, page 6034, for a copy of this proposal.]

Heyman moved and Mroz seconded the motion to accept Proposal 11-96. Senator Caspary stated that faculty don't seem to care one way or the other, but that staff can have problems if they are not in their office full time because they are attending to something outside the university. As at will employees, they have no protection. The procedures read more like a policy. He went on to state that Bill Blumhardt had serious reservations about the proposal because it was inappropriate for much of the contracting he needed and he did not have

any input on these service contracts. Senator Heyman stated that the issues are very complex and that we cannot micro manage the future. He also expressed concern that the guidelines could be used as a weapon against at-will employees. He pointed out that the proposal had undergone considerable modifications in some sections based on Blumhardt's concerns (see p.15 of the proposal and minutes of Meeting 248 p. 6028 report on item 6.2.1).

Thayer MOVED and Vichich seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m. with an open motion on Proposal 11-96 on the floor.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.