

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 258  
30 May 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the emergency Senate Meeting 258 to order at 6:40 p.m. on Wednesday, 30 May 1996, in Room U113 of the Mineral and Materials Engineering Building.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large senators Robert Filer and Laurie Whitt, and representatives from Biological Sciences, Business and Engineering Administration, Chemical Engineering, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Forestry and Wood Products, ME-EM, Social Sciences, Technology, Army/AF ROTC, Fine Arts, Physical Education, Enrollment Management, Finance/Advancement, and Academic Services/Engineering. No Liaisons were present. Only 23 Senators were present; 26 were needed for a quorum, so the quorum failed and the meeting was adjourned.

Visitors were Laura Alexander (Human Resources), Mike Gilles (Research/Communication Services/Administrative Offices), and Marcia Goodrich.

Respectfully submitted by Janice M. Glime  
Secretary of the Senate

INFORMAL DISCUSSION: 2+2

An informal discussion followed, following the agenda that had been set for the meeting.

Senator Leifer stated that on 16 May, Provost Dobney met with the department Chairs and asked them to find out if faculty wanted to take the 2+2 option and if so, they would get a 1% decrease in salary raise. The way Dobney phrased it, it would be 1+3. Senator Beck stated that Dobney had said there would not be enough money to fund 2+2 the first year and he suggested 1+1 the first year with nothing out of the salary raise. The next year we could look forward to the second increment.

Senator Gilles stated that Dobney had admitted the \$130 parking allowance was coming from our salary increment. We have heard for many years that salaries and benefits are the number one priority, but they are always on the bottom of the agenda. If industry fails to meet its number one priority, they would be looking for new jobs. Money at MTU is never an object except for salaries.

Senator Pegg responded to Beck, that if we suggest less now and more later, later never comes. We should go on record that we don't want to back off.

Leifer stated that the administrators are not reluctant to hire other administrators such as the Director for Center for Teaching Excellence, Director for Wellness, Director for International Relations, and Vice President for Government Relations.

Senator Thayer stated that if you look at the budgeting, it is not Fred's money. They have been sandbagging half a million dollars per year for building programs. Who is concerned? We can't attract quality

people. Senators say we can't afford things when they haven't looked at the budget. Shared governance is only shared blame. Thayer can't believe that Senators could go along with this.

Senator Bradley asked if there had been an official response. President Bornhorst stated that there had been none and that the Provost had no intention of giving one, at least not before fall quarter.

Senator Beck stated that if individual faculty communicate what we want, there is no telling what we will get. We need an open discussion; there has been none in departments so far. This discussion is the only mechanism we have, and we should take this back to the departments. Bornhorst responded that he also needs to hear this discussion to take to the Provost. He will tell the Provost that we want the 2+2 we voted on.

Vice President Walck stated that we did not vote to take the 2+2 out of our salaries. This would hurt us when we compete for new faculty, but new faculty get market rates [creating disparity among those already here].

Senator Leifer agreed. Faculty don't have enough [money] to retire. We need the Leifer plan - work until we drop dead in the classroom; therefore we would get the benefits until death. Tompkins has an edifice complex and Leifer doesn't want it on his back.

Bradley stated that the way the 2+2 passed, it doesn't say where it comes from.

Leifer asked if we could take a straw vote and Bornhorst responded that we could.

Senator Sweany stated that we can't talk about money coming from someplace else because the raise pool is what is left over.

Senator Diebel stated that salaries for new faculty is causing dissension in the ranks because of inequity in salaries of senior faculty. We can't satisfy this out of the existing salary pool.

Senator Thayer stated that administrative people start with the salary of the previous person and work up. Their salaries are like those of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

Senator Chavis asked if anyone is addressing losing students.

Leifer stated that 2 years ago the Finance Committee issued a report on the cost of the decline in enrollment; he will send a copy to Chavis. Another problem is funding graduate programs - you shouldn't fund graduate programs from the general fund. Funding should be external, using industrial funded fellowships, and a large endowment. Another problem is the cost of legal fees. The Bracco case costs over \$500,000. There has also been a pyramiding of administrative offices.

Senator Flynn asked what the estimated cost is to fund graduate students. Beck responded \$4 million. He presented the Provost with a page and a half of new hires. They spent money on the treats and sweets - a new interview center, retooling the 5th floor [of the Administration Building]. All faculty are asking for are cost-of-living raises.

Leifer stated that the University is getting a 6.1% increase in state money. But the governor might have a recession bill in January, so the administration wants to give you a raise in January. Leifer wants the raises now; if there is a problem in January, we will deal with it in January. Bradley responded that that is one way to put salaries first.

Thayer stated that there has been an adversarial relationship with the Administration for 37 years [his tenure at MTU]. We are funding graduate students from the general fund. Sweany asked about the effect this would have on GTA's. Leifer responded that he is not talking about the GTA funding; the GRA's are funded from the general fund and should not be.

Flynn stated that there might be a counter argument that the status achieved by graduating Ph.D.'s is directly related to the money the state will give MTU. Bornhorst responded that it is not that simple. Beck added that the University is close to the number of Ph.D.'s needed; we need to be more efficient and graduate these students sooner. There should be no more expansion at the expense of the general fund.

Leifer stated that if he wants 12 Ph.D.'s and has a million

dollars, no one will complain if they are funded from his grant. If these are funded from the general fund, there is no 1% in TIAA/CREF.

Beck asked if anyone preferred to wait until January to receive a raise. Sweany responded that he had polled faculty and some prefer not to have to give back money. Leifer stated that he prefers to have the raise start in September. If there is a recision, then lower the salary in January. Sweany responded that some of his faculty consider this as a pay cut in January and don't want it.

Bornhorst stated that it would depend on how it was taken away. It could result in pay that is less than the previous year. Bradley asked why only cut salaries when [the Administration] could cut elsewhere. Do all departments go over their budgets? Thayer agreed that gravy is built into the budget. Bornhorst added that some departments save money and roll it over to the next year. Vichich stated that if people are important, then salaries should be put first. Soldan suggested that people could ask payroll to hold back part of their pay so they would have less shock in January if there is a cutback.

#### INFORMAL DISCUSSION: LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Senator Leifer stated that Dr. Logan has the right to write what she chooses. He totally agrees with Sury [Dr. Suryanarayana wrote a letter to the Mining Gazette], but a response shouldn't have to come from the faculty. Why has there been no response from any administrator, chair on up? Their silence reinforces this point of view in a public forum so that the public think they were right [in believing the kinds of things in Logan's letter]. Leifer quoted part of a commencement address to the United States Naval Academy, that defined leadership as consisting of three things: competence, caring, and character. Leifer has asked Duane Thayer and Martha Sloan if they would be willing to serve on a committee to respond to Dr. Logan's letter and they agreed. We should respond.

Senator Flynn asked if the response letter would go to the Gazette and when. Leifer responded it would go to the Gazette, and the sooner the better.

Goodrich (Tech Topics) suggested that we get a "million" people to sign the letter. Glime suggested showing Logan's letter to students so that they could respond if they chose; her class read the letter and were appalled to think a member of the Board could be so naive about the responsibilities of a faculty member. Dr. Logan provided her address and invited responses from faculty, staff, students, and parents.

Senator Bradley asked why the Administration had not responded. Lutzke stated that the administration never publicly responds; some of them have stated that they disagree. Senator Beck stated that the World Trade Organization is above the Supreme Court; we could take it there.

Senator Thayer stated that the letter would be innocuous if the fourth paragraph were taken out. He recalls that when he came to MTU the tuition was \$0.00.

Vice President Walck stated that the Senate should write the letter and it should be signed by the Senate. Tuition should be addressed; starting salaries for our students have gone up too. Senator Vichich added that most starting salaries for our students are above those of many faculty.

Leifer asked if we could have a committee. Bornhorst responded that we could form a committee; it just would not be a Senate committee. The letter could not be official if not passed by the Senate, even if 26 people [number needed for a quorum] signed it. Soldan suggested we could meet for 15 minutes just to approve the letter. Senator McKimpson agreed that we would be more likely to get people to such a short meeting.

Senator Flynn asked if there was any way to conduct Senate business without a meeting. Bornhorst responded there was not.

Senator Vichich suggested we meet before the Board meeting and then present the letter to the Board.

Leifer suggested that Thayer and Sloan and anyone else who wants

to contribute should draft a letter.

Sweany reminded the group that Leifer had stated two things: A response was needed, and the Administration had failed to respond. Do we want to do something about the Administration?

Flynn stated that it appeared the Administration had responded; the Board meeting was cancelled for lack of a quorum. This appears to have been a cover to provide more time to respond to Dr. Logan's letter.

Goodrich responded that they knew that there would not be a quorum before the letter became public; the publication had been timed to be right before the meeting; cancellation of Board meetings for lack of a quorum is not uncommon.

Sweany stated that we ought to write to the Administration. They have shown an appalling lack of leadership. Pegg suggested mentioning in the letter to the Administration that someone has to fill the gap.

Leifer said let the Administration sink of their own weight because they will look bad. Lutzke asked "look bad to who?" Leifer responded "us."

Senator Chavis stated that the news will go beyond this community and the results of this situation could escalate.

Thayer stated that the letter should not bash, it should be informative. It should be polite and be done with integrity and honesty.

Bornhorst stated that to expedite it, a draft could go out with time to get input, then have a meeting. Leifer suggested meeting 12 June. Bradley suggested that we have a time strategy. This depends on when Sloan will be back; after that it could be drafted in 3 days.

Senator Soldan suggested a small committee with a small second tier.

Leifer suggested that the draft committee put the letter together and have the officers review it. Senator Bradley asked if we will present it to the Board with the Senate report. Thayer responded that it should go to the Board and the Newspaper at the same time.

Bornhorst responded that the Board gets an official agenda; the letter could be put with the agenda. It would be needed on Tuesday to take it to Detroit for the Board meeting on 21 June.

Bradley suggested we meet on 17 June. Chavis asked if the letter is addressing the Board or Dr. Logan.

Senator Diebel responded that the bigger problem is that someone could be on the Board and understand so little. We need a "take a Board member to work day."

Thayer stated that the Administration has made an effort to insulate the Board from the faculty. The Senate is the voice of the faculty and staff. We would be remiss if we didn't answer. Senator Vichich supported that statement.

Vice President Walck stated that the letter is important and must be drafted carefully. Dr. Logan's letter represents the larger public sentiment.

Senator Nordberg stated that this is cyclical about every 4 years - from boards, legislators, and the public. It needs to be addressed, but to whom do we send suggestions?

The discussion ended at approximately 7:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Janice M. Glime  
Secretary of the Senate