

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 260
11 September 1996

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) approved the schedule of meeting dates.
- (2) heard that Proposal 13-96, Associate in Applied Science Degree in Chemical Engineering Technology, and Proposal 23-96, Policy on Faculty Availability, have been approved by the Administration.
- (3) heard that the Board of Control has approved Proposal 32-95, Ph.D. Program in Mathematical Sciences, and Proposal 10-96, M.S. Program in Environmental Policy.
- (4) was invited to submit nominees for the Ad Hoc Committee on Separation, Academic Tenure Committee, Faculty Review Committee (Grievance), Academic Integrity Committee, Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct), General Education Committee, and Sabbatical Leave Committee.
- (5) heard Kurt Pregitzer summarize the report from the Research Organization Task Force.
- (6) amended Proposal 29-96, Sabbatical Leave Recommendations, to strike the statement giving extra funding priority to faculty requesting multiple-term sabbatical leaves.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate Meeting 260 to order at 5:31 p.m. on Wednesday, 11 September 1996, in Room B45 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large senators William Shapton and Laurie Whitt, and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, KRC, and Finance and Advancement. Liaisons in attendance were Max Seel, (Dean, College of Sciences and Arts) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Ingrid Cheney (Benefits & Human Resources), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Freydoon Arbabi (Civil & Environmental Engineering), Kurt Pregitzer (School of Forestry), and Ellen Horsch (Human Resources).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mroz MOVED and McKilligan seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion to approve PASSED on 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 MEETINGS 255-259

Carstens MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 255. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

McKimpson MOVED and Richter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 256. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Senator Beck asked if item 6 in the Synopsis of meeting 257 should read President Tompkins or Provost Dobney instead of President Bornhorst. President Bornhorst agreed.

Beck stated that item 15 of the synopsis of meeting 257 was confusing. He interprets that it looks as though there is a limit of \$15,000 (5 x \$1000 + \$10,000 for up to five years) to be paid over five years. Leifer responded that this was inaccurate; however, it would require being here 45 years to get \$.25 million. This needs to be clarified.

Beck MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 257 with the noted clarification. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

[NOTE: Secretary Glime has subsequently checked with Les Leifer and Provost Dobney for clarification. The part of the proposal that was eliminated by amendment would have provided, for example, that a person who served MTU for 25 years would get a raise of \$25,000 for prior service (\$1000 per year of service) plus \$10,000, which would become part of the base pay for five more years of service, after which the faculty member must retire. Thus, if a person currently earns \$60,000, that person would, under plan B, earn \$60,000 plus \$25,000 plus \$10,000, or \$95,000 per year until retirement five years later, totaling \$175,000 supplemental income. The issue of prefunding such a plan has not been

settled.]

Carstens MOVED and McKimpson seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 258. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Sweany MOVED and Richter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 259. Senator Keen stated that there had been a good bit of discussion but he did not know if it occurred before or after the meeting. President Bornhorst clarified that if there is not a quorum the meeting is immediately adjourned after roll call. Secretary Glime added that there are notes for the discussions that followed. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. PROPOSED MEETING DATES

There was no discussion on the suggested meeting dates. Seely MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to approve the meeting dates as proposed. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Scheduled meeting dates will be 11 & 18 Sept, 2 & 16 Oct, 6 Nov, 11 Dec, 8 & 22 Jan, 5 & 19 Feb, 12 & 26 Mar, 2, 16, & 30 Apr, and 14 May.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that the Administration has approved Proposal 13-96, Associate in Applied Science Degree in Chemical Engineering Technology and Proposal 23-96, Policy on Faculty Availability. President Bornhorst has transmitted all proposals passed by the Senate at the end of last year, including Proposal 23-96, Policy on Faculty Availability (approved); Proposal 24-96, Recommendation on Health Insurance Benefits; Proposal 25-96, Recommendation on Retirement Income Program; Proposal 32-96, Policies and Procedures Regarding Tenure-track Appointments. Provost Dobney is still considering Proposal 18-96, Basic Benefits Package, Proposal 24-96, Health Insurance Benefits, and Proposal 25-96, Retirement income Program; he has referred these proposals to the University Benefits Committee for further deliberation. [Appendices B-G]

President Tompkins has approved more departmental charters: Computer Science, School of Business and Engineering Administration, Chemical Engineering, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Social Sciences, Civil and Environmental Engineering, and Humanities.

During the summer everyone on campus received a copy of the Administrative Evaluation Commission Report, as specified in the Senate proposal. [Appendix H] Bornhorst requested permission to send a thank you letter on behalf of the Senate to the Commission for all their hard work. There was no objection.

The Board of Control has approved Proposal 32-95, Ph. D. Program in Mathematical Sciences, and Proposal 10-96, M. S. Program in Environmental Policy. [Appendices I-J]

Last spring, the Senate agreed to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Separation; that committee needed to do work on retrenchment. The Senate agreed that this committee would include both faculty and professional staff, not necessarily on the Senate. The Senate Assistant will gather the current status of the policy and all documents available. Senators are encouraged to gather volunteers.

The Senate previously authorized the President of the Senate to send a letter to Bresnan regarding televising Senate meetings; this letter is being held while the Administration continues to negotiate.

Senate Officers met on 3 September and discussed agenda and committee assignments. The Senate Officers met with the Provost on 3 September and discussed the status of Senate Proposals.

Two proposals on degree programs remain from last year: Proposal 27-96, M.S. in Environmental Engineering Degree; Proposal 28-96, B. S. in Applied Ecology and Environmental Sciences degree. These proposals have been transmitted to the interim chair of the Curricular Policy Committee for discussion at their first meeting. [Appendix K]

Proposal 30-96 on Ad Hoc Committees, put together by the Officers, has been withdrawn and the issue has been sent to the Constitution Committee. The Constitution Committee is going to propose some major rewrites and clarification of the introductory language. [Appendix L]

Applications are available for the Visiting Women Lecturers Series and the Visiting Women and Minority Scholar Series. Applications are available from Educational Opportunity and are due 7 October 1996.

The Senate needs to fill University Committee Vacancies as follows:

Elected by Faculty-

Academic Tenure Committee, 1 tenured faculty member
(3-year term)

Faculty Review Committee (Faculty Grievance), 2 faculty
members (3-year term)

Elected by Senate-

Academic Integrity Committee, 1 faculty member
(3-year term)

Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct), 1 faculty
member (3-year term)

List of Nominees to President Tompkins-

General Education Committee, 1 faculty member (4-year term)

Sabbatical Leave Committee, 1 faculty member (5-year term)

(3 nominees are forwarded to President Tompkins; Senate elects 3 nominees from list of all persons nominated)

Names of nominees with evidence that they agree to be nominated should be sent to the Senate Assistant. The Senate Assistant will E-mail a list of committee needs to all Senators and Alternates.

Senator Walck reported that the last university accreditation was in 1988. The evaluation team will come to accredit us in January 1998; we must go through a self-study process this year. Walck will report to the Senate on this process at the 18 September Senate meeting.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. 1996 Committee Assignments

The method of assigning members to committees is detailed in Appendix M. Senators are asked to notify the Senate Assistant if they wish to trade or move.

B. Research Organization Task Force [Appendix N].

Kurt Pregitzer summarized the report of this task force, titled "Research at Michigan Tech University: New Culture, New Practices, New Organization." The committee consisted of Kurt Pregitzer (chair), John Crittenden, Michael Gretz, Neil Hutzler, Komar Kawatra, James Rogers, Maximilian Seel. They examined the structure used at many other universities and visited West Virginia University to look at their research structure.

They set the goals of evolving the culture for research and graduate education through a series of actions designed to improve the quality and quantity of research, to improve administrative functionality, and to increase external visibility. The committee recognized the need for a new culture regarding research at MTU. They felt that the university must recognize that unity in teaching and research define the very core of a technological university. MTU needs to overcome the notion that research and undergraduate education are in conflict. Research is a prerequisite for excellence in higher education at a technological university. Scholars have a responsibility to bring their expertise alive in the classroom. We need to improve the climate and rewards for interdisciplinary teaching and research, to recognize the value of postdoctoral scholars and research faculty, and to promote undergraduate student involvement in every research project. To accomplish the goals, we need to change the reward structure, establish a program development fund, and integrate the functional path of the research. To accomplish the latter, the task force recommends a new structure in the establishment of a single research administrative umbrella, the MTU Research Foundation.

The committee recommended the formation of an MTU Research Foundation with the President as the Chair.

Senator Beck commented that he had only heard about the committee two times and wanted to know how much input there had been from academic departments. Pregitzer responded that the committee gathered information and made recommendations that they are now bringing to the academic faculty for input. The formation of the committee was announced in Tech Topics.

Senator Leifer asked where we would get the funding for the proposed changes. Pregitzer responded that the task force did not expect a need for more funding. Leifer queried if there is more research, where will money come from? Dean Seel responded that 15% of the overhead will go to the Vice Provost for Research, an amount approximately equivalent to what is now spent for matching and start-up funds. The position of executive secretary would be a new position. Pregitzer stressed the importance of education AND research.

Vice President Soldan commented that Pregitzer stated that it is always better to increase research; is there a limit? If we concentrate on teaching, research, or both, we will reach a point of one at the expense of the other. Pregitzer responded that this is a misinterpretation of their intention. One can only do so much. There is no reason we can't be good at both. Research can enrich the undergraduate experience. It is important for scientists to be in the classroom.

Senator Seely stated that the formation of a foundation will attract the most attention. In the 30's universities didn't accept contracts from outside the university, so the university set up foundations to be buffers but retain intellectual control. Financial needs were the primary reason for establishing foundations. Why do we need a foundation to tackle issues that are not financial?

Provost Dobney stated that we need to demonstrate that we can manage large scale projects; Vice Provost Lee says that it doesn't appear to sponsors that we have the experience of dealing with large-scale research. Pregitzer added that the purpose is to provide one umbrella from the sponsor's perspective. Seel stated that Michigan doesn't have the legal constraints but the problems are exactly what Dobney has described.

Senator McKimpson asked the status of the recommendations. Bornhorst clarified that the President would like a sense of how the

Senate feels on these issues. In particular, he is interested in the changes in indirect cost and in the structural change. We could bring this to the floor at our next meeting or send it to a Senate Committee. He asked Senator Reed, as interim chair of the Research Policy Committee, to respond. Reed felt that the Research Policy Committee should dig into the entire report. Senator Beck added that he supports Reed. We shouldn't present the solution before we know what the problems are for the people "in the trenches."

Seel stated that all members of the task force are active researchers except himself. Beck responded that the researchers have problems when a contract ends and money is owed, but accounting can be at fault when they have not collected the money from the sponsor.

Pregitzer referred to action item 8, which addresses accounting. The Foundation gives a consistent and coherent policy forum to resolve issues through time. President Bornhorst added that we do not want to re-invent the wheel. Senator Keen asked if the Research Integrity Committee was the same as the Scientific Inquiry Committee; Pregitzer responded it was.

Senator Walck asked if we need to vote. Bornhorst stated that the President would like our recommendation. Bornhorst recommended that our Research Policy Committee should take the full report and make a recommendation. There was no objection to that recommendation.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 36-95: Scientific Misconduct Policy Statement.

[See minutes, page 6085, for a copy of this proposal.]

President Bornhorst requested a motion to remove from the table Proposal 36-95, which was tabled to the first meeting of this year. Keen MOVED and Seely seconded the motion to bring the proposal off the table. The motion to bring from the table PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Bornhorst then asked for a motion to table the proposal until 2 October so that the Provost could report on recommended new wording regarding "due process." Senator Sweany asked what the problem is with due process and Senator Keen responded that he would try to translate from the lawyer. "Due process" has many meanings, so the policy should spell out what is meant. Secretary Glime questioned whether this must be spelled out in the policy or only in the procedure. Provost Dobney replied that we want a policy that guarantees protection. Beck MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to table the proposal until 2 October. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

B. Proposal 26-96: Recommendation on Life Insurance.

[See minutes, page 6385, for a copy of this proposal.]

Arici MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to approve Proposal 26-96. The recommended voting units were the full Senate. There were no objections to the voting units so they stood as recommended. Mroz asked for the expected cost and Leifer stated that it would be \$1920 if there were 10 retirees per year, at the rate of \$100,000 insurance per retiree. Dobney asked if the committee had actuarial figures to support that; he would like an independent third party to provide it. If the pool of insured people were expanded to include older people, the rates would change. Leifer responded that this is only paying what we are now paying. There are two advantages: the retiree doesn't have to convert from term to whole life insurance (they can continue on term) and it would provide them with a group policy, keeping the cost down. It would otherwise cost the employee \$9500 to convert. It costs the university \$.16 per \$1000 per month. The university contribution would continue at the present rate, but anything over that would be born by the individual. Mroz asked if there is a need for prefunding or if it could come out of the operating budget. Dobney responded that the legal question has not been resolved regarding the requirement for prefunding. Senator Sloan stated that most retirees probably would not want this plan, but it would let people stay in the pool and pay their own insurance. Senator Gale stated that people should set their own policy long before retirement. Ingrid Cheney (Manager, Benefits) stated that the cost won't just be \$1920 because rates will change when the pool of older people is added. Bidding by insurance companies is now progressing so that we will soon know the costs if we add the retirees. Vice President Soldan asked when bids would be available and Cheney responded that the present contract ends 1 January so we would probably have these by mid October. Senator Beck stated that there is no longer a required retirement age, so the pool may be older. Leifer stated that it is strange to talk about spending millions and then to balk at \$1900; don't be absurd.

Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics) asked if this program would be retroactive; Leifer answered no. Glime MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to table the motion until we get a quote from the insurance companies and get that information from Ingrid. The motion to table PASSED on show of hands vote, 19:7.

C. Proposal 29-96: Sabbatical Leave Recommendations.

[See minutes, page 6426, for a copy of this proposal.]

Walck MOVED and Seely seconded the motion to approve Proposal 29-96. The recommended voting units are academic-degree-granting departments and other course-offering units. Beck MOVED and Walck seconded the motion to amend A.1.3 to read "Incentives should be implemented enabling and encouraging more faculty in units which are underutilizing sabbatical leaves to take more sabbatical leaves." Senator Shonnard suggested keeping the proposed named units as examples. Vice President Soldan stated that the departments needing to be encouraged could change.

Soldan questioned whether the term unit was clear; the sense of the body was that it is.

The amendment PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Senator Beck asked if the changes could be considered editorial and President Bornhorst ruled them to be editorial. There were no objections.

Senator Shonnard questioned why A.1.2 stated specifically 10-15 years; are there any data from other schools to support this choice of numbers? Walck responded that the Task Force had recommended a lower number, but the Senate committee had changed it. Senator McKimpson suggested that the wording might include "at least" to clarify. Walck responded that the original wording did have "at least." Senator Nordberg stated that the wording 10-15 years might be a disincentive to take a sabbatical leave. Senator Pegg suggested that we could add "up to 7 years." Dae Young commented that in Mining no one can take a sabbatical leave for 30 years because the department can't afford it.

Secretary Glime stated that A.1.2 needs to be considered in balance with A.2.2, which deals with an additional pool of funds to support departments during the absence of a faculty member. Walck MOVED and Beck seconded the motion to amend the proposal to read "Incentives should be implemented encouraging all eligible faculty to take a sabbatical at least once every 10-15 years." The motion PASSED on voice vote with 1 dissent. President Bornhorst ruled the change as editorial; there were no objections.

Regarding A.2.6, Walck stated that it would be almost impossible to guarantee the same job to returning spouses. Walck moved and Mroz seconded the motion to change the wording "their present" to "an equivalent." Ellen Horsch (Human Resources) stated that we may want to keep both (present or equivalent) because there may not be an equivalent job. Senator Vichich asked what now happens when someone is on leave of absence from a staff position. Horsch responded that there is no guarantee except for that provided by the Family Medical Leave Act. The position may be filled by a temporary position, but if the person on leave is replaced, that person can try for an equivalent position or interview rights.

Walck reminded the Senate that spouse job security was stated as a significant reason for not taking a sabbatical leave. Senator Carstens agreed that he would not take one if his wife could not come back to her job. The motion to amend FAILED on voice vote with no assent. Walck MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to change the wording to read "Implement a policy so that MTU-employed spouses accompanying faculty on a sabbatical leave would be granted a leave-of-absence from their present job with a guarantee they would return to their present or an equivalent job and salary rate when their spouse's sabbatical is completed." The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. President Bornhorst ruled the change to be editorial; there was no objection.

Senator Reed asked why, in A.2.1, priority was given for multi-term sabbatical leaves in determining recipients of extra funding. Walck responded that many more people were taking a 1-term sabbatical and the Task Force wanted to encourage people to take longer leaves. Reed added that some people want to take only one term because of family. Walck reminded the Senate that persons on one-term sabbatical leaves already receive full pay.

Reed MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to strike the last sentence of A.2.1. Walck argued that more cost would be incurred during longer leaves. Reed stated that it is too strong a statement and could have the effect of having other considerations eliminated. Mroz added that most of the members in his department have gotten additional salary outside during the sabbatical; on the other hand, the spouse may work outside and may be unable to take the longer time off without losing a job; everyone has a different kind of problem to limit taking a sabbatical leave. Seely commented that not everyone can get a complete replacement salary. Walck reminded the Senate that the intent was to encourage longer sabbaticals. Senator Keen suggested changing the wording to "some" priority.

Senator Glime stated that item A.2.1 is trying to address two problems at the same time; one is to encourage longer sabbatical leaves and the other is to relieve financial constraints. We don't want to discourage people who want to take only one term and who have a spouse working who cannot take a longer leave. The motion to amend by striking the last sentence PASSED by show of hands 12:8. Item A.2.1 now reads "Generate a competitive pool of funds, administered by the Sabbatical Leave Committee, for extra expenses, such as travel, housing supplement,

or other costs which clearly might hinder a faculty member's ability to take a sabbatical."

President Bornhorst ruled that the change was not editorial so that the entire amended proposal could only be voted on if it were treated as an emergency proposal. There was no objection to the ruling.

Walck MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to amend the proposal by adding number A.1.7: "Faculty should be encouraged to take multiple-term sabbatical leaves." There was no discussion. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with dissent.

Mroz MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.