

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 262
2 October 1996

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) approved Proposal 29-96, Sabbatical Leave Recommendations.
- (2) approved the 1996-97 Senate committee membership.
- (3) heard a report from Christa Walck on the procedure for preparing for the 1998 NCA accreditation process.
- (4) referred Proposal 31-96, Social Security Numbers as Student Identification Numbers, to the appropriate Senate committee.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called Senate Meeting 262 to order at 5:30 PM on Wednesday, 2 October 1996, in Room B45 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large senators Harold Evensen and William Shapton, and representatives from Chemical Engineering, KRC, and Finance and Advancement. Liaison in attendance was Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Tim Malette (Financial Aid) and Sharron Paris (Enrollment Management).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mroz MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the agenda. 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. OPEN MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSAL 29-96: SABBATICAL LEAVE RECOMMENDATIONS [Appendix B]

Senator Gale expressed concern about the pool of funds referred to in A.2. He felt that we shouldn't establish funding for so few people at the expense of many. This would also cause more work for the Sabbatical Leave Committee. Gale MOVED to amend the proposal to delete A.2., Recommendations which require funding. There was no second.

Senator Kitalong objected to A.2.6. because it gave faculty spouses privileges not available to other staff; she presented the wording of the Procedures Manual regarding staff leave, which indicates that a person returning from leave would be placed in the former job or one of like pay unless circumstances prevent it. She contended that it is too easy to make circumstances prevent it. She suggested that the leave policy should be changed to have stronger wording to provide equivalence to that stated for faculty spouses in the proposed sabbatical leave policy.

Pegg MOVED and Arici seconded the motion to change the wording of A.2.6. to read "Implement a policy so that employees on any approved leave, including 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 equivalent job and salary rate when their spouse's sabbatical is completed."

Senator Seely commented that the sabbatical leave policy was not the place to put such a policy for staff. Senator Mroz added that there might be problems of conflict with bargaining units. Senator Whitt agreed that the policy would be more beneficial if it were separate; the committee on staff issues should take up the issue.

Senator Walck stated that the amendment would go beyond the purpose of the proposal. Pegg stated that he would recommend deletion of item A.2.6. if the amendment failed (all covered or no one covered). Walck

argued that keeping this statement in would introduce the issue. Senator Reed reminded the Senate that this is only a recommendation and can be ignored or carried out for all staff as we have discussed.

Senator Chavis stated that the reinstatement after a leave was not likely to come up as an issue for staff. If it is not stated here, the issue is likely to be lost for staff.

Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics) stated that item A.2.6. could open the chance for a unit to force a disliked person to go to another unit. Senator Shonnard countered that it might result in the person working for someone who was happier to have them.

Whitt questioned the inclusion of the words "or equivalent." Kitalong responded that it would make this policy wording more like that of the current staff policy. President Bornhorst added that it is his understanding from comments by Ellen Horsch at the last meeting that the present wording is consistent with the language used for the bargaining unit employees.

Senator Nordberg commented that the spouse position could be at any level within the university. Senator Vichich added that fixed term positions are created all the time and could be used to fill positions vacated during a leave.

Keen wondered if anyone else was concerned that an inequity was created for anyone whose spouse works outside the university. Walck countered these arguments by reminding the Senate that one of the major reasons given for not taking a sabbatical leave was spouse employment. Nordberg stated that we need to consider the purpose of a sabbatical - if it is to take the spouse along, we need to provide for their return to employment; if it is to do research, then the spouse shouldn't be a consideration. Discussion ended.

The voting units are academic-degree-granting departments and other course-offering units. The motion to amend FAILED on voice vote with some assenting votes.

Pegg MOVED and Keen seconded the motion to delete A.2.6. Whitt asked if this would be seen as a wedge to provide better leave benefits for staff. Chavis commented that the University would be unable to get someone locally to fill her position; if there is a job transfer to a new location in industry, the spouse has to move too; nothing seems to work unless we eliminate statement A.2.6. Lutzke responded that it depends on the individual situation. Some jobs you can't allow the person to leave. In the military, there are some locations where the spouse is not permitted to go. Mroz added that he agreed with these comments and that someone could challenge the use of the word "spouse" instead of "lover."

Walck reminded the Senate that they supported helping dual career faculty couples, but now don't seem to want to support helping if the spouse is a staff member. She stated that this is not the military and that the purpose of the sabbatical leave is to broaden experience.

Sharron Paris (Enrollment Management) stated that the staff handbook committee is dealing with the issue of reinstatement after returning from leaves. Lutzke pointed out that the staff handbook is only advisory; however, the issue won't be lost, but they [staff] would appreciate any help.

Reed reminded the Senate that this is only a recommendation. Whitt stated that if we could create something comparable for all staff returning from leave, we would be taking a first step [toward making staff leaves possible].

Senator Beck asked if staff could accrue vacation days; Vice President Soldan responded that they could accumulate up to 32 days.

Chavis asked if the staff handbook would guarantee something when a person returns from leave. Lutzke responded that the handbook only serves as guidelines.

Soldan stated that A.2.6. only slightly strengthens what is now in the procedures manual; this is not an unreasonable request. This is a small community and many spouses work for MTU.

Senator Sandberg stated that if the spouse has a job off campus, that person has to take a permanent leave; why couldn't we extend this provision to guarantee these people jobs at MTU when they return?

Soldan stated that we need to solve one problem at a time; there are other problems such as children to move; spouses returning to a position

at MTU is one problem we can solve. Sandberg repeated that we could hire all the off-campus spouses. Walck responded that we should do what we can do.

Keen moved to end the debate, there was no second and discussion ended. The motion to delete item A.2.6. FAILED on voice vote, with some assenting votes.

Keen questioned how item A.2.7., which provides for appointing an individual to assist with relocation housing problems, could be implemented without requiring funding. Walck responded that it would be added to someone's existing duties; we had someone to do this until a few years ago, and this was a recommendation to reinstate that assistance.

Reed stated that the Office of International Programs does not fund faculty foreign travel. Reed MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to delete from A.2. the statement, "Supplementary funding for foreign travel should be made available through the Office for International Programs."

Nordberg reminded the Senate that the spirit of section A.2. is one of recommendation and that this might encourage funding from this office. Senator Carstens agreed and asked if this had been discussed with the Office of International Programs. It had not.

Walck felt that the statement regarding funding travel would encourage that office to seek more funding for that purpose, that the committee felt the Office of International Programs was not doing enough for faculty. Discussion ended. The motion to delete A.2. FAILED on voice vote with some assenting votes.

Shonnard MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to increase the supplementary funding from \$50K to \$150K in A.2.1. and increase the award per faculty member from \$5k to \$15K in A.2.1.1. Shonnard argued that housing is so much more expensive elsewhere.

Gale countered that this would require sizable funds and questioned where they would come from; what would be cut. Faculty have been able to get outside funds; the extra expenses should be worked out in negotiating with people where the person is going for the sabbatical. Shonnard stated that there might be other sources for funding and might not require cuts in other parts of the budget. For example, some might be obtained through the Capital Campaign.

Senator Arici reminded the Senate that they would not spend a small amount for retirement benefits, but they are talking about \$150K for sabbatical leaves.

Walck stated that the Task Force had recommended a small amount to see if the added funding would induce people to take a sabbatical leave. Shonnard reminded us that this is only a recommendation and that if we feel this amount is important, that is what we should recommend. Mroz asked if the survey showed that people did not go on sabbatical leave because of not enough money. Walck responded that the number one reason given was money. The Senate had passed a proposal to increase the percentage of salary, but the Administration had rejected it. The expense funding would not be taxable and would therefore be more cost effective.

Keen stated that he went on sabbatical leave without any extra university support. It sounds like people would take the sabbatical leave for the money, not to educate themselves. We should stick to the original proposal; people should find supplementary funds themselves. Offering \$15K would be 20-25% of the salary.

Walck stated that funding limitations limited where people could go. Gale countered that \$150K is almost equivalent to the cost of a 1% salary increase. Discussion ended.

The motion to amend FAILED on voice vote with dissent.

There was no further discussion. The motion to approve Proposal 29-96 PASSED on voice vote with dissent. Gale added that Al Brokaw, who had chaired the Sabbatical Leave Committee, recommended that faculty receive their funds after they return and have submitted their sabbatical leave report. Walck argued that people have to cover extra expenses as they occur and that any expenditures have to go through the university as they are spent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that the report from the Research Task

Force has been sent to the Senate Research Policy Committee. [Appendix C]

President Bornhorst has sent letters, on behalf of the Senate, to thank those who worked on the Administrative Evaluation for their many hours of hard work.

The Provost has forwarded a report advocating an interdisciplinary minor in remote sensing and asked the Senate to review the issue of minors on campus.

Only five people have volunteered for the university committees. Bornhorst asked for permission to make phone calls to invite people to be members of these committees. Senator Seely stated that we will need the President to do this because everyone has too many other committee responsibilities to volunteer. Bornhorst asked which committees should be prioritized. Senator Pegg suggested the committee dealing with separation should have priority.

Bornhorst reported that At-Large Senator Bill Shapton is on leave at Ford for the year. The Constitution gives the President the right to appoint a temporary replacement, so Bornhorst asked for suggestions. Senator Walck suggested looking at the list of others who ran for the position of Senator-At-Large.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. 1996-97 Committee Assignments. [Appendix D]

President Bornhorst reported that the assignments remained as previously published except that Barry Pegg had asked to switch from the Finance Committee to the Fringe Benefits Committee, trading with Rudi Greuer. Bornhorst pointed out that this would put two members of the Humanities department on the Fringe Benefits Committee, violating the precedent used to assign committee membership. Vichich MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the committee assignments as presented (including the Pegg/Greuer switch).

Senator Whitt asked why the Administrative Policy Committee was so small and Bornhorst responded that the committee had little work and had not met at all last year.

Senator Shonnard stated that in view of the policy we should have a compelling reason why Pegg should be put on the Fringe Benefits Committee. Pegg had requested it because he had been the liaison from the Finance Committee to the Fringe Benefits Committee and now understood fringe benefits and wanted to work on it. Senator Soldan stated that if he wants to be on that committee, we should allow him.

Senator Lutzke asked how much time was to be given to units who had no representatives yet to choose those representatives. President Bornhorst stated that we had been trying to get them to select someone. The motion to approve the committee assignments as presented PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

President Bornhorst reported that the Fringe Benefits Committee had selected a chair already, but that the selection was not legitimate because the committee membership had not yet been approved by the Senate. He RULED that the committee would have to hold that election again. There was no objection to the ruling.

B. North Central Association Accreditation Process [Appendix E].

Christa Walck reported on the procedures we will follow relative to re-accreditation. The last accreditation was in 1988, when we were accredited for the maximum of 10 years. This accreditation will be done by members of peer institutions who will evaluate and make recommendations. Prior to that evaluation, we are required to have a self-study. Five criteria must be used in the evaluation:

1. Clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with the mission.
2. Evidence we have organized to accomplish these purposes.
3. Evidence of accomplishing these purposes.
4. Evidence we can continue to accomplish these purposes.
5. Demonstration of integrity.

Senator Arici stated that these all relate to education and asked about research. Walck responded that research is part of our purpose.

Walck pointed out that Minnesota got only a 2-year accreditation, but NCA would not relay any information. Many schools get the maximum accreditation, but she does not know the percent.

Pegg asked how this accreditation related to ABET accreditation. Walck pointed out that NCA accreditation had to precede ABET accreditation, but that ABET would come the same year. NCA accreditation is required for ABET accreditation.

Walck continued that our self-study centers around our 8 strategic goals. There will be general participation in the self-study, which will be organized through 10 committees, each charged with one goal or subgoal. She completed her presentation by outlining the process, requirements, and timeline.

Senator Whitt asked if there would be any problem if the purpose and goals differed. Walck responded that the purpose is in our mission statement, but that the mission has been broadened by various presidents, resulting in our goals.

Arici asked about the forthcoming workshops and Walck responded that these workshops dealt with assessment and were not a direct function of the accreditation self-study. Schools across the nation are being asked to develop an assessment plan. Steve Bowen (Assoc. Dean, Sciences and Arts) is coordinating the assessment effort and could answer questions about the two forthcoming workshops, one of which is next week. Whitt asked how the goal of integrity would be addressed. Walck responded that each committee must address each of the five goals and consider the kinds of issues related to each goal. For example, does the catalog reflect what we really offer?

C. Board of Control Relations Committee.

At the Board of Control meeting on 27 September, President Bornhorst reported on Senate activities, including the efforts to revise the constitution. He requested reinstatement of direct meetings of select Senators with the Board. Since the Board meetings will be moved back to the afternoon, this should again be possible. When the Board met in the morning, there was no time for them to meet with anyone before the Board meeting.

Senator Pegg asked what basis was used to select Senators for these meetings and Bornhorst stated that it depended on the theme of the meeting. Since none were scheduled, he had given no thought to it.

Senator Whitt asked what the Board has decided regarding future legal counsel. Bornhorst reported that no formal decision has been made. The Board continues to use Bob Vercruyse as their legal counsel. The University is using several lawyers. Bornhorst does not know if the Board has discussed the issue of legal counsel, but that President Tompkins has discussed it with some of the individual Board members. President Tompkins is encouraging the Board to form subcommittees so that issues such as this can be discussed without a public meeting as required by a quorum, and recommendations can then be brought to the Board.

Senator Vichich pointed out that the official counsel is the firm of Butzel and Long.

Bornhorst added that certain projects had been given to Bob Vercruyse for completion, but he does not know if any new projects have been given to him.

Seely asked about the rumor that members of the Board of Control had proposed arrangements for tenure for the new Dean of Engineering that violated the Board's own policy. Bornhorst stated that the violation had been pointed out and that no motion was put on the table.

Vichich MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to change the agenda to take up item 7C next because several guests had come to the meeting specifically to address the Senate about that item. The motion to so amend the agenda PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

7. OLD BUSINESS

C. Proposal 31-96: Social Security Numbers as Student Identification Numbers. [See minutes, page 6552, for a copy of this proposal.]

Tim Malette (Financial Aid) stated that all financial aid forms require the social security number. This impacts most of the student body. It is also used for all employees, again impacting many student records. It is necessary for matching records and being certain of having the right person when two people have the same name. The social security number has been removed from the ID card, so Malette suggested

that the proposal was unnecessary.

Sharron Paris (Enrollment Management) spoke that there were concerns about the posting of student grades by SS numbers or any other form of identification that other persons might know.

Senator Lutzke asked if this means that you can't post grades. Paris responded that the number must be unique and known only to the faculty member and the student. Others questioned whether the last 4 or 5 digits could be used.

Senator Sandberg pointed out that the proposal only prevents general use of this as an ID number; it does not prevent financial aid from using this number. It does not ban the use of the number for legitimate purposes. The new ID card no longer has the SS number, but we should go on record that this use should not happen again in the future.

Senator Keen stated that legally one has to shred class lists and other lists containing SS numbers. The numbers should be removed from class lists and other generated lists.

Senator Walck asked how other universities handle the number problem and Paris responded that they use the Social Security number. Senator Mroz responded that Michigan State University does not.

Malette contributed that all people he had talked to who have stopped using the SS number advise us not to change; it is much easier to use the SS number.

Senator Whitt stated that we need clarity on what we mean by "general purpose identification." Senator Perrott stated that the Air Force uses social security numbers for administrative ease, but that the number is shielded from general purpose use. They usually hide the first three or more digits [which are unique to each state].

Keen MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to refer this proposal to the appropriate committee. The motion to refer to committee PASSED with no dissent.

Arici MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.