

The Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 278

14 May 1997

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Approved Proposal 5-97, Certificate in Industrial Forestry.
 - (2) Approved Proposal 17-97, Earth Science Education Option in the B.S. in Geology Degree.
 - (3) Approved Proposal 18-97, Amendment of Teaching Evaluation Policy.
 - (4) Heard that the Administration endorses Proposals 8-97, Recommended Amendment to Proposed New TIAA-CREF Retiree Health Care Benefits, 25-96, Recommendation on Retirement Income Programs, and 24-96, Recommendation on Health Insurance Benefits.
 - (5) Heard that the Administration has approved Proposal 14-97, Correcting of Student Grades and Retention of Student Work, with the editorial change that work from spring term must be retained until one month after the start of fall term.
 - (6) Heard that of the 83% of the faculty voting, 67% favored a change to semesters, and agreed to hold a faculty referendum vote on semesters vs quarters starting week 10.
 - (7) Heard a report from the Research Policy Committee chair Dave Reed and comments from Mike Abbott (Accounting Services) in response to the report from the Research Task Force.
 - (8) Sent Proposal 16-97, Minor Degrees back to committee for clarification.
 - (9) Heard Les Lefier rebut the Provost's budget report.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER

President Bornhorst called the Senate Meeting 278 to order at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, 14 May 1997, in Room B45 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

2. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were At-large Senators Laurie Whitt and Harold Evensen, representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Human Resources/Facilities Management, and Academic Services/Engineering. Liaisons in attendance were Geoff Roelant (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

3. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Les Leifer (Chemistry), Fred Dobney (Provost), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Bornhorst requested that a new item 7, Academic Calendar, be added as New Business. Former Items 7-9 should be renumbered. Item 8a (Instructional Policy Committee -- Bob Keen) should be eliminated and Item 8b renumbered to 8a. There were no objections.

Senator Leifer asked for time to address the Senate. Bornhorst responded that if Leifer were permitted to address the Senate instead of going through the proper procedures, he would request time to rebut Leifer in any future meetings of the Senate.

Leifer MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to amend the agenda, adding Item 10, to permit Leifer to address the Senate. Secretary Glime asked the topic of Leifer's address. Leifer responded that he would rebut Dobney's finance statement.

Vice President Soldan asked if the proper procedure was for Leifer to take the issue to the proper committee. Bornhorst responded affirmatively.

Senator Sweany asked why the request by Leifer required a vote. Senator Gale asked if there is a time limit when people speak.

Senator Keen stated that various people ask to address the Senate and get on the agenda; he asked if Leifer had requested to be on the agenda. Bornhorst responded that Leifer had requested time on the agenda and he had denied it.

Senator Rypma asked why Senators were not made aware that Leifer had requested to be on the agenda. Bornhorst responded that Leifer had been asked to address his concerns to the Senate Finance Committee.

Senate Assistant Meyers reminded Bornhorst that Leifer could not make a motion because he was not there as a Senator. Bornhorst asked if someone else wanted to make the motion. Williams MOVED the same motion and Sweany seconded it.

Bornhorst called for a secret ballot. The motion to amend the agenda and add Leifer's statement as Item 10 PASSED on secret ballot with 18 yes, 16 no votes.

Vichich MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with dissent. [**Appendix A. NOTE: Only official Senate and Library Archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.**]

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETINGS 275 AND 276.

Regarding the Minutes of Meeting 275, Senator Lutzke requested that the third paragraph from the end of page 6929 be reworded as follows:

"Lutzke added that we are all aware that in the last several years MTU has lost two significant court cases because proper procedures were not followed in the dismissal. The Patricia Jensen case was settled for \$37,000, but the Kenny Bracco case has cost the University over \$300,000, not counting attorney fees."

Nordberg MOVED and Seely seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 275 as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Williams MOVED and Santeford seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 276. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 5-97: Certificate in Industrial Forestry. [See minutes, page 6978, for a copy of this proposal.]

Mroz MOVED and Shonnard seconded the motion to approve Proposal 5-97.

Shonnard stated that the proposal is well thought out and will benefit other departments.

Bornhorst stated that the voting units were academic-degree-granting departments. There were no objections. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

B. Proposal 17-97: Earth Science Education Option in the B.S. in Geology Degree. [See minutes, page 6982, for a copy of this proposal.]

Carstens MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to approve Proposal 17-97. There was no discussion. The voting units were academic-degree-granting departments. There were no objections. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

C. Proposal 18-97: Amendment of Teaching Evaluation Policy. [See minutes, page 6986, for a copy of this proposal.]

Sweany MOVED and Seely seconded the motion to approve Proposal 18-97.

Senator Nordberg asked if the Senate had gotten feedback on the trial use of the new IDEA evaluation form. Senator Keen responded that the Instructional Policy Committee got the results and reviewed them and that the Committee recommends adoption of the IDEA form.

Senator Flynn asked what information was to be retained from the results of the evaluations. Kennedy (Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development) responded that the Center would retain the data, which is not possible now. It would not be available to others, but could be used for long-term data analysis and comparison.

Flynn asked if names would be retained with the data. Kennedy responded that they would be retained for one year for each person; comments are not retained at all.

Senator Shonnard asked if the long or short form would be used. Kennedy responded that next year it would be the long form, but that later a faculty member might use the long form in a course that person wanted to improve, but use the short form in others. The short form eliminates the items related to teaching methodology and is only 14 items. He said he would encourage people to use the long form frequently, but not in all courses all the time.

Senator Walck stated that she would argue in favor of adoption of the IDEA form. People argue that the current form isn't good. Her only concern is that we need to drive home to department chairs that this is only part of the evaluation of teaching. Kennedy has recommended that it should be only about 25% of that evaluation.

Keen responded that this isn't the place to put an amendment in the evaluation document. It means that faculty will have to get their act together in other areas of the teaching evaluation.

Walck MOVED and Sloan seconded the motion to add "(less than 50%)" to the last statement on the proposal page 2 of 4.

Senator Milligan stated that some departments don't have algorithms for evaluating teaching. Senator Santeford added that the teacher evaluation form results were the only things used by some departments.

Senator Reed asked if this issue should be addressed in the department charters instead.

Senator Seely expressed the opinion that this [using only the forms for evaluating teaching] needs to change.

Keen responded that if this is the only means of evaluation, it violates university policy.

Bornhorst ruled that the academic-degree-granting departments and other course-offering units should vote on this amendment and the proposal. There were no objections.

Bornhorst ruled that the motion passed on voice vote (with dissent). Milligan called for a show-of-hands vote. The motion to amend PASSED 16 for:4 against the amendment by show of hands.

Bornhorst ruled that the amendment was editorial. There was no objection.

Flynn asked if Kennedy had visited all departments to explain the IDEA form. Kennedy responded that he had had the opportunity to visit about half the departments.

Flynn observed that the scores for most faculty were quite low. This is scary for faculty because the best teachers really went down; it was depressing.

Senator Mroz commented that he thought that the current system had come from the University of Illinois and that the scores had been low until they went to in-house scoring.

Shonnard commented that he doesn't feel threatened by the scores.

Senator Sloan agreed; she found the feedback very useful.

Seely asked what quarter the form would be administered. It could be used, but the comparison would be inappropriate because the campus atmosphere is very different in the summer.

Sandberg responded one way to solve that is not to give Kennedy any money for summer. Kennedy responded that having the forms available solely for use by the instructor in the summer would solve the problem.

Bornhorst restated that the academic-degree-granting departments and other course-offering units could vote.

Proposal 18-97, as amended, PASSED on voice vote with one dissent.

7. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that the following proposals have been forwarded to the Administration for approval: 14-97, Policy on Correcting Student Grades and Retention of Student Work; 4-97, Recommendation to Change Administrative Procedures; 7-97, Recommendation to Change Section 6.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook; 12-97, Recommendation to Change the Eligibility Conditions of Section 6.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook; 11-97, Recommendation on Retirement Health Benefit Fund; 15-97, Recommendation for Marketing Survey on the Academic Calendar. **[Appendices B-G]**

The Administration concurs and endorses recommendations in Proposals 8-97, Recommended Amendment to Proposed New TIAA-CREF Retiree Health Care Benefits, 25-96, Recommendation on Retirement Income Programs, and 24-96, (Recommendation on Health Insurance Benefits. **[Appendix H]**)

The Provost does not agree with the recommendations in Proposal 18-96 on the basic benefits package. He doesn't, "believe that life insurance for retirees should be a University obligation." He is, "disappointed that this proposal lacks financial and budgetary analysis. Shared governance requires that all parties accept a certain level of responsibility for assuring the overall financial welfare of the University. In the future, I hope that the Senate will provide a budgetary impact analysis with any proposals that have budgetary implications, as well as providing justification by comparison with peer and benchmark institutions." **[Appendix I]**

The Provost does not concur with Proposal 6-97, Recommendation to Change Retirement Medical Benefit Plan, to expunge the "Plan" and use the "program" to govern the retiree medical benefit program. "The Board must have a plan, which is the legal authorizing document. The program is the approach used to implement the plan." He will propose significant changes at the May 23 Board of Control meeting to reflect the spirit of the discussion and concerns expressed by the Senators. **[Appendix J]**

On Proposal 11-96, Conflict of Interest Procedures, the Provost requests extension of the current deadline for decision until May 1998 while some of the issues are worked out. In the meantime, the provisions of Proposal 11-96 are being used. Bornhorst has agreed to extend the response deadline to May 1998. **[Appendix K]**

The Provost has problems to resolve with Proposal 29-97, Sabbatical Leave Recommendations. He is consulting with the Sabbatical Leave Committee and the Academic Forum to resolve some of these issues. He will have a response by the end of fall 1997. **[Appendix L]**

The Provost and Deans have agreed to Proposal 14-97, Policy on Correcting Student Grades and Retention of Student Work, with one editorial clarification, that the quarter following spring be considered fall and not summer. President Tompkins has approved it with the editorial change.

Senator Keen questioned if the student who detects an error must still notify the faculty member of the error within one month following spring term. However, he agreed that if the Administrators were more comfortable

with this change, we should approve it as editorial.

Keen MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to accept the administrative editorial change. The motion to accept PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. **[Appendix M]**

The recommendations in the Research Resolution are being pursued by the Administration. Questions regarding their progress should be directed to the Vice Provost for Research. **[Appendix N]**

President Bornhorst announced that he has appointed Henry Santeford (Civil Eng) to serve as Senator-at-large while newly-elected Senator-at-large Tom Drummer is on sabbatical leave during fall term.

Bornhorst announced that the Senate needs to appoint a replacement for Dave Reed on the Computer Executive Committee. The consensus was that President Bornhorst should appoint the replacement.

Bornhorst reported that he had lunch with President Tompkins on 14 May and that the discussion centered on the Academic Calendar.

The ballots on the Constitutional amendment were sent to 459 constituents. Only 39% were returned, with 129 yes and 52 no votes, so the Amendment to the Constitution was approved by the required 2/3 vote. Bornhorst has started the process of getting it to the Board of Control.

President Bornhorst thanked the officers he served with, with a special thanks to Senate Assistant Jeanne Meyers. The Senate gave Meyers a round of applause.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Keen reported on the academic calendar survey. The ballot return was 83%. Some people commented that they considered the survey to be biased. Most comments indicated impatience with one more calendar survey.

Only 20% of the faculty favored the present calendar, whereas 67% favored a semester calendar. However, 13% out of the 67 felt that other considerations (time and cost) might make it undesirable to change.

Bornhorst stated that the Administration is ready to move forward with the calendar change by taking it to the Board of Control, but probably not at the May meeting. Bornhorst had reminded the Provost that the faculty were told this was a poll, not a vote, and that a referendum vote should be used to decide the issue.

Bornhorst and the other officers recommend that the ballots be hand-carried.

Senator Shonnard requested that Senate Assistant Meyers send a summary to the Senators before the vote so that they can inform constituents. Keen responded that he has a 4-page report ready for her to send.

Bornhorst stated that the details of implementation of the calendar change would be best worked out by the Administration by inquiring of other administrators on what to do and not to do.

Senator Suryanarayana asked how many times we must do the survey. Can we indicate that the Provost and President are almost ready? Bornhorst responded that if it passes, it WILL go to the Board.

Senator Vichich stated that he did a straw poll of his constituents, with a 30% response rate, and 70% favored semesters.

Senator Carstens stated that he would be willing to go along with the change if there would be a minimum of a year to make the change. Dobney responded that it would be a minimum of two years.

Bornhorst added that we would likely decide the when and what after completion of the NCA report and with two years beyond that it would be three years.

Senator Reed contended that we need more information before deciding; we shouldn't leave that to the administration to gather later.

Vice President Soldan asked what the cost would be; the Board would want to know.

Carstens stated that he would like us to go on record that MTU can change.

Senator Gale echoed the concern that he wanted to know the cost of the change.

Provost Dobney stated that they estimated they would have a continued savings of \$60,000 per year in registration costs, but that the time cost to make the change is significant. He added that the MSU administration had decided to change based on a faculty vote of 400:399! They argued that if it had been 399:400 the faculty would not expect them to change. He stated that the students will always be opposed and considered it significant that the students were only 70% opposed in their recent vote; he expected it to be 95%; he considered that a resounding support for semesters.

Senator Dietlin stated that according to people she knew at MSU, the complaining stopped after four years.

Shonnard stated that we shouldn't discount the student concerns; they had a well-thought out response.

Carstens responded that the current students don't have to live with the new calendar because they are only here for four years.

Dobney responded that the Board would listen to the students and they might not approve the change.

Senator Flynn asked if we should specify which semester calendar.

Senator Sweany stated that it really was not overwhelming support; it was only 59% if we consider the budget.

Senator Sandberg felt that we shouldn't cram the ballot into the tenth week.

Secretary Glime stated concern that an early semester might deprive students of summer jobs that required them to work until Labor Day. Mroz responded that MSU starts on 25 August; students at other schools in the state already deal with this problem.

Dietlin added that it is hard to place students in co-op positions because we are on quarters. If a student stays long enough to satisfy the co-op employer, that student misses two quarters instead of one semester.

Bornhorst reminded the Senate that we need to decide on when to send out the formal ballot (now or fall).

Senator Seely stated that if Senators would be responsible for getting ballots to the constituents we would get around some of the perception of pushing it through when people are too busy to consider the issue.

Carstens MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to take the change to semester issue to a constituent referendum now.

Reed asked if voting now instead of fall would make any difference in the speed of implementation.

Dobney responded that it would be good to know before the ABET evaluation and to be able to tell them what we are planning it, but that we would not switch until after the evaluation.

Senator Santeford stated that if we are planning to change to semesters, ABET might not give as long an accreditation.

Senator Milligan emphasized that we should inform the voters that this is being done based on the survey and that the Provost and President will support the change; this should be stated right on the ballot. Bornhorst

agreed.

Senator Walck suggested that Senators distribute and collect the ballots.

Keen agreed that we could do it like we did last time where Senators distribute and collect the ballots.

Senator Sloan repeated Reed's question, why act now if it is not necessary.

Sandberg stated that there are always conspiracy theorists; let's not feed the fire by rushing the vote.

There was no further discussion. Bornhorst ruled that the voting units were the academic-degree-granting departments and at-large Senators. There were no objections.

The voice vote was not clear. The motion to hold the referendum now PASSED on show of hands vote with 11 for and 9 opposed.

Walck suggested that the Senators distribute the ballots individually and the ballots be mailed to the elections committee.

Senator Richter stated that bulk mailing would be more efficient. Soldan countered that the vote is important and ballots should be hand-delivered.

Senator Shonnard stated that the Senators should inform their constituents about the vote. Bornhorst stated that this could be done in campus email.

Senator Williams stated that this is a good opportunity to explain why we are in essence conducting the same vote twice.

Suryanarayana repeated the importance of putting a statement on the ballot about the agreement of the Provost and President to take this to the Board of Control. Bornhorst agreed.

Bornhorst stated that Senators should encourage their constituents to vote.

9. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Research Policy Committee [Appendix O]

Dave Reed reported on the discussions regarding the concerns raised by researchers on the survey that had been conducted by the Research Task Force. The main problems seemed to relate to research accounting. People wanted understandable Banner reports. Only 17 persons provided positive comments, whereas 42 provided only negative ones and 8 had mixed comments. Problems arise with negative feedback from funding agencies regarding billing. The committee sent a memo to accounting, research, and payroll services regarding the finding of the survey.

Mike Abbott (Accounting Services) reported that the recipients of the memo had met and agree with 95% of the comments. They need to address these concerns and plan to work with chairs and faculty. Banner is woefully inadequate for research accounting, necessitating that much of the work on bills be done by hand. The research accounting personnel have begun working with Val See (KRC) to improve the accounting procedures; she will work with them for several years to help improve the accounting for research. Roberta Dalquist works with the Accurate Report Writer; it helps to make Banner reports intelligible. She has written over 800 reports and will be more involved in research accounting reports. Deans want to know where payroll goes, but we can't encumber payroll because we don't have a good position control system in place right now.

Soldan stated that he works with these accounting people all the time. They are all intelligent, competent, hard-working, dedicated people. Researchers want more personal attention; research dollars have quadrupled and thus there need to be more people to help.

Milligan added that the survey showed that there was high satisfaction with the people, but not with the Banner reports.

10. OLD BUSINESS

Proposal 16-97: Minor Degrees. [See minutes, page 6925, for a copy of this proposal.]

Sweany MOVED and Gale seconded the motion to approve Proposal 16-97.

Gale stated that this proposal came from the Curricular Policy Committee; it had been requested from the departments of Physics and Geological Engineering and Sciences. There are no current minors, so the committee had to construct a minor before they could consider the proposal.

The minor is somewhere between an option and a certificate. This proposal has 24 credits; some have 30.

President Bornhorst stated that the Administration supports the concept of minors.

Senator Williams asked for clarification as to whether the additional 9 credit hours can double count for degree requirements. Gale stated that the way the committee had discussed it, they could double-count.

Senator Gopal stated that in mathematics 23 introductory credits are required and only 8 are allowed for the minor; the others must be above the calculus sequence in upper division courses. Gale stated that the committee recognized that there might be a problem if people in mathematics decide to define a minor.

Senator Santeford observed that if the credits can double count, then there could be as little as 9 additional credits needed for a minor. Gale agreed.

Senator Keen asked if the additional credits must be beyond the 192 credits required for the degree.

Provost Dobney stated that the minor must show evidence of some depth in a secondary field; you have to count the courses that contribute to that depth of understanding and some must be upper division courses.

Santeford asked if a student could get a minor in a different area within a department. Gale responded that it must be in a separate department.

Senator Sloan stated that the wording must be crystal clear to students. If the faculty cannot understand this, then it is obviously not clear.

Keen MOVED and Sloan seconded the motion to return this proposal to the committee for clarification.

Williams questioned that if this is restricted to one department or school, then who would put it forward if the program is in two schools (like polymers).

Bornhorst ruled that the degree-granting departments could vote on the motion. There were no objections. The motion to send back to committee PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Since two hours had passed since Meeting 278 convened, President Bornhorst asked for a motion to adjourn. Ouillette MOVED and Dietlin seconded the motion to adjourn.

Senator Suryanarayana suggested that we should let Les Leifer make his presentation.

The vote to adjourn was not clear on voice vote. Flynn called for a roll call vote. The motion to adjourn FAILED with 11 yes and 20 no votes:

Glime yes

Young no

Reed yes

Nadgorny no

Santeford no
Seely yes
Walck no
Carstens no
Keen yes
Goldstein no
Gale yes
Nordberg yes
Williams no
Rypma no
Barna no
McKimpson no
Sandberg yes
Richter no
Sweany no
Green yes
Sloan no
Oillette yes
Mroz yes
Chavis no
Flynn no
Soldan no
Gopal no
Dietlin yes
Suryanarayana no
Long no
Milligan no

Leifer (Chemistry) stated that if you want 12 graduate students, ask the University to support 12 graduate students. That support is on the backs of the faculty. We now have 200 graduate fellowships from the general fund. At a cost of \$20,000, this costs the university \$4 million. The loss of 800 undergraduate students has cost us \$4.3 million.

He cited administrative excesses as another major cause of budget tightness:

1. legal fees
2. government relations and international relations positions
3. luxurious retreats - these could go to the SDC, not to Santa Bello or an executive mansion.
4. pyramiding administrative offices

He compared salaries to those of Northern, indicating that faculty at Northern were better paid at the same rank and years of service in the same fields.

Carstens MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate