

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 284

10 December 1997

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) amended the Student Academic Grievance Policy, Proposal 1-98, to refer to the right of appeal by faculty as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.
- (2) heard that the Provost has rejected Proposals 11-97, 12-97, and 7-97 regarding health benefits.
- (3) heard that the Provost has rejected Proposal 15-97, recommendation for a marketing survey on the Academic Calendar, because the change to semesters has already been approved by the Board of Control.
- (4) heard that Pushpa Murthy has agreed to serve as outside faculty reviewer on the SBE Dean Evaluation Committee.
- (5) approved the updated Senate Committee Membership.
- (6) heard that the Board has approved a change in the language of the retiree health benefits to provide an appeal process if benefits are terminated.
- (7) nominated Ted Soldan for Vice President of the University Senate.
- (8) Approved Proposal 16-97, Minors in Degree Programs, with editorial amendments.
- (9) heard a report from Bruce Barna, chair, Finance Committee, on potential costs of a new degree in Computer Engineering (Proposal 13-97).

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 284 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 December 1997, in Room U113 of the Minerals and Materials Engineering Building.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator David Reed, and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Institute of Materials Processing, and HR and Facilities Management. Liaisons in attendance were Geoff Roelant (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included David Caspary (Chem. Eng.), Dennis Wiitanen (Electrical Engineering), Bob Warrington (Dean of Eng.), Mike LaCourt (ME-EM), Ryan Kucera (*Lode*), Fred Dobney (Provost), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Seely requested that items 7B and 8 be switched on the agenda. Pennington MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to approve the amendment to the agenda. The motion to approve the amendment PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Richter MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. 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 MEETING 283

Joyce MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 283. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. OPEN MOTION ON PROPOSAL 1-98, STUDENT ACADEMIC GRIEVANCES [Appendix B. See minutes, page 7178, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Evensen reviewed the changes made to Proposal 1-98 based on Senate discussion in Meeting 283. The major discussion on whether the student handbook, and thus this proposal, should include language on the rights of faculty to appeal the decision.

Senator Pegg reported that he was unable to find reference to academic grievances in the Faculty Handbook. President Seely reported that it could be covered in the section on Grievances in the Faculty Handbook, although the language did not directly include such academic matters. Seely offered an additional statement for possible inclusion in Proposal 1-98: It should be understood by students that faculty also have a right to appeal a decision rendered by their supervisor, in accordance with the Faculty Grievance Policy outlined in Appendix C in the *Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Handbook*.

Senator Pegg felt that the Faculty Handbook did not make it clear that this was an item eligible for grievance and the handbook would need to be modified. Therefore, the student policy statement should refer to the new location of that language in the Faculty Handbook.

Vice President Soldan asked who would be the final arbiter and what would end the appeal process.

Pegg stated that one could only appeal on the basis of new information.

Seely added that appeals could be based on procedural violations as well as on new information.

Snyder MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to include Seely's statement as an amendment, to appear at the end of Proposal 1-98 with a bullet.

Snyder stated that this addition fits with the faculty grievance policy because the grievance is with the faculty member's supervisor.

Glime added that the statement is needed in the Student Handbook because the students should be aware that an appeal by the faculty member is possible.

Seely ruled that the academic departments comprised the voting units. The amendment PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

There was no further discussion. Seely ruled that the change was more than editorial and therefore the vote on the proposal will occur at the next Senate meeting.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

Memos from the Provost: President Seely has received several memos from the Provost regarding Senate Proposals. The Provost has rejected Proposal 11-97, Recommendation on Retirement Health Benefit Fund; Proposal 12-97, Recommendation to Change the Eligibility Conditions of Section 6.3.1 of the Faculty Handbook; Proposal 7-97, Recommendation to Change Section 6.3.1; and Proposal 15-97, Recommendation for a Marketing Survey on the Academic Calendar. The latter proposal has become moot since the Board of Control has approved the change to semesters. **[Appendices C-E]**

The Provost has requested more time for Proposal 13-95, which requires a review of the Grievance Procedures. No grievance has been filed, so there is no basis for an evaluation. Senator Greuer responded that he has filed a grievance but that there has been no action because there is no ombudsperson. **[Appendix F]**

The Provost has responded to Proposal 30-95, Academic Freedom, with the materials provided with the Agenda of Meeting 284.

Memos sent by Senate President: Senate Proposal 2-98, Pre-law Option to the BS in Social Studies, was sent to the Curricular Policy Committee for review. **[Appendix G]** Senate Proposal 3-98, Education Option to the BS in Social Sciences, was sent to the Curricular Policy Committee for review. **[Appendix H]**

Senate Proposal 4-98, Terminal Year Sabbatical, was sent to the Academic Policy Committee and the Finance Committee. This is a proposal to encourage early retirement, requiring 85 points. **[Appendices I-J]**

A request was sent to the Academic Policy Committee to review the University procedures and policies concerning faculty holding emeritus rank. **[Appendix K]**

Other communications: President Seely sent a letter to Bresnan requesting a meeting to discuss televising the Senate meetings. **[Appendix L]**

Pushpa Murthy has agreed to serve as the outside faculty member on the SBE Dean Review Committee. **[Appendix M]**

President Seely has prepared the charge for the Ad-hoc Committee on Separation and requested that it be read into the minutes for distribution. **[Appendix N]**

Senate roster: The Senate roster is now complete except for one department. New members include for Finance/Advancement, Sharon Haapala (Internal Audit), Senator, and Gary Neuman (Advancement), Alternate; for Academic Services: Engineering, June Hansen (CenCITT), Senator, and Mike Lacourt (Eng. Scientist, ME-EM), Alternate; for Academic Services: Non-engineering, Pamela Long (Lab Supervisor, Chem.), Senator, and Richard Selfe (Technology-based Instruction), Alternate. **[Appendix O]**

Senate committee members: President Seely presented the updated list of membership on Senate committees. **[Appendix P]** He pointed out that Doug McDowell had resigned as chair of the Academic Policy Committee and that Ed Nadgorny had agreed to be the interim chair.

Carstens MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to accept the Committee membership as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Board of Control Report: The Board approved the change in academic calendar to semesters, but the implementation date is not set.

The Board approved the change in the language governing the retiree health benefits, based on concerns raised by Senator Leifer at the May meeting; this language creates an appeal process if someone is removed from health benefits due to causes such as lack of payment.

Lunch with President Tompkins: President Seely had lunch with the President on 4 December. They primarily discussed how the Senate fits into the strategy of using Task Forces to deal with issues. The President likes task forces and sees their role to serve for global issues whereas the Senate deals primarily with smaller issues. Seely will pursue this further with the President to include the Senate in more of these discussion topics. One possibility might be to make the existing committees into ad hoc committees with broader representation.

Provost - officers meeting: On 8 December the Provost, Vice Provosts Lee and Bowen, VP Tahtinen, and Debbie Lassila met with the Senate Officers. The Provost indicated that he will request an extension in responding to the Sabbatical Leave Proposal because there is no agreement among the Sabbatical Leave Committee, the Academic Forum, and the Administration on how to proceed, especially with regard to the distribution of internal funds to those requesting them.

The group discussed how the Senate will articulate with the new Task Force on Graduate Education and Research, which emerged from the Board's Retreat at the end of October. John Williams has been appointed to that committee as Chair of the Senate Research Policy Committee; the Senate President is already a member of the Task Force. President Tompkins will chair the Task Force.

The process for the calendar change is still under discussion within the administration. They intend to use existing structures, including the Senate, where appropriate. General Education seems a likely candidate for Senate involvement.

The group also discussed the request to amend the language of the University employment application. The Senate President and Vice President will draft a letter to the Board Chair explaining our position and the importance of this issue.

Election of Vice President: The election for Vice President can now move forward. Only Senate members of the non-academic units are eligible.

Nordberg NOMINATED Ted Soldan and Lutzke seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.

Seely stated that nominations were open to the entire Senate constituency and that a list of eligible Senate members would be sent to constituents.

Comments from floor: Senator Barna questioned the procedure of having the Board of Control vote on a bonding issue without any opportunity for input from the Senate. It appeared that the students were more in tune with what was happening than the Senate was.

Seely responded that he would raise this issue with the Administration.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 16-97, Minors in Degree Programs [Appendix Q. See minutes, page 7175, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Nesbitt reviewed the changes as being those of language to remove reference to minor *degrees*.

Pegg MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to amend the first line of the new proposal to read, "Minors will be granted to students...", replacing the use of the wording "The Minor is a degree conferred to students..." The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote

with no opposition.

Senator Nadgorny asked what is meant by "designated department."

Senator Snyder responded that if no department exists, one must be designated to handle the paper work otherwise delegated to a department.

Pegg moved to amend the next to last sentence of paragraph 1 to replace the wording "department (college) or school (no departments)" with "each degree-granting unit." After discussion about the appropriate wording, the motion was seconded by general consensus. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Seely ruled the amendments to be editorial and the voting units to be the academic departments. There were no objections.

The motion to approve Proposal 16-97 PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

B. Committee Business/Reports [Appendix R]

Senator Barna reported for the Finance Committee on Proposal 13-97. Other members of that committee are Gruenberg, Sloan, Suryanarayana, and Pickens. The Curricular Policy Committee will report on the proposal later.

Barna reported that the authors of Proposal 13-97 and the Finance Committee have come to different conclusions about the cost of the program. If the dorms continue to be over-booked, there will be no new revenue for auxiliary enterprises. On the other hand, if this model were followed throughout the university, it would shut down all existing programs; however, new programs require new revenues or realignment of money from old programs.

Dobney reminded the Senate that there is an annual redistribution of funds amounting to \$500,000, which could possibly fund 2-3 new positions. Most likely the money available to this one program would be less than \$250,000 per year for the next few years only.

Barna continued that the state appropriation is not likely to generate new revenue because we already receive more (\$6800/student) than the base level of funding per student (\$6000/student). Unless the average drops below \$6000 we are not likely to realize any additional funds because of more students in the new program.

If no new space is needed and we now have 12.7 FTES/FTEF, we could set a target of 14-15 FTES/FTEF.

Barna distributed a new set of cost projections based on his meeting with the Provost, emphasizing that the Finance Committee had not reviewed these numbers.

Dobney congratulated Barna and the committee on an excellent first effort at a good model of the way things ought to work. However, it is not the way things actually work. The model presented by the EE Department assumes 100% retention, which is unlikely. Faculty hiring past the first year of the program would depend on the enrollment. No additional staff support would be provided until the program grows to become a department, and no new space will be built. Furthermore, since the first two years of the program would be general engineering education, it would be 2 years before specialized faculty would be needed.

Barna then presented a scenario that projected costs if the program had 20 FTES/FTEF. He stated that we need to know how many people actually need to be hired.

Dobney asked how many of the projected students are actually existing students who are currently in other majors.

Senator Snyder asked what is the minimum number of faculty we need to hire to support the minimum number of students.

Senator Sloan responded that none of the present faculty are so-trained. ABET wants a minimum of five people and therefore five would be needed by the time students are seniors. Others responded that ABET philosophy was changing and they had been told the minimum was what the department determined it needed to run the program.

Senator Pennington stated that any program that expands will cause the University to lose money. This assumes that there will be no added appropriations with new enrollment. We're saying that any program that expands the size of the University without additional outside money is going to lose money. Then we have a more fundamental decision, do we stay with the present configuration of the University, whether the programs continue to make the University attractive or not.

Barna added that tuition does not pay the cost of instruction.

Senator Shapton stated that the appropriations and tuition have gone up, but not salaries; where has the money been put?

Senator Joyce stated that we need to think incrementally so that things can happen. What is the cost if we don't add this program?

Barna stated that this might require a realignment of faculty in departments with low enrollments per FTEF.

Dobney stated that we probably need to send the proposal back to the two departments involved. We need to find out from other universities the number of faculty needed and the cost to run the program, where do the students come from, what is the minimum number of faculty needed for us to offer an adequate program, and what new hires will we need in other departments to support the added number of students. What is the minimum we will need to operate so that we can develop a quality program eventually? The numbers are alarming, but they don't tell us the answer.

Snyder stated that these faculty might have the lightest load in the University.

Senator Leifer commended Barna on his thoroughness. He stated that we have heard from deans etc. that new programs won't cost us anything, but they have cost us dearly. Presidents build buildings, but good presidents don't build buildings on the backs of faculty and staff. We need to go to other universities and find the cost. The university is operating on illusions and needs to get to reality.

Barna stated that when the University moved from a formula to fixed funding they recommended reduced enrollment and determined that 5200 students was the ideal number.

Senator Suryanarayana stated that the Provost made a good point that we should all work hard. However, we have added administrators and every administrative budget has gone up.

Dobney countered that we may add administrators, but a new program will not drive the administrative budget up.

Suryanarayana stated that the new unit will need a secretary and an administrative aide.

Dobney responded that that would happen eventually.

Leifer stated that if Barna's numbers say we will go in the hole \$18 million and we only go in the hole \$9 million, we still can't afford it. If Tompkins gets the dollars for the program, then we can get the program.

Suryanarayana stated that we need to realign students so there is no increase overall.

Dobney reminded the Senate that in 92-93 we had 6990 students. We have 50 more faculty now and fewer students. Therefore, we could absorb more students.

Suryanarayana stated that we wanted more faculty because we wanted the ratio to go down. Wouldn't that reverse this?

Dobney added that we have more responsibility for faculty now and that we reduced the ratio on purpose so faculty could do more research. We did not purposely reduce the number of students.

Seely pointed out that this proposal differs from others we have discussed in that it requires new faculty and the others have not.

Barna stated that maybe we need an incentive on early retirement to re-align the money.

Seely stated that there is currently discussion of early retirement of a terminal sabbatical for those whose age + years of service = 85.

Snyder commented that the University loses money on every student and that our tuition is too low.

Seely stated that he felt it was good that this proposal, for the first time, involved discussion among administrators, proposers, and the Finance Committee. He thanked Barna and the committee for their efforts on this proposal.

8. DISCUSSION OF PROVOST'S RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL 30-95, ACADEMIC FREEDOM

President Seely stated that insufficient time remained to begin discussion of this proposal and called for a motion to adjourn.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Leifer MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the University Senate