

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 297 16 September 1998

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a report from Stephen Bowen (Vice Provost for Instruction) on the General Education Task Force.
 - (2) heard a report from Ellen Seidel (Librarian) on library journal cutbacks.
 - (3) approved 1998-99 Senate Committee assignments.
 - (4) heard that Proposal 6-98 (English Education Option to the B.A. in Liberal Arts Degree) has been approved by the Administration.
 - (5) heard that nominees are needed for the University Judiciary Committee and the Academic Integrity Committee, as well as for university committee positions.
 - (6) reviewed Senate committee charges for the year.
 - (7) heard from Les Leifer (Chemistry) on an update on retiree health care benefits.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 297 to order at 5:34 p.m. on Wednesday, 16 September 1998, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator William Shapton and the representative from Institute of Materials Processing. Liaison in attendance was Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Stephen Bowen (Vice Provost for Instruction), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Les Leifer (Chemistry), Ellen Seidel (Library), Phyllis Johnson (Library), Theresa Spence (Library), Nancy Szofran (Library), Dick Blanning (Fine Arts), Cal White (Metallurgy), Ted Lockhart (Humanities), and Mike LaCourt (ME-EM).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Arici MOVED and Williams 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 295 AND 296

Nordberg MOVED and Prince seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 295. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Nordberg MOVED and Nadgorny seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 296. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. General Education Task Force -- Steve Bowen

Bowen (Vice Provost for Instruction) presented the philosophy behind the general education program that was distributed to the faculty earlier in the week. [Appendix B] Most of the committee members spent 6-8 hours per week.

The proposed program consists of nine courses in two groups, totaling 28 credits. The core group will be the same for every student. The other group, called distribution courses, will include choices. In addition, the program includes 3 units of physical education that will provide no credits and cost no tuition. Additional activity options in other areas such as fine arts might be added, totaling up to 6 units.

Bowen explained that the primary goal of the general education program is to engage students as active learners and set the course for the rest of their education.

Senator Gale asked if the sequence of freshman courses would be required prerequisites for the sophomore course and Senator Nordberg inquired about transfer students. Bowen responded that the intention is for students to take these in sequence, but that students who fail the first one would be allowed to continue, and courses already taken by transfer students would be evaluated on an individual basis; it would be of no benefit for a junior to be in the freshman courses.

Leifer (Chemistry) reminded Seely and Bowen that the Senate had agreed to have the Finance Committee review all program proposals. Bowen stated that he would discuss that later in his presentation.

Bowen stated that the committee members had attempted to get a sense of how the University community would respond to the proposal. They determined that most faculty and administrators like the nature of the program and its goals. The primary concern is about implementation. He pointed out that the 32 credits of general education proposed by the Provost did not leave any room for innovation within most departments. The reduction to 28 credits provided a tighter structure and the committee felt it would actually provide more education than the 32-credit equivalent to what we have now.

Senator Tampas asked for clarification of the PE requirement. Bowen responded that the present thinking of the committee is to require three units of activities, but that it could be expanded to six and include other activities such as the Keweenaw Symphony Orchestra or other fine arts. These likewise would be no credit and no tuition. Discussions are still underway with the affected departments.

Senator Chavis asked why PE was in the initial proposal and not fine arts - was this a "male thing?" Bowen responded that the PE requirement was a direct translation from our current program, but that several committee members had suggested fine arts as a possibility. There had not been enough time to determine if this could work out with the affected departments, since some of the faculty involved were out of town.

Tampas asked why there was to be no credit or grade. Senator Snyder responded that many schools don't give credit for these courses, including MIT. President Seely added that ABET won't allow PE to count toward elective credit requirements.

Bowen presented a table to show how the course loads could be met, indicating that the proposed general education requirements were approximately the same size as the current requirements (including the thematic studies). The task force considered that the Department of Biological Sciences and School of Forestry and Wood Products taught courses primarily for their own majors and that only a percentage of the School of Business and Economics courses were part of general education. They estimated that it would require 342 sections to teach the envisioned general program. This would actually be 27 fewer sections than that required by the current program. There would be an increase for forestry and the College of Engineering, but both groups had indicated an interest in developing courses for the program. Engineering wants to be part of the program to contribute the engineering perspective. On the other hand, the Department of Humanities, which along with the Department of Social Sciences, teaches the bulk of our current general education courses, would have 30 fewer sections. This decrease is due largely to the reduction to a half year composition requirement.

Provost Dobney stated that he is committed to support for summer salary for those faculty who will teach the new courses.

Senator Gale questioned why the first course (perspectives) would have only 20 students but that the world cultures course would have 225. Bowen responded that studies indicate that it makes little difference how large

the class is when the numbers exceed 80. Furthermore, each section would be accompanied by discussion groups of 20 students, the same groups that had been together in perspectives.

Secretary Glime asked how the lab science requirement would impact the departments such as Biological Sciences that were not included in the table. Bowen responded that they had set the mathematics and science requirements outside the gen ed curriculum per se. For almost all curricula, students have more than you would expect them to need for any normal general education curriculum. Glime asked for clarification that the requirement for at least one laboratory science is not part of the 28 gen ed credits and Bowen confirmed this. Seely added that for the non-technical student there is a requirement for science and mathematics. This approach did not differ from the present requirement for these courses.

Tampas observed that these are not part of general education for the SS and other non-science students but that they would be in most liberal arts programs and questioned why they were treated this way.

Seely responded that this affects only a small percentage of students; for the non-science/math students these courses would be general education. For the others they are part of the required curriculum of the major.

Snyder added that this presentation is the same as we use now.

White (Metallurgy) asked if the current communication/composition courses are taught by faculty or GTA's. Bowen responded that of the 650 HU sections, about 155 are composition courses. Almost all of the 101-103 sequence sections are taught by GTA's; the proposed general education program would have all the perspectives sections taught by faculty. GTA's would only be involved in the world cultures sections in the small group discussions.

White asked how this plan would affect the number of faculty vs the number of GTA's needed. Bowen responded that faculty would be used in the perspectives course and GTA's in support of the world cultures course. Dobney added that most of the HU faculty would be involved in teaching the perspectives courses.

Bowen stated that while the number of credits and departmental distribution of teaching sections would approximate that of our current program, the focus would be different. The changes need not disrupt any department.

Leifer stated that no program should go through the Senate without an analysis by the Finance Committee. Seely responded that Bowen is discussing the proposal with each department chair to see if they have the faculty to handle their part in the program. If the departments agree that they have the faculty, then there should be sufficient resources.

Leifer responded that he didn't want to be "non-trustworthy" but that if the Provost or Dean approaches a chair there is pressure felt. Seely responded that the chairs had not hesitated to be outspoken regarding the general education issues.

Leifer contended that the Finance Committee had shown that in some cases having more students may cause a loss of money, and that the committee may see costs that the task force had missed.

Senator Williams asked if there would be any problem in sending the proposal to the Finance Committee for analysis; would it cause too much delay?

Seely responded that the Senate would not vote on the proposal; it would go to the faculty as a referendum. Time was short, but it appeared that the plan to have the ballot go out on 29 September was not going to work anyway because of questions that still required attention.

Bowen added that there would be additional cost of summer salary for those who were developing the new courses. Seventeen members of the task force each received stipends of \$1000 for their work during the summer.

Dobney added that he anticipates a cost of about \$100,000 per year to support faculty preparing for the new courses.

Snyder pointed out that the course titled perspectives is not 65 similar courses but that the topics would differ, with common objectives. Most faculty would have two sections of the course.

Glime asked if there is any provision for team teaching. Bowen responded that there would be no additional resources to do that, but that is the case now with team-taught courses.

Senator Nadgorny asked why science staff were not included in any of these courses. Bowen responded that science faculty were not needed to deliver the courses, but that they would be encouraged to participate. Some departments are not interested in participating. Snyder added that some faculty in Biological Sciences are interested in participating.

Lockhart (Humanities) asked if there had been any survey of who would be available in the summer to prepare the courses. Bowen responded that only 10% of the faculty would be involved in the courses.

Seely reminded the Senate that approval of the general education program is on a tight time table. Departments cannot define their own programs until the general education program is defined. There will be an open forum 4-5:30 tomorrow (17 September). The task force hoped to distribute ballots on 29 September, but there are still issues to resolve, so the vote will probably occur near the end of October.

Dobney asked about the structure of voting. Could the Senate advise the faculty on how to vote?

Seely responded that the Senate Elections Committee would distribute the ballot to all faculty and that the vote would be according to Senate regulations. The Senate could issue a statement on its position on the issue.

Bowen stated that we don't want to quibble over details, but that we need to approve the philosophy of the proposal. We can work on the details for the next two years. He relayed a comment by a 1991 graduate who now works for McGraw Hill; he wished this general education focus had been part of his education.

Tampas asked what happens if the proposal doesn't pass.

Dobney responded that the alternative is to go to a transliteration of what we have now. However, this would be a fragmented solution by chairs, deans, and the Provost and that credits in some courses would not translate easily.

Seely added that the NCA stipulated that we must send a report in three years to describe how we have altered our general education program. We need to do something different from the menu approach now in existence.

Gale asked if the proposal would go to the Finance Committee. Seely responded that they would ask the Finance Committee to meet with Bowen to discuss the costs of the proposal.

B. Library Journals - Phyllis Johnson

Phyllis Johnson (Director, J. R. Van Pelt Library) introduced Ellen Seidel (Librarian), who presented the problems of escalating costs of journals. The journal cost has risen disproportionately to that of the cost of living and the library's budget. Seidel reported that the library needs to cut \$200,000 in the cost of library journals. This will require elimination of 200-220 titles, or 7% of the library's current subscriptions. A list of projected cuts, based on fewer than 5 uses per year, has been distributed to departmental liaisons and is available on the library web page. Feedback should go to the liaisons and a second list will be published by 2 October. Final faculty response is needed by 16 October.

Leifer (Chemistry) asked about receiving a list of journals to be cut; Seidel responded that these had been sent to the departmental liaison.

Senator Nadgorny asked about access to electronic copies of journals and Seidel responded that these would be available if they meet the budget line.

Secretary Glime asked how the journal cut would relate to the concerns of the NCA accrediting team. Seidel responded that all libraries are facing the same problem and that it will involve a shift in how we look at library resources.

Provost Dobney added that the library had been given a 10% budget increase and would continue for several years to get a 10% increase. Furthermore, the President had given the library \$25,000 from the President's Club.

Vice President Soldan asked what one can do if one needs a journal. Seidel responded that one can request an inter-library loan, use document delivery services, or use Carl Uncover. The latter permits a subscriber to choose up to 50 journals and use up to 25 search strategies. One can then request an article, but each typically costs \$20-\$40 (about what ILL's cost the library). The table of contents of the selected journals come to the subscribers by email.

C. 1998-1999 Committee Assignments [Appendix C]

Seely pointed out that Department of Physics Alternate John Jaszczak will be unable to serve on the Senate and that the Department of Mining still needs an alternate. Each Senate committee must select its chair or ratify the position of the temporary chair.

Arici MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to accept the slate of committee members as presented. The motion to accept PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Seely summarized the summer activities. Bresnan will once again broadcast the Senate meetings (at no charge), although they will not be live. They will appear on Channel 24 (CCISD) on Thursdays 6-8 and Mondays 7-9, resulting in 4 broadcasts of nearly every meeting.

Proposals 8-98 (Revision of Scientific Misconduct Procedures) and 13-98 (Senate Resolution on the University Budget) have been sent to the Administration. Proposal 6-98 (English Education Option to the B.A. in Liberal Arts Degree) has been approved by the President. **[Appendices D-F]**

Seely presented the new Michigan Tech logo, to replace the MTU logo. This will appear on official letterhead and other official documents when the old ones are used up.

Seely presented the proposed Senate meeting dates for 1998-99. **[Appendix G]** There were no objections.

There has been much discussion of the employment policy for professional staff. The Provost and Seely have reached agreement with Attorney Verduyck on the text, the 3-month probationary period, and the arbitration process. However, contrary to earlier advice of the Board lawyer, he wants the procedure to be part of the policy. The Board will decide the issue this Friday, 18 September.

The Board has decided that the Senate President will NOT be part of any Board Committee. However, Seely is still pursuing this question and will discuss with Ken Rowe the possibility of joining the Academic Committee.

Seely met with the Provost and Board Chair Jim Mitchell. The Board has set the following priorities:

1. calendar change and general education program
2. report of Task Force on Graduate Research and Education
3. promoting student involvement/sense of ownership in MTU
4. 2025 program/campus master plan

5. Capital Campaign kick-off

6. integrated marketing plan/enrollment

7. grass roots legislative task force

Vice Provost Janners (Student Affairs) is working on rules that must change as a result of the calendar change.

Bill Kennedy is working, with the help of the Instructional Policy Committee, on a new form for teaching evaluation. The IDEA form is being changed and will become more cumbersome to administer and interpret, increasing its report to 10 pages. The changes do not reflect our needs and he has decided to discontinue its use. He has designed a new form, modified through discussions with the Instructional Policy Committee and Senate Officers, and will bring this new form to the Senate soon. This will result in a loss of the national database, but it will be much less expensive to administer and will focus on improvement, not punishment. He hopes it will be ready for a vote on 7 October. The form is on the web at

Discussions have continued with the Provost on Proposal 11-98, Revision of Transition to Full Co-pay of Health Care Premiums for Retirees.

Seely announced that there will be a reception with the President and Vice Presidents as soon as they can find a date when all will be available.

Nominees are needed for university committee appointments. The University Judiciary Committee and Academic Integrity Committee each require a member. Nominees are also needed for the elected University Committees. Seely asked the Elections Committee to help in obtaining nominees, and all Senators are urged to contribute to the nominations.

Seely pointed out the importance of committee work. the Senate can only discuss and act if the committees act expeditiously.

The Academic Policy Committee is charged with completing Proposal 10-98, Emeritus Professor Policy, and reviewing faculty service award, adjunct position, sabbatical leave compensation, faculty success model (with research Policy Committee).

The Administrative Policy Committee needs to review and develop a proposal regarding the World Wide Web Policy and procedures for academic program review.

The Curricular Policy Committee is charged with presenting Proposal 9-98, MS in Engineering Science (Environmental) and developing proposals for minors in degree programs, computer engineering proposals, and format for degree/program proposals (with Seely and Spence).

The Elections Committee is charged with handling the General Education Report Referendum, University Committee Elections, and nominations for the University Committees.

The Finance Committee is charged with continued budget oversight, trade-offs for retiree health benefits, and cost of the computer engineering proposal.

The Fringe Benefits Committee is charged with presentation/revision of Proposals 11-98, Revision of Transition to Full Co-pay of Health Care Premiums for Retirees, and 12-98, Revision of the Retirement Medical Benefit Plan. They also need to investigate the reimbursement policy for off-campus medical expenses.

The Institutional Planning Committee is charged with reviewing the assignment of patents/patent development.

The Instructional Policy Committee is charged with developing a proposal regarding student rating of instruction. They also need to review definitions of academic distinction and calendar change issues (jointly with USG) and develop appropriate proposals.

The Professional Staff Policy Committee is charged with developing a proposal regarding staff development leaves.

The Research Policy Committee is charged with reviewing recommendations of the Research Task Force, developing a faculty success model (with the Academic Policy Committee), investigating faculty contract language that indicates their responsibility for obtaining grants and contracts to cover part of their salaries (per query from Dave Reed), and developing a plan to encourage undergraduate research involvement.

At the 30 September meeting the Senate must discuss the teaching evaluation instrument, the World Wide Web Draft Policy, and the Fringe Benefit Report. At the 7 October meeting they must vote on the new teaching evaluation instrument.

7. NEW BUSINESS

B. Proposal 1-99, Policy and Procedures for a Financial Crisis [Appendix H]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

C. Proposal 2-99, Policy and Procedures for Periods of Financial Stress [Appendix I]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

D. Proposal 3-99, Board of Control Policy for a Financial Crisis [Appendix J]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

E. Proposal 4-99, Board of Control Policy for a Period of Financial Stress [Appendix K]

The proposal was introduced as new business.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 11-98, Revision of Transition to Full Co-pay of Health Care Premiums for Retirees [See minutes, page 7590, for a copy of this proposal.]

Leifer (Chemistry) presented recent discussions on fringe benefits. The present plan in which retirees pay only 20% of the cost of their premiums and the University 80% will change to 100% payment by retirees. MTU has increased their TIAA/CREF contribution by 1% last year and another 1% this year, which must be matched by employees. Ten and fifteen-year analyses were run to see the effect of delaying the cost-sharing.

The Fringe Benefits Committee now has a program whereby any individual can put in information such as salary, retirement date, life expectancy, and find the amount of money needed to cover health benefits. Leifer showed that in the graphs presented with the agenda a person with a salary of \$30,000 would lose money if that person lived beyond the year 2019, i.e., that person would not have enough money saved to cover health benefit costs. He advised that if you expect to live another 35 years you should take the TIAA/CREF annuity; if you have \$4000 it would give \$260 forever. But if you expect to die young, you should take the sinking fund annuity plan (for 20 years) that gets you the most money while you are alive; it would pay \$341 for 20 years. If you have \$4000 accumulated in TIAA/CREF, you would break even in 26-27 years. Leifer recommends extending the transition period from co-pay to full-pay to 15 years.

Seely added that for those people with incomes below \$50,000 per year, i.e., below the median income, who cannot accumulate enough TIAA/CREF money to pay for their health insurance when they retire, the Provost has suggested a one-time payment option to make up the difference. This amount would be computed on an individual basis and is currently under consideration.

Leifer pointed out that for those retiring in the next five years, many will not accumulate enough additional TIAA/CREF money to cover the new medical benefits costs. Seely stated that the various contingents working on the models needed to get the same assumptions in their models. He pointed out that expenses of health care costs had risen significantly in the last year and that the University is looking for a policy change in 1999.

9.ADJOURNMENT

Gale MOVED and Reed seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

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