

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

## Minutes of Meeting 298 30 September 1998

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard that the Board of Control has approved the new Employment Policy for Professional Staff, thus eliminating the "at will" wording of non-union staff contracts.
- (2) heard that the general education referendum is on hold to permit more time for discussions.
- (3) heard from Dean Woodbeck (Advancement) regarding standards for MTU web pages.
- (4) elected Ghatu Subhash to the Academic Integrity Committee.
- (5) heard that nominees are needed for the Academic Tenure Committee, the Conflict of Interest Committee, General Education Committee, the Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct), the Presidential Commission for Women, the Presidential Commission for Diversity, and the Sabbatical Leave Committee.
- (6) heard from Bill Kennedy (Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development) regarding a new form for teaching evaluation, introduced as Proposal 5-99; this will be treated as an emergency proposal at the meeting 7 October.
- (7) heard from President Tompkins regarding approaches to planning for University growth during the next 25 years.
- (8) heard from Les Leifer (Chemistry) regarding alternative plans to cover health care costs for those who will not be able to accumulate enough additional TIAA/CREF funds before retirement to cover those costs (alternatives to Proposal 11-98).

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 298 to order at 5:32 p.m. on Wednesday, 30 September 1998, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator David Reed and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Mechanical Engineering-Engineering Mechanics, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Mining Engineering, Physical Education, Institute of Materials Processing, Keweenaw Research Center, Enrollment Management, and Research and Graduate Studies/University Relations/Administrative Offices. Liaisons in attendance were Anthony Moretti (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Curt Tompkins (President), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Les Leifer (Chemistry), Dean Woodbeck (Advancement), Bill Kennedy (Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development), Richard Blanning (Fine Arts), Mike LaCourt (ME-EM), Jarrod Karau (All Campus Card), and Nancy Seely (Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development).

### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ouellette MOVED and Shapton 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 MEETING 297**

Senator Watwood questioned the representation of Bowen's presentation on page 7616, "Bowen responded that the lab science requirement, mathematics, and computer science were not included as part of general education, but were part of a list of skill courses." Bowen had agreed that this is not what he said. Secretary Glime will check on this.

Long MOVED and Drummer seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 297, pending clarification of Bowen's statement. [As recorded on the tape for Meeting 297, Bowen actually stated 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.] The motion to approve the minutes PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

#### **5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT**

Board of Control: President Seely reported that the officers met with Jim Mitchell (Chair of the Board of Control) on 18 September at 6:45 a.m., primarily to discuss the employment policy for professional staff and the calendar conversion. Hainault, Collins, Seely, Haapapuro, and Paxton worked on the policy and procedures for arbitration. Although this has taken a long time, it shows that shared governance can work.

At the Board meeting on 18 September the Employment Policy for Professional Staff was approved. The only issue was the separation of policy and procedure. However, the Board approved the basic policy with the procedure left to the Administration. They included the qualifier of "no substantive procedural changes without Board approval."

Seely has sent letters of appreciation to Board Chair Jim Mitchell and Board member Rick Berquist. Seely expressed his appreciation to Mitchell for his handling of the concerns of the Board and his support of the process of shared governance. To Berquist he expressed appreciation for his way of handling his own concerns, for listening to the arguments, and for ultimately supporting the separation of policy and procedure.

Seely has held discussions with Ellen Horsch (Human Resources Director) regarding the process of implementation. The same committee that drafted the new wording will work on this process, including forms to be used to facilitate the process. Appropriate parts of this deliberation will go to the Staff Policy Committee for review and/or comment.

General Education Referendum: The general education referendum is on hold for a week or two to provide time for discussion.

Committee Chairs: Seely reminded the committees and their temporary chairs of the need to meet and finalize selection of chairs because they need to get their work started. They should let Seely know their selection right away. He has met with members of the Instructional Policy, Finance, Fringe Benefits, and Research Policy Committees. He expects to meet with others, especially the Academic Policy and Curricular Policy Committees in the next week.

Senator Leifer stated that he understands that the "at will" policy does not apply to faculty and union employees, but asked what does apply to the union employees. Seely responded that the policy applying to them is part of the contract language. Leifer asked if that meant they were not "at will" and Seely verified that they are not.

#### **6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

##### **A. Web Oversight Committee -- Dean Woodbeck**

Woodbeck (Advancement) reported on the Web policy that his committee had developed. They had followed the philosophy that they should encourage use of the web as a learning tool and that the policy should be as unrestrictive as possible.

Web pages should follow legal restrictions regarding trademark, copyright, and privacy regulations. All pages should include the identification of the owner (department, organization, student, faculty, staff), and a way to contact the owner.

For department home pages he outlined the committee recommendations. All pages should have a link to the MTU home page; subsidiary pages should be linked to the department home page. Each should include the date updated, an email address for visitor comment, the department address and phone number, and a disclaimer on the links to faculty, staff, and students.

Vice President Soldan suggested that it have a VALID email address to address comments.

## **B. University Committee Nominees**

Seely presented the nominees for the Academic Integrity Committee: David Rudd (Business and Economics), Ghatu Subhash (ME-EM), and Jerry Taylor (School of Technology). Current members and their term expiration dates are Jimmy Diehl (Geological Sciences and Engineering), August 1998; Fred Williams (Chemistry), August 1999; Anil Jambekar (Business & Economics), August 2000.

Pegg MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to accept the slate of nominees. The motion to accept PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Subhash won with 13 votes, followed by Taylor with 9 and Rudd with 8.

Seely presented the University committees for which the Senate needs to provide members or nominees, i.e. those expiring in 1998. He implored the Senators to suggest names for these.

The Academic Tenure Committee requires a tenured faculty member elected by the academic faculty. Current members are Dave Sikarskie (31 August 1998), Sheryl Sorby (31 August 1999), and Dallas Bates (31 August 2000).

The Conflict of Interest Committee requires faculty members elected by the Senate. Current members are William Sproule (31 August 1998), Laurie Whitt (31 August 1999), and Al Brokaw (31 August 2000).

The General Education Committee requires that the Senate elect a slate of nominees from which the President will make a selection. Current members are Richard Blanning (31 August 1998), Robert Zulinski (31 August 1999), Ted Lockhart (31 August 2000), and Steve Seidel (31 August 2001).

The Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct) requires three members and one alternate selected by the Senate. Current members include Faith Morrison (31 August 1998), Marvin McKimpson (31 August 1999), and Jennifer Slack (31 August 2000).

The Presidential Commission for Women requires faculty members elected by the Senate. The current member is Jackie Huntoon (31 August 2000). The position expiring 31 August 2001 is vacant.

The Presidential Commission for Diversity requires one faculty member from each college/school, elected by the Senate. Current members are Anand Kulkarni (College of Engineering), Gopi Podila (College of Sciences and Arts), and Bill Sewell (College of Sciences and Arts), all elected November 1995.

The Sabbatical Leave Committee requires five tenured faculty members to be appointed by the President from a slate elected by the Senate. Current members are John Lukowski (1 July 1998), William Shapton (1 July 1999), Ashok Goel (1 July 2000), Ann Maclean (1 July 2001), Mohan Rao (1 July 2002).

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **Proposal 5-99, Amendment to Teaching Evaluation Policy: Student Ratings of Instruction [Appendix B]**

President Seely reviewed the recommendations from the Instructional Policy Committee, distributed as Proposal 5-99. It recommends that the IDEA system be replaced with an internally developed and administered evaluation instrument. During 1998-99 the Committee will evaluate the efficacy of the individual questions, based on

student responses, and study means of organizing and reporting the data generated, to be reported to the Senate no later than fall of 1999. It clearly states that the primary purpose of the evaluation is to provide information that can assist faculty in improving their teaching activities, limiting its use to no more than 50% of the departmental teaching evaluation of the faculty member.

Kennedy presented the rationale behind the proposal. He had collected opinions on the short-comings of the IDEA form, including confusing reports that were difficult to interpret, and that the questions it asked often were inappropriate for the course. When Kansas State University revised the report form, it grew from 4 pages to 8 and became even more difficult to interpret. In spite of stating that analyses might not be meaningful for small classes, it proceeded to provide detailed analyses as if they were. Kennedy stated that he didn't want us to pay for their learning that they have done the "wrong thing" in their revision.

Kennedy stressed the formative use of the instrument, as a tool for improvement. It has been used as the reward system for teaching, and in some departments the number it provides is the only information used for evaluation of teaching. He suggests that we adopt a more benign system.

Minor variations in student responses on the idea form can have a large impact on the rank. In one example, a faculty member ranked in the 80th percentile in three sections and in the 20th in the fourth of the same course taught in the same way. He attributed this to three disgruntled students who had not done well on an essay exam and who were probably the students who marked all 1's, regardless of the order of the choices from good to bad or bad to good.

Senator Pennington expressed concern that we were not supposed to be able to identify the students who responded. Kennedy responded that they didn't, that they had only made a supposition.

Kennedy pointed out that the disadvantage to the MTU form is that there is no national database for comparison. However, we can generate a database internally.

Vice President Soldan stated that the percentile problem won't be solved by using an internal instrument. Kennedy responded that they won't report the percentile, but will instead use data ranges. Through our use of the IDEA form, we recognize that it is harder to teach big sections than small ones and that it is harder to teach if the students don't want to be there.

The 5-question form didn't tell us anything; the responses indicated that the questions were intercorrelated. If the number is the only result we want, then we only need one question; and "the number will be 4.1."

The new form will provide for comments on the same form and can be answered in 10 minutes. Its focus will be on the development of better teaching.

The IDEA form indicates that students should share the responsibility, asking them if they tried hard. The new form makes the statement that "an effective teaching/learning environment is interactive and requires the cooperative efforts of the students and the instructor. For a course to effectively foster student learning, students must have mastered the appropriate prerequisite knowledge and skills, purchase and read textbooks, complete course assignments, and actively contribute to the learning environment of the class."

Kennedy reviewed some of the major attributes of a good teacher, explaining that the same factors seem to appear in most of the large body of literature on the subject.

Kennedy pointed out that one of the most important factors to make the evaluation successful is that students need to realize they are talking to you, not your boss, when they fill out the forms.

He suggested that we could obtain a number from two questions, "would you take another course from this instructor," and "taking everything into account, I consider this instructor to be an excellent teacher." And the numbers would be in a tight group around 4.1.

Seely explained that this is probably draft 29, [i.e., many revisions] and that the final form strongly resembled the original. He attributed the current well-thought-out document to the efforts of Senator Evensen, Kennedy, and the Instructional Policy Committee, who moved quickly over the summer.

Senator Rogers asked if we can get at students' perceptions of how well they are progressing toward ABET outcomes. Kennedy responded that there was no plan for separate forms for engineering students that might indicate that.

Senator Gale asked if the forms would be processed here. Kennedy responded that it would not be done by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development, but that Butler and the Processing Center would handle the processing. Vice President Soldan would help in setting up the analysis (with advice from Senator Drummer).

Senator Leifer asked how this form would differ from the old 5-question form. Kennedy responded that it would be more comprehensive. There is no one way to teach. In fact, in his course on persuasion, Kennedy provoked the students and this resulted in their ranking him low on a question regarding treating them with respect. It is important to determine if the instrument results will correlate with a measure of student learning.

Senator Drummer (Interim Chair of the Instructional Policy Committee) stated that some concerns he encountered were that the answers to questions 1, 2, and 17 were totally predictable; we need to state use of the form is only for instructor input; and the form should not be used by departments to evaluate faculty until we have a larger database.

Kennedy commented that the students try to make an honest effort on the evaluations. We don't want to imply that their input is not important by telling them that it will not be used by anyone but the instructor. Furthermore, this should always be an evolving instrument.

Seely reminded Senators that we would need to vote on Proposal 5-99 at the next meeting (7 October). Therefore, it will require treatment as an emergency proposal because Senators will not have the proposal for 10 days before voting. Delaying the vote until the 28 October meeting would make it too late to use the form this term.

Snyder MOVED and Drummer seconded the motion to accept Proposal 5-99.

Blanning (Fine Arts) stated that he had used the new form as a trial in the summer and discovered from the students their irritation with the IDEA form. They were offended by it because it seemed to evaluate the students more than the faculty.

Nancy Seely (Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development) added that she also had tested the new form in the summer and had gotten the same reaction from her students. They liked the new form and complained that the IDEA form questions were stupid and it was too long. They felt that the questions on this form were more pertinent.

Bruce Seely stated that previous use had indicated that student motivation and class size were the most important influences on how students responded, but that responses also differed by discipline. Some fields were very difficult to teach, even for a star.

Seely stated that Drummer will work to develop cells to categorize data by class size and College of Engineering vs the other colleges/schools.

Gale asked about the comment questions. Kennedy responded that they are on the back of the form provided.

Secretary Glime stated that when faculty used the 5-question form, they were instructed not to comment before handing out forms; when using the IDEA form, they were encouraged to explain their objectives and discuss the

use of the form. The Senate needs to decide what sort of introduction instructors should provide when using this form.

Kennedy responded that the faculty should be there to explain why they are using the form and that they value the students responses and comments. Then the faculty member should leave the room and a student should be designated to take the completed forms to the office. Students think the forms go to the faculty member's boss.

Pennington suggested a change in phraseology to reinforce the use of the results by the instructor. For example, where it refers to "the instructor" it should refer to "I, the instructor," as in the statement "what might I the instructor do to improve this course."

Kennedy agreed.

Seely stated that the USG would like to have the information released. Kennedy responded that the Senate (faculty) need to decide where they want the information distributed. Students have complained that the faculty no longer use the USG form because of the time required for completing the IDEA form. They had asked Kennedy for results of the IDEA form, but Kennedy said no. Faculty were told that the information would be private and the information cannot be petitioned through the freedom of information act, according to the University lawyer.

Kennedy implored the Senate not to put the information out for someone before that person achieves tenure, especially the first few years. It takes a few years to work out how to be a good teacher and present the material.

Seely stated that voting on Proposal 5-99 will be by academic units. Senators should share the proposal with their colleagues or give them the URL address where it can be viewed. The document will continue to change. We will discuss the proposal at the next meeting.

Pickens MOVED and Drummer seconded the motion to table Proposal 5-99 until the 7 October meeting. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## **8. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT**

President Tompkins congratulated the Senate on the 25th Anniversary of its founding. This is the 298th meeting and we shouldn't pass this milestone lightly. He thanked each Senator for investing their time.

He stated that he had asked each chair/director for 3-5 points of pride, which he will publish in the Annual Report. There were too many to include them in the State of the University address.

Tompkins addressed the planning and financial priorities. First, the focus would be on a long range plan for the next 10 to 25 or more years. Second, there would be an update of the campus master plan. Third, we need to rethink the library. The University will hire consultants for the long-range plans and library, addressing such questions as whether to renovate or build a new library. He stated that the next capital outlay would certainly be used to renovate Fisher Hall and do something with the library.

He could not state when the next capital outlay would happen, but it certainly would not be in 1998 or 99.

Tompkins then focused on the 2025 program. There would be a series of outside speakers to provoke thinking on our future. He needs suggestions for speakers. Among the speakers already invited are Eric Block (former NSF head), Danny Hillis (Walt Disney Corporation), and others.

Another source of thinking about our future would come student essays, with a provision for awards. Students would be encouraged to think about the future of the world and their professions.

MTU will be colluding with the Texas A & M University on their 2020 focus, which is similar to our own plan. It is important that we coordinate our vision of the next 20-25 years with our campus master plan.

The Governor has set up Michigan Technologies Incorporated, comprised of the four research universities. Its purpose is to think about better ways to use the various funds to help universities develop technologies that will benefit Michigan. He is concerned that we devise ways to keep developments of technology and intellectual properties in Michigan. There will be four Governor's innovation forums. MTU will host the second one next week. Most of the members of the forum have never been to the UP, so they will arrive early for tours. Tens of millions of dollars have been divided among 17 different entities. The Governor wants to reform this distribution and put the money where the forums suggest. They want to focus on three key technologies: information technology, biotechnology, and manufacturing.

Tompkins explained that the new term limits in the legislature will require new ways to deal with the appropriations committee and other government groups. Instead of dealing with legislators who have been in office for many years and are familiar with the institutions, we will probably have to deal with the staff to these new legislators because they will have the memory and have more influence than in the past. Therefore, we need to be more involved and aggressive to keep both legislators and staff informed.

The state is recognizing \$100 million less revenue this year than anticipated due to a loss of \$30 million due to the General Motors strike and another \$70 million due to the Northwest Airlines strike. Therefore, there is unlikely to be any one-time money this year.

The Presidential Council (of 17 presidents) has launched an ongoing public relations effort to help the public understand what universities do to help the state.

The Kellogg Foundation will sponsor an analysis of the state correctional system. A new prison gets 100% of its operating money, but when a university gets a new building, it gets nothing for operating it. There are also concerns about the sentencing guidelines; the group will look for other options in sentencing that might save state money and would not be subject to private interests.

The Board of Trustees of the Tech Fund is focusing on potential donors capable of giving \$10 million to the Capital Campaign. Tompkins is scheduled to call on ten such people per month to support the funding effort. Donor commitment will be assessed by 1 July in order to assess the effectiveness and goals of the Capital Campaign.

Tompkins expressed two major concerns: endowment and enrollment. Our endowment is only \$4000 per student, a figure Tompkins referred to as pitiful compared to other schools. With such a small endowment, there is no fallback. He reported that of 23,000 inquiries about MTU last year, only 13% became applicants; our peer institutions have an average of 22%, and that figure is down from 30%. They have developed an integrated marketing plan and will be very aggressive. The University needs to utilize its capacities fully in certain portions of the University where there is room to grow without requiring more faculty.

## **9. 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.]**

Seely reported that the Provost had offered an alternative. Instead of stretching the time period to 15 years before reaching full co-pay for everyone (Proposal 11-98), he suggested a one-time payment to TIAA/CREF accounts for those non-union employees who earn less than \$50,000 annually and who would be unable to accrue enough to cover the new health care costs.

Leifer (Chemistry) stated that people need time to plan. People who earn less than \$30,000 can't handle ramping up the payments. They could retire in 2019, but they need to die in 6 months or they will be in the hole relative to health care benefit costs.

The Provost's new plan would take care of those people, but his plan does not care for those people now over 60; there isn't enough time for them to accrue sufficient TIAA/CREF money if they retire within the next five years.

Leifer continued by presenting the costs of covering benefits for those people as well. He stated that there are 27 people earning \$50,00-\$100,000 who fall in that group and that the maximum upper limit of cost would be \$95,877. He said we can also take care of those who are now 59; if it raises the cost to \$135,000, let's do it anyway as a one-time expense. We have had other one-time expenses that were less worthy: carpeting the fifth floor of the Administration Building, the Pro Shop, and the Meese Center.

Leifer expressed dismay that President Tompkins didn't list the faculty and staff among his primary concerns. There shouldn't even be a debate about whether we should provide additional health care support for these people.

Soldan questioned reference to those earning less than \$30,000 per year; the Provost set the figure at \$50,000. Why these arbitrary cutoffs?

Leifer responded "money;" he prefers the '92 plan with no co-pay. The present plan was initiated in 1995 to stop the prefunding.

Senator Nordberg observed that under the Provost's plan those who earn under \$50,000 are cared for, but the second group earning less than \$100,000 who retire within five years are not cared for.

Seely stated that most of the problems are for those who are over 40 years old; others should accrue sufficient TIAA/CREF money. The Provost hopes to increment the TIAA/CREF money to reach 15%. There are 80 people covered by the Provost's suggested plan and an additional 27 in the plan suggested by Leifer on behalf of the Fringe Benefit's Committee.

Senator Gale asked about the cost. Leifer estimated \$120,000, with \$360,000 one-time money for those earning less than \$50,000. The increased TIAA/CREF contribution is an on-going base budget item.

Goodrich (*Tech Topics*) asked if the suggested payment of the balance was intended just for those employees with the University now or if it included new hires.

Seely responded that it is a one-time payment and would not be given to new hires. The amount is calculated for each individual to see how much money will accrue.

Leifer stated that if someone joins the University at age 48, then that person has 20 years to accrue money at the higher TIAA/CREF contribution.

Seely added that this contribution will make MTU's contribution the second highest in Michigan. Only Northern Michigan University has a higher rate. At the University of Michigan retirees are able to buy health care coverage at the university group rate, but at other Michigan universities, retirees are unable to buy health insurance at the university rate.

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

Gale MOVED and Richter seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

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