

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 309 10 March 1999

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) changed 7 April meeting date to 31 March.
 - (2) learned that 58.8% of the faculty voted in the 14- vs. 15-week semester referendum, with 54.3% of these favoring the 14-week semester.
 - (3) learned that 42.8% of the staff voted in the referendum, with 79.3% favoring the 15-week semester.
 - (4) learned from Provost Dobney that the prospects for the 1999-2000 budget are not good due to over-estimating enrollment, increase in health care expenditures, and low budget recommendation from the Governor.
 - (5) learned from Provost Dobney that funding for Proposal 9-99, Transition to Full Co-pay of Health Care Premiums for Retirees, is not planned for the 1999-2000 budget.
 - (6) passed Proposal 9-98, MS in Environmental Engineering Science.
 - (7) passed Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 309 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 March 1999, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Tampas and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Mining Engineering, and Physical Education. Liaisons in attendance were Ted Soldan (Staff Council), Pratima Ungarala (GSC), and Anthony Moretti (USG).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Steve Seidel (Computer Science), Debbie Lassila (Planning, Budget and Analysis), Marty Auer (Civil & Environmental Engineering), Hope Cammareri (Channel 10 Reporter).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Senator Leifer stated that there is a hand-out to replace Proposal 19-99.

Nesbitt MOVED and Blanning 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 308

Senator Chavis stated that in the paragraph third from the end of column 1 on page 7888 the next to last sentence should read "His discussions with students suggest that they *overwhelmingly* are in favor of the 14-week semester."

Senator D. Reed requested that all references to Reed in this and other minutes should refer to D. Reed to distinguish his statements from those of Senator B. Reed. He also stated that his statement on page 7888, first column in the paragraph beginning "Senator Reed complimented President Seely," he meant Bruce Barna, not President Bruce Seely.

President Seely requested that the paragraph on page 7888, column 2, beginning "Seely stated that if the referendum shows," would more accurately reflect the President's statement if the sentence were changed to read "Seely stated that if the referendum shows strong support for 14-week semesters, the President indicated he would seriously consider supporting it when he addresses the Board."

B. Reed MOVED and Richter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 308 as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Seely reported that Proposal 15-99, Amendment of the 1999-2000 Academic Calendar has been sent to the Administration for approval. Although there has been no formal response, the Administration response will probably be favorable. **[Appendix B]**

President Seely drafted a series of questions, reviewed by the officers, for Sung Lee regarding research matters. Sung Lee has responded to these already and the responses will be forwarded to the Research Policy Committee. **[Appendix C]**

President Seely has received no comments from Senators regarding the procedures to accompany Proposal 1-97, Policy on Threatening and Violent Behavior, so he will forward Proposal 1-97 to the Administration. The Senate had chosen to hold the proposal until they had an opportunity to review the procedures. **[Appendix D]**

Seely asked if there were any problems or objections to changing the meeting date of 7 April to 31 March. There were no objections, so the meeting date will change. Senators will receive notification of this change.

Seely announced that tomorrow (11 March) 4-6 p.m. there will be an AAUP discussion, led by Bob Keen (Biol. Sci.) on the Separation Policy proposals.

Seely announced the results of the faculty staff referendum. There were 391 ballots mailed to faculty and 230 returned (58.8%). The vote was 125 (54.3%) to 105 (45.7%) in support of the 14-week semester. There were 451 ballots mailed to staff; 193 voted (42.8%). The vote was 153 (79.3%) to 40 (20.7%) in favor of the 15-week semester.

Senator Drummer asked if there would be a student ballot. Seely reported that Secretary Glime had investigated possible options for conducting such a survey should the USG or Senate choose to do so.

Liaison Moretti (USG) stated that USG will vote at their meeting tonight on whether to conduct a student referendum.

Seely reported that Glime had gathered ideas from Senators and had suggested a method to accomplish a student referendum on short notice [based on a suggestion from Bill Kennedy]. This same mechanism could be used should such a need arise in the future. It calls for identification of the time slot in which the largest number of students is in class. All instructors teaching at that time would be asked to provide their students with background information on the issue, in this case, the same information that was provided to the faculty, then conduct a ballot during the next class meeting. This method would probably reach about 25-33% of the students.

Senator Chavis asked if Staff Council had any indication why there is such an overwhelming staff vote for 15-week semesters. Vice President Soldan (Staff Council liaison) responded that he had no idea.

Senator Pickens stated that the Senate had voted against re-asking the question of whether to change to semesters, but would the faculty now support the change if the Board of Control wants a 15-week semester?

Senator Gale stated that he would support re-asking the question of changing to semesters.

Senator Suryanarayana stated that a lot of people have put a lot work into the changeover and that both the Senate and a faculty referendum have supported it. The changeover has gone past the point of no return. How do we know what point of view the Board will support; they are intelligent people and will listen to the faculty. It

would be inappropriate to re-ask the quarter to semester question again at this time. President Seely will argue the 14-week semester to the Board.

Seely responded that the students hold the key issue.

Suryanarayana responded that the Board is equating the USG officers with the student body.

Senator Snyder stated that he would encourage the USG to use the suggested sampling design of voting in during the most subscribed class hour because it has sampling validity.

Senator D. Reed commented that the margin of faculty vote for the 14-week semester is three times greater than the one that got us the clear mandate for the general education program. The faculty have never expressed themselves on key issues of the calendar except gen-ed. Maybe it is valid to go back to the faculty on the quarter to semester question now that the key issues are more well known.

Seely stated that he was skeptical that we could put this together before the Board meeting and it would require a special meeting of the Senate.

Senator Barna stated that he believes the students can drive the issue in whatever direction they prefer.

Snyder stated that if the USG declines to hold the referendum, then the Senate should conduct one.

Seely responded that it would be a problem of turf invasion.

Snyder countered that the Senate had held the faculty/staff referendum in response to the President's reaction to the Senate vote. A student poll would be appropriate.

Senator Sloan stated that we will know tonight what the response is from USG and can poll the Senate in the morning.

Seely stated that he had received a memo from GSC President Tom Flicker and asked GSC representative Pratima Ungarala to report on the GSC discussions on the issue. **[Appendix E]**

Ungarala stated that the GSC had discussed the decisions the Senate had made and how they might conduct a referendum similar to the one for faculty and staff. They had concluded that they had no way to poll their constituents in a manner that would be statistically valid. GSC representatives had asked as many individuals as they could how they felt about the 14- vs. 15-week semester. Most students had responded that it didn't matter. She read part of the letter to Bruce Seely from Tom Flicker (GSC President) on behalf of the GSC. That letter emphasized that "The Graduate Student Council at Michigan Technological University would like to state its objection to the Senate's disregard of any boundary conditions approved by the Board of Control."

Seely will explain the Senate's position on the 14-week semester to the Board of Control at its meeting on 19 March.

On 26 February the Fringe Benefits Committee, Provost Dobney, Debbie Lassila, and Seely discussed Proposal 12-98 and expect to have a final document from that committee to clarify the language of the fringe benefits for faculty and staff.

Seely reviewed Proposal 21-99, Policy on Religious Observance, and stated that in the calendar proposals drafted by the Senate the professional staff are mostly concerned about the loss of the half-day Good Friday holiday. **[Appendix F]** The CICC had considered the problem of religious holidays and were aware of the MSU policy, which could provide a reasonable model. He had discussed this policy with the officers and the administration, who favored its approach. Ellen Horsch had indicated that the Good Friday half-day holiday was contractual for the Union employees and that it would remain as a half-day holiday for both union staff and professional staff. This is not an unusual circumstance - staff work during winter carnival when faculty don't

have to teach. Proposal 21-99, Policy on Religious Observance, therefore is only of importance for faculty and students. It also provides an opportunity for those of other religions to celebrate their religious holidays.

The Board has raised concerns about the loss of the Good Friday holiday in both calendar proposals; this proposal extends the opportunity for religious observance. Seely asked for a sense of the Senate before he presented this argument to the Board. He did not want to rush this proposal through as an emergency without time for adequate consideration of its effects. No one objected to having Seely indicate to the Board of Control that something like Proposal 21-99 was a likely outcome.

Senator Drummer asked how long this policy had been in effect at MSU and what had been the outcome.

Seely responded that it had been in effect a very long time. MSU reported no problems. Students must indicate their intentions in advance and indicate how they will make up the work. MSU provides a list of 19 religious holidays, but the list is not exhaustive. **[Appendix G]**

Drummer stated that he is skeptical; he felt that at MTU Good Friday would be a day of travel.

Seely added that it is not clear that religion is the driving force for wanting the holiday.

Sloan stated that we have to be sensitive to more religious faiths. She would like to see the half day for staff become flexible so that they could take the holiday on a different day.

Seely explained that staff will continue to work during the half-day holiday on Martin Luther King Day; the addition of this holiday for students will not create another paid holiday for staff.

Senator Chavis stated that she and Gloria [Melton] will work on Martin Luther King Day.

Senator Long asked if Rensselaer, to whom we are often compared, also have staff who are responsible for teaching or labs.

Seely responded that we might be able to negotiate a different arrangement for staff holidays when the students have holidays.

Senator Suryanarayana stated that we could offer staff an optional religious holiday in place of the traditional Good Friday holiday.

Provost Dobney responded that the Administration hasn't discussed this topic, but that the holiday could be open.

Seely repeated that the paid holiday for staff will not shift to Martin Luther King Day.

Senator Blanning stated that this optional holiday approach would only create a bigger and bigger mess.

Snyder stated that the staff can renegotiate their holidays in their next contract.

Drummer asked if MSU is the only school in the state with this policy for religious holidays.

Seely stated that there is no Good Friday holiday on most campuses with strong research and a more diverse student body, but that in most of the campuses in the northern part of the state there is a holiday.

Seely asked if there is a strong sense that something like this policy is possible, stating that it will require some thinking to work out the procedures.

Drummer stated his opposition because this is tough to work out.

Senator Pickens stated that if a family is mixed Christian and Jewish, they could have only 12-week semesters.

Seely stated that the policy shows sensitivity to what others [non-Christians] practice.

Senator Nordberg stated concerns that this is taking away a paid holiday for staff. Seely responded that the Administration is not going to do that.

Seely stated that he would report to the Board, if necessary, on the discussion on this issue in the Senate and convey that the Senate sees this as one way of dealing with the absence of a Good Friday holiday.

6. UNIVERSITY BUDGET REPORT

Provost Dobney reported on the budget scenarios he will present to the Board of Control. **[Appendix H]** There are four tiers of schools identified in the proposed state budget. Budgeting for the lowest tier is \$4500 per FYES [fiscal year equated student], the second is \$4600, the third \$4700. MTU is in the highest tier (the research universities), including MSU, U of M, and Wayne State, at \$8500 FYES. If the educational tax credit is revoked, as requested by the Governor, the money saved would be distributed to the universities that hold their undergraduate tuition rise to 3%.

Dobney presented three options for the budget. Option 1 called for a 3% state increase in funding, a 3% resident undergraduate tuition rise, and a 3.5% salary increment. Under this budget scenario we would eliminate the ramped tuition in which upper class students pay more than freshmen and sophomores. This option results in 0 increases in several major budget categories. It would still have a deficit of \$1.264 million. The deficit results from an anticipated \$2 million less tuition and fees income and an increasing student shortage.

Senator Drummer asked why the anticipated enrollment showed an overall increase.

Dobney stated that it is based on the number of high school graduates and the demand for a college education. However, the shortfall now will continue to keep us below our projections in the 5-year plan. In 1998-99 there is a \$.75 million shortfall. By 1999-2000 it will be \$2 million, by 2000-2001 \$3 million, and by 2001-2002 \$2.5 million.

Another cause for loss of income is that the state is now spreading its payments over 11 months instead of 9, causing a loss of investment income. Furthermore, there has been a significant increase in health care costs.

Health care costs rose from \$4.5 million in 1995 to \$4.8 million in 1997. In 1998 it rose to \$6.3 million and in 1999 is already \$.75 million over the 1998 costs. MTU has the richest health care program in the state. We are the only school with no co-pay or deductible on hospital costs. We may have to increase the co-pay of office visits and prescriptions.

President Seely commented that he thought the move to BCBS was intended to improve the health care cost burden because BCBS provides a 25% discount to the university whereas Wausau had only a 6% discount.

Dobney explained that it would take a while to get that benefit.

Senator Suryanarayana asked how much of the cost increase is due to an increase in medical charges. Dobney explained that it is due primarily to the addition of 125 employees and is not due to an increased cost in health care. In addition there have been a number of very expensive surgeries this year.

Senator Leifer asked how this report fit with President Tompkins' recent comment that this is the best financial year ever at MTU.

Dobney responded that it is the best fund-raising year, but that it doesn't help the general fund except for the student financial aid. The state has provided no operating money for new buildings, but it funds operations for new prison buildings at %100.

Dobney continued to explain that Tompkins has argued to the state that we [MTU] educate out-of-state students who stay in Michigan when they graduate and fill areas of need in the state. The state should support MTU so that we can educate more engineers since there is a shortage of engineers in the state.

Vice President Soldan stated that investing in wellness should pay off later by reducing financial costs. Senator Barna stated that the increase in number of employees is approximately 10%. Therefore, we are not really over budget on a per employee basis.

Dobney stated that health care costs have never been fully budgeted. The cost for retirees last year was \$800,000, not a significant increase. There was, however, a significant increase in dental costs for the university.

Senator Watwood asked how many of the new employees were hired for fund-raising.

Dobney responded that six were hired for colleges and schools, but he did not know the exact total - perhaps 20.

Barna asked where this leaves Proposal 9-99, Transition to Full Co-pay of Health Care Premiums for Retirees.

Dobney responded that he intended to fund it, but in view of the budget cuts he does not anticipate funding Proposal 9-99. He still hopes to do it, but "don't anticipate it this year." He realizes that delaying funding will cost more to fund the program.

Barna added that the increase in cost would be substantial.

Dobney stated that he hopes to hold the health care premium constant. It has only gone up 12% in the last 10 years.

Senator Leifer reminded the Provost that the 2+2 plan only covers added health care costs for those making \$130,000.

Dobney responded that there is a similar problem with those who got 10.5% before 1992 and don't have sufficient retirement funds. He asked Leifer "Why did you allow it?"

Leifer responded "I'm not the President and I don't build buildings on the backs of faculty."

Senator Snyder stated that MSU and U of M didn't play the game of holding tuition rise to 3% and they came out ahead. Dobney agreed that such a scenario needs to be weighed.

Dobney presented option 2. That scenario assumes a 1.5% state increase, undergraduate tuition 5.9% for lower and 9% upper class students, and 3.5% salary increase. If we don't get the 3% base budget increase he recommends that we ignore the 3% tuition increase limit and go with the 5-year plan for the budget.

Option 3 is the optimistic scenario, providing an excess of \$201,000. It provides for a 6% state increase, 3% resident undergraduate tuition increase, and a 3.5% salary increase.

He warned that MTU would not be able to announce raises before June or later. The State Senate hearings would occur in late April.

Senator Drummer stated that he understood there is a new marketing plan that included TV.

Dobney reported that the plan was to call people inquiring about the undergraduate program and turn them into applicants and to call those applying and turn them into enrollees. They would also try to get more students into the undersubscribed (non-engineering) areas.

Dobney stated that he doesn't necessarily agree to the increased marketing program due to cost but he is willing to try it when they can afford it. We can't go any farther the old way.

Soldan suggested maybe we could get sponsors for the Senate broadcast.

Dobney suggested that we need to get corporate relations people to help recruit students to enter MTU because these people need more engineers.

Senator Nordberg asked if he was correct that there would be no increase in funding for the library. Dobney indicated that increases would only be possible if funds were reallocated from elsewhere.

Seely stated that this is a preliminary draft. The Provost will work with the Finance Committee. The Board has made it clear that if we want to do something we must make clear how we will do it. The budget proposals will go to the Board Finance Committee on Friday.

Dobney stated that he prefers not to cut the health care or increase premiums until we have another year of experience with BCBS.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 19-99, Extension of Executive Preventive Medicine Benefits to All Employees [Appendix I]

The proposal was introduced.

B. Proposal 20-99, Announcement and Commencement Date of Raises [Appendix J]

The proposal was introduced.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 9-98, MS in Environmental Engineering Science [See minutes, page 7849, for a copy of this proposal.]

Marty Auer (Civil and Environmental Engineering) stated that the primary issue regarding this proposal was whether or not the MS in Environmental Science would provide an opportunity for graduates to sit for the P. E. exam. Upon inquiries he found that the program must have an identical name to an accredited program for this to happen. If they offer a MS in Environmental Engineering, the graduates can sit for the exam, but if it is called MS in Environmental Engineering Science, they cannot take this exam.

Therefore, the title of Environmental Engineering Science provides a way to separate those with no engineering degree. If the degree is in Engineering, graduates could take the exam and get the MS in Environmental Engineering. If they have no degree in engineering, they would take the Environmental Engineering Science MS.

The traditional program in environmental science is broad-based and not consistent with the proposed program. The title of environmental science also conflicts with the program in forestry called MS in Applied Ecology and Environmental Science.

Senators Barna and Nesbitt withdrew the concerns they had raised at the previous Senate meeting.

Barna stated that the Finance Committee had estimated the cost of the program to be \$40-60,000 increase based on the estimate of 10 new students in this program. Barna asked if the university should prioritize such additional programs in view of the tight budget.

Provost Dobney asked Auer if the department would be making a budget request to run the program. Auer responded that he doesn't see the program changing anything (faculty, books, equipment, etc.).

Drummer inquired about outside funding for the program. Auer responded that the vast majority of students would be funded as GRA's.

Barna stated that the Finance Committee has estimated that the University could absorb half the costs of this Environmental Engineering Science program. According to the material examined by the committee, a number of the courses in this program were undersubscribed and students could therefore be accommodated without the addition of new sections.

Secretary Glime asked if having the program would make more grant funding possible.

Auer responded that it would not do it directly but that it would serve as a feeder program for their PhD program, which would make it possible to bring in more grant money.

Glime asked how this could serve as a feeder program for the PhD program when this proposal is only for the MS degree and the students would not have an engineering degree.

Auer responded that the PhD degree does not require a degree in engineering.

Senator Gale stated that it is important to think of the hidden costs.

Senator Pickens stated that this financial report is not just from Barna, but represents the report of the Finance Committee. They had considered such hidden costs as the space allocation. They had accounted for everything they could think of that could be absorbed.

Barna stated that they didn't need the outside firm, suggested by Dobney, to analyze the cost. They only need to convince Dobney that the Finance Committee's representations were valid.

Dobney stated that we have lost 600 majors in electrical engineering but have not seen any savings in the money it would have cost to educate them.

Barna responded that he assumed they would have needed fewer faculty.

Dobney stated that the 600 students lost are the difference needed to make a balanced budget.

Barna stated that he has no opposition to this program. It is an expenditure, but it is also an investment.

Senator Watwood stated that the whole discussion is against his common sense. The proposed program is in an area closely allied to existing programs and the environmental program has been extremely successful.

Snyder MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to bring Proposal 9-98 from the table. The motion to bring from the table PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Senator Leifer called for a secret ballot.

Proposal 9-98, MS in Environmental Engineering Science, PASSED by secret ballot with 21 yes votes, 2 no, and 2 abstentions (Academic Units only voting).

B. Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors [See minutes, page 7881, for a copy of this proposal.]

Steve Seidel (Computer Science) explained the proposal. It is a single degree that acknowledges that the student has satisfied the degree requirements of two majors. It differs from the dual degree because only one degree is awarded. There is no specific implication that a student must earn more credits than are required for a single degree, although some program requirements will necessitate this.

Seidel showed several examples. For a combination of electrical engineering and computer science a student would need 24 credits over the graduation requirements for one major. For mathematics and computer science, no additional credits would be needed. For physics and mathematics, 24 additional credits would be needed to satisfy both majors.

Senator Nesbitt stated that Tami Olson had gathered considerable information from peer institutions on the dual major degree.

Senator Barna asked that if, under the current degree guidelines, you satisfy all the degree requirements of two different degrees, why don't you get the other degree automatically?

Senator Snyder responded that the issue had never been addressed.

Senator Nesbitt stated that it has been an accounting problem. He explained that a dual degree is awarded to people who go to school two different times and have already earned a degree, then come back later to complete

another degree.

Snyder stated that many peer institutions have both dual majors and dual degrees.

Seidel stated that the dual degree would indicate a fresh degree.

Secretary Glime asked for clarification of the earlier statement that there is no implication that additional credits would be required for graduation, but then Seidel listed two program pairs that would require an additional 24 credits.

Seidel responded that it depends on the major; the dual major program does not automatically imply more credits are needed, as in the combination of mathematics and computer science.

Senator Suryanarayana inquired about awarding degrees with majors in two different degree types.

Seidel responded that if, for example, someone had a double major in fine arts (BA) and engineering (BS), the student must choose one as the primary major to apply to the degree.

Watwood stated there might be problems if a student were to get a double major with a BS in civil engineering and a second major in surveying, for example. Both have professional licensing requirements and he wondered how the licensing group would interpret the degree. We don't want to give a degree that is no good.

Nesbitt stated that the student must seek an advisor and be sure that requirements are met for licensing.

Senator D. Reed stated that if a student has, for example, 23 electives, the student should judiciously choose the electives to meet both degree requirements.

Senator Sutter asked if every mathematics and computer science major would automatically get a dual major degree.

Seidel stated that they would if they took the right courses.

Sweeney MOVED and Gale seconded the motion to approve Proposal 14-99.

Sweeney MOVED and Gale seconded the motion to amend Proposal 14-99 to eliminate superfluous wording as follows:

Eliminate the first paragraph under Proposed Catalog Copy.

Eliminate from the second paragraph the portion beginning with "but does not qualify."

Eliminate the third and fourth paragraphs.

In the fifth paragraph, first sentence, change "will receive one degree" to "will be awarded one degree."

Seely ruled that the wording change in the fifth paragraph was an editorial change and would be accepted by consensus.

Snyder responded to the amendment and said it was appropriate to include all the statements in the suggested strikeouts, since this is to be catalog copy, because the statements provided advice to the students.

Blanning stated that some of these statements had been added because the committee did not understand the text without them.

The motion to amend by striking out these statements FAILED on voice vote with some supporting votes.

The editorial change will be made.

The motion to approve Proposal 14-99, Proposal to Institute Double Majors at MTU, PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

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