

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

## Minutes of Meeting 313 5 May 1999

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard that Susan Martin had been elected for a 3-year term and Bogue Sandberg for a 2-year term on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee.
- (2) heard that Carol MacLennan and Barry Kunz are the only nominees for the two positions of Senator At-large.
- (3) heard that the Center for Biomedical Engineering was granting tenure but had not gone through Senate procedures for being recognized as an academic unit.
- (4) heard that the slate of nominees for the Administrative Evaluation Committee is complete, but that two deans have nominated themselves as the only candidates from their units because no one else had volunteered.
- (5) heard a request and proposal from Residential Services to begin summer school in 2000 one week earlier to permit enough time after summer school to prepare residence halls for fall.
- (6) passed Proposal 25-99, BS in Computer Engineering.
- (7) passed Proposal 22-99, Marginal Cost/Revenue Information for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs.
- (8) unanimously passed Proposal 23-99, Implementation of the Co-pay Increase for Retiree Health Benefits.

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 313 to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 5 May 1999, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Computer Science, Mining Engineering, Physical Education, and Institute of Materials Processing. Liaisons in attendance were Ted Soldan (Staff Council) and Anthony Moretti (USG).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Les Leifer (Chemistry), Tim Schulz (Electrical Engineering), Jon Soper (Electrical Engineering), Marty Janners (Vice Provost for Student Affairs), Bob Warrington (Dean of Engineering), Max Seel (Dean of Sciences and Arts), Linda Ott (Computer Science), and John Rovano (Residential Services).

### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Leifer (Chemistry) suggested that the order of Proposals 25-99 and 22-99 should be reversed on the agenda.

Pegg moved and Williams seconded the motion to reverse these two items.

Senator Barna stated that we won't learn anything from the decision on Proposal 22-99 that affects Proposal 25-99.

The motion to change the order of the proposals on the agenda FAILED with one supporting vote.

Williams MOVED and B. Reed 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 312**

Sloan MOVED and Ouellette seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 312. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

#### **5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

Senate Proposal 13-99, Amendment to Grading System Policy, has been forwarded to the Administration for approval. [**Appendix B**]

President Seely reported on the results of the faculty election of members to serve on the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee: Susan Martin (3-year term) and Bogue Sandberg (2-year term) were elected. In addition, Vern Watwood (2-year term) and Dick Blanning (3-year term) will serve as representatives of the Senate. The Provost will select one additional person for a 1-year term. The procedure for selection must be approved by the Provost; the committee can use the procedures established for the staff award as a starting point.

There are only two nominees to fill two vacancies for Senator At-large: Carol MacLennan (Social Sciences) and Barry Kunz (Electrical Engineering). As a result, if no additional nominees are presented these will be the Senators At-large and no election will be held.

Seely reported that the Senate officers and Tom Drummer had met with Marcus Gioe (President of USG) and Luke Trier (Chair of USG Committee on Teacher Evaluations) regarding the publication of teacher evaluations. USG will be bringing a proposal to the Senate.

The Executive Committee met on 28 April primarily to discuss a constituency issue. Dave Nelson presented an argument for representation for faculty from the Center for Biomedical Engineering. The request and Seely's summary of the Executive Committee's response are in **Appendix C**. Faculty in the Center for Biomedical Engineering are granted tenure in the Center and therefore are not currently represented in the Senate. The Senate cannot create a department, and faculty representation is defined by departments. Seely reported that the Executive Committee was concerned that the Senate had never discussed the creation of the Center and therefore the Committee recommended that the Senate should not create a representation. The creation of the Center had not gone through the normal process. The Executive Committee argued that faculty in that unit must be represented by Senators At-large. The Senate will review the issue of having a Center grant tenure, an activity that is normally only the purview of a department.

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

President Seely reported on the selection of nominees to represent departments on the Administrative Evaluation Committee. The slate has been completed except that some units have presented only one nominee instead of the required three. The Senate nominees are Brad Baltensperger and Beth Flynn (Senate representative serves as chair). Other nominees are:

##### **School of Business**

Larry Davis  
Paul Nelson  
Christa Walck

##### **School of Forestry and Wood Products**

Ed Frayer

##### **School of Technology**

Tim Collins

##### **Research Units**

Nick Popko (IMP)

Jay Meldrum (KRC)  
Dana Richter (IWR)

### **College of Engineering**

Suzanne Beske-Diehl (Geol. & Geol. Sci.)  
Ed Fisher (Chem. Eng.)  
Jong Lee (Met. & Mat. Eng.)  
Bill Shapton (ME-EM)  
Richard Gertsch (Mining Eng.)  
Bernie Alkire (Civil & Env. Eng.)  
Jon Soper (Elec. Eng.)

### **College of Sciences and Arts**

Al Baartmans (Math.)  
Dick Brown (Chem.)  
Debra Bruch (Fine Arts)  
Eunice Carlson (Biol. Sci.)  
Xiaoqiu Huang (Computer Sci.)  
John Jaszczak (Physics)  
Willie Melton (Soc. Sci.)  
Dan Rypma (Phys. Ed.)  
Laurie Whitt (Humanities)  
Bill Yarroch (Education)

### **Non-academic Units**

Dave Bezotte (Library)  
Becky Christianson (Qual. Serv. Ed.)  
Cynthia MacDonald (Info. Tech.)  
Sharron Paris (OSRR)  
Lorri Reilly (Chem. lab sup.)  
Shalini Rudak (Ed. Op.)  
Julie Seppala (Acct. Srv.)  
Nancy Sprague (Inst. Anal.)  
Tom Vichich (Dan. Hts.)  
Paula Zenner (ME-EM asst. to chair)

Seely pointed out that not only was there only one nominee from the School of Forestry and from the School of Technology, but both nominees are deans.

Leifer (Chemistry) asked what the Senate President would do if a department doesn't get a Senator.

Seely responded that he has only the "moral authority of the office" and little means of enforcing it.

Leifer stated that placing deans on this committee could be viewed as a conflict of interest and pointed out that Seely had acted as Conflict of Interest Officer for the University.

Barna asked if we could allow units to opt out of representation.

Seely responded that it raises an equity issue. We should do everything we can to avoid opting out.

Senator Gale asked if all other slots were full and Seely responded that they were.

Vice President Soldan stated that maybe there should be more pressure from the Senate President and Provost for those units to get additional nominees.

Gale reported that Dr. Edward Grant had been selected as the outside committee member. Dr. Grant was a faculty member at MTU from 1972 to 1977, had served as Chief Financial Officer at Central Michigan University, and now serves as a department chair.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 26-99, Amendment of the 1999-2000 Summer Academic Calendar [Appendix D]**

Seely explained that residence hall personnel need an extra week between summer and fall terms to prepare the halls. Therefore, they have proposed changing the summer school calendar to start one week sooner and provide only a one-week break between spring and summer terms. This would provide a one-week period in which dorms would be empty and could be cleaned at the end of summer session before freshmen arrive.

Rovano (Residential Services) stated that the students have a contract for 34 weeks of dormitory service. This permits upper class students to come early to set up lofts and get their rooms ready as well as providing dorm rooms during freshman orientation. Under the current calendar configuration for summer of 2000, summer school would end and freshmen would arrive the next day.

Vice President Soldan asked what effect it would have if we don't allow upper class students to return early.

Rovano pointed out that 55% of the residents are first-year students.

Secretary Glime stated that to maintain this contract and permit students to come early, yet clean the dorms, it would be necessary to break another contract with the students. We have guaranteed a list of courses and terms when they would be taught so that students can plan their transition to semesters. There are at least two courses that are taught during the two weeks between spring and summer terms. If this time is reduced to one week, students will have no time to take one of these courses if they also plan to take track A summer school courses. It is too late to expect them to reschedule their plans for this summer to accommodate this change.

Rovano responded that a possible alternative would be not to allow students to stay in the dorm during the second summer term. Few students stay in the dorm then anyway.

Senator D. Reed stated that the Senate had already dealt with this problem and solved it when they approved the 14-week calendar, but the Administration and Board of Control had recreated this problem by their failure to endorse the calendar passed by the Senate and faculty. The Senate should not have to solve the problems created by this decision.

Rovano stated that all summer school residents are assigned to McNair Hall.

Senator Snyder asked if all freshmen could be assigned to Wads - it would solve a lot of problems. It is easier to make a programmatic decision than a calendar decision. Janners and Rovano indicated that such a separation was not desirable.

Seely responded to D. Reed's suggestion by stating that we would be giving away what power we do have by refusing to deal with this problem because we did not create it and therefore won't fix it.

Proposal 26-99 would be eligible for a vote at the meeting next week.

### **B. Proposal 27-99, Cost Reduction Retirement Equity Program [Appendix E]**

The proposal was introduced as new business.

## **8. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 25-99, BS in Computer Engineering [See minutes, page 8005, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Blanning reported that the Curricular Policy Committee had recognized that they are not a business committee, but that the BS in Computer Engineering is a very important degree and should move forward.

Senator Barna presented the conclusions of the Finance Committee following discussions with the Provost on estimated costs.

1. This program is a highly desirable and strategic addition.
2. The Provost's financial projection is unrealistic
3. The probable cost is likely to be \$1-2 million by the third year.
4. The Provost thought it would bring in revenue by the third year. (The Finance Committee disagreed.)
5. The 5-year budget may not adequately reflect the cost.

Barna asked if we are in a financial position to commit \$1-2 million to a new program. The resources are no longer available. Barna presented a series of revenue losses (in millions of dollars) that must be faced:

- 5.7 from the retirement health care fund
- 7.1 reserve and insurance gains
- 10-15 bond to long-term debt from building costs
- 1.2 current budget deficit
- loss of auxiliary surpluses (now counted as part of general fund)
- endowment investment gains could go down
- deficit: \$24-29 million

This suggests a spending of \$2-5 million over intake yearly.

The University is required to have \$6,840,000 in the Reserve and Insurance Gains Account on 30 June of each year. Therefore, a stock market crash could mean that the University has to make up the difference.

Barna stated that the Provost said the Computer Engineering program would require 4 new faculty positions for upper division courses and none at lower levels.

If the program adds 80 students, they would generate a revenue of \$600,000-700,000 per year after year three. If only 20 students are added, the program would lose more than \$2.5 million.

Leifer commented that a \$10-15 million long-term bond would cost as much as \$600,000 interest. Pickens stated that we are currently paying 2.5-3% and that it might be closer to 4% when it converts to long term.

Seel (Dean, Sciences and Arts) stated that each new program is a money-losing enterprise. The issue is complex. If we don't have this program, we will lose students. There is a shift in enrollment toward computer science and engineering.

Barna stated that he shares the opinion of needs. However, we need a better cost estimate to make the trade-offs needed to cover those costs.

Seel stated that these fields are here to stay.

Soper (Electrical Engineering) presented estimates of enrollment and faculty to be hired.

comp. eng. EE total

current 0 650 650

4 yrs 350 350 700

fac 3 18 21

fac, 4 yr 10 15 25

Soper added that EE could lose 50 students if they don't get the computer engineering program.

Ott (Computer Science) stated that the CS enrollment has increased dramatically. The Provost is making the right decisions in moving resources where the students are.

Senator Tampas stated that the College of Engineering acceptances were down 10% for next year. He is worried about the health of the college.

Warrington (Dean of Engineering) stated that the number that have paid the \$50 deposit is only down about 1%.

Soper (Electrical Engineering) stated that the electrical engineering enrollment is up this year.

Senator Gale stated that the University enrollment has been down since 1991.

Janners (Vice President for Student Affairs) stated that there was no increase in the size of the applicant pool, so the enrollment is probably not going up.

Senator Watwood stated that he wants to be sure that the Dean of Engineering supports the proposal, since there was no statement of his support with the proposal.

Warrington responded that he is in favor of it and that for some reason his statement did not get copied with the proposal package.

Watwood asked what the electrical engineering enrollment was in 1990.

Soper stated that it was around 1100.

Watwood responded that enrollments go up and down and that we cannot say accurately which way they will go or what the cost will be. By this reasoning we should never fill a vacant position. Then we would eventually have zero faculty and lots of students, so we would have lots of money.

Senator D. Reed stated that the applied ecology proposal tied the number of faculty to the number of new students.

Senator Snyder responded that no one follows those suggestions. This proposal differs in that the applied ecology program could be started with existing faculty whereas the computer engineering program requires new faculty expertise at the onset.

Senator Pickens stated that he had made the same suggestion as Reed's to the Provost and that the Provost was not receptive.

Ott stated that a department has many roles and that we need the total summary to indicate if we need more resources

Leifer stated that this program cannot come from salaries and benefits. The administration should stop building buildings. In reference to Leifer's complaint about building buildings on the backs of the faculty, the Provost had asked Leifer, "why didn't you stop us?" We should put in bold letters with this proposal that no buildings will be built until this is paid for.

Seely stated that the difference lies in the way the Provost and the Finance Committee compute the cost. The Provost doesn't use a formula. The Senate needs to remember that we are not going to build space for this program. The Provost says that four new positions are needed for Computer Engineering. The model breaks

down in projecting the number of students. If we agree that we have to do computer engineering, we'll do it, but we don't have anywhere to go to find money to support the program. We don't know what commitments of funds lie out there three years from now. For example, the Whittaker Foundation has supported the startup of the Center for Biomedical Engineering, but the University will have to absorb those costs in three years.

Seely is putting together a proposal for a strategic planning committee. The Senate can't do a detailed cost estimate. Therefore, we need to do strategic planning. This assumes that the Administration will try to generate costs. At present there is no CPA involved in planning. McGarry has stated to Seely that there are two kinds of cost accounting: garbage, where there is not enough information, and very expensive and detailed, but no one trusts it because they have different estimates of the costs of the details. We can debate the numbers forever. The Provost and McGarry don't disagree fundamentally. The University is making commitments without viewing how the whole picture fits together.

Barna agreed that we can't predict costs well because enrollments are unknown, but we can if we sit down with someone and base costs on specific number scenarios. We can't show this program as a revenue generator.

Senator Blanning stated that when he joined the Senate as a new Senator in the fall he thought the Senate was concerned with education. Instead it has been all business, in which he has little interest. It is no wonder that faculty won't volunteer for committees.

Snyder reminded Blanning that this is not a faculty Senate, but a University Senate, and therefore not all issues will be educational.

Blanning asked why we are paying administrators if the Senate debates all this.

Warrington stated that advice and strategic planning can help. We haven't been doing a good job at that. The College of Engineering will start doing it.

Richter MOVED and Vanden Avond seconded the motion to table Proposal 25-99.

Watwood argued that we may lose money in EE because we did not develop this program. If a business stops making new products because it is in financial trouble, it will be dead.

Richter withdrew his motion to table.

Gale stated that he thinks we should table this motion to resolve the difference in cost estimates between the Finance Committee and the Provost.

Snyder called for the question and Pennington seconded the motion. The motion to call the question PASSED on voice vote with one opposing vote.

D. Reed called for a secret ballot.

Proposal 25-99 PASSED by secret ballot with 15 yes, 5 no, and 1 abstention.

### **B. Proposal 22-99, Marginal Cost/Revenue Information for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs [See minutes, page 7975, for a copy of this proposal.]**

President Seely stated that firms like PricewaterhouseCoopers have costs that begin at \$350/hour for personnel. Therefore, the cost for outside consultants would probably go over \$5000. Larry Davis will soon return to the Business Department and has experience and could do an in-house assessment, if he would agree to do it.

Senator Barna stated that he had been favorably impressed by the assessment by Anderson, Tackman and Company, PLC on facilities.

Senator Snyder stated that if we don't have \$5000, are we doing any more than recommending this to a hostile audience?

Seely stated that the Provost pointed out that he was the one who asked the Senate to pay attention to the cost of their recommendations, but that he didn't mean this much attention. McGarry (Chief Financial Officer) made an analogy, that a corporation wouldn't figure the cost of one car, but would figure the cost of a given number of these cars of a specific model to be produced in a particular plant.

Senator Watwood stated that he supported the proposal to the extent that finances should be put in order. Many personnel have been added to development and have been put on the state payroll. People have been moving out of the ad building to other locations, but the ad building is still bulging with administrators. We need to figure where the money is going in the ad building.

Barna stated that the campus has never looked worse, but it is not the fault of facilities. Downstate schools receive \$5-7 per square foot, whereas our facilities group has been provided \$4. Now they are only provided \$3. They are doing an outstanding job with what they have.

Senator Sutter stated that the Provost made the point clear how he will receive this proposal. We should take a broader look at strategic planning.

Proposal 22-99 PASSED on voice vote with some opposition.

**C. Proposal 23-99, Implementation of the Co-pay Increase for Retiree Health Benefits [See minutes, page 7977, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Leifer (Chemistry) stated that the Senate supported Proposal 9-99 by a 20:4 vote. There is no cost for Proposal 23-99 if Proposal 9-99 is implemented.

Snyder MOVED and Vanden Avond seconded the motion to bring Proposal 23-99 from the table. The motion to bring from the table PASSED with no opposition.

Senator Barna stated that the Provost supports Proposal 9-99 but wants to defer it until the budget can cover it, probably for one year. This would reduce the cost of 9-99 when implemented.

President Seely stated that there is some chance that Proposal 9-99 can still be covered in the 99-2000 budget.

Leifer stated that the committee had severe time constraints to prepare Proposal 9-99 so that it could get into the budget. The committee had met the commitment; the Provost should meet his.

Senator Lutzke called for the question.

Barna called for a show of hands vote.

The motion to approve Proposal 23-99 PASSED unanimously by show of hands vote with 31 yes.

**D. Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies [See minutes, page 7989, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Senator Drummer summarized the proposed changes in the academic policies, most of which are a direct translation of the existing policy. It proposes a 10-week drop period: that is like most other schools, it is proportional to the current drop period, and it is after mid-semester grades for freshmen. The proposal also adds two additional situations to possible conditions for dismissal: 0 credits earned in a term or a GPA below 1.0 in any term. The second semester would require being out of school for two semesters excluding summer. Probation would result from a GPA of less than two based on 16 (not 15) credits.

Williams MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to approve Proposal 24-99.

Leifer asked why summer couldn't count as a semester for purposes of re-instatement.

Janners (Vice Provost for Student Affairs) stated that it takes three months for the student to get beyond considering the dismissal as a vacation and another three to re-evaluate his/her approach to college.

Senator Pennington suggested that the wording be changed to a semester plus summer off.

Gale MOVED (at the request of the Social Sciences Department) and Vanden Avond seconded the motion to amend item 3 of Proposal 24-99 to read as follows:

"Courses dropped between the beginning of the **third** week and the end of the **sixth** week of a semester will be indicated by a grade of W on the transcript. After the **sixth** week of a semester, a student may request a late drop from the Dean of Students office, which will consider only those requests that clearly involve extenuating circumstances beyond a student's control."

**"First-year students may drop a course only after first obtaining the approval of the instructor, and then securing the approval of the appropriate academic adviser."**

Senator Tampas asked for the rationale for requiring signatures of the advisor and instructor.

Senator Snyder responded that some students think they are failing when actually they are not.

Leifer (Chemistry) stated that if there are only two exams in a course, then there is no basis for a student to make a decision within six weeks.

Vice President Soldan stated that the length of the drop period and the requirement for signatures should be two separate amendments. Seely explained that this could be accomplished by a call for division of the question.

Senator Gale stated that he favors giving students as much flexibility as we can.

Seel (Dean of Sciences and Arts) stated that he supports shortening of the drop period; too many students over enroll.

Tampas stated that we can't add other students that late in the term anyway.

Senator Williams stated that with the increase in the length of the term there should be more tests so that there should be at least two in the term, not counting the final.

Snyder stated that now students enroll for one more course than they can complete, but that it won't happen that way under the semester. However, the earlier drop date encourages students to put in more work up front in the course.

Senator Ouillete clarified that the first year refers to the first year for a freshman.

President Seely stated that we wouldn't require third-year transfer students to get signatures. The amendment refers to those students who are brand new to college.

Senator Watwood stated that he also favors the earlier date. However, he would recommend changing approval of instructor to informing the instructor. The instructor shouldn't have veto power.

Janners stated that she supports the spirit of the amendment because it forces students to interact with the faculty and advisor.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

Gale MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m. with an open motion and a motion to amend on the floor.

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