

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 315 12 May 1999

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) unanimously passed Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies, with amendments to reduce the drop period to 6 weeks and to require the first-year students to discuss their status with the instructor and get the signature of an advisor.
 - (2) heard that the Administration had accepted the Emeritus Professor Policy.
 - (3) applauded, with thanks, the outgoing Senators and Senator Secretary.
 - (4) selected members of the Administrative Evaluation Commission: Chair and Senate Representative - Brad Baltensperger; School of Business and Economics - Paul Nelson; School of Forestry and Wood Products - Ed Frayer; School of Technology - Tim Collins; Research Units - Dana Richter; College of Engineering - Ed Fisher (Chem. Eng.), Bill Shapton (ME-EM), Jon Soper (Electrical Engineering; College of Sciences and Arts - Eunice Carlson (Biol. Sci.), Willie Melton (Soc. Sci.), Dick Brown (Chemistry); Non-Academic Units - Dave Bezotte (Library), Sharron Paris (OSRR), and Tom Vichich (Daniell Heights).
 - (5) heard from Provost Dobney that the best scenario for the budget is a 3% increase and that a 1-2% salary increment is likely; President Tompkins has set up a University Budget Committee.
 - (6) refused to act on Proposal 26-99, Amendment of the 1999-2000 Summer Academic Calendar that called for starting the 2000 summer school session a week earlier.
 - (7) defeated Proposal 27-99, Cost Reduction Retirement Equity Program, by lack of a second.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 315 to order at 5:42 p.m. on Wednesday, 12 May 1999, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were At-large Senator Beth Reed and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Computer Science, Education, Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, Metallurgical and Materials 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 Fred Dobney (Provost), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), and Les Leifer (Chemistry).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Blanning MOVED and Ouellette 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 313

Senator Tampas asked that for clarification the second column of page 8032 be changed, beginning with "Senator Tampas stated," to read: "Senator Tampas stated that the College of Engineering acceptances was down 10% for next year. He is worried about the health of the college." The following paragraph should be changed to "Warrington (Dean of Engineering) stated that the number that have paid the \$50 deposit is only down about 1%."

Senator Pickens clarified, also on page 8032, beginning with the paragraph "Leifer commented" to read "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."

President Seely corrected page 8033, the paragraph beginning "Seely stated that," to read "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* (Vice President for Finance) 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."

Williams MOVED and Nadgorny seconded the motion to accept the minutes as corrected. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

5. OPEN MOTION ON PROPOSAL 24-99, AMENDMENTS TO ACADEMIC POLICIES [See minutes, page 7989, for a copy of this proposal.]

Drummer called for DIVISION OF THE QUESTION on the amendment to Proposal 24-99, 3, Drop Period. Voting units would be academic units only.

Senator D. Reed stated that we need an explicit definition in the student handbook of what is meant by first year students. Senator Ouillette stated that students would understand what this means.

Senator Green argued that students shouldn't have to get approval from anyone.

Senator Watwood stated that students can't take a course without approval of an advisor.

Senator Gale stated that a student recently came to his faculty advisor in business, ready to graduate, and the advisor had never seen him before.

Senator Tampas stated that the requirements and intent were mixed up. The intent is so that a student won't do something that will complicate future scheduling.

President Seely called for a vote on the first part of the amendment: Courses dropped between the beginning of the *third* week and the end of the *sixth* week 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.

President Seely ruled that the ayes had it on voice vote, with opposition. Senators called for a show of hands vote. The motion to amend PASSED 11:7 by show of hands vote.

The second part of the amendment states, "First-year students may drop a course only after first ~~obtaining the approval of~~ *discussing their status with* the instructor and then securing approval of the appropriate academic advisor."

The second part PASSED on voice vote, with opposition.

Senator Drummer reminded the Senate of the discussion regarding the meaning of "at least 1 semester excluding summer." Snyder MOVED and Sutter seconded the motion to treat this as an emergency proposal. The motion to treat as an emergency proposal PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

The motion to approve Proposal 24-99 as amended PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Seely reported that Proposals 22-99, Marginal Cost/Revenue Information for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, 23-99, Implementation of the Co-pay increase for Retiree Health Benefits, and 25-99, BS in Computer Engineering have been sent to the Administration. [Appendices B-D] Proposal 25-99 will go to the Board of Control at its May 21 meeting.

The President has accepted Proposal 10-98, Emeritus/Emerita Professor Policy and will be notifying eligible retirees of their title change. [Appendix E]

President Seely read a memo from Vice Provost for Research Sung Lee regarding a recent case of scientific misconduct involving plagiarism. The Investigating Committee had recommended that we need to educate faculty and students on the types of things that can be considered plagiarism.

Seely stated that the Senate has some responsibility to follow up on their scientific misconduct policy to ensure that activities occur to ensure proper scientific conduct, i.e. education.

Seely expressed his thanks to the Copper Country Intermediate School District for running the Senate tapes on their channel. He announced that the USG had requested that the Senate broadcast on the closed circuit TV that reaches the students. He will arrange for that to happen.

Seely thanked those Senators who had served the maximum term of 6 years: Janice Glime, Dana Richter, Les Leifer, Dennis Hagenbuch, Oner Arici, and Willie Melton.

He commended Senator Leifer for his nine years of service as Senator or Alternate and an additional year as chair of an ad hoc Senate committee.

Seely also thanked Dae Young, Ed Nadgorny, Pat Joyce, and Anita Quinn who will leave the Senate this year after completing one three-year term.

The Senate applauded the service of all the departing Senators.

Seely closed his President's report by awarding a bird's eye maple plate, crafted and engraved by Dave Stimac at Ford Forestry Center in Baraga, to Secretary Glime in recognition of her "superb job" as Secretary of the Senate from 1995 to 1999.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Administrative Evaluation Commission

President Seely presented the slate of nominees submitted from the campus units. He reported that in addition to the nominees listed in the Minutes of Meeting 313, the School of Technology had added three nominees: Paul Buda, John Daavettila, and John Lukowski.

Seely stated that the School of Forestry still has only one nominee, the Dean of the College Ed Frayer.

Senator Gale stated that the nominees provide good representation of faculty and staff, but that the evaluation committee needs to have lower levels of administrators represented such as deans and chairs.

Senator Pickens stated that the Forestry faculty are comfortable with Frayer as their only nominee.

Seely stated that Senators should vote for one person to represent the Senate and act as chair, one person per school, one per research unit, and three per college.

The following committee was elected by the Senate on secret ballot: Chair and Senate Representative - Brad Baltensperger; School of Business and Economics - Paul Nelson; School of Forestry and Wood Products - Ed Frayer; School of Technology - Tim Collins; Research Units - Dana Richter; College of Engineering - Ed Fisher (Chem. Eng.), Bill Shapton (ME-EM), Jon Soper (Electrical Engineering); College of Sciences and Arts - Eunice Carlson (Biol. Sci.), Willie Melton (Soc. Sci.), Dick Brown (Chemistry), in runoff ballot against Laurie Whitt (Humanities); Non-Academic Units - Dave Bezotte (Library), Sharron Paris (OSRR), and Tom Vichich (Daniell Heights), in runoff ballot against Nancy Sprague (Inst. Anal.).

B. University Budget Update

Provost Dobney summarized the current status of the University Budget for 1999-2000. The House passed a 1.5% across-the-board budget increase and a 1.5% one-time allotment for schools that restrain the tuition

increase to the 3% cost of living increase, but only if the tuition tax credit is repealed. The Senate has proposed a 3% increase across the board. These are the best of all possible scenarios.

President Tompkins wants to formalize a budget committee to include the President, all Vice Presidents, Budget Director, and President of the Senate. The committee will hold hearings next week for the Deans, Directors, Vice Presidents, and Vice Provosts to defend their budgets.

Dobney reported that the salary increment would probably be 1-2%. The Board probably will not pass the new budget until June or July.

Senator Barna asked if the Committee will be permanent. Dobney indicated that it would.

Seely stated that he will bring a proposal to the Senate for a committee to implement a strategic planning process for the University.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 12-98, Revision of the Retirement Medical Plan [Appendix F]

Leifer (Chemistry) outlined the history that led to these revisions, which began in 1997. He had pointed out to the Board of Control that under the present guidelines, if one fails to pay the insurance premium for 60 days, the insurance would be cancelled and the person can't get back in. The Board had approved that set of guidelines 5:1. After the vote, Mitchell had asked Dobney if Leifer was right. Dobney had answered yes, but that there was an appeal process.

At the next meeting of the Board, Mitchell has said, "Isn't Les right?" Board Lawyer Vercruysse had responded that it is not our language; it is from the insurance company. But Leifer pointed out that MTU is the insurer. Leifer continued that Mitchell brought the concern up again and the Board had eliminated that language, but only in one place in the document.

Leifer thanked the Fringe Benefits Committee for the fantastic job they had done this year.

Leifer also pointed out that the Administration is not at fault for the language of the Health Insurance document; it comes from the Board of Control lawyer, Robert Vercruysse.

Senator Pegg highlighted the changes named in the Proposal. The supplements of the policy agreement are not available for us to see. The intent was to protect the University, not the faculty and staff.

Pegg stated that the Proposal is divided into 4 principles.

One concern is the fate of benefits in a financial emergency. We have recently seen our \$2.9 million emergency fund transferred to the general fund; the Senate has already heard arguments over prefunding.

Seely stated that the Fringe Benefits Committee and the Provost had met in March. The Provost had pointed out a number of desired changes that could be made as editorial without going to the Board with them.

Barna MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to accept Proposal 12-98.

Barna asked about the employee who was retiring and was asked to sign the insurance agreement without being able to read it.

Pegg responded that a faculty member who had retired recently had been asked to sign agreement to the policy, but was told that he could not see the agreement until after he had signed it.

Leifer stated that even if we go to 100% copay we would still be paying our premiums to the University.

Vice President Soldan stated that it would be far more devastating if we would suddenly be told that we could no longer be included in the group policy.

Senator Pickens pointed out that in Principle 4 of the Proposal, "not reduce" should be "not increase." Seely ruled this to be an editorial change.

Senator Watwood asked what the effect would be if one is not yet 65.

Leifer responded that then there would be no Medigap coverage.

Senator Pennington stated that the meaning of the statement questioned by Pickens was not to reduce the funds available for Medigap coverage.

Williams MOVED and Watwood seconded the motion to Table Proposal 12-98.

The motion to table PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

B. Proposal 16-99, Professional Development Leave for Non-faculty, Non-represented, Exempt Staff [Appendix G]

Senator Henkel introduced the proposal. She stated that it will not affect non-exempt staff. One has to be here 5 years to get the benefits because MPSERS requires 5. It provides for a job to come back to and helps the spouses of faculty, permitting more faculty to take sabbatical leaves.

Nordberg MOVED and Long seconded the motion to accept Proposal 16-99.

Vice President Soldan asked if there had been a cost analysis.

Henkel stated that there had not because the costs must be covered within each department by using the portion of unused salary and filling in by other members of the unit.

Senator Long asked if the request for leave can go farther up if the supervisor doesn't agree to it.

Henkel explained that it can still go forward.

Senator D. Reed asked if the only change is in the payment of benefits by the University.

Henkel responded that it is.

Soldan added that it also ensures that there will be a job to come back to.

Henkel agreed that the job security is also new.

Senator Drummer asked if there is a requirement to come back to the unit, as there is for a faculty sabbatical leave.

Henkel stated that there is, or the employee must repay earnings accrued during the leave. She explained that the person might, however, move to a higher position.

Senator LaCourt explained that the salary is negotiable at the time a person applies for the leave.

President Seely stated that as had been the practice in the past, the procedures had been kept separate. They are hard to change if they become Board Policy.

Senator Lutzke stated that a person must receive some salary from the University to be eligible for benefits.

Senator Reed stated that it appears that there are a policy and procedures now and that this policy changes only the benefits.

LaCourt stated that the current policy allows for leave without pay or benefits and no job guarantee.

Leifer (Chemistry) asked if the University requires a certain number of hours to receive benefits.

Provost Dobney responded that a person must be employed 3/4 time to receive benefits. However, faculty on sabbatical leave get full benefits even if they are on 1/2 salary.

Long stated that for her the biggest change is the possibility of salary and that it should be part of the proposal.

Senator Nordberg stated that it sounds more negotiable.

LaCourt responded that it is negotiable almost exclusively with the supervisor.

Seely stated that this proposal follows the principle of separating the procedures from the policy.

Senator D. Reed asked for clarification of whether the leave is paid or unpaid.

Lutzke explained that the situation now is that some people can get paid to attend a seminar that is needed for their current job, but they cannot get paid for an extended leave.

Senator Williams stated that there is a distinction between faculty and staff leaves. The faculty are assumed to be fully qualified for their jobs and take leaves so that they can do them better. Staff, on the other hand, can take a leave to improve themselves and move up to a better position.

Leifer expressed confusion because Nordberg stated that staff can go for 1-2 months to take a course and get paid, but Lutzke says that they can't.

Nordberg explained that staff can only go for 1-2 months if the training they receive is required by their job.

Senator Green stated that he would be happy to negotiate no salary if he would still receive full benefits.

Senator Pegg stated that under this proposal TIAA/CREF benefits would be based on a \$0.00 salary, but that a person would retain health benefits.

Williams MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to table Proposal 16-99 until the procedures are available for review.

The motion to table PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

C. Proposal 26-99, Amendment of the 1999-2000 Summer Academic Calendar. [See minutes, page 8041, for a copy of this proposal.]

President Seely stated that the officers had met with the Provost that morning and had discussed Proposal 26-99. This proposal is to move the summer schedule up to start the day after Memorial Day. However, there are at least four departments (Forestry, Geology, Civil Engineering, and Biology) that offer interim courses. As part of the conversion to semesters, we have a contract with the students to offer these courses at this time.

Seely explained that if we don't bring the proposal from the table it dies.

Senator Williams asked whose proposal it is.

Seely explained that it came from Residence Life.

There was no motion on Proposal 26-99, so the proposal dies.

D. Proposal 27-99, Cost Reduction Retirement Equity Program. [See minutes, page 8042, for a copy of this proposal.]

Leifer (Chemistry) explained some of the ramifications of Proposal 27-99. There would be 26 faculty and 7 staff eligible for the proposed retirement benefit if we require 60 years of age and 25 years of service. If the age

requirement is removed, there would be 37 faculty and 7 staff who have 85 points. In 2000 there would be 6 more faculty and 5 more staff eligible.

Leifer pointed out the developing bulge in faculty (especially) and staff who are eligible for retirement; these result from not providing financial encouragement for retirement. If we don't retire these people, they will cost us \$22 million in salaries. If they retire with the plan suggested by the proposal, the University would need a loan for the first year but would save money thereafter by replacing them with new faculty who earn lower salaries.

He explained that the benefit is to roll over faculty faster and avoid the bubble of a large number of those eligible to retire.

Pegg MOVED to accept Proposal 27-99. The motion FAILED due to lack of a second.

9. ADJOURNMENT

B. Reed MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

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