

The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 332

26 April 2000

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard a report on the preliminary University budget from Interim Provost Steve Bowen.
 - (2) Introduced several new proposals.
 - (3) Adopted Proposals 7-00, 10-00, 13-00, and 14-00.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 332 to order at 5:32 p.m. on Wednesday, 26 April 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Reed called roll. Absent were At-Large Senators Tom Drummer and Barry Kunz and representatives from Chemistry, Education, Mining Engineering, Institute of Materials Processing, HR and Facilities Management, Research and Graduate School/University Relations/Administrative Offices, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Josh Bennett (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Steve Bowen (Interim Provost), Debbie Lassila (Budget Office), Mike Abbott (Budget Office), Barry Solomon (Social Sciences), Cal White (Materials Science and Engineering), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Dave Nelson (Biomedical Engineering), and Jonathan Fox (Army ROTC).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Seely proposed adding an item, 7.G. Proposal 21-00, Referendum on Presidential Performance, to new business.

Blanning MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. 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 331

Gale MOVED and Goltz seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 331 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

Proposal 11-00, Revision of Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies, was transmitted to the administration. [Appendix B]

Seely reported that he has the bare minimum number of nominees for the at-large seats. Phil Sweany (Computer Science), Dieter Adolphs (Humanities), Lee Oberto (School of Technology), and Bob Keen (Biological Sciences) agreed to be nominated for the at-large seats. Seely requested Senate approval to appoint Adolphs and Sweany to the two three-year seats, Oberto to replace Carol MacLennan during her 2000-2001 Academic Year sabbatical, and Keen to fill the remainder of the term for Pete Tampas.

Nordberg MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to approve the at-large appointments. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with dissent. This means that there is no need for an election of at-large Senators this year since there are no contested seats.

Seely requested Senators to solicit nominees for the officer positions. Elections of Senate officers for 2000-2001 will be held on May 10.

Seely reported that the Senate will not attempt to reschedule the meeting with President Tompkins at this point. Seely asked that Senators provide any comments to the responses to questions posed by Tompkins no later than Friday.

The Report of the Administrative Evaluation Commission has been sent to Senate constituents. The Senate thanks the individuals that served on the Commission, especially Brad Baltensperger, Chair.

Seely distributed a communication from Jim Mitchell, Board of Control Chair. [**Appendix C**]

Seely reported that Proposal 21-00, Referendum on Presidential Performance, [**Appendix D**] grew out of discussions with the Senate Executive Committee. The intent of the Committee was to respond to the difficulties identified in the Evaluation Commission report. The Senate will meet on May 3 to discuss the proposal.

The Senate officers met with Steve Bowen on the remaining agenda items, noting that there are a great deal of pending proposals and only two remaining meetings this year.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Preliminary University Budget Report [Appendix E]

Bowen updated his preliminary University budget report from the April 12 meeting, indicating that there were a few changes reflecting more precision in estimates of enrollment. He provided a summary of planned increases in expenditures for 2000-01, some additional items under discussion, and the use of REF funds next year. He also reported that there will be a balanced budget on June 30, 2000, with an expected \$2.775 million in negative variances and \$2.800 million in positive variances this year.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 16-00, Certificate in Design Engineering

B. Proposal 17-00, Certificate in Media

C. Proposal 18-00, Certificate in Writing

D. Proposal 19-00, Non-Departmental PhD Program in Propulsion Systems Engineering

E. Proposal 20-00, AS Degree Program in Engineering Fundamentals

F. Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education Policy Report

G. Proposal 21-00, Referendum on Presidential Performance

The proposals were introduced as new business.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 10-00, Approval of Minors in Degree Programs [Appendix F]

Pickens MOVED and B. Reed seconded the motion to approve Proposal 10-00.

An editorial correction was suggested on item 1 to replace "proportionally" with "directly." There were no objections.

The motion to approve Proposal 10-00 PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

B. Proposal 7-00, Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Procedures [See minutes, page 8379, for a copy of this proposal.]

Gale MOVED and Goltz seconded the motion to approve Proposal 7-00.

Seely introduced four amendments received from the Task Force since the April 12 meeting.

Barna MOVED and Vilmann seconded the motion to approve the proposed amendments as a package.

Page 7

3.5.1.2. College review.

paragraph 2

The dean will formulate a separate statement on each case, to be presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek advisory input, e.g. from department chairs. ~~Such advisory input does not become part of the candidate's record and is not included in the candidate's tenure application file~~ **clarification of issues from the candidate, members of the department personnel committee, the chair of the department, or members of the college committee. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.**

Page 8

3.5.2.3. **Dean's recommendation.** The dean formulates a separate statement on each tenure application from the school. The statement is added to the candidate's tenure application file and presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek advisory input. ~~Such advisory input does not become part of the candidate's record and is not included in the candidate's tenure application file~~ **clarification of issues from the candidate, members of the school personnel committee, or members of the inter-school committee. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.**

Page 10

4.3.1.2. College review.

paragraph 2

The dean will formulate a separate recommendation statement on each case, to be presented to the Provost. In formulating this recommendation, the dean may seek advisory input, e.g. from department chairs. ~~Such advisory input does not become part of the candidate's record and is not included in the candidate's tenure application file~~ **clarification of issues from the candidate, members of the department personnel committee, the chair of the department, or members of the college committee. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.**

Page 11

4.3.2.3. **Dean's review.** The dean formulates a separate recommendation statement on each promotion application from the school. The statement is added to the candidate's promotion application file and presented to the Provost. In formulating a recommendation, the dean may seek advisory input. ~~Such advisory input does not become part of the candidate's record and is not included in the candidate's tenure application file~~ **clarification of issues from the candidate, members of the school personnel committee, or members of the inter-school committee. The dean shall maintain a written record of such communications.**

Ftaclas asked if the intent was to prohibit Deans from seeking input from parties not mentioned in the policy. Nelson said this was the clear intent and the reasonable interpretation of the amendments. MacLennan noted that the intent is to reinforce positive behavior. Sometimes there are contradictions in a file, and legitimate clarifications are sometimes needed. The intent is not to make it difficult for a Dean to seek such clarification. Barna noted that the amendments preclude a Dean from consulting with the Provost or President before forming a recommendation.

Barna MOVED and Vilmann seconded the motion to add "and advice only" after "clarification of issues" and "external referee" at the end of the same sentence in each section.

The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Seely noted that after Senate approval, this goes to the Committee on Academic Tenure to hold a forum and conduct a meeting for a vote of the faculty. The question of whether this sort of change can be made during a union drive has been raised. The AAUP representative recently on campus indicated that this would be considered to be business as usual since it has been in process for several years, and that not acting might be considered to be a violation of business as usual.

The motion to approve Proposal 7-00 PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

C. Proposal 13-00, Supplemental TIAA-CREF Contribution for Eligible Employees to Assist with Post-Retirement Health Insurance Costs [See minutes, page 8469, for a copy of this proposal.]

Seely introduced the proposal, noting that the intent is to encourage funding those individuals making more than \$50,000 per year that qualify under Proposal 9-99.

Ftaclas MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to approve Proposal 13-00.

Pegg noted that this proposal applies only to those paying 100% of the health care premium. Gale asked about the cost; Pegg indicated about \$400,000. Seely noted that there would be no recalculation of benefits or addition of individuals to those identified in analyses prior to the approval of 9-99.

Seely indicated that there was likely to be a question from the administration regarding whether this was a higher priority than a salary increase (in other words, should this be funded in place of a larger salary increase?). Hodek did not feel that this would necessarily have to come from the salary pool, and Pegg noted that high priority does not mean a higher priority than salary. Barna made the point that this was not a tradeoff with salary - this is one-time money while salary is a continuing commitment.

Pickens asked if the intent was to implement the ramped phase out of payment between \$50,000 and \$100,000 salary that was in 9-99, or is this to be implemented with no ramp. Pegg said the intent is to implement precisely as described in 9-99, including the ramp.

Snyder MOVED and Pickens seconded the motion to add "Consistent with Proposal 9-99" to the second sentence of paragraph 2 under History. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

The amendment was ruled editorial. There were no objections.

Seely asked again for a consensus on the funding priority. Vilmann felt it was not the Senate's role to indicate priority unless all potential increases were considered (i.e., it is not just a question of this proposal versus salary). Green suggested that this be added to the list of 'Items Under Discussion' in Bowen's earlier handout. The Senate indicated that this was the appropriate action.

The motion to approve Proposal 13-00 PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

D. Proposal 14-00, BS Degree Program in Biomedical Engineering [See minutes, page 8471, for a copy of this proposal.]

Senator Snyder introduced the proposal, with the idea that the intent was to upgrade the existing degree program (now an option in the BS in Engineering) to a BS degree. This is consistent with the program, it is a quality program, and the Curricular Policy Committee recommends approval.

Hodek MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to approve Proposal 14-00.

Hodek asked about the accrediting authority. Snyder indicated it is ABET. Hodek asked about the first visit, and Nelson indicated it is in 2000.

Barna MOVED and Snyder seconded the motion to delete the second paragraph of section B. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

The amendment was ruled editorial. There were no objections.

D. Reed asked about the approval process. Bowen indicated that if this is a spinoff, and not a new program, then the approval process is internal to MTU. Nelson indicated that it is intended as a spinoff.

The motion to approve Proposal 14-00 PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Gale MOVED and Sutter seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by David D. Reed
Secretary of the University Senate