

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

## Minutes of Meeting 335

10 May 2000

### Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard that President Tompkins approved Proposal 10-00, Approval of Minors in Degree Programs, and Proposal 11-00, Revision of Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies.
  - (2) heard a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education.
  - (3) approved Proposals 16-00, 17-00, 18-00, 19-00, 22-00, and 12-00.
  - (4) tabled Proposals 23-00, 15-00, and 20-00.
- 

### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 335 to order at 5:45 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 May 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Reed called roll. Absent were At-large Senators Kunz and Goltz and representatives from Education, School of Forestry and Wood Products, Materials Science and Engineering, Mining Engineering, Institute of Materials Processing, and Auxiliary Enterprises. Liaisons in attendance were Josh Bennett (USG) and Geoff Roelant (GSC).

### 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Steve Bowen (Interim Provost), Tony Rogers (Chemical Engineering), Neil Hutzler (College of Engineering), Sheryl Sorby (General Engineering), Bill Shapton (ME-EM), Duane Abata (ME-EM), Carole LaPointe (Educational Opportunity), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

### 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Gale 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 MEETINGS 332 AND 333

Williams MOVED and B. Reed seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 332 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Long MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 333 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

### 5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Seely reported that Proposals 10-00, Approval of Minors in Degree Programs, 13-00, Supplemental TIAA-CREF Contribution for Eligible Employees to Assist with Post-Retirement Health Insurance Costs, and 14-00, BS Degree Program in Biomedical Engineering, were transmitted to the administration. [**Appendices B-D**]

He also reported that Proposals 10-00, Approval of Minors in Degree Programs, and 11-00, Revision of Proposal 24-99, Amendments to Academic Policies, were approved by the President. [**Appendices E and F**]

The Senate will have an informal meeting with President Tompkins on Tuesday, May 23, at 3:00 p.m. in the Alumni Lounge.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote on the proposed tenure, promotion, and reappointment policy on Thursday, May 11, from 4:00-6:00 p.m. in U115 of the M&M Building.

Seely reminded the Senate that referendum ballots (presidential performance) are due on Monday, May 15, by 5:00 p.m.

President Seely thanked the Senate "for the privilege of having had the opportunity to serve as Senate President." He also thanked Senators and committee chairs for their efforts.

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

### **Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education Policy [Appendix G]**

Pauline Moore, Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Distance Education, presented the committee report. The major findings were that distance education occurs in a fluid context within a period of transformation and expansion, a unified version of distance education has not emerged, and MTU has modest, long-standing programs with new initiatives taking shape. The imminent hiring of a new Provost will affect MTU distance education. The committee identified a broad array of distance education/distance learning issues with many stakeholders.

It is critical for MTU to put a long-term process in place. The committee has four major recommendations (below) and 15 guiding principles in their report:

- MTU's efforts should be framed in the context of distance learning;
- MTU should establish administrative offices at the upper level to support distance learning;
- The committees to support distance education/distance learning recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee should be established; and
- There should be campus-wide discussions of distance learning concepts and procedures.

Information is on reserve at the library that discusses intellectual property issues and concerns.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **Proposal 23-00, Amendments to Senate Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures [Appendix H]**

The proposal was introduced as new business.

MacLennan MOVED and Snyder seconded the motion to approve Proposal 23-00.

Seely noted that the administration never formally approved Proposal 13-95 under which MTU has been operating. The idea was to operate under informal approval pending experience. Provost Dobney requested a Senate committee meet with him and Peck Cho (Ombudsperson) to formulate a final policy. Senator B. Reed reviewed the suggested changes in the policy following those discussions. In particular, recommendations are included to change the role of the ombudsperson in the process. There are also some minor changes clarifying the role of Human Resources and time limits for various steps during the summer term.

Barna MOVED and Sloan seconded the motion to table the Proposal until a meeting in fall 2000. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote.

## **8. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 15-00, Health Care Premium Cap for Medicare-Eligible Retirees [See minutes, page 8479, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Hodek MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to remove Proposal 15-00 from the table. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

Seely indicated that the Benefits Liaison Group met to discuss the medical cost index but that nothing was received from the consultant (AON) yet. Ingrid Cheney noted that there were good numbers from BCBS on the actual year-to-year cost changes for MTU. Barna indicated that the Finance Committee had used 3-7% annual cost increases in their analyses.

The Senate noted a need to attach explanatory information to the proposal. Next year's rates take effect on January 1, 2001. The Committee agreed to do some individual scenarios.

Williams MOVED and Chavis seconded the motion to table the proposal until a meeting in fall 2000. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote.

**B. Proposal 16-00, Certificate in Design Engineering [Appendix I]**

**C. Proposal 17-00, Certificate in Media [Appendix J]**

**D. Proposal 18-00, Certificate in Writing [Appendix K]**

Senator Snyder introduced the proposals. Snyder indicated that the committee recommended approving all three; they are all straightforward and there should be no incremental cost to the University for any of the three.

Sloan MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to consider the three proposals as a group. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

Vilmann MOVED and Pegg seconded the motion to approve Proposals 16-00, 17-00, and 18-00. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**E. Proposal 19-00, Non-Departmental PhD Program in Propulsion Systems [Appendix L]**

Senator Snyder introduced the proposal. He noted that this exactly parallels the Computer Science Engineering proposal. The Committee did not understand why PhD's could not be granted under current programs. This is a philosophical issue. The Committee recommended approval, noting that this would be consistent with policy and precedent.

Seely noted that the Chair of an Interdisciplinary Committee administers the program. Snyder noted a difference with the Dean of the Graduate School's comments; the proposal calls for the Committee to select its own Chair in concurrence with the Dean of Engineering and Dean of the Graduate School.

Williams MOVED and Pennington seconded the motion to approve Proposal 19-00. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**F. Proposal 20-00, AS Degree Program in Engineering Fundamentals [Appendix M]**

Senator Snyder introduced the proposal and noted that this is a College of Engineering/General Engineering proposal to establish a 2-year degree program in the Department of General Engineering. This proposal is instigated by pending legislation to provide limited scholarships for students pursuing AS degrees; it is unclear how much might be distributed to MTU. AAS programs in the School of Technology serve community college functions. The committee does not recommend approval because there is no clear academic reason for this program, support for this program in the College of Engineering is not clear, it is inconsistent with the MTU strategic plan, and there is an equity issue. If this funding is for low income students only, they will be clearly identified by being in this program.

Seely noted that the prospects for the legislation is not clear, and VP Tahtinen indicated that the final form is not clear, but he indicated that the maximum support would be \$300,000 and maybe less.

Hutzler indicated that it is true that this was instigated by the legislation. He indicated that this would not have much effect on the College of Engineering, but the position there is that this is the right thing to do. It is viewed as an interim degree for engineering students; it is not intended to be the terminal degree, but only a step to the BS. This would not be required for students, but it would be possible for students to participate. It may also fit in a distance learning program and help with cooperative studies.

Hutzler indicated that this had been discussed in the College of Engineering, but that there was not overwhelming support. The Engineering Council (Department Chairs) supported the proposal. As far as the equity issue, the AS degree could be pursued by all students and may increase the diversity of our student body.

Sorby indicated that this was an attempt to enable students to qualify for scholarship help in their first two years, and it may lead to better summer employment possibilities.

Hodek noted that there was a lot of speculation in the discussion. Department chairs may be for it, but the CEE faculty debated it at length and there needs to be more time for faculty to discuss.

Snyder encouraged the Senate to not approve until the situation was resolved.

MacLennan MOVED and LaCourt seconded the motion to approve Proposal 20-00.

Hodek MOVED and Vilmann seconded the motion to table the Proposal to a future Senate meeting. The motion to table PASSED on voice vote.

**G. Proposal 22-00, Recommendations on Medical and Health Insurance Benefits [See minutes, page 8500, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Seely introduced the proposal. The proposal has been recommended by the Senate Fringe Benefits Committee and the Benefits Liaison Group. This would establish the Benefits Liaison Group as a permanent vehicle for expressing concerns that has not existed before. Adequate reporting will allow better planning; relevant administrators have not expressed objections.

Long MOVED and Jamison seconded the motion to approve Proposal 22-00. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**H. Proposal 12-00, Encouragement of Sabbatical Leaves [Appendix N]**

Seely introduced the proposal.

Snyder MOVED and Blanning seconded the motion to approve Proposal 12-00.

Williams MOVED and Sloan seconded the motion to amend item C as follows.

Implement a policy that MTU-employed spouses accompanying faculty on a sabbatical leave would be granted a leave-of-absence from their present job with a guarantee they would return to their present or equivalent job and salary rate *and the same retirement package* when their spouse's sabbatical is completed.

The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote.

Seely ruled that the amendment was editorial. There were no objections.

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

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Pennington MOVED and Ouellette seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

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