

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF  
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 342  
29 November 2000

**Synopsis:** The Senate

- (1) heard a report on the process that proposed academic degree granting proposals must follow for approval from Provost Wray.
- (2) heard a report on Summer Session faculty compensation from Vice Provost Bowen.
- (3) heard a general report from Vice President McGarry.
- (4) heard a brief report on the Senior Vice President for Advancement and Marketing Search from Wayne Pennington.
- (5) elected Dave Ouillette as Senate Vice President.
- (6) elected Tom Snyder to the Academic Tenure Committee.
- (7) Adopted Senate Proposals 3-01 and 4-01.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Keen called University Senate Meeting 342 to order at 5:36 p.m. on Wednesday, 29 November 2000, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Pickens called roll. Absent were At-Large Senator Kunz and representatives from Electrical and Computer Engineering, ME-EM, Mining and Materials Processing Engineering, Institute of Materials Processing, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Anup Bandivadekar (GSC), Josh Bennett (USG) and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Bill McGarry (Vice President for Finance and Administration), Steve Bowen (Vice Provost for Instruction), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Keen presented the agenda. Hodek MOVED and Ftaclas seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. **[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 339, 340, AND 341

President Keen asked for corrections to the minutes of Meeting 339. There were none. There were no objections to approving the minutes as presented.

President Keen asked for corrections to the minutes of Meeting 340. There were none. There were no objections to approving the minutes as presented.

President Keen asked for corrections to the minutes of Meeting 341. Senator Beck noted an extra *Aby@* on page 8716, suggested adding the word *Aannual@* (Setting the maximum *annual*) to item B.2. on page 8717, and to replace the word *Aof@* with *Afor@* (Senator Barna asked if the patient is responsible *for*) on the same page. Senator Christianson suggested adding the word *Aup@* (Prescription costs went *up*) in the second paragraph of item B on page 8717. There were no objections to approving the minutes as corrected.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Keen reported that he received a request from Associate Dean Neil Hutzler for the Senate Office to relocate.

Keen met with Provost Wray on November 3, 10, and 17. They discussed the status of Senate approved policies/recommendations and the strategic plan.

The Strategic Planning Working Group met on October 27, November 10 and 17. They have reduced the number of campaigns, which are major strategic initiatives, under consideration.

The Budget Working Group met on November 9 to discuss the Fringe Benefit Planning Document.

Keen reported that Proposal 12-00, Encouragement of Sabbatical Leaves, is under review by Provost Wray. Wray had indicated that he will send the proposal back to the Senate with suggestions intended to reduce cost.

President Tompkins has appointed John Lowther to the Sabbatical Leave Committee.

The academic faculty elected Bogue Sandberg to serve on the Academic Tenure Committee. President Tompkins appointed Sarah Green to the committee.

Provost Wray appointed Carl Anderson to the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee. The committee elected Susan Martin as chair.

Proposal 5-01, MS Program in Applied Science Education, has been sent to the Curricular Policy Committee for review.

Keen reported that the AAUP will print a response by Keen to the November 13 flyer in their next flyer.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

**A. Degree Proposals Flowchart C Kent Wray [Appendix B]**

Provost Wray presented the formal process that proposed academic degree granting programs must follow to be approved. The presentation focused on two flow diagrams, one presenting the previous conceptual path and one showing what is currently followed. The second diagram corresponds with what we have done over the past several years, and is now the official process for proposal approval. Proposals originate with faculty who then present them to their department or school for approval. They then must be approved by the appropriate dean and are transmitted to the Provost. The Provost solicits input from groups such as the Graduate School and Academic Forum as appropriate. Next, they must be reviewed by the Senate and returned to the Provost. They then enter an extensive administrative review involving the President, the BOC, and the State Academic Officers. Proposals can be stopped at many points in this process including the Senate. The Curricular Policy Committee of the Senate is instrumental in the evaluation, and has responsibility for assuring that the proposed program is academically sound and that the proposing units either have the required resources to implement the program or recognize deficiencies and request resources to eliminate any weaknesses. This process emphasizes the centrality of the Senate in the evaluation and approval of degree proposals.

Senator Ftaclas asked how the process and resource allocation decisions are integrated with the strategic plan and its emphasis of graduate education to support the process of improving our Carnegie classification. Wray responded that the allocation of resources to support the plan would be made in the Provost's Office if the Dean did not have sufficient resources and the proposed program was judged to be sufficiently meritorious to receive the added resources. However, the plan must survive the early levels of review and reach the Provost's office to be considered for supplemental funds.

Senator Snyder noted that the new procedure differed from the old procedure in that the new procedure requires that the Senate must approve any new degree programs before they can be implemented. Under the previous flow chart several other groups reviewed degree programs at the same time as the Senate, and it was not clear that Senate approval was required. Provost Wray confirmed Snyder's assertion that Senate approval was required before degree programs can be initiated.

Senator Beck asked about the possibility of proposals being submitted that required a degree program that is not currently available. Therefore, if the proposal is funded, it could commit MTU to developing the referenced degree program. Provost Wray responded that this possibility should trigger review of the proposal by his office, and that the issue of the missing degree program would need to be resolved.

#### **B. Summer Session C Steve Bowen [Appendix C]**

Vice Provost Bowen presented a new plan for establishing summer session teaching compensation, and the impact on net revenue resulting from summer session.

The new compensation approach is based on the assumption that most faculty appointments are about 50% teaching and 50% scholarship. Under this appointment the average faculty member teaches about 6 credit hours per term. Therefore, 4.166% of the annual salary is, on average, earned for each credit hour taught. The proposal establishes a pay rate of 4.166% of academic year salary for each credit taught during the summer. Total summer compensation is limited by Board of Control (BOC) policy to 14/38 of academic year salary. Therefore, the maximum that can be earned during the summer by teaching full time is the salary associated with teaching 8.84 credits; if a faculty member teaches 9 credits they would receive this maximum payment. Clearly, teaching and research funding can both be used to reach the maximum summer salary. This provides compensation that is about 19% higher than currently paid for MTU summer session teaching, and puts MTU at or near the top of summer session compensation.

Summer session currently generates about twice as much revenue as the amount paid to summer session instructors. The net revenue for summer session goes directly into the general fund and is budgeted for general fund activities.

Senator Beck asked how the semester conversion would impact the demand for summer session courses. Bowen responded that more courses were offered last summer in anticipation of students trying to finish prior to semester conversion, but that summer enrollment was less than previous years. They expect summer enrollment to increase this summer.

Senator Ftaclas asked if there was evidence that students take summer session in order to graduate earlier rather than to make up deficiencies resulting from dropping or failing classes. Bowen responded that there was not evidence of that in the MTU summer session history. He noted that MTU has an untapped opportunity to expand summer session since facilities are not being used then. Bowen noted that there was some risk to expanding summer session because additional students may not attend. In the past there were three ways to justify teaching summer classes, enrollment limits, acceptance by the faculty of pro rata salary, or if other departmental funds can make up the shortfall. The proposed new policy is similar except the enrollment limits are replaced by a requirement that the revenue generated by the class be greater than the faculty compensation.

Senator Strong asked if there was a mechanism to provide revenue to the academic unit to defray the cost incurred by offering summer courses. Bowen responded that one option discussed was to provide 20% of the net revenue to the departments, but that is not policy at this time. Senator Beck asked if there were attempts to determine student interest in summer session, specifically what classes students wanted. Bowen responded that there were efforts involving surveys in the past, and that advertising to increase enrollment was done. It is currently hard to get student input, but they might try to improve their predictions.

Senator Williams noted that large classes require more resources, especially teaching assistants. Bowen responded that TA positions are allocated during the summer, and that Chemistry, which offers more large classes than other departments, gets most of the TAs.

Senator Barna questioned the assumption that summer session generates a net increase in revenue. If students would have taken the courses during the academic year, then additional costs occur for the summer session while total student course enrollment would not increase. Bowen responded that they had inspected student registration patterns and did not think that would happen. That is because students often take summer courses to reduce their load during the regular school year, and increasing the number of credits taken does not increase revenue between 12 and 20 credits. If some shifting does occur, it would reduce class sizes which is a specific goal of some units in the strategic plan.

Senator Hodek asked how long the university would subsidize a course if it was not recovering full cost. He said this was desirable to develop a history of offering courses during the summer to assure students the courses would really be taught. Bowen responded that there was no intention to make up any shortfall centrally.

#### **C. Senior Vice President for Advancement and Marketing Search Committee Update C Wayne Pennington**

Senator Pennington provided an update on the search for a replacement for John Sellers. The position has been advertised and a search firm, Morris and Berger, is helping build and filter the applicant pool. They are currently waiting for applications. There is a web site with complete information on the search (<http://www.mtu.edu/temp/svp/index.html>).

#### **D. Remarks by Vice President for Finance and Administration Bill McGarry [Appendix D]**

Vice President McGarry provided a description of the process and time line for developing last year=s budget. He identified areas where changes might occur this year, with special emphasis on Senate participation. The main issue is if the Senate=s representatives should be involved earlier in the process. A difficulty in recent years, especially last year, has been the lack of timely budget actions by the state government.

McGarry provided an overview of last year=s final budget status and the areas where new funds were allocated for this year. Last year MTU ended with a budget surplus of about \$1.2 million, which more or less offset the deficit in the previous year. This includes two summer sessions, which occurred because of our shift to semesters; the summer term is allocated to whichever year has more of the summer term, and under semesters the year just ending has more days.

Major expenditures from new funds for this year were faculty, staff, and graduate student salaries and benefits, followed by advertising, building opening costs, and Internet I and II.

Senator Barna asked about the financial status for this fiscal year to date. McGarry responded that there are positive variances of \$2.5 million, which are matched with negative variances of \$2.5 million. Therefore, they are projecting a balanced budget for this fiscal year.

Senator Strong asked if next year=s budget will be balanced. McGarry commented that the commitments and proposed initiatives always exceed the new revenue at this point of the process. Difficult tradeoffs need to be made, and a balanced budget for next year will be the result. Strong emphasized that the Senate should be involved in those tradeoffs early in the process, prior to commitments that reduce the size of the pool of new funds.

Senator Ftaclas asked what the connection was between the budget planning process and the strategic plan. McGarry responded that there are three planning models; a budget model, a strategic planning model, and a cost accounting model. Integration of those models and processes are the key to linking the strategic plan with the budget. The process of selecting initiatives to support with new funds is dominated by the initiatives that the various unit administrators bring forward. Ftaclas emphasized that where new funds are allocated determines what we will be in the future, and that these expenditures should support the strategic plan.

#### **E. Election of Senate Vice President**

President Keen presented the slate of nominees for Vice President, Becky Christianson and Dave Ouillette, and opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. Ouillette was elected with 18 votes and Christianson had 15.

#### **F. University Tenure Committee Election**

President Keen announced that Tom Snyder has agreed to be nominated for the University Tenure Committee. There were no other nominations, and Tom Snyder was elected.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Proposal 3-01, Revision of Senate Bylaws [Appendix E]**

Williams MOVED and Snyder seconded the motion to approve Proposal 3-01, which defines a numbering system for proposals. Under the old bylaws, proposals do not expire. The Executive Committee recommended that proposals would generally die and disappear one year after initially proposed. If there was adequate reason to retain the old numbers for a proposal, then the Executive Committee could vote to retain the original numbering. Proposals that expire can be resubmitted at any time and receive a new number.

Senator Pegg asked for clarification of the logic for proposal expiration. Keen responded that the major concern was the growing list of active proposals with no apparent movement. Pegg responded that he believed that proposals which have neither been approved nor rejected by the Senate should remain as reminders of unfinished business. Snyder commented that the proposals that end up in this status are often sent back to committee many times, and generally lack support. Keen pointed out that being resubmitted and renumbered has the potential to give the proposal a new start with better prospects of passage.

Senator Williams asked if there could be an intermediate position, where the Senate votes to either continue or drop proposals at the last meeting of each year. Senator Beck responded that the last meeting always has a crowded agenda, and that the Executive Committee considered this problem when they set the expiration date one year after a proposal was introduced. He added that the clock for the proposals currently in this status would not start until the bylaws were changed.

The motion to approve PASSED with dissent.

**B. Proposal 4-01, Revision of Senate Bylaws [Appendix F]**

Williams MOVED and LaCourt seconded the motion to approve Proposal 4-01. This proposal eliminates the Institute of Materials Processing (IMP) as a unit with its own Senate representative. People in IMP would still be Senate constituents, but would be placed into other represented groups.

Williams MOVED and Seidel seconded the motion to add an item D. 5. Graduate Faculty Council. The motion to amend PASSED with dissent. President Keen ruled the amendment as editorial. There were no objections.

The motion to approve PASSED with no dissent.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Strong MOVED and Long seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by James B. Pickens  
Secretary of the University Senate