

# THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 392

10 September 2003

## **Synopsis: The Senate**

1. heard an update on the Office of Student Affairs from Vice Provost Les Cook.
  2. heard an update on layoffs from Director of Human Resources Ellen Horsch.
  3. approved Proposal 19-03, Changing Principal Investigators on Funded Research Projects.
  4. approved amended Proposal 15-03, Procedures for Loss of Untenured Faculty and Staff Positions.
- 

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 392 to order at 5:34 p.m. on Wednesday, 10 September 2003, in Room B45 EERC.

### **1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS**

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, School of Business and Economics, Chemical Engineering, Fine Arts, Mathematical Sciences, the Keweenaw Research Center, Auxiliary Enterprises, and Finance and Advancement. Liaisons in attendance were David Tobias (GSC), Phil Ribeiro (USG), and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

### **2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost), Dave Reed (Vice President for Research), Les Cook (Vice Provost for Student Affairs), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

### **3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Keen presented the agenda and asked for amendments. None were offered. Keen said that if there were no objections, the agenda would be followed as presented. There were no objections. [**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 389 AND 390**

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 389 and asked for corrections or amendments. Keen proposed a correction on page 10293, column B. He asked that a paragraph be deleted and replaced with "Keen's reply indicated confusion about the question." He asked for additional corrections or amendments. There were none. There were no objections to approving the minutes as amended.

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 390 and asked for corrections or amendments. There were none. There were no objections to approving the minutes as presented.

### **5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Keen said that he forwarded to the administration the sense of the senate indicating that senate's wish that the search for a vice provost be conducted internally. [**Appendix B**]

The Task Force on Career Opportunities for Professional Staff has reconvened. Proposals from the task force should be forthcoming.

Keen said that the new enrollment-verification process has been required by the state and federal governments. Notification of this new process was sent to department chairs around Labor Day. Keen asked senators to refer any difficulties with this process to the senate's Instructional Policy Committee.

Keen said that Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs Dave Reed has convened a task force to draft an institutional conflict of interest policy. Senator Dave Hand will represent the senate's Research Policy Committee as a liaison member of this task force. The task force will present a proposal to the senate sometime this year.

Keen said that many university committees still need members. He urged senators to solicit candidates for these positions from among their constituents.

Keen said that the senate held a senate-orientation meeting September 3 to discuss parliamentary procedure and the way the senate conducts business.

Keen said that Senate Secretary Craig Waddell would be going on sabbatical in the spring; hence, the senate needs to elect a new secretary.

Keen said that he had sent an e-mail message to the senate earlier in the day indicating some problems with the Administrative Evaluation Commission. Proposal 22-94 established this commission. The commission has 13 members, only one of whom can come from the non-academic units. Keen said that in the two previous administrations of the evaluation, the senate simply added extra people to the commission. He said that he didn't think that this was a wise practice given the senate's reaction to President Tompkins' addition of two members to the provost search committee. The senate passed Senate Proposal 1-00, Senate Resolution on the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Search Committee, which criticized President Tompkins for altering the search committee in violation of university policy and requested that the senate appointees stand down from service on this committee until President Tompkins complied with university policy.

Keen said that, at the time, he was associate chair of this search committee. Since the chair was out of town, Keen led the walkout of the senate members of the committee. Given this history, Keen said that he was reluctant to unilaterally modify the composition of the Administrative Evaluation Commission.

Keen asked if the senate wished to follow the existing composition of the Administrative Evaluation Commission or if it wished to amend Proposal 22-94 to match past precedent.

Senator Don Beck said that this was a question of timing. If the Board of Control is going to evaluate President Tompkins at its October 7 meeting, and if the senate wants to have some input into this evaluation, then the senate needs to collect data prior to this meeting. Hence, the senate's evaluation of President Tompkins' performance should be conducted expeditiously. The existing evaluation forms should be distributed to the university community by the members of the previous Administrative Evaluation Commission. Since only President Tompkins' performance will be evaluated by the BOC on October 7, the Administrative Evaluation Commission should restrict its evaluation to President Tompkins.

Keen said that if the senate wished to conduct an evaluation of President Tompkins' performance prior to the October 7 BOC meeting, it would have to do so by some means other than the quadrennial evaluation defined by Senate Proposal 22-94. Keen said that Proposal 22-94 requires the senate to first elect the members of the Administrative Evaluation Commission. Next "The Commission shall gather relevant documentary evidence about university goals, directions, and plans, such as vision statements, five year plans, and other long-range plans" (Proposal 22-94, Section 3.a). Next, the commission has to solicit self-evaluations from all of the

people being evaluated. Hence, it would be a violation of these procedures to single out President Tompkins for evaluation. If the senate evaluates President Tompkins now by some other means, President Tompkins would have to be evaluated again when the Administrative Evaluation Commission conducts its required quadrennial evaluation.

Senator Cindy Selfe said that she agreed with Keen that university procedures for evaluations should be followed. However, Michigan Tech's budget crisis has called President Tompkins' leadership into question. Hence, Selfe agreed with Beck that the senate needs to move quickly to provide feedback to the BOC prior to the board's October 7 evaluation of President Tompkins. If the Administrative Evaluation Commission cannot perform this task prior to the board's October 7 meeting, then the senate should appoint a special committee to provide feedback to the BOC. Selfe asked why the senate was muddling about.

Keen said that it was because the senate had passed Proposal 22-94, which provides guidelines for evaluating the administration.

C. Selfe said that the senate was free to provide feedback on the president's performance to the BOC by additional means.

Senator Dickie Selfe said that the senate should follow Proposal 22-94, but that there was no reason to not also do what Beck had suggested in addition to this.

Senator Erik Nordberg asked if the senate knew how the BOC was planning to evaluate President Tompkins and if the BOC was seeking input from faculty, staff, and students. He asked if the BOC had expressed any interest in the Administrative Evaluation Commission quadrennial review.

Keen said senate officers have twice told the BOC that a quadrennial evaluation is upcoming. During the first discussion of these evaluations, BOC Chair David Brule said that he would not consider unsigned comments on such evaluations. During the second discussion, BOC members indicated that they had forgotten about the quadrennial Administrative Evaluation Commission evaluations.

Waddell said that at last fall's meeting with senate officers and the BOC Finance Committee, BOC Vice Chair Rodger Kershner specifically asked for feedback on President Tompkins' performance, which would be feedback in addition to the formal evaluation provided by the Administrative Evaluation Commission.

Keen said that in answer to Nordberg's question, no one outside of the BOC knows what process the board will use to evaluate President Tompkins' performance. The meetings to discuss this issue have been closed to everyone except BOC members, despite a protest from a Daily Mining Gazette reporter that this was in violation of Michigan's Open Meetings Act.

Nordberg said that during the budget crisis last year, the university did not apply the financial crisis/financial stress procedures that had been passed by the senate and approved by the administration. Instead, the budget crisis was addressed by the President's Budget Reduction Advisory Committee, and the results were less than optimal. Hence, he said that he was not in favor of abandoning the administration-evaluation procedures established by Proposal 22-94, even if those procedures are slow and cumbersome. He said that the senate had no reason to believe that the BOC would give any weight to a quick-and-dirty evaluation.

Keen said that the second part of his September 10 e-mail message to the senate indicated that the evaluation process defined in Proposal 22-94 takes 9-10 months to complete. He asked that this message be included in the minutes. It is reproduced below:

"Senators and Alternates-

As you know, the Senate has to initiate this year the evaluation of the administration, described in Senate Proposal 22-94. If possible, please review this proposal before the meeting this evening:

[www.sas.it.mtu.edu/usenate/propose/94/22-94.htm](http://www.sas.it.mtu.edu/usenate/propose/94/22-94.htm)

There are two aspects of this proposal that the Senate will probably wish to discuss. Normally the Senate Executive Committee initially would consider such matters, but it is not yet formed.

[1] The proposal indicates that the evaluation commission will be comprised of eleven tenured faculty, one external member, and one individual from the non-academic units. In the two most recent evaluations, the Senate added members from the non-academic units to the commission. However, because the Senate strongly reacted against the President's unilateral addition of members to the provost search committee in 1999, it will be unwise of the Senate to do the same with the evaluation commission this year.

The Senate may wish to: A. Violate its own procedures and add commission members; B. Adhere to the procedural guidelines; C. Amend the procedures to reflect changes in the Senate since 1993.

[2] Many senators appear to agree with Don Beck's comments at the last meeting that the evaluation should proceed quickly. However, the mechanics of the evaluation described in Proposal 22-94 are in fact quite lengthy, and the previous evaluation required about 11 months from the election of the commission.

The Senate may wish to consider revising the evaluation process to accomplish a more timely evaluation, even allowing for the time needed for revision.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

--Bob Keen"

Keen asked if the senate would like to streamline this process and make it more frequent. He said that President Tompkins has requested that the evaluation process be more frequent and less formal.

Senator Bill Gregg asked who would receive the Administrative Evaluation Commission's report. He also asked if the BOC's evaluation of President Tompkins's performance would be released to the public.

Keen said that the BOC would release its evaluation to President Tompkins and that President Tompkins had shared with the university community the evaluation that the BOC completed three years ago.

With respect to the Administrative Evaluation Commission's report, Keen read section 3.h of Proposal 22-94: "Copies of the final report with appendices shall be submitted to the University Senate and the Board of Control. Copies with appendices shall be put on reserve at the Library and deposited in the MTU archives. Copies of the main text of the report and self-evaluations (but no other appendices) shall be distributed to all members of the Senate constituency."

Keen again asked if the senate would like to streamline the evaluation process defined in Proposal 22-94, make it more frequent, and make the Administrative Evaluation Commission more representative of the senate constituency. Currently 11 of the 13 members of the commission are tenured faculty.

Senator Marilyn Cooper asked if there was a reason why the process had been made so long and formal.

Keen said that the process began in 1989 when many in the campus community were dissatisfied with former President Dale Stein's performance.

Senator Becky Christianson said that some of her constituents were concerned that the Administrative Evaluation Commission was too heavily weighted on the academic side, especially given that the commission is responsible for evaluating some administrators who do not have academic responsibilities.

Keen said that the reason that the Administrative Evaluation Commission was weighted so heavily toward tenured faculty was because of the fear of repercussions.

Senator Scott Pollins said that many of his constituents had expressed the same concerns that Christianson's constituents expressed.

With respect to an immediate evaluation of the president, Keen said that he would ask the Senate Executive Committee to meet and develop a proposal, which could be presented at the senate's September 24 meeting. With respect to the Administrative Evaluation Commission's evaluation, Keen said that he would ask the Administrative Policy Committee to address as soon as possible the issue of revising Proposal 22-94.

Nordberg asked Keen to encourage the Administrative Policy Committee to contact both the BOC and the reviewed administrators to see what they would like to have included in this evaluation.

Keen said that he would. He said that several administrators had already requested an opportunity to influence the formulation of the procedures. He said that faculty have input into how they are evaluated; the same opportunity should be afforded to administrators.

Keen said that the senate would meet informally with President Tompkins on Thursday, September 18, at 3:00 p.m. in Ballroom A of the MUB. In preparation for this meeting, Keen urged senators to attend the President's Convocation on Wednesday, September 17, at 3:00 p.m. in the Rozsa Center.

Keen called for questions.

C. Selfe asked if at the meeting with President Tompkins it would be appropriate to ask questions about recent layoffs.

Keen said that Director of Human Resources Ellen Horsch would discuss the recent layoffs during the current senate meeting. He said that Chief Financial Officer Dan Greenlee was not available to report on the general university finances at the current senate meeting. Keen said that he assumed that President Tompkins would discuss this in his State of the University address at convocation. However, he said that it would be appropriate to ask questions about either topic during the senate's September 17 meeting with President Tompkins.

C. Selfe asked if the senate could assemble for President Tompkins a list of questions from senators and their constituents.

Keen said that senators could forward questions to him or to Senate Assistant Jeanne Meyers.

Beck asked if the president's State of the University message would be available on Michigan Tech's Web site.

Keen said that he didn't know. [The text of this address is available at [www.mtu.edu/convo/](http://www.mtu.edu/convo/).]

## **6. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **A. Update on Office of Student Affairs - Les Cook**

Les Cook said that he began work as vice provost for student affairs and dean of students at Michigan Tech on July 21, 2003. He said that he had been involved with new-student-orientation programs for almost 20 years, and Michigan Tech's orientation program is one of the best that he's seen.

Cook said that Michigan Tech's retention rate has increased by 4% over last year. He said that he was working with the provost's office to create a University Student Commission, which will include a wide variety of people from across campus, about half of whom will be students. The goal of this commission will be to further improve retention.

Cook said that he was interested in exploring ways in which the Office of Student Affairs could partner better with other groups across campus and in how co-curricular and academic experiences could be melded.

Cook said that he was pleased to find that Michigan Tech does not have a lot of students-discipline problems. He said that Patricia Gotschalk, who is an attorney, is the new director of judicial affairs in the Office of Student Affairs. Cook said that when Associate Dean of Student Affairs Steve Tyrell left Michigan Tech a year ago, Student Affairs was restructured to separate responsibilities for judicial affairs and Greek life. Cook said that the Office of Student Affairs is currently reviewing and revising Michigan Tech's policies and procedures on student rights and responsibilities.

Cook said that last year's search for an associate dean for Greek life was unsuccessful. Hence, this position will be posted again this year and will be broadened to include someone who can also work with community service and broad-based leadership development for Michigan Tech students.

Cook said that Michigan Tech participated in a number of surveys last year, including the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This survey looks at students' interactions during their first year and during their senior year in the classroom, with faculty members, and in activities outside the classroom. Michigan Tech also participates in the Your First College Year survey and in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. Cook said that the Office of Student Affairs would examine the results of these surveys to help determine how to improve student life at Michigan Tech.

Cook encouraged senators to look for opportunities to include students on more university committees.

Cook called for questions.

D. Selfe said the University Student Commission was a good idea and that Bonnie Gorman had done an outstanding job with the orientation activities.

Cook said that the student Orientation Team Leaders were outstanding.

Keen thanked Cook for his presentation.

### **B. Update on layoffs - Ellen Horsch**

Director of Human Resources Ellen Horsch said that a chart posted on Michigan Tech's Web site last spring projected the elimination of 16 tenured/tenure-track faculty lines, 5 additional tenured/tenure-track faculty lines through retirement, and one tenured/tenure-track faculty line

through layoff, for a total of 22 tenured/tenure-track faculty lines eliminated. Overall, 63 positions were affected by the budget reductions. Horsch said that 10 of these 63 affected positions were reductions in hours or months of work, which resulted in loss of health insurance for these people.

Horsch said that since this chart was posted, three key variables have affected the elimination of positions: (1) the Employee Severance Program (ESP); (2) position review/hold on hiring; and (3) preferential hiring and "bumping."

Horsch said that 31 people participated in the ESP. Of that number, 16 were already retiring under the Retirement Supplemental Voluntary Plan (RSVP). Four employees whose positions were designated for elimination enrolled in the ESP; hence, they were not laid off. Two people whose positions were designated for elimination were placed in positions vacated by ESP participants. The RSVP is more costly to Michigan Tech during the first year participants are enrolled in this program, partly because the ESP spreads payments to participants over 10 years.

Horsch said that the thing that worked best was position review and the hold on hiring. Because of the hold on hiring, some Michigan Tech employees were able to bump into higher-level positions. Hence, technically, there was no bumping. In 1991, about 23 United Auto Workers positions were eliminated at Michigan Tech, but this resulted in over 50 positions being disrupted by more senior UAW workers being bumped into positions held by more junior UAW workers.

Horsch said that the University Senate had passed a proposal [Proposal 15-03, Procedures for Loss of Untenured Faculty and Staff Positions] that would allow for preferential rehiring of removed staff and non-tenure-track faculty to fill any vacancy for which they are qualified within the university. So far, one person whose position was designated for elimination has successfully used this procedure.

Horsch said that six UAW positions had been frozen. She said that several people were put at an economic disadvantage by being bumped into positions that pay perhaps 25 percent or more less than the positions they previously held. Three of these people were UAW employees, but none of them lost their health insurance. One AFSCME [American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees] employee lost about \$2.25 per hour, and four professional employees were put at an economic disadvantage. Two UAW employees received an economic advantage from the bumping.

Senator Bill Gregg asked what positions had been held by the 31 people who participate in the ESP.

Horsch said that 17 faculty, 8 non-union staff, 2 UAW employees, and 4 AFSCME employees participated in ESP.

Gregg asked what advantage people gained from converting from the RSVP to the ESP.

Horsch said that ESP participants would receive more money in the long term.

Senator Tony Rogers said that the ESP payments come out of the General Fund but the RSVP payments come out of the department budgets.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if this meant that the departments would retain the entire amount of the salaries of employees who retired under the ESP.

Horsch said that if the line-item salary is eliminated, departments can keep the differential unless elimination of that position is part of the department's budget cuts. Not all of the positions affected by the ESP were part of the units' budget cuts.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked what the difference was between the 27 people who participated in the ESP whose positions were not designated for elimination and the number of people who usually sever their ties with Michigan Tech in a given year.

Horsch said that she did not know. She said that she could find out.

C. Selfe said that it would be interesting to know how many of these 27 people participated in the ESP because they were concerned about the fiscal health of Michigan Tech.

Horsch said that 15 of these people were RSVP participants and, hence, already planning on retiring.

Senator Bahne Cornilsen asked how many RSVP employees remained in the RSVP.

Horsch said that some people remained in this program, but she didn't know how many.

Senator Don Beck said that he believed that the departments had to pay severance and retirement benefits all at once but that in order to lessen the burden on the university, some of the severance and retirement programs pay benefits out over a number of years. He asked why this was the case.

Horsch said that under the RSVP, the departments plan for and pay the one-time costs. She said that if a department approves a two-year phase-out, the employee would work for the next two years; on the third year, the department would give the employee one-third of his or her eligible benefit.

Beck said that the departments should not be more financially burdened than the university. If the university can distribute payments over 10 years, the departments should be able to do the same.

Horsch said that she was not sure how the accounting worked for the RSVP. She asked Senate Finance Committee Co-Chair Jim Pickens if he could answer this question.

Pickens said that he didn't know how the accounting worked for the RSVP, but that with the ESP, if an employee was going to receive a \$10,000 payment and he or she made \$50,000 per year, the department would pay the \$10,000 and keep \$40,000.

C. Selfe asked what Horsch concluded from the experience of the past year.

Horsch said that eight Michigan Tech employees are now financially worse off than they were a year ago, and one employee has been laid off. She said that this situation was unfortunate, but it was an improvement over the way Michigan Tech's financial crisis was handled in 1991, largely because of position review and the hiring freeze.

C. Selfe asked if the hiring freeze had been planned to deal with such a crisis.

Keen said that position control was announced by Provost Wray in March of his first year at Michigan Tech [2000-2001].

Horsch said position control led to a hiring freeze in February 2003. She said that this did save people from being laid off.



Senator Susan Martin said that in the Social Sciences Department, two staff positions were eliminated and were replaced by one-half of a staff position. Since the work level remains the same, the extra work is assigned to the remaining staff. Hence, one person is working a job and a half. This cost isn't accounted for in budget-reduction numbers: the charts do not show the real number of people affected by these changes.

Horsch said that if a unit is expected to cut its budget by 30 percent, it is unreasonable to expect that unit to continue to carry the same workload. She said that there is also a union issue in the Social Sciences Department: by contract, non-union people cannot do union work.

Senator Ron Roblee said that such cuts affect faculty as well as staff.

D. Selfe said that within the past three or four years, the Department of Humanities has lost six tenure-track positions and, hence, must administer the same programs with six fewer faculty. He said that although staff got hit hardest in 1991 and 2003, the slow attrition of faculty lines is bleeding departments.

Horsch said that the university is down 61 FTEs [full-time equivalents]. That's a significant loss. However, fewer people actually lost their jobs this year than did in 1991.

C. Selfe asked how many FTEs the university lost in 1991.

Horsch said that about 60 people were affected, and about 50 of those were laid off. Some of them subsequently got their jobs back.

C. Selfe asked how many FTEs this equated to.

Horsch said that she didn't know. She said that she would find out.

C. Selfe asked how much money the university saved by eliminating these 61 FTEs.

Horsch said that she could get this information also.

Keen thanked Horsch for her presentation.

### **C. Senate committee assignments**

Keen distributed a list of the committee assignments requested by senators. He said that where no requests had been made, he had assigned senators to committees. He said that a convener has been designated for each committee. That person should call the first committee meeting as soon as possible to elect the chair of the committee. Immediately thereafter, the convener should convey the name of the committee chair to Senate Assistant Jeanne Meyers so that the Senate Executive Committee can be convened. Keen said that 10 senators and alternates have yet to be named. Hence, the list of committee members is not complete. Keen said that people who wish to change committee assignments can contact him or, preferably, negotiate a change in assignment with another senator.

D. Selfe said that the Senate Computer Committee had convened and elected Senator John Pilling chair.

## **7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **Proposal 19-03, Changing Principal Investigators on Funded Research Projects [See minutes, page 10290, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Keen said that some questions were raised when Proposal 19-03 was presented at the senate's previous meeting. Hence, Vice President for Research Dave Reed was at tonight's senate meeting to answer questions about the proposal.

Keen called for a motion to approve Proposal 19-03.

Senator Jim Pickens MOVED and Senator Dave Hand seconded the motion to approve Proposal 19-03.

Keen opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Jacek Borysow said that he had several comments from himself and from his constituents. He said that although Michigan Tech generally signs research contracts, the grantor is always treated as the actual recipient of the contract. He complimented the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs for not intervening in this process. He said that Proposal 19-03 does not address when Michigan Tech should intervene, such as when a principal investigator is negligent in fulfilling the terms of a contract, which could jeopardize Michigan Tech's prospects for future grants from the granting agency.

From the section of Proposal 19-03 entitled "If the PI leaves the University," Borysow read the following sentence: "If MTU Co-PI's are involved, they should approve of the transfer." He said that he had one co-PI who was a student, and he didn't think a student should determine the fate of a research project if the faculty co-PI left Michigan Tech.

Keen asked if Borysow was proposing an amendment to Proposal 19-03 or if he was proposing that Proposal 19-03 not be approved until this problem was fixed.

Borysow said that he thought this problem should be fixed.

Keen asked Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs Dave Reed to comment

Reed said he understood the situation that Borysow was referring to and that it was unusual for a student to be a co-PI. He said that when two faculty members are co-PIs, it would be inappropriate for the co-PIs not to consult about the fate of a project when one of them was preparing to leave Michigan Tech. He said that he would hate to eliminate this guideline on the basis of an exceptional case.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if there was a due-process procedure that would allow for exceptions to the policy to be considered.

Reed said that when PIs want to modify a sponsored research project, they must complete a request-for-modification form. Such requests are processed through the appropriate administrative channels. Reed said that the decision on the disposition of a sponsored project when a PI leaves Michigan Tech involved four parties: the PI who is leaving, the sponsor, the institution to which the PI is moving, and possibly co-PIs.

Senator Bill Gregg said that if a sponsor approved of a co-PI who is a graduate student taking over a research project with the departure of a faculty co-PI that would be fine. The sponsor should have the final say in such situations.

Senator Dave Hand said that Michigan Tech has a responsibility to ensure that the terms of the contract are fulfilled. Hence, if Michigan Tech does not believe that the student is capable of fulfilling the terms of the contract, the university should have a voice in the disposition of the contract when the faculty PI leaves Michigan Tech.

Reed said that in such a case, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs would probably ask the department chair or some other faculty member to serve as the PI.

Gregg asked if students received any special employment status when they are co-PIs, such as temporary research associates.

Reed said that they do not.

Senators Hand and Rogers said that this could be done.

Borysow said that his purpose in appointing a student as a co-PI was to help further the student's career.

Keen asked if Borysow's objection had been resolved.

Borysow said that it had been.

Senator Bahne Cornilsen asked if Proposal 19-03 implied that Michigan Tech's general policy was to disallow the transfer of a sponsored research project when the PI leaves Michigan Tech.

Reed said that this was not the case.

Keen asked if there was any further discussion of Proposal 19-03. There was none.

The motion to approve Proposal 19-03 PASSED on a voice vote by academic departments and research units without objection.

**B. Proposal 15-03, Procedures for Loss of Untenured Faculty and Staff Positions [See minutes, page 10379, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Keen said that the senate had passed Proposal 15-03 last spring and that President Tompkins had subsequently requested that Section C.2 be changed from "Preferential rehiring of removed persons to fill any vacancy for which they are qualified within the University, for a period of at least three years after their removal" to "Preferential rehiring of removed persons to fill any vacancy for which they are qualified within the University, for a period of three years after their removal."

Keen asked for a motion to approve the amendment.

Senator Becky Christianson MOVED and Senator Jim Pickens seconded the motion to approve amended Proposal 15-03.

Keen called for discussion of the motion.

Christianson said that Section C.8 also included the phrase "at least"; she asked if this was to be removed as well.

Keen said that it was not.

Pickens said that Proposal 15-03 addressed procedure, not policy. He asked if he was correct in thinking that for this reason, the proposal did not require the approval of the Board of Control.

Keen said that this was correct.

Senator Jim Turnquist said that one of his constituents had requested that the phrase "at least" in Section C.8 also be removed and perhaps changed to "continuous enrollment until received desired degrees." Turnquist said that as currently written, Proposal 15-03 could allow an employee to leave Michigan Tech and return 20 years later and expect Michigan Tech to pay for his or her education.

Gregg said that employees have to apply for tuition reduction; hence, this would allow for rejection of exceptional cases.

Turnquist said that this would apply under the Tuition Reduction Incentive Program (TRIP), but it would not necessarily apply under the Employment Benefit Program.

Keen said that the administration could end the Employment Benefit Program any time after three years; hence, it is not an open-ended program. He said that this could be highlighted in a letter of transmittal.

Turnquist said that this would satisfy his concern.

Senator Susan Amato-Henderson asked if employees could be rehired with lesser benefits.

Keen said that they could.

Keen called for further discussion. There was none.

The motion to approve amended Proposal 15-03 PASSED on a voice vote without objection.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Senator Pollins MOVED and Senator Nordberg seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell  
Secretary of the University Senate