

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 442
11 October 2006

Synopsis:

The Senate

- (1) Heard a report from Les Cook and John Lehman on our present enrollment statistics and plans for the future.
 - (2) Passed Proposal 2-07, Amendment to Proposal 18-01, Search Procedures for University Administrators (revised).
 - (4) Passed Proposal 3-07, Amendment to Proposal 19-01, Search Procedures for College Deans, as an emergency proposal.
 - (5) Heard a presentation from Sheryl Sorby on Proposal 4-07, Proposal for Changes in Non-Tenure Track Instructor and Lecturer Appointments.
 - (6) Heard a report from Larry Sutter (Research Policy Committee) on Proposal 5-07, Michigan Technological University Faculty External Funding Incentive Program.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 442 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 11 October 2006, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Craig Waddell, Brenda Helminen, and Scott Pollins, and representatives from Fine Arts, Library, and Mathematical Sciences. Liaisons in attendance were Cailee Pearson (USG) and Nick Nanninga (GSC). Academic Services C, Auxiliaries, and Advancement currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Les Cook (Student Affairs), John Lehman (Enrollment Services), Dave Reed (Provost), and Sheryl Sorby (Assoc. Dean Engineering).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Miller MOVED and Hagenbuch seconded the motion to approve the agenda. 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. ENROLLMENT AND ADMISSIONS PRESENTATION, LES COOK AND JOHN LEHMAN

Les Cook presented enrollment statistics. Undergraduate enrollment this fall is 5629, up by 18 from last fall. Graduate enrollment is 915, also up 18 from last fall. However, credit hours are down from 14.4 to 14.3 per student. Part of this decline is because there are 56 more students out on co-op positions. More employers are using co-ops as a trial run for students. If we look at the trend for the past 5-6 years, the on-campus enrollment has continued to grow. However, distance enrollment is down, damping the curve. Transfer students are up a little. Enrollments from southeast Michigan are down. The number of students indicating on their ACT's that they have an interest in engineering is down.

There are 60 more female students this year, up from 19% last year to 25% this year. Retention in 2002 was 75.6% for first-time freshmen and 77.8% for first-time transfer students. In 2005-06, it was 80.7% for first-time freshmen and 84% for first-time transfers.

John Lehman explained that when he began his job at MTU there were no university-wide goals for enrollment and recruitment. He met with advisors, chairs, and outreach coordinators. They indicated that they wanted high-quality applicants, that capacity and enrollment are interlaced, and that they would appreciate a coordinated effort. Academic departments are not told enough about what the recruitment office is doing. He learned that departments are working hard on recruitment and that many feel overburdened with weekend programs.

There seem to be too many forms and information packets sent to prospective students from different groups within the university. Website presentation is left to the individual units. Departments welcome help on the most effective way to communicate with potential students.

The enrollment plan is now tied to the strategic plan. There is a concerted effort to increase diversity and quality. We are presenting ourselves as providing opportunities to obtain a distinctive education with rigorous discovery-based learning.

The enrollment plan in the 10-year plan was to have 7000 students by 2010. We are ahead of the plan on graduate enrollment.

The undergraduate recruiting focus has changed. On-campus visits are important – 80-85% who visit campus enroll. We are using more students in recruitment and have department call nights. We will tailor mailing of information to the student's interest. We are trying to reach new markets in Fox Valley, Chicago, and California – areas where a greater percentage of students leave the state for their college education.

The approach to scholarships and financial aid is also changing. The Board of Control has just approved changing the leading scholars program to reward a combination of scholarship and leadership. There will be more concentration on diversity. There is a planned schedule of mailing and calls after the award notice to the students. Of major importance is our effort to ensure student success.

The YES Expo has 22,000 students registered this year. Last year there were only 12,000. Schools number 150 with 55 corporations represented. Bill Nye, the Science Guy, will be there and students with ACT scores greater than 30 will meet with him and with MTU students the night before.

Melton (Social Science) stated that he has been tracking female enrollment for nearly 20 years and asked why females dipped to 19% in 2005. It was the year in which electrical and computer engineering programs bottomed out, but they are not

typically high in females. The norm ranges around 22%, with 25% usually being the high end at MTU.

Senator Flynn stated that multicultural centers are obvious on many campuses and that private schools send out more stuff. Lehman responded that private schools typically spend about \$2500 per student on recruiting materials and information; public schools spend about \$500.

Flynn stated that the Twin Cities and Illinois are good places to recruit. Several schools she has visited had African American admissions officers, but none were visible here.

Lehman responded that we have two, but they are working in Detroit and Chicago. Darnisha did come back for the open house.

Senator Sutter asked if more students necessarily mean more revenue. Lehman responded that schools with more recruitment only retain about 60% of their students. We retain about 80%. We are shifting to higher ACT scores and this results in higher retention.

Cook stated that our past practices have resulted in the perception that the money offered to students was perceived as an award or tuition rebate, not a scholarship; scholarships are more prestigious. However, we are attracting more of higher income students from Illinois, but we would like to help more students who can't pay.

Senator Janners asked if the decrease in the number of credit hours meant that the income is also down. Cook responded that we don't have final numbers yet for this semester.

Senator Flaspohler asked if MTU has lobbied for out-of state student exchanges and tuition rates, adding that some schools give preference to students in under-subscribed programs. Smith added that there are reciprocity agreements in Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Flynn added that at the University of Minnesota-Duluth, students in the top fourth of their class can get in-state tuition.

Cook ended by stating that we emphasize that MTU provides a quality education.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 441

Boersma MOVED and Hohnholt seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 442 as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan welcomed Senators and guests and reported that the meeting would feature several interesting and controversial issues. We'll hope to adjourn before the winter storm reaches near blizzard conditions as the National Weather Service predicts.

Ombuds – Brenda Helminen, who is at an out-of-town conference, asked President Sloan to announce that the Ombuds Selection Committee is seeking nominations for the Ombuds Officer and to encourage senators to nominate candidates for the position. Further details are in Tech Today.

Here is the text from the Tech Today article:

Applications and nominations are being sought for the position of ombuds officer at Michigan Tech. The purpose of the Office of the Ombuds is to provide confidential, impartial, informal conflict resolution services to faculty, staff, and students prior to the filing of any formal grievance. The ombuds officer seeks to resolve conflicts through informal mediation efforts. Release time and resources required to successfully execute the duties of the ombuds officer shall be provided by the university as determined by the President. Any full-time University faculty or staff with a record of honesty, confidentiality, and neutrality are eligible for this position.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 2-07, Amendment to Proposal 18-01: Search Procedures for University Administrators (revised).

Janners MOVED and Nitz seconded the motion to approve proposal 2-07 [Appendix B].

Senator Mattila asked if the proposal would be retroactive to the current search. President Sloan responded that the current searches haven't reached that stage yet.

Mattila asked if that would mean that all policies would change as soon as proposals affecting them were voted on by the Senate. Janners added that proposals should have a starting date. Janners and Nitz agreed to an understanding that proposal 2-07 would start immediately.

Proposal 2-07 PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with no opposition.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 3-07, Amendment to Proposal 19-01: Search Procedures for College Deans

President Sloan stated that the Dean of Engineering Search Committee had requested that Proposal 3-07 [Appendix C] be treated as an emergency proposal. The screening for the dean search begins next week and the committee will request references after that, preferably before the next Senate meeting.

Nitz MOVED and Luck seconded the motion to approve Proposal 3-07 as an emergency proposal.

Mattila stated that as in the previous proposal we have to agree that the proposal should take effect immediately. Nitz and Luck agreed.

The motion to approve Proposal 3-07 PASSED as an emergency proposal on voice vote of the full Senate with no opposition.

B. Proposal 4-07, Proposal for Changes in Non-Tenure Track Instructor and Lecturer Appointments [Appendix D]

Sorby stated that lecturers bring lots of experience to the classroom and allow others to do more research. Some have many consecutive years of service to the University. The position of Instructor should be used for temporary needs such as replacing someone on leave.

The proposal provides a 3-step track for lecturers. In addition, the Professor of Practice is reserved for persons with many years of experience in their field outside the university setting.

Senator Luck stated that there were no lecturers in the chemistry or biomedical departments at Duke, yet Duke was one example given with the proposed structure. He asked how many NTTF are currently at MTU. Sorby responded there are about

Luck asked how many there would be if this proposal were to pass. Provost Reed responded that the proposal would not have any effect on the number. The positions filled by lecturers would be determined by the faculty in each unit.

Luck asked if the committee would accept a change in the proposal to add that a person in the lecturer track would have the opportunity to move into the tenure track. Sorby responded that the possibility already exists. She began in the lecturer position and then became tenure track in an Assistant Professor position.

Nitz agreed that it could happen in any case. Putting it in the proposal may give false expectations. He was concerned that the department or school committee was involved but that the college committee was not. Sorby responded that the College of Engineering faculty had indicated they didn't want more work and that the deans didn't think a college level committee was necessary.

Mattila stated that the college committee ensures consistency. Sorby stated that they wanted to let the units retain control. Expectations are different in different departments.

Mattila stated that having a college committee would give a faculty member an option if the department didn't value that person.

Senator Jambekar asked why not 2-tier. He asked why we need a rigorous regional search; many positions are filled by faculty spouses to fill vacancies due to leaves. Sorby responded that such vacancies should be filled by instructors.

Senator Flynn stated that now lecturers have 3-year terms, but the proposal only gives them 2-year terms. Sorby responded that these are 2-year rolling terms, so that a lecturer will always know a year in advance if the contract will not be renewed. Now they can be notified at the end of three years that the contract would not be renewed for the next year.

Flynn stated that the proposal needs a background section that describes the present situation, including how many lecturers we have now and what departments have them.

Janners stated that two faculty members in the Department of Biological Sciences are lecturers in the Clinical Lab Sciences Program; one has been a lecturer for 20 years. These people are extremely valuable to the department. She is happy we can recognize them. She requested that the word industrial be changed to professional since industrial does not apply to many of the disciplines represented by the proposal.

Senator Sutter asked about the statement "expected to advise... and possibly conduct research. Sorby responded that the expectations vary by unit. Sutter stated that these may also vary with time as the administration of the department changes.

Reed suggested that the statement should change "will" to "may."

Senator Clancey stated that not all lecturer appointments are on the general fund budget. Sorby responded that that is why the proposal states "may."

Senator Miskioglu stated that this list of expectations sounds like the description of a faculty appointment and wondered how the lecturer appointment differed. Sorby responded that the balance is different, usually with a greater percentage of time spent for teaching.

Miskioglu asked how this proposal would affect faculty lines. The Administration could give a department only a lecturer line instead of a faculty line. Sorby responded that they could do that now. The proposal only impacts the career path.

Luck stated that some universities have only 40% tenure lines. This would be a tenure-like position. It is important to recognize these lecturers, but the administration could change and ask for more lecturers and fewer faculty.

Reed commented that terminal degrees are required for tenure track positions now but would not be for lecturers.

Jambekar asked if people with terminal degrees could apply for lecturer positions. Sorby responded, "sure."

Senator Boersma stated that in Engineering Fundamentals, all eight faculty members are lecturers. This proposal would be a great service to them. Now they may not find out until the last week of the spring semester that they will be re-hired the next year. They don't know until the last minute if they have benefits for the summer. This proposal would also reduce paperwork.

Melton stated that this would be a good recruitment tool. Sorby added that Bill Bulleit had commented that it could help dual-career couples.

Senator Hohnholt asked if it would impact the ROTC. It was not clear how it will affect them; Sorby will need to check on that.

Smith stated that he assumed the lecturers could be eligible for the graduate faculty. Sorby responded that they could be *ad hoc* on graduate committees. This does not preclude their being on the graduate faculty.

C. Proposal 5-07, Michigan Technological University Faculty External Funding Incentive Program [Appendix E].

Sutter presented the proposal on behalf of the Research Policy Committee. Currently the bonus to faculty who have academic salary in research grants is only available to SFRES faculty. This is an incentive to include a portion of the academic year salary in the contract. No release time would be granted; expectation of work load would be the same. It will help to support the University budget.

The basic concepts of the proposal are to create savings in the general fund and, in return for those efforts, reward faculty. The general fund budget of the department would retain 25% of the savings created by bringing in academic salary from an external source and the faculty member would get the other 75% of the savings as a bonus. The faculty member would also receive TIAA/CREF contributions on the bonus.

The External Funding Incentive Program (EFIP) differs from the existing SFRES program by including the Senate in changes proposed by the Administration. For example, a scholarly activity could be to develop a new course and a faculty member might get a grant to develop the course, thus paying for part of the salary through external funding.

Nitz stated that he has serious problems with the proposal. It states that there is no release time, but the sponsor provides faculty funding to get more of the faculty member's time. This would seem to violate A21 on the federally sponsored research. It seems unethical.

Sutter responded that NSF has looked at plans like this one and considers them legal. The sponsor still gets what was promised.

Nitz stated that the grant recipient would have done that anyway; his agency frowns on his doing anything that increases his salary.

Sutter responded that the academic salary in the project pays part of the faculty member's academic year salary so that the general fund has to pay less.

Melton stated that this is not release time from teaching; somebody outside the University is paying for the 40% research that is expected from a faculty member.

Jambekar viewed it differently. He stated if he is expected to do a 40:40:20 ratio of research, teaching, and service, then when he gets a grant he may be doing 60:40:20. The sponsor may want to negotiate lower support dollars because not as much time is available for the research.

Nitz asked why not just give raises for persons who get grants.

Senator Miller stated that the finance committee had similar concerns. They considered it to be compensation for faculty working overtime. They have no problems with the cost of the program. However, they consider there to be ethical issues. Faculty are being compensated two times. It raises issues with constituencies.

Luck stated that it seems like less money is coming to the faculty. Sutter responded that this is a bonus on top of salary.

Secretary Glime asked what would happen if someone were to get three grants and needed to teach less to get it all done. Sutter explained that the faculty member would have a choice to take additional salary or release time.

Kern stated that a faculty member might want to use it for release time but the chair might not want to grant it.

Smith asked how the general fund saved money. Sutter responded that it is created by bringing in academic year salary from external sources. However, the incentive only applies to academic year salary.

Smith asked if summer support is from the general fund, could the faculty member get additional salary. Sutter responded they could not.

Mattila asked why this proposal originated. Sutter responded that a number of faculty had asked him why only one unit had this incentive. He asked himself the same question and didn't have any answer.

Mattila asked if it had increased research productivity in SFRES. Reed responded that most wouldn't take this option unless they had full summer funding as well. Research has increased in SFRES since 1992 when the incentive began but that it is not clear if the incentive had any effect on it.

Mattila raised the legality question again. Sutter responded that Anita Quinn looked at the proposal and said that it is the method of administration that makes it legal.

[Attached is a memo **Appendix F** from the MTU-AAUP Executive Committee which was distributed at the meeting and relates to this proposal]

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 pm.

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