

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 462
2 April 2008

Synopsis:

The Senate

- (1) heard a report on the Honors Institute presented by Jeff Katalenich
 - (2) heard an update on health care benefits presented by Ingrid Cheney
 - (3) passed Proposal 20-08: Amendment to Proposal 42-04: Evaluation Procedure for the President
 - (4) passed Proposal 21-08: Academic and Provisional Calendars for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011
 - (5) passed Proposal 22-08: Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters (To Complement University Senate Proposal 16-92)
 - (6) agreed to the interpretation of which charter items were required so that an index could be provided on the Senate webpage
 - (7) passed Proposal 23-08: Certificate in Geographic Information Systems
 - (8) passed Proposal 24-08: Minor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry
 - (9) introduced Proposal 16-08: GFC and Senate Resolution on Graduate Education
 - (10) passed Proposal 25-08: Amendment to Proposal 2-04: Honorary Posthumous Degrees as an emergency proposal
 - (11) introduced Proposal 26-08: Syllabus Requirement for all Courses at Michigan Technological University.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 462 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 2 April 2008, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Brenda Helminen and Nick Koszykowski and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Library, ME-EM, Academic Services A & C, and Research. Liaisons in attendance were SherAaron Hurt (USG), Lakshmi Krishna (GSC), and Becky Christianson (Staff Council). Auxiliaries currently has no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Lesley Lovett-Doust (Provost), Ingrid Cheney (Benefits), Jeff Katalenich (Honors Institute), and John Irwin (School of Technology).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Sloan indicated that there was an error on the agenda, listing two items numbered 8. a. The first was renumbered as a-1 and the second as a-2.

P. Nelson MOVED and Gorman seconded the motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

4. PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON THE HONORS INSTITUTE presented by Jeff Katalenich

Katalenich identified himself as an honors student, a junior, and a member of the first honors cohort. He reported that Dr. Mary Durfee had founded the institute and that this year it is directed by Dr. Andrew Storer while Dr. Durfee is on sabbatical leave in Malta.

Katalenich informed the Senate that each class picks the name of the next class, with the one starting in 2008 being named Tesla. The program permits honors students to meet other people that they might want to work with in the future.

To enter the honors program, high school students must not only have a good academic record, but must also write an essay. To graduate in the program, they must have a 3.5 GPA, participate in an honors perspective section, complete the essay portion of a nationally-competitive scholarship, and complete three contracts.

For fall of 2008, more than 600 students qualify. The program provides opportunities that are not available to other students, including support to go to conferences, special funds for SURF projects, honors contracts that can be really creative and are an extra part of a class. Sample contracts include 1) a critical design for the Airforce Research Lab wherein the students were funded to present it in Washington, D.C.; this resulted in their gaining mentorship from members of the industry and setting up a summer internship for another student. In another project students designed sensors to put on washing machines that could be accessed on the students' computers to determine if their laundry was done. A third group put GPS on a robotic car to make its operation more efficient.

Their view to the future includes having the first honors graduates next year and providing a network with those students in the current honors institute. This will provide them with a group of students they might want to try to hire in the future.

Current priorities include finding a designated space where they can meet with each other, creating more honors sections, allowing students meeting certain criteria to join the honors institute after the first year at MTU, having an honors thesis instead of three contracts, and developing a strong identity and presence on campus.

Current members with AP credits would like to be able to take advanced courses when they enter MTU, necessitating earlier registration so there is still room for them. They would like to have honors sections in Engineering Fundamentals.

The students hope to meet the honors needs and bring recognition to the University.

Senator Smith asked if the survey of honors students presented here included all of the honors students. Katalenich responded that it included about half [later corrected by Andrew Storer to ~50 responses, or 25%]. Senator Gotschalk asked if

there is a cap on enrollment or any discussion of one. Katalenic responded that the present goal is to bring in as many of these good students as possible.

5. PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON HEALTH CARE BENEFITS presented by Ingrid Cheney

Cheney reported that as part of Senate Proposal 22-00 she is required to report expenditures and changes in benefits to the Senate. She stated that the benefits staff include Nancy Bykkonen, Amy Olson, Renee Hiller, and herself.

She provided a printed copy of her report to the Senators (attached) and highlighted some of the items of importance. She pointed out that the costs in 2007 were approximately 17% greater than in 2006. The cost per contract was \$11,228. Several factors account for the rise in costs: an older faculty and staff population, few available choices for health care insurers, rising medical costs, and some serious medical claims.

Senator Luck asked if it was possible to find one's own medical costs paid by the university. Cheney suggested that it should be online with BCBS, but that prescription costs would probably not be there. They should be available from the pharmacist.

Cheney reported that she got her highest bill ever from BCBS last week – over \$500,000. This is because some claims had been held because the contracts were not in the system earlier. The cost per contract is now ~\$12,700.

Claims in 2007 were approximately 20% higher than in 2006. 2007 had a 15.5% cost increase, amounting to \$12,876,332 in claims payments. As of March, the claims are up 14.3% above last year. The cost per contract in gross claims has risen from ~\$7,000 in 2000 to ~\$12,000 in 2008.

She reported a savings to MTU of \$50,000 by dropping the aggregate. This was a protection against having an extremely large claim and setting a max, above which BCBS would pay. However, that max was only exceeded once in her 19 years at MTU and was not cost effective. Instead, it is now set so that if one family exceeds \$300,000, BCBS pays the difference.

The number of employees enrolling in the premium plan has grown and the number in the standard plan has dropped. Hence the Budget Liaison Group decided to offer more options. This year they offer the Premium, Standard, Deductible, and Husky 1, 2, and 3 plans. There are also two dental and vision plans to accompany the Husky plans. There are currently 68 people in the Husky 3 plan with a high deductible (\$2000 out of pocket).

The group is concerned with cost containment, which is subject to state funding, escalating costs, and differences in the standard and premium plans. They have expanded the eligibility of dependents to provide for older college student dependents living at home and for persons with a living relationship who are not related and not tenants. An added fitness benefit is a \$150 discount at TechFit activities. The requirement for working for two years or being at least age 35 has been lifted from the TIAA-CREF benefit contribution by the University. The latter has resulted in 88 people being added to this benefit; five people have still not completed the enrollment.

The RSVP retirement program requires 80 points (age plus years at MTU) and permits four options. By giving a one-year notice, an employee is eligible for 50% of salary at retirement to be contributed to health care insurance. This will be deposited in the bank and will earn interest.

Senator Davis asked when the 80 points would be counted for someone seeking phased retirement (3 years with half the responsibilities to the university, but full health care benefits). Cheney responded that it would be at the time the phased retirement began.

Davis asked to which hospital most of the payments go. Cheney reported that Portage clearly received the most, then Marquette, Mayo, and Keweenaw Memorial.

Davis asked if Tech would help an employee in obtaining and keeping a non-Tech health care insurance. Cheney responded that they had done it with one employee; payments must be accumulated and put into one payment per year. Davis stated that an outside company can cancel the policy later and asked if there was a way MTU could help employees get contracts that prevented that. Cheney stated that she would look into the possibility of such an arrangement with AARP. There are many states, e.g. Arizona & Florida, where the doctors will not recognize the BCBS Medicare Advantage Plan and refuse to treat patients with that plan because it is too difficult to get the payments. Aetna wants to come to Michigan and might be an alternative. BCBS needs competition. If other universities (MUCH group) would join, it might be possible to contract with a different company.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 461

Secretary Glime stated that the minutes should be amended to indicate that the representative from ETS (David Chard) had been present at the meeting.

Gotschalk MOVED and P. Nelson seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 461 as corrected. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

7. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Sloan reported that the Senate vice president is missing tonight due to cancelled flights from Lansing.

Elections: Ballots will shortly be sent by campus mail to Senate constituents. Faculty will vote for faculty senator-at-large; there is one three-year term and one one-year term substituting for a faculty senator-at-large on sabbatical. Professional staff will vote for staff senator-at-large; there is one three-year term.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty will vote on two proposed amendments that passed the Senate last year. If approved by a majority, they will be submitted for approval in turn to the Provost, President, and Board of Control. These amendments are Proposal 13-06 "Extension of the Tenure Clock" and Proposal 16-07 "Transfer of Tenure and Rank between Academic Units."

Election of Senate officers will be done by the 2008-2009 Senate (incoming and continuing Senators) at the next Senate meeting in two weeks. The current vice president and secretary are term-limited and hence must be replaced; the president will be term-limited in another year so could serve next year to provide continuity if the Senate wants. The Elections Committee, chaired by Jason Keith, is soliciting candidates. The incumbent officers would be pleased to discuss their duties with any incoming or continuing Senator who is interested. Nominations can be made from the floor with prior agreement of the nominee.

President Mroz will make a presentation at the second Senate meeting on 16 April, a meeting of the 2007-2008 Senate. He will talk on international issues and the budget.

8. OLD BUSINESS

a-1. Proposal 20-08: Amendment to Proposal 42-04: Evaluation Procedure for the President presented by the Administrative Policy Committee.

Christianson MOVED and Gotschalk seconded the motion to approve Proposal 20-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of the full Senate with no opposition.

a-2. Proposal 21-08: Academic and Provisional Calendars for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 presented by the Instructional Policy Committee.

P. Nelson MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to approve Proposal 21-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of the academic units with no opposition.

b. Proposal 22-08: Procedures for the Establishment and Amendment of Charters (To Complement University Senate Proposal 16-92) presented by Janice Glime.

Secretary Glime explained that the inclusion of the required and optional items had caused considerable confusion over what was new. The original proposal had two issues. First, it provided procedures for updating and approving charters. Second, it put all the Senate Proposals related to charters in one place. The proposal presented here has removed the past proposals and deals only with the new procedures. That will be followed by a motion for the Senate to approve her interpretation of the past proposals by listing required vs. optional items.

Vable MOVED and Davis seconded the motion to approve Proposal 22-08.

Senator Luck asked who would mediate the current problem in the Chemistry Department wherein their charter required a 2/3 vote of the Senate Constituents of the department to make a change, but it was unclear who the intended constituents were. Vable responded that the charter proposal predated the constitutional change in which the professional staff were included in the Senate. Therefore, at that time only faculty were constituents. Glime suggested that approval dates for the Constitution and the department charter should be checked to determine which occurred first.

Luck expressed concern over who could take a grievance to the Grievance Committee if their charter required that half the members support the grievance, but the grievance was over the constituency. Drelich expressed a similar concern.

Glime responded that such a problem needed a solution, but that it should not be part of this proposal.

Provost Lovett-Doust expressed her concern over the "drop dead" wording in several places, whereby the charter would receive approval by default if the Administration did not respond to it within a specified time, usually 60 days. She was concerned that treating it as approved could cause a department to do something that was illegal and that building such permission into the policy meant that Senate would share responsibility.

Senator Gregg asked if this is new. Glime responded that it was, then later pointed out that it really isn't because 16-92 states that charters are to be treated like Senate Proposals and therefore would be subject to the same approval time requirement as a Senate Proposal.

Senator Gorman asked the Provost if she could provide an example of something that might be in a charter but be illegal. She responded that they could put in a statement that no woman could be hired to fill a certain position. Vable reminded the Provost that the proposal clearly states that the university procedures supersede unit charters. Gorman pointed out that the wording of the procedures states that a charter is only considered approved until the unit is notified otherwise. Therefore, the Provost could notify the unit that there are items needing the opinion of a lawyer and that approval must wait until that occurs. Senator Veurink reiterated that in the three places she had found the wording that concerned the Provost, the procedures state that if there is no explanation, then it is approved.

Senator Gregg asked if the problem could be solved by extending the time and asked for a reasonable number. The Provost responded that there should be no "drop dead" clause.

Glime explained that under the present status without this pocket approval, two units still had no approved charters after four years because their Dean and the Provost had not acted upon their submitted charters and had provided no explanation.

Gregg MOVED and Gorman seconded the motion to amend the wording requiring response within 60 days to requiring response within 9 months.

Glime stated that the amendment was unnecessary since the Provost need only notify the department that extra time was needed to get the lawyer's opinion.

The amendment FAILED on voice vote of academic units.

The motion to approve Proposal 22-08 PASSED on voice vote of academic units with opposition.

c. Index to Charter Content

Davis MOVED and Keith seconded the motion to approve the index of required and optional items of charter contents.

Veurink asked why item g was necessary as it seemed to belong with item h and all other items referred to a specific proposal. Glime responded that it could perhaps be put with h but that it did refer to a policy of the Board of Control. The Board reference could be added, but this BOC evaluation requirement was one that needed to be made clear in the charters.

Drelich stated that his department felt that procedures for admitting graduate students should be required. Glime agreed, but stated that it is not currently required by any policy. However, any department can put this in their charter.

Provost Lovett-Doust reported that the statement that these items are approved by the Senate and the Administration is incorrect. She found a copy of the policy approved by the Administration and the Board of Control and only the policy statement was included, not the list of items. They were in fact still in development, and were explicitly excluded from the Senate Policy document. Glime stated that the Senate Assistant has thus far been unable to locate a signature copy with Administrative approval of the items, but the proposal on the Senate website included the items and indicated dates of Senate and Administrative approval.

Gregg MOVED and Solomon seconded the motion to add in front of the Part II statement "Some examples of" so that it is clear that the list is not all inclusive. The amendment PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

Gregg MOVED and Keith seconded the motion to remove the words "and Administration" in the second introductory sentence. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

The motion to approve the amended Proposal 22-08 PASSED as amended on voice vote of academic units with opposition.

d. Proposal 23-08: Certificate in Geographic Information Systems presented by the Curricular Policy Committee.

Gorman MOVED and P. Nelson seconded the motion to approve Proposal 23-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

e. **Proposal 24-08: Minor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry** presented by the Curricular Policy Committee.
Gorman MOVED and P. Nelson seconded the motion to approve Proposal 24-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

9. NEW BUSINESS

a. **Proposal 16-08: GFC and Senate Resolution on Graduate Education** presented by GFC, Senate Officers, Jackie Huntoon, and Lesley Lovett-Doust

Gotschalk questioned the functions in Article III because there were graduate legal issues outside the jurisdiction of the Senate. Glime responded that the Article was part of the Senate Constitution and was provided only as background. President Sloan stated that the officers could discuss the issue with her later because it was a different issue.

b. **Proposal 25-08: Amendment to Proposal 2-04: Honorary Posthumous Degrees** presented by Provost Lovett-Doust

The Provost explained that these degrees were important as a tribute to the student's goals, and intention to earn a degree from Michigan Tech, and meant a lot to the families. The previous policy had criteria about the student's academic standing, but obviously this is an honorary degree, and not open to any form of abuse

Luck added that the standing of the student at the time of death should not play a role.

There was a brief discussion regarding possible awards at this commencement. Lovett-Doust stated that there was one pending. There would be little time remaining to make arrangements to award this posthumous degree this year if there were a delay of another two weeks.

Davis MOVED and Smith seconded the motion to treat this proposal as an emergency proposal. The motion to make this an emergency proposal PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

Davis MOVED and Keith seconded the motion to approve Proposal 25-08. The motion PASSED on voice vote of academic units with no opposition.

c. **Proposal 26-08: Syllabus Requirement for all Courses at Michigan Technological University** presented by the Instructional Policy Committee

Senator Boschetto-Sandoval stated that students are often confused about the requirements of a course. The syllabus would provide them with a clear statement of these.

Vable stated that the syllabus is better for undergraduate courses. Consideration of syllabi for graduate courses should be left to the Graduate Council and should be more flexible.

Sloan stated that her department felt the guidelines were inappropriate for courses involving directed readings, seminars, etc. and thought that the proposal was nanomanagement.

Luck stated that the wording should be changed to "should be available" so that an instructor could put the syllabus on the web. Some syllabi are 10 pages long for a course of 250 students.

Senator Givens asked what is meant by behavior standards. Gotschalk responded it could include things like not eating in class or turning off cell phones. Gorman added that the behavior item was only an example and did not need to be included.

Boschetto-Sandoval explained that there are legal implications. If there is no written policy, a student can say that he/she didn't know what was going on.

Senator Yaroch stated that under the required content, the use of parentheses was inconsistent, making it unclear. Some items in parentheses were required and some were not.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:27 pm.

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