**The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 488
24 February 2010

Synopsis:
The Senate

- The Vice President for Research discussed recommendations from the incentive return task force
- The Elections Committee filled multiple committee vacancies
- Proposal 11-10, Amendment for Proposal 20-04, Graduate Certificates passed

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 488 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, February 24, 2010. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were Senators Marilyn Vogler, and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences, Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, Academic Services B, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment, Advancement, USG and the Graduate Student Council.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Dave Reed (VP for Research Office) and Max Seel (Provost Office).

3. Approval of agenda. Hamlin **moved** approval of the agenda; Onder seconded the motion; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 487. Luck asked if there was approval of the minutes. Boschetto-Sandoval asked if the words 'survey guru', quoted from Caneba, could be removed. Changes were accepted. No other changes were requested. President Luck declared that the minutes stood approved.

5. Report from Vice President for Research
Reed presented the recommendations of the Incentive Return Task Force. He started by detailing the mission of the task force to review current practices, benchmark other institutions, and make recommendations if changes are needed to improve our research infrastructure and meet our strategic goals. Reed added the approach currently being used was originally established in the 1980s and was based on administrative costs at that time.

Incentive Return Task Force members include:
Carl Anderson, College of Engineering
Will Cantrell, Department of Physics/EPSSI
Jason Carter, Department of Exercise Science, Health, & Physical Education
Jim Frendewey, School of Technology
Deb Lassila, Office of Budget and Planning
Terry McNinch, Michigan Tech Transportation Institute
David Reed, Vice President for Research (Chair)
David Shonnard, Department of Chemical Engineering/SFI

Reed stated that the amount of General Fund support given to Investigators, Department Chairs, College and School Deans and Institute Directors is based on percentages of the Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Cost recovery associated with sponsored projects. In FY2009, $6.2 million of the $10 million in F&A Cost recovery was distributed as incentive returns. The intended purpose of the incentive return funds will be left unchanged as it remains consistent with the University Strategic Plan. Reed then delivered the recommendations of the Incentive Return Task Force. Mullins inquired about the apparent discrepancy between the percentage returns currently in place and the $6.2 of $10 million returned in the form of incentive returns as shown earlier in the presentation. Reed detailed where those numbers came from to reach that figure. Luck asked how much currently goes to institutes. Reed noted that it is currently 50%, but that percentage will decrease to balance the increased return to investigators. Following up, Luck inquired about the potential negative impact this decrease in funds might have on the centers and institutes. Reed speculated on a range of potential impacts this change might have. He added that the committee will recommend that centers not be allowed to change their current incentive return allocations. Seel clarified that the full 20% [a combination of the 10% to departments and 10% to colleges] is given to the center. Reed elaborated that center allocation of that 20% is at their discretion. Dewey asked if the departments accepted losing 2%. Reed said he discussed these changes with chairs and deans to make the deans realize they will have to do more for the departments [due to the increase of 2.7% in the allocation to colleges]. Seel detailed examples of fund usage for grant matches and startup funds, which ultimately benefit the departments. Moran inquired as to the role of finding adequate startup funds as a motivator for such changes in the allocation of incentive return funds. Reed affirmed the concern for fund allocation and the importance of the issue. Moran asked if the task force will assess the cost and needs for startup funds to determine if there is a match with resources. Reed, careful not to speak for the task force, expected the answer to that question to be yes, and that where those monies come from and what they are spent on can be tracked. In reference to recommendation 6, Storer asked how the committee decided that administration would know better than centers and institutes, where funds should be allocated. Reed notes varying degrees of support and opposition from faculty. He added that chairs, deans and faculty not involved in centers were in favor of recommendation 6. Pierce, fearing an increase in the bureaucracy at Tech, struggled to understand why we do not just give chairs a greater percentage of the funds rather than the incentive return allocation being kept at the administrative level. Reed answered this question using the

example of it being easier to allocate money from a single source than pooling funds from multiple smaller sources. Kilpela asked if the writing center was included in the task force recommendations. Reed said the writing center does not get incentive returns and consequently was not included in these discussions. Moran noted the recommendation preserves centers ability to allocate by standard allocation. Reed affirmed this and added that the centers will be held accountable for how they spend their funds. Moran added that recommendation 7 is not interfering with center autonomy but, rather, providing a means to assess fund usage. Reed affirmed this saying the recommendation results in more autonomous decision-making by the centers. Smith noted these recommendations result in an increase in flexibility and less money. Reed said the P.I.'s get a greater percent return than they do now. Storer felt that recommendation 6 was not necessary due to recommendation 7. He further remarked on the apparent redundancy of the two recommendations and added that the message being sent in recommendation 6 is wrong. Seel added that there is not a separate standard between departments and centers. Storer noted the restrictions on centers stated in recommendation 6 are not placed on departments or deans. Reed stated that the department and dean pools are not already divided into percent allocations, as is the case for the centers, although they have the discretion to do so. Moran asked Storer about the wording of recommendation 6. Storer restated his opinion that the wording in recommendation 7 makes recommendation 6 redundant. Dewey asked about the elimination of the word incentive. Reed noted the change in terminology was based on a desire to better reflect what the funds are for, which is to increase research and graduate capacity rather than deemphasize the incentive. Herbig asked about the projected change in disbursement of funds. Reed felt it was too difficult to project the percentage of funds returned from F&A at this time. He added that being involved in a center should be for the intellectual benefits and if it is based solely on incentive return some individual P.I.'s may not be as interested in the center as the percent return from centers decreases. Luck thanked Reed for discussing the matter with the Senate.

7. Report from the President

Luck lauded Judi Smigowski, Senate Assistant, for working hard on website updates and improvements. He then acquainted the Senate with the website and encouraged people to persevere to find items of interest. Next, Luck mentioned the approval of Proposals 12-10 and 10-10. He then described the approval mechanism as the documents leave his office en route for signatures by the provost and president. Luck noted the administration has approved amendments to the charter of the School of Technology. Luck thanked the full senate for finding volunteers for the committee assignments, especially Onder, Chair of the Elections Committee, Zanello, Chair of the Research Policy Committee and Smigowski, Senate Assistant. He acknowledged the volunteers as a means to encourage Senators and inject some excitement into the Senate. He noted that elections are forthcoming and if anyone has nominations, they should bring them forward.

8. Report of Senate Committees

Onder thanked all those who volunteered to fill committee vacancies and listed the remaining vacancies in the faculty and staff at-large positions. He noted that the ballots will go out next week for the positions and asked President Luck if he can approve those positions which have only one nomination. Luck said we should wait for additional nominations before voting and proceeded to ask for additional nominations. Onder sought a vote on the Athletic Council nominee Dana Johnson. Luck **moved** for a vote on Dana Johnson as the Senate nominee for the Athletic Council; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote. The next committee is the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee. Luck asks for more nominations. There being none, Luck **moved** for a vote on Roger Kleckhafer for the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote. Next, Luck **moved** for a vote on Pat Goschalk for the Misconduct in Reseach, Scholarly, and Creative Endeavors Inquiry Committee; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote. Up next for consideration was the Sabbatical leave committee, which has two nominations, Onder requests we vote to send both names to the president. Luck asked if there were any other nominees. There being none, Luck **moved** for a vote; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote. Onder lists two nominees for the Conflict of Interest Committee and declared a vote to be necessary. Luck requests a brief biography of the two nominees (Aparna Pandey and Joe Thompson). Luck illustrates the use of the iclicker, which was to be used for the vote. Luck called for the vote via iclicker. Aparna Pandey acquired a majority of the votes and was approved for the position. Onder thanked everyone and closed his comments by stating the results of the vote.

9. Old business.
Proposal 11-10, Amendment for Proposal 20-04, Graduate Certificates
Storer, on behalf of the Curricular Policy Committee, described Proposal 11-10, an amendment to Proposal 20-04, originally discussed during the last Senate meeting. Moran asked if the committee supports the proposal as written. Storer affirmed that they do. Luck asked for additional comments. There were none. Luck **moved** for a vote on the proposal; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

10. New business.
Proposal 12-10, Modification to Professional Leave Policy
Scarlett noted that this proposal is a consequence of the friendly amendment put forth by Stockero during the previous meeting. He reminded everyone that this was to insert part-time and full-time wording into the professional leave policy, to be consistent with the new entrepreneurial leave policy. The Academic Policy Committee endorsed this change. Herbig inquired about the process for approving leaves, which addresses the faculty organizational structure only. Scarlett did not create specific language addressing staff issues, as this was written by and for faculty. He added that staff was asked to modify their version of the proposed policy change appropriately while staying in the spirit of the resolution. Luck asked what the concerns would be to adding immediate supervisors. Scarlett saw no obvious problem with that change. Seel noted the proposal was written for the faculty handbook and consequently has faculty-based language. He added that a similar change in the staff version of the policy would require changing chair or dean to supervisor. LDavis noted that Colleges and Schools have deans, but Schools don't have department chairs. Scarlett speculated on what can be changed. Herbig asked if immediate supervisor would universally address this. Snyder said it would not. Luck requested the language for faculty and staff be made to fit each situation as it applies. Luck charged Scarlett with updating this with corrected language. He noted the corrected language will be made and the proposal will be submitted in the next few days so that voting can take place during the next Senate meeting.

11. Adjournment. Hamlin **moved** to adjourn; Storer seconded the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted
by Marty Thompson
Secretary of the University Senate