

**The University Senate  
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 490  
31 March 2010

**Synopsis:**

The Senate

- Proposal 8-10, Ph.D. Program in Environmental and Energy Policy passed.
- Proposal 13-10, Doctor of Philosophy in Geophysics passed.
- Proposal 14-10, Amendment to Proposal 4-10 passed.
- Proposal 15-10, Academic Calendar 2011-12 and Provisional Academic Calendar 2012-13 passed.
- Proposal 16-10, Current Policy and Procedures passed.
- Proposal 17-10, Modifications to Syllabus Requirement was rejected.

**1. Call to order and roll call.** President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 490 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, March 31, 2010. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were Senators Nick Koszykowski, and representatives of Materials Science and Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, Academic Services A, Advancement, IT, Research, USG and the Graduate Student Council.

**2. Recognition of visitors.** Guests included Anita Quinn (Human Resources), Patrick Martin (Social Sciences), Antonio Donati (Inter-Residence Hall Council), Max Seel (Provost Office), Joe Herbig (Accounting Services), Bob Keen (Biological Sciences), Bruce Seely (College of Sciences and Arts), Alex Mayer (Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences), Jackie Huntoon (Graduate School) and Pat Joyce (School of Business and Economics).

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

**4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 489.** Luck asked if there was approval of the agenda. No changes were requested. President Luck declared that the agenda stood approved.

**5. Presentation: "Michigan Tech's Athletic Program" presented by Pat Joyce**

Joyce spoke about the things that make Michigan Tech athletics special. He highlighted the enhancement of institutional diversity and academic success attributed to the athletic program. The graduation rate of MTU athletes is among the best in the nation. LDavis asked how the graduation rate was measured. Joyce stated the graduation rate is calculated based on five years. He added that due to the excellent academic achievement of athletes, athletes benefit from both athletic and academic scholarships. Hamlin asked about the academic scholarship cited in the presentation. Joyce noted that academic and athletic scholarships are separate and because of the high GPA of Tech students, this provides an advantage. LDavis commented on the nature of financial aid disbursement. Joyce stated that financial aid should be a benefit and used strategically. Vogler asked if the value of the 2005-2006 and 2009-2010 grants disbursed are given in constant dollars. Joyce said they were not. Scarlett inquired if the tuition and academic aid announcement timing common to all Michigan schools or just at Tech. Herbig thought it was common to all Michigan schools due to the timing of the state appropriations. Mullins stated that several elite schools have early admits, most of which are athletes and asked if enrollment of domestic nonresident students was adversely impacted by this. Joyce recalled that the numbers are below the 2008 number. Seely mentioned this year was the first year showing a student decrease. Caneba asked if prospective students have an obligation once admitted and wondered if there is a mechanism to get commitments from students. Joyce felt the major difference was that tuition and aid have not been decided prior to the recruiting process and consequently these amounts are not known. He felt this was a disadvantage considering that competing schools have that information and can make specific offers, whereas Tech cannot.

**6. The Nature of Michigan Tech's Self Insurance presented by Larry Davis**

LDavis described the differences in self-insured versus fully-insured healthcare. Mullins asked about the charges of the consultant Aon. LDavis deferred to a later point in his presentation where he planned to address that point. Pierce asked about negotiated rates of insurance companies versus the rates Tech gets from service providers. LDavis commented that the rates are typically lower than for self-coverage. Luck commented that the administrative fee is 10-15%. Wood asked how much choice we as employees have with these companies. Quinn stated that insurers cover the provider's fees, whereas companies like Aetna are customer oriented. Wood stated these are not really insurance companies, but third party administrators. Caneba commented the size of the risk is overlooked. Herbig stated that Tech is buying for a pool called MTU employees. Vogler said that self-insuring is a negative for recruiting graduate students because it would increase the size of the pool. Quinn felt the Benefits Liaison Group (BLG) could look into this issue. She added that in a consortium with other universities, we would lose flexibility in cost and coverage. LDavis agreed that self-insuring provided more flexibility, and the potential for greater coverage and lower cost. He added this may not be realized by the employees but we have the ability to do so. Mullins asked about fees paid to Aon. Quinn did not know what those fees were. Joe mentioned that Aon is a consultant that acts as a bridge between Aetna and MTU. He thought the fee was paid by the insurer and not Tech, although the true cost is probably within our existing costs paid to Aetna. LDavis and Quinn approximated the amount Tech pays to Aetna at \$18 million for healthcare in the last period. Snyder said that Aon acts as an actuary. Joe added that the fee is within the insurance costs.

**7. Report from the President**

Luck unveiled the BLG binder he needs to read through and goes on to provide an update regarding Proposal 17-10. He mentioned that the Academic Policy Committee was provided with the proposal and had an ample opportunity to examine it prior to the previous meeting. Luck then provided a list of departments that need to provide Judi with their selection for Senator for the coming academic year.

## **8. Report of Senate Committees**

Caneba (Administrative Policy Committee) mentioned the survey of President Mroz begins today. He added that survey questions will be on the website and everyone should be receiving their electronic tokens in the next few days. Fernandez added that the token (i.e. the ballot) is used to enter survey answers. He added the point of the token is to avoid repeat surveys and it does not compromise anonymity. Luck requested that the manner in which the survey results will be discussed should be provided so Senators can disseminate the information to their constituents. Fernandez clarified the timeline of survey availability and the existence of the token. Luck asked if the function of the token were to be posted on the website and requested it be so posted.

Keen (Curricular Policy Committee) added five more proposals for consideration by the Senate to ensure they can be voted on prior to the April deadline. The proposals are:

1. Amendment of Proposal 11-01, "Requirements for Graduation" (Board of Control Policy 8.5)"
2. International Dual Graduate Degree
3. Approval of "Procedures to prepare and submit a thesis or dissertation to Michigan Technological University's Graduate School"
4. Certificate In Hybrid Electric Drive Vehicle Engineering
5. Graduate Certificate In Hybrid Electric Drive Vehicle Engineering

Seel noted the international dual degree programs are popular and sought clarity of this type of degree from two institutions versus dual graduate degrees from a single institution. Wood asked if dual means two universities or two degrees. Keen clarified this by stating that one would get a degree in their major area from both Tech and the associated university. Keen referred everyone to the Senate website to read the exact text of each proposal and sought a vote on the April 14<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting. Seel proposed that a discussion take place to spread out the workload of the Curricular Policy Committee (CPC). Luck echoed the provost's sentiments and added that to ensure meaningful discussions on each proposal, the distribution of the CPC workload should be examined.

## **9. Report from the Provost**

Seel provided more information on 'Extra Compensation' from his prior report on 'Effort Reporting' (Senate Meeting #487). He proceeded to define the terms corresponding to additional and supplemental compensation. Seel commented that bonuses come in different types and defined signing, retention and performance bonuses. Snyder asked if there were any examples of a faculty member getting a signing bonus. Seely stated there were currently two outstanding offers for faculty that include signing bonuses. Seel concluded by describing Sponsored Funding Bonuses. Snyder felt the problem with bonuses is the negative appearance these financial incentives have for a public institution in a state suffering an economic crisis.

## **10. Old business.**

### **Proposal 8-10, Ph.D. Program in Environmental and Energy Policy**

Keen stated that this proposal has the full support of the CPC. He felt the proposal was well-prepared and logical. Luck sought questions. LDavis, on behalf of the Finance Committee, brought forward some calculations of the short-term cost of the program. Projections were based on eight students, state appropriations, financial aid and operating costs, ultimately showing a net loss of \$69,136 per year. He surmised that the university has added several new programs with low enrollment that lose money. Hamlin asked if this was for the first three years and how these numbers change over time. Martin (Chair, Social Sciences) stated what he considers to be flaws in the calculations being presented by the Finance Committee. First, the support being discussed was requested and has not yet been granted. Second, that the calculation being presented does not factor in student tuition income. Finally, Martin disagreed with the idea that university programs should be viewed from a profit-loss perspective as is done with a business. LDavis stated the assumption that people teaching these courses were graduate students. Wood asked how much money is made or lost if we keep adding these programs. LDavis felt losses were not implicit. Seel stated the costs of a program and the university, in general, are complex, expensive and do not make money. He compared the amount of money coming from and going to different departments, citing Social Sciences as generating a positive cash flow. Seel stated his support of the new program regardless of the costs and that it fits in with the strategic goals of the university. Luck interjected to say that our objective to support it does not preclude the surrounding and necessary financial discussions. It is supported by the chair, dean and the provost and these entities are the ones ultimately responsible for the costs. He reminded the Senate of the need to be aware of program costs and thanked the Finance Committee. LDavis expressed his concern for the continued passage of programs that lose money. Martin added that this program builds on an existing Masters program that requires expansion to a Doctoral program to be competitive. He felt strongly that this change would facilitate the acquisition of external funding. Luck asked if there were any other comments. There being none, he called for a vote. It **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

### **Proposal 13-10, Doctor of Philosophy in Geophysics**

Keen described the proposal, which had unanimous committee support. He added that the infrastructure in the department was already in place for this degree. Luck asked if there were any other comments. There being none, he called for a vote. It **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

### **Proposal 14-10, Amendment to Proposal 4-10**

Scarlett restated the language changes that were previously discussed. Luck asked if there were any other comments. There being none, he called for a voice vote. It **passed** unanimously.

#### **Proposal 15-10, Academic Calendar 2011-12 and Provisional Academic Calendar 2012-13**

Snyder restated the academic calendar is based on the Registrar's calendar and based on what day Christmas falls. Luck asked if there were any other comments. There being none, he called for a vote. It **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

#### **Proposal 16-10, Current Policy and Procedures**

Luck restated the numbering change of Senate approved proposals. Luck asked if there were any other comments. There being none, he called for a voice vote. It **passed** on a voice vote with one dissenting vote.

#### **Proposal 17-10, Modifications to Syllabus Requirement - Senate Policy 312.1**

Snyder explained the streamlined proposal and stated the rationale as making students and faculty aware of the proposal. He added that the word evaluation needed to be changed to survey, as it was not the same as the end of the semester class-evaluation by students. Luck noted that the word must was changed to should. Donati added that he felt the word change from must to should side-stepped the problem. Snyder noted that this early-term evaluation was at the discretion of the instructor and the word change from must to 'should' appropriately reflects the optional nature of the proposal. Pierce understood the proposal as written means putting the statement on the syllabus would be optional. Snyder affirmed that this is optional. Pierce felt this still did not require the faculty member to add this information to their syllabus. Snyder added that this proposal is not the solution to the problem. Pierce stated that students do not feel like they can bring redress to faculty. Snyder said if someone requests changing should back to must, he would support voting on that wording. Mullins requested we table this proposal for future discussion. Wood asked if one student can trigger this. Several affirmations were heard. Pierce said this only informs students that the policy exists. Pierce moved to change should back to must. Scarlett seconded. Luck clarified that the wording change from must to should means it does not have to be in the syllabus. Snyder agreed. Mullins felt this proposal should be tabled. Snyder said this proposal is to make people aware of an existing policy. Pierce asked that if it passes with should this means nothing to students. Scarlett asked if there is another means to make students aware of this because in his experience many students do not read the syllabus. He also asked if there were another means to make students aware of the proposal than passing this additional proposal. Hamlin agreed and asked if USG informing the students as their constituents would be a more appropriate means of making students aware of the early-term class surveys. Mullins added that incomplete syllabi can or have been used for action against a faculty member that this issue grows into a faculty-rights issue. Luck calls for a voice vote of the academic units as to changing the word 'should' to 'must' in the proposal. The wording change is **rejected**. Pierce requested that this proposal be rejected as written. Luck calls for a voice vote of the academic units for passage of the proposal. The proposal is **rejected** on a voice vote.

### **11. New business.**

#### **Proposal 18-10, Amendment to Proposal 02-07: Search Procedure for University Administrators**

Caneba, Administrative Policy Committee, introduced the streamlined procedure which is proposed to be used to hire administrators. Mayer confirmed that the process and committee will be streamlined. Changes in the composition of the committee are to make the process more efficient. Caneba requested clarification on what changes were made. Keen asked if the term 'executive team' defined anywhere and does the term go away with a new president. LDavis noted this terminology permits circumvention of the hiring process. Luck noted that some of the many vice-presidents are part of this team and others are not. LDavis asked if there was any way he Senate could have input if someone is hired and later added to the executive team. Luck noted that has happened quite frequently and currently the Senate President is consulted. He concluded that the Senate participated more than the search committee in the recent provost search. Caneba added that the size of the committee needs to be of a certain size because the provost represents the entire university, as compared to other vice-president positions. Luck added that the time and expense of such a bulky committee is in part the reason for streamlining the search process.

#### **Proposal 19-10, Increase Membership of Academic Integrity Committee by Amendment of Proposal 27-95**

Snyder, Instructional Policy Committee, credited Pat Goschalk's initiation of and contribution to this proposal. The goal being with the increased workload, more members are needed to accomplish the work. Pressure is on the Senate to find three more members for a total of six. Gotschalk said she helps to recruit members for this committee. Hamlin reinforces the fact that the increased workload requires more people.

#### **Proposal 20-10, Change of Name of an Academic Program from Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts with a Concentration in English to Bachelor of Arts in English**

Keen, Curricular Policy Committee, felt this was a logical development of an existing program and there is no new costs, as it is a name change only.

#### **Proposal 21-10, Change of Name of an Academic Program from Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts with a Concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies to Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts**

Keen, Curricular Policy Committee, noted that this proposal addresses the particular degree concentration that currently exists, which has no record of implementation.

#### **Proposal 22-10, Amendment of Proposals on Minors in Degree Programs**

Keen, Curricular Policy Committee, described the proposal and noted an additional change in special permission is required to earn a certificate in the same area as a minor. Luck encouraged all Senators to distribute these proposals to their constituency.

**12. Adjournment.** Herbig **moved** to adjourn; LDavis seconded the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 7:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted  
by Marty Thompson  
Secretary of the University Senate