

**The University Senate  
of Michigan Technological University**

Minutes of Meeting 496  
13 October 2010

**Synopsis:**

The Senate

- Presentation of the Start-up Task Force Report
- Presentation of the Sabbatical Leave Committee's Annual Report

**1. Call to order and roll call.** President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 496 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, October 13, 2010. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were Senators Marilyn Cooper, Nick Koszykowski and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Academic Services A, Academic Services B, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment and IT.

**2. Recognition of visitors.** Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office), Will Cantrell (Physics), Mary Durfee and Anita Quinn (Human resources).

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

**4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 495.** Storer requested that indirect costs (IRAD) be changed. Seel clarified his statements referring to IRAD, which were incorporated into the minutes. Luck sought additional changes. There being none, Luck declared the minutes stood **approved**.

**5. Presentation: "[Start-up Task Force Report](#)" by Dr. Will Cantrell**

Barkdoll, chair of the Research Policy Committee, introduced Will Cantrell who presented a report from the startup task force. Cantrell noted that the start-up task force came out of a recommendation from the incentive return task force. Members of the Startup Task Force were:

Will Cantrell, co-chair

Mike Gibson, co-chair

Peg Gale

David Reed

Tim Schultz

Max Seel

Cantrell focused the discussion on addressing three key questions: [1] Is the University losing or not attracting high quality potential faculty as a result of inadequate startup support? [2] Are faculty struggling once they are here because of inadequate startup? [3] Is the emphasis on startup the best use of IRAD funds? (is startup detracting from other initiatives). He presented data including; the sources of startup funds, the dollar amounts and number of startup packages, and comparisons with other R1 Public Universities. Cantrell noted that the startup support allocation data only included those startup packages that went through the Vice-President for Research Office. The task force concluded the answer to the first question was that the amount of startup was not adversely impacting a candidate's decision to come to Tech. The task force concluded the answer to the second question was that the amount of startup was not hindering the success of new faculty. The two caveats to that conclusion are associated with existing infrastructure (e.g. major equipment) and availability of personnel (e.g. post-docs and technicians). The task force concluded the answer to the third question was that all entities that can convert IRAD funds to startup funds are already doing it. Cantrell concluded by summarizing the recommendations of the task force (Table 3 in presentation), which included; tracking startup funds, retaining diversification of startup fund sources and maintaining stakeholder responsibility, incentivizing supporting graduate students by returning tuition to departments, and the Vice-President for Research Office should explore possibilities to fund postdoctoral scholars for new faculty. Barkdoll asked how the university could be more competitive with other R1 institutions in terms of providing more money for startup. Cantrell stated that startups could be enhanced through endowments. Seel noted the startup costs from other institutions may include difficult to define amounts, such as release time. Mullins asked what the task force included in the startup cost data. Cantrell stated the number definitely includes cash and graduate students, but noted the difficulty in tracking exactly what comprise the numbers given for startup costs. He added that release time should be included, but he was not entirely sure which cases included this figure and which did not. Mullins asked if it was known if release time was included in the costs. Cantrell could not say definitively whether release time is included. Seel stated that release time was not included in the amounts listed, but the figures do include instruments and GRAs. He added that we need a better tracking system to get all the data. Mullins asked REF money was included. Seel said no, but the data does include faculty salary. Cantrell said the numbers are taken from the D startup accounts setup for new faculty. Barkdoll asked what role centers and institutes will have in hiring if they contribute to the startup costs. Cantrell, noting his role as an institute director, disclosed that he has made contributions to startup and prefers to meet the interviewee in advance of making a hiring decision. He felt directors should have a say in whether or not they will contribute to startup costs. Seel pointed out the contributions to startup funds from all sources, noting that most centers and institutes make contributions to faculty after they arrive on campus and have become members of the given center or institute. Barkdoll asked for clarification as to what is meant by startup being the responsibility of stakeholders. Seel stated that \$6 million dollars has been returned from the general fund to incentivize centers and institutes. He then referred past discussions of whether to retain

the funds centrally to simplify negotiating startup funds or whether to redistribute the funds. Seel noted that more negotiation is involved if startup funds come from multiple stakeholders, but he felt this results in a better startup package. Barkdoll asked if the department is the primary stakeholder in the hiring of a new faculty member, wouldn't it make more sense to give the general fund moneys to the department so they can prepare an offer. Seel stated that the university is the primary stakeholder. Moran clarified the question by stating that the department chair is responsible for recruiting faculty and finding startup funds. He added that putting more stakeholders into this process is a greater impediment to hiring research active faculty. Seel said the question of distribution of IRAD funds is intimately connected with who are the stakeholders. Moran expressed concern about the mechanism in which the IRAD funds come back to the departments. Seel said there is still some question about what is the best use of IRAD funds. Moran noted we are not offering as much as our competitors were ten years ago, but the task force concluded that we were not losing people as a result of this. He sought clarification how this conclusion was derived from the data. Cantrell noted the data contains significant error. Moran felt the data was not good enough to draw a conclusion, but rather the committee is expressing an opinion. Cantrell stated that we are not losing people based solely on the amount of startup being offered. He added there is a certain degree of selection by search committees to direct recruiting efforts to those candidates we can afford. Moran stated that we are not spending as much per faculty as top research universities and those people who require higher startup costs usually bring in more research dollars. Barkdoll asked about startup fund centralization. Seel said it was left decentralized. Barkdoll asked how startup funds are derived from open faculty lines. Seel said that was common practice and to save up for a startup package when money is tight the funds for the open faculty line are used. Onder asked if there were any data showing that someone requiring a large startup brings in more money than someone getting a smaller startup package. Cantrell was not aware of any examples but noted several discussions on who is accountable for startup expenditures. He questioned the measurement of research productivity in terms of dollars. Smith noted there was no solid survey of why people chose to accept another offer, nor was it discussed with people why they left Tech. Cantrell noted they did speak with department heads. Smith agreed, but noted the distinction between speaking with department heads versus the candidate themselves. Seel stated the people who leave have the option of speaking with the Ombuds in a neutral environment. Scarlett asked if spousal accommodations were considered by the task force. Cantrell noted this can be a big factor but it was not included in startup cost calculation. He added that it is most likely a major factor in why a person accepts an offer. Seel noted that contributions to (spousal) salary were made in the past as long as the person was appropriately qualified and meets criteria pertaining to tenure-track faculty. Mullins asked if expenditures from startup accounts are considered internal research expenditures. Seel said it could be considered internal research support. Quinn said IRAD was probably considered an internal research expenditure but startup was not. Seel noted it was not counted twice, but said he would find out how startup was accounted. Moran commented that there was a risk of micromanaging startup funds of new faculty. Seel noted the exception might be in the purchase of major equipment. Luck concluded by noting the overall critical nature of which the senators received the data and expressed shock that the university does not know how many startup funds were given and the cost for each.

#### **6. Presentation: "Annual Report from the Sabbatical Leave Committee" by Dr. Mary Durfee**

Durfee provided the number of sabbaticals applied for last year and the colleges from which applicants originated. She noted that all fourteen applicants were approved last year and compared that number with the previous three years. Durfee noted only one sabbatical leave report from last year has been filed. Snyder asked how many faculty in any given year would be eligible for sabbatical. Durfee estimated that of roughly 224 tenured faculty members, there would be approximately 32 eligible for sabbatical. She referenced a report from 1990-1995 that estimated 3-4 percent of eligible faculty took sabbatical in any given year. Smith noted faculty would be eligible again after seven years. Mullins recalled that in the early 90's few faculty took sabbatical. He added that by making it more generous the number of sabbaticals increased. Seel asked for clarification of what was more generous. Mullins noted that when Tech was on quarters, the prorated salary calculation was a disincentive. Caneba noted pre-screening at the department level was a factor in getting denied sabbatical. Durfee noted that previously all sabbaticals were approved by the committee. She noted the balance between department chair and the committee in making sabbatical decisions. Snyder noted there are chairs who have stated they will only approve full year sabbaticals. Durfee said that is not policy and that the applications should be submitted anyways because the department chair will have to explain the decision. Seel agreed that there should not be a general rule regarding sabbatical length, but noted that department chairs have to make certain decisions based on financial constraints. Luck asked when the deadline was for sabbaticals. Durfee said there was no set deadline, but noted that March submission gives the committee sufficient time to respond. Seel noted March 15 was the deadline for sabbaticals. He noted the need for providing lead-time for scheduling courses and other decisions for the upcoming academic year. Luck thanked Durfee for the report.

#### **7. Report from the Senate President**

Luck summarized the recent changes to faculty and staff parking. He speculated that in the short-term we should be able to assess its effectiveness. Luck presented the current formatting guidelines for proposals submitted to the senate (See [Senate Procedure 108.1.1](#) (Proposal 38-04 and Proposal 51-04) and the Provost's website at: <http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/prov/ProposingNewDegreePrograms.html> for detailed submission information.

#### **8. Report from Senate Standing Committees**

Onder, Elections Committee, presented four nominees for the Athletic Council. He asked to send these names to President Mroz for selection. Scarlett **moved** to send the list of nominees to the president; Malette **seconded** the motion; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote. Onder stated that the Committee on Academics, Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment (CATPR) has two nominees. Luck noted the importance of getting engineers to participate in senate activities.

Scarlett, Academic Policy Committee, said the committee is considering sabbatical issues.

#### **9. Old Business**

There was no old business.

## **10. New Business**

There was no new business.

**Adjournment.** Onder **moved** to adjourn; Storer **seconded** the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:41pm

Respectfully submitted  
by Marty Thompson  
Secretary of the University Senate