The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 497 27 October 2010

Synopsis:

The Senate

- Presentation of the 2010 Enrollment Report
- Presentation of the 2011 Benefit Changes

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 497 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, October 27, 2010. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Materials Science and Engineering, School of Technology, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment and Student Affairs.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office), Anita Quinn (Human Resources), Karen Hext (Human Resources), Renee Hiller (Human Resources), Mike Johnson (Registrars Office), Ellen Horsch (Administration), John Lehman (Enrollment Services) and Mark VanDerWegen (Civil/Institutions).

3. Approval of agenda. Luck changed the order of the two presentations. There being no objections, the changes were made. Hamlin **moved** approval of the agenda; Onder seconded the motion; it **passed** unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 496. Luck mentioned the inclusion of a link referencing senate procedures into the minutes and sought approval of the senators. There being no objections, the inclusion of the link was accepted. Luck declared the minutes stood **approved**.

5. Presentation: "Enrollment Report" by John Lehman

Kangas, Chair of the Institutional Planning Committee, introduced John Lehmen who presented the Fall 2010 enrollment report. He presented enrollment statistics for the years 1970-2010. For the current year our enrollment is 6957, down from last years' high of 7132. Lehman stated the goal of the enrollment plan of approximately 7000 students. He added that the goal of increasing graduate students was moving in the right direction up from 13% in 2004 to 18% currently. Additional highlights discussed were; female enrollment has increased to 25.9%, ACT composite scores increased to 26.1 (national ACT composite average score is 21) and increased domestic and international diversity. There were 1346 new students for 2010, down 49 from last year. Lehman attributed these successes to marketing and branding. Scarlett asked if the numbers presented in the graphs reflect people or FTE calculations. Lehman stated the values shown reflect numbers of people. Donohue asked about the decrease in Ph.D. enrollment. Lehman said the overall increase in graduate students was most important. Seel had no clear explanation of why new student numbers increased for M.S. students and decreased for Ph.D. students. Donohue stated the strategic plan put an emphasis on Ph.D. students. He added that the university should put an emphasis on recruitment and admission of Ph.D. students. Luck asked if there could be more incentives for in-state rather than out-of-state or international students. Lehman said they look at the net cost to students after factoring in student aid. He noted Chicago and Milwaukee as target markets, both closer than an in-state population center, such as Detroit. Barkdoll asked how sensitive enrollment is to tuition. Lehman noted the delicate relationship between tuition and student numbers to maximize revenue. Barkdoll asked how our tuition compared to competing institutions. Lehman noted we are close to Michigan State University and the University of Michigan. Wood asked what the average out of state tuition is once all discounts are considered. Lehman said \$30-40,000. Cooper noted the small number of African American students. Lehman noted the change in federal racial accounting criteria may be contributing to this apparent decrease stating that there was an increase in the multiracial category. Scarlett asked why the chart did not have an undeclared or unidentified category. Lehman said that data was not included in the chart and consequently the data shown is missing about 5% of the population. Hamlin said an undeclared should not be included in the data because we do not really know how to categorize the information if it is not provided. Depew asked the reason for increasing enrollment. Lehman said that student faculty ratios were determined for graduate and undergraduate students to compare Tech with our benchmark institutions. These comparisons suggest that we need to increase graduate student numbers to be more like out peer institutions. Kangas thanked Lehman for his presentation.

6. Presentation: "2011 Benefit Changes" by Renee Hiller

Luokkanen, Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, introduced Renee Hiller, Director of Benefit Services, who presented benefit changes to be implemented in 2011. She noted the Benefits Liaison Group (BLG) acts as an advisory group and listed the BLG members:

Donald Beck, Jane Berner, David Chard, Mike Hendricks, Joe Herbig, Renee Hiller, Ellen Horsch, Amy Hughes, Deb Lassila, Rudy Luck, Pattie Luokkanen, Michael Mullins, Anita Quinn and Tony Rodgers.

Hiller stated the philosophy of the BLG is to have a shared responsibility on the cost containment/reduction with University employees and communities. She added that the charge of the BLG was to shift employees from unaccountable consumers into the role of informed consumers with the tools to manage their own healthcare. Hiller summarized the key objectives as emphasizing prevention, effective health management, shift from paternalism to individual accountability, enhance flexibility to meet individual needs and provide protection to the seriously ill. Mullins asked what the current deductible was for the HSA. Hiller stated these were \$1500 single, \$3000 family. Barkdoll asked how these deductibles worked. Hiller stated \$1500 single and \$3000 family. All family members in a family plan go toward the \$3000 (no individual deductible). Hiller discussed some of

the impacts of the new national healthcare plan on Tech's healthcare. She presented to two Tech healthcare plans for next year and provided the details of each Luck asked what the current percent cost was for Dental/Vision. Hiller said it varies for each family. Snyder estimated that the increase will be roughly \$42 per month based on the projected cost shift. Hiller said the trends show increasing costs and the amount is based on 20% of next year's costs not this year's costs. Snyder asked what the 15% increase was based on. Hiller said its 15% of the funding rate. Mullins asked what the costs would be for a family of four with two young children. Hiller said \$270. Scarlett said his constituency requested examples of costs for different family structures and scenarios. Hiller said that will be done for the employee form. Hamlin asked what our rate of increase in healthcare costs are. Hiller estimated about 5% overall. She provided a four year plan to implement wellness initiatives. Scarlett asked what happens to the Aetna wellness survey data. Hiller said it was confidential and for individual use only. Luck asked the percent of people who completed the survey. Hiller said the number completed was 500 out of the 1300 possible. Luck asked to include the plan estimator on the site. Hiller said it would be there and described the function of the plan estimator. Barkdoll asked if there was a way to opt out of coverage for children over 20. Hiller said no because only those with children over 20 would be charged. Luck noted the reduced healthcare costs for children 21-26 years of age via Blue Cross-Blue Shield (BCBS) for roughly \$60/mo. Scarlett clarified the mechanism of the BCBS would be separate from Tech. Luck noted that a child of the consultant was on the BCBS plan. Caneba noted the timing of the enrollment. Hiller said it is the calendar year for Tech. Caneba asked about insurance for college aged children and if the time range of coverage could be altered. Hiller said no. Snyder asked if a child could be withdrawn from the plan. Hiller affirmed that could be done with a status change. Luck asked if it was necessary for the child to be insured. Hiller said no, but expects there will be a requirement in the future. Caneba said those adult children in our current system should shift plans from Tech to the school they are attending. Hiller said ves and reminded everyone that enrollment will be online. Snyder asked if the deductibles and copayments were going to be the same for 2011. Hiller said the PPO will be the same and noted the HSA will be changed as previously discussed. Onder asked about cost containment, noting he has no decision-making power. Hiller said that the HSA and PPO are same in that respect. Onder noted he is paying more for the same service and felt that the university should leverage their power to negotiate better plans. Mullins raised the issue of cost containment as it pertains to the university and asked how much the cost has increased for individuals. Horsch said she did not know the cost numbers for last year. Mullins noted the costs are not being contained but shifted from the university to the individual. He noted that when costs are being shifted to individuals in years when no raises are given are regressive and the burden shifts more and more to the individual employee. Mullins hoped that cost containment would one day apply to individual employees and not just the university. Scarlett asked if there was a ceiling to the costs being shifted to individuals from the university. Hiller said they wanted the number to be at 20%, but that does not refer to a ceiling, but rather a current stopping point. Scarlett verified that answer by describing long term projections we cannot say where this trend will be. He also noted that slides 2-6 had offensive language in which he cited the terms paternalism and informed consumerism. Scarlett said this type of language masked the reduction in benefits. Mullins asked for a comparison of healthcare paid by a person with PPO vs HSA. Hiller noted the PPO and HSA were both around 23-24%. Mullin concluded that we were already at or above the 20% park set by the president. Horsch noted the 20% referred to just for the premium and did not include other costs. Luck thanked Hiller.

7. Report from the Senate President

Luck announced the C2E2 fund availability versus the amounts requested. He mentioned several updates to the university senate website including; the list of past and current senators, the listing of proposals and the system to code proposals at various stages of committee evaluation. Luck concluded by announcing the resignation of Bob Keen.

8. Report from Senate Standing Committees

Kangas, Chair of the Institutional Planning Committee, mentioned the new parking procedure and requested everyone update their vehicle information on the Banweb website. He noted that 50% of people have completed the update and have been issued new parking permits. The parking task force has requested three firms provide proposals to do a campus-wide study. Koszykowski asked if there was a limit to the number of vehicles one can get permits for. Kangas was not aware of any limits. Onder asked if the lot assignment will revert back to assigned lots from the new open lot plan. Kangas said such aspects of campus parking will be referred to the consultant. He added that the DPS received very few complaints regarding the new policy. Storer asked if a budget was set for the consultant. Kangas said a dollar amount had not been set.

Provost Seel expressed his thanks to Bob Keen for his years of Senate service.

9. Old Business

There was no old business.

10. New Business

Proposal 2-11. Academic Renewal

Snyder, Chair of the Instructional Policy Committee, noted that the registrar's office brought forward some recommendations for this policy. The committee clarified the document and referred to Johnson for additional details. Johnson said the academic renewal policy was unclear on what was expected from students to remove past coursework. He noted the clarifying changes were that the student had to be degree seeking and could not simply take a single course and get the same benefit. Johnson mentioned that the original idea for academic renewal had an all-or-nothing approach. Johnson noted that item 4 stated that renewal applies to all courses taken during the period in which renewal is granted, regardless of the grades earned. Item 6 goes on to say that those grades will not appear in the GPA calculation. It is suggested the credits also be removed from the student's record. He noted 18 students have taken academic renewal in the last 8 years. He added that students will have to follow the degree requirements in place upon their return. Johnson noted that only 18 had applied for academic renewal. Hamlin noted that average years should not be used, but the median of 8 years is more revealing. Mullins sought clarification on what grades appear on the transcript. Johnson said the renewal grading scheme is already in place. He added that an RI grade for incompletes should be added. Luck asked if RI should be in the current proposal. Johnson said it would be helpful but not part

of this policy. Mullins interpreted this new policy as more restrictive than other institutions. Johnson said the intent was to clarify the policy, not make it more or less restrictive. Luck noted the lack of demand for academic renewal. Mullins asked if more students seeking then are granted renewal. Johnson said there are few requests. William Yarroch was one of the original authors of the policy and then it was felt that five years away from the university was needed for reasons of maturity. Onder asked if we are legally bound to put this information on transcripts. Johnson said we are not legally bound. Onder said R would appear and asked if this is a legal requirement or due to this policy. Johnson said it is policy. Snyder noted examples where transcript recipients do not accept academic renewal and sometimes complete transcripts are requested. He added that if the data is erased then we would not have that information. Snyder noted that other schools are not obligated to accept these transcript changes. Luck made an apocryphal comment about the meaning of renewal and concluded the discussion.

11. Adjournment. Storer moved to adjourn; Hamlin seconded the motion. President Luck adjourned the meeting at 6:57pm

Respectfully submitted by Marty Thompson Secretary of the University Senate