Meeting No. 186 was called to order on December 18, 1991 at 7:04 p.m. in room 325 of Fisher Hall by President Julien.

I. Roll call of regularly members

Twenty-nine members and alternates were present at this meeting. Absent: Peter Tampas, John Daavettila, Marvin McKimpson, Curtis Tompkins, and William Powers.

II. Recognition of visitors

Sixteen visitors were present: Walter Olson, Kris Lipman, Patrick Martin, Larry Lankton, Terry Reynolds, Allen Solomon, Jim Lutzke, Ed Vandette, Sam Marshall, Lynn Colombe, Scott Doelling, Don Daavettila, Dave Sikarskie, John Ligon, Richard Brown, and Frank Monasa.

III. Minutes of Special Meeting No. 4

The minutes of special meeting No. 4 were not yet available.

IV. President's Report

Items were brought up as the need arose in the agenda. No separate report was given.

V. Vice President's Report

The Governor's representative requested a copy of the report of the Board of Control Liaison Task Force which was presented at the Board of Control meeting of November 30, 1991. This report has been sent.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Elections

1. The results of the vote of confidence were presented. The report is attached as Appendix A. The comments have been sent to the individuals named.

   It was moved by Bruce Seely and seconded by Carl Vilmann to preserve the ballots for one month and then destroy them. Passed.

2. Gay Pliska-Matyshak reported that the Graduate Student Council also held a vote of confidence. The results are available from the Graduate Student Council representative or Andrew Kline.
B. Budget Liaison Officer

The Financial Advisory Committee report was read by James Gale. This report is attached as Appendix B. A copy of this report will be sent to all faculty cabinet members.

C. Curricular Policy

No report from the Curricular Policy Committee.

D. Faculty Handbook

No report from the Faculty Handbook Committee.

E. Fringe Benefits

A proposal about an augmented retirement plan was submitted. The report is attached as Appendix C. Several aspects of the report were discussed by Les Leifer. The proposal will be new business for the Senate meeting on January 15, 1992.

F. Institutional Evaluation

1. Motions were presented to be considered under Old Business.

2. There was a discussion of the legal aspects of releasing evaluation comments or summaries of comments for public viewing. Vernon Watwood had sent a memo to the Institutional Evaluation Committee stating that no comments could be released. The Committee does not have a complete understanding of the basis for this. The MTU attorney recommended that comments not be released because of the need to avoid libel litigation. The opinion of outside counsel is needed about two points:
   
a. Would having the evaluation procedure as part of a position description affect the legal aspects of releasing comments?

b. Will MTU protect the members of any evaluation committee from legal action?

At this point in the meeting, the Old Business item related to the motions presented by the Committee were acted upon. Voting was by show of hands.

Motion 1 was made by Madhukar Vable and seconded by Davis Hubbard.

Moved by Konrad Heuvers and seconded by Robert Keen to delete the sentence "This includes....and all faculty." Passed.

The Instructional Policy Committee is assigned the task of investigating whether or not to publish the results of instructor evaluations.

The amended motion was passed--19 yes, 5 no. The text of the amended motion is as follows:
Motion 1:

The tabulated results of the questionnaire for all evaluations of administrators will be made public.

In addition the synopsis made by the evaluation committee of the individual comments and the result of ballot on reappointment of administrators will be made public.

The individual comments on the questionnaire for the administrator will be seen only by the evaluating committee.

Motion 2(b) was made by Konrad Heuvers and seconded by Davis Hubbard. The motion was passed--16 yes, 2 no. The text of the motion is as follows:

Motion 2:

(a) The evaluation will be conducted every year. The synopsis of comments and balloting on reappointment will be conducted in the final year of the term unless:

(1) the evaluation committee or the person above the supervisor recommends it on the basis of the evaluation results.
(2) the administrator is on yearly appointment for reasons described later.
(3) the supervisor requests it.

or

(b) The evaluation committee will be formed every three years to conduct the evaluation and balloting. The individual supervisors may conduct their own evaluation by sending out the questionnaire for purpose of feedback.

Motion 4 was made by Madhukar Vable and seconded by Davis Hubbard. The motion was passed-- 23 yes, 2 no. The text of the motion is as follows:

Motion 4:

The results of the ballot on reappointment will be binding if 2/3 of the vote cast is one way and if the 2/3 vote is greater than or equal to 50% of the unit voting constituency. This applies to reappointment and dismissal of the supervisor.

Motion 3 was made by Madhukar Vable and seconded by Davis Hubbard. The motion was revised by making some editorial changes. The revised motion was passed-- 24 yes, 0 no.
The person above the supervisor must explain in writing his/her reasons to the unit if the supervisor is appointed or dismissed contrary to a simple majority vote.

Motion 5 was made by Madhukar Vable and seconded by Davis Hubbard. This motion was revised by making some editorial changes. The revised motion was passed--24 yes, 0 no. The text of the revised motion is as follows:

Motion 5:

If a supervisor is to be reappointed contrary to a majority vote then:

(1) The term of reappointment will be for one year renewable for the next two years.
(2) Balloting on reappointment will be conducted in each of the two years.
(3) The supervisor will be dismissed if he/she is unable to obtain a simple majority of the vote cast during one year appointments.

The committee is instructed to clarify the phrase "simple majority".

The committee report was continued following the disposition of the motions.

3. The committee is directed to approach Curtis Tompkins about funding for a legal opinion about the questions related to releasing comments obtained during evaluations.

4. The response to the request from Larry Julien for volunteers to serve on the Institutional Evaluation Committee was reported. This request is attached as Appendix D. Ann Marie LaHaie, Glenn Mroz, and Janice Glime were selected to serve.

G. Instructional Policy

The student integrity policy is being examined.

H. Board of Control Liaison Task Force

A list of chairpeople and members for all committees is needed. The chairperson of each committee--standing or ad hoc--is asked to submit a list of members to Davis Hubbard.

VIII. Old Business

Not all items listed in the agenda were addressed.
selecting members and for screening candidates. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 were modified.

The first sentence in 2.4 will read--

"The search committee will have fourteen (14) elected and two (2) appointed members from the following university constituencies:"

The following sentence will be added to 2.4 after the list of member constituencies.

"A representative from the council for social justice will sit on the search committee as a non-voting member."

The text of the document showing some of these changes is attached as Appendix E.

It was moved by Bruce Seely and seconded by Michael Mullins that the alumni and community members be non-voting. Defeated--6 yes, 16 no.

It was moved by Cynthia Selfe and seconded by Konrad Heuvers to accept the procedures as amended. Passed--23 yes, 0 no.

C. Proposal for M.S. degree in Industrial Archaeology

This proposal was introduced at the previous Senate meeting and was ready to be acted upon.

Moved by Konrad Heuvers and seconded by Davis Hubbard that the proposal be approved. Passed.

B. Distribution of Senate minutes

The secretary was instructed to begin to use E-mail to distribute the Senate minutes and other documents. A public domain file should be maintained at the Computer Technology Services.

A. Budget for Senate expenses

The secretary was instructed to prepare a budget for secretarial services, printing and duplicating, travel, and other administrative expenses.

IX. New Business

It was moved by William Shapton and seconded by Konrad Heuvers that the Senate report the results of the vote of confidence and take no specific action related to the vote. Passed.

X. Correspondence received

A letter from Allen Solomon related to the letter from Diana George which was published in the minutes of Special Meeting No. 4 of 1991 (December 4, 1991). The letter from Solomon is attached as Appendix F.
The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.
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