Meeting 188 was called to order at 7:05 pm on 1992 March 25 in Ballroom B-1 of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call
   26 senators or alternates were present.

II. Visitor
    V. B. Watwood

III. Minutes
     The minutes for Meeting No. 187 were approved as corrected. The minutes for Special Meeting No. 3 of 1992 were distributed. These minutes will be considered at a future meeting.

IV. President's Report
    A. L. Julien made comments about promotion and tenure activities. He also mentioned that there is a case pending. This will be discussed under new business.

    B. W. J. Powers has sent a response to the old business item discussed at Special Meeting No. 3 of 1992. This related to the review by the deans of promotion and tenure actions. A letter from W. Powers discussing this matter is attached as Appendix A. There was further discussion of this letter. The Senate requests that any policy matter be submitted for consideration at a Senate meeting.

    Moved by C. Selfe and seconded by R. Freisinger.

    The Senate recognizes the Provost's rationale for having a committee of deans to review promotion and tenure decisions, but the Senate recommends that the committee of deans review all promotion and tenure cases after the MTU Board of Control has made a decision. The Senate further recommends that any new policy on promotion and tenure be submitted to the Senate for consideration.

    Passed (no dissent)

V. Vice-President's Report
    C. Vilmann attended the Board of Control meeting in Detroit.

This meeting was devoted mainly to the budget. A copy of his written report is attached as Appendix B.
The request from the University Professors and Professional Staff Alliance for information about the way in which expense reduction decisions were reached in November 1991 is included as part of the vice-president's report. The Board of Control said that the questions raised would be answered in writing at a later time.

A discussion of budget matters followed.

* Information from the President's Cabinet was that the $250K program development item might be used for new positions.
* The question was raised about a comparison of the MTU and NMU budgets. How can salary increases and retirement contributions be so much larger at NMU?
* What are the details of the $60.4M base costs? A special Senate meeting should be devoted to this. This item is addressed in the budget liaison officers report.

VI. Committee Reports

A. Elections

The election for two members for the President's Commission on Women was completed.

Candidates:  
Susan Martin (Soc. Sci)  
Ruthann Ruehr (Hum.)  
James Mihelcic (Civil)  
Pat Joyce (Bus Ad)

Ruthann Ruehr and James Mihelcic were elected.

B. Budget Liaison Officer

1. The Financial Advisory Committee has received the budget detail. This was transmitted to the committee in confidence.


3. There is a 50% chance that we will not receive the final payment from the State of Michigan. A contingency plan is needed. Many budgeted items might be rescinded.

4. The committee has not reviewed the AFT budget document.

**************************************************************

The Senate asks for a comparison of the two--A. Anderson and AFT--budget analyses. This will be the main agenda item for the Senate meeting scheduled for April 15. The discussion should cover the following topics:

- Budget
- Cash flow model
- Cash short fall prediction
- Comparison of analyses
- Transfer of funds--trade-offs
- Contingency plans
C. Curricular Policy

No report.

D. Fringe Benefits

A group has been appointed to work on the implementation of proposal 1-92, the retirement benefits plan. The members are:

D. Smith  R. Rogge
P. Boutilier  B. Whitten
R. Brown  J. Gale

The health benefits package seems to be in final form. The annuity package is now being discussed. Some discussion points are:

* Is there to be equality between TIAA and Michigan programs.
* The plan is not just for one group. There will be some fine tuning to make the final plans nearly the same.
* People who have elected the Michigan plan met and devised an alternative. The committee members are:
  R. Rogge  R. Hauswirth
  M. Wirt  D. Wiitanen

E. Institutional Evaluation

The committee presented documents to be collectively known as proposal 2-92.

1. There was a discussion of evaluation of senior administrators. This evaluation will be initiated by those being evaluated. The results for the trial year will be compiled using examination grading sheets.

2. The items about governance should be voted on by the entire faculty. The procedure could be as follows.

a) Senators discuss the proposal in a department meeting.
b) Everyone will be encouraged to participate.
c) There will be a general faculty open forum to provide further information about the proposal and to receive suggestions.
d) The entire faculty will vote on the final proposal.
e) Filling a chairperson position should always involve a national search.

3. The proposal as presented was not deemed suitable for discussion.

Moved by C. Selfe and seconded by J. Pilling.

The institutional evaluation committee should edit the document and send it to the Senators for
discussion in the departments. The edited document should have the following features:
  a) Numbered pages
  b) Rearrange the sections in the following order:
      1. Guidelines for department/school charter
      2. Selection of interim supervisors
      3. Search procedures for department chair and dean/director of school
      4. Search procedure for dean of a college
      5. Evaluation for reappointment of supervisors of academic programs
  c) Make the Roman numbers on the ballot correspond to the numbers on the sections of the document.
  d) Change the wording wherever the document reads Full Professors to read all faculty.

Passed.

Moved by W. Shapton and seconded by K. Heuvers.

The proposal should be further edited so that each item on the ballot is a separate proposal.

Passed.

F. Instructional Policy

No report

G. Board of Control Liaison Task Force

This item was covered in the vice-president's report.

VII. Reports of Affiliated Committee

***************************************************************************************************************
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A. Task Force on Trade-Offs

No report

B. University Computer Executive Committee

No report

C. President's Cabinet

This item was covered in the Senate president's report.

D. Departmental Governance and Selection of Supervisors

This item was done as part of the institutional evaluation committee report.

E. Senate Constitution and Constituency

No report

VIII Old Business

Promotion and tenure discussion was covered in the discussion of the letter form W. Powers as part of the
IX. New Business

A. A tenured faculty member from the library has been notified that he or she will be terminated. The matter will be reviewed by the Academic Tenure Committee. This review is being initiated by senior administrators.

B. Providing firearms to the public safety officers was questioned. There is a committee of faculty investigating the matter. Members are:
   J. Glime     P. Nelson
   C. White     M. Gopal
   C. McKlennan

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 pm.

Submitted by

Davis W. Hubbard
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