

The Senate of Michigan Technological University  
Minutes of Meeting No.192

I. Call to Order

President Sharik called the meeting to order at 7:05pm on 4 November 1992 in Room 105, Memorial Union Building.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

19 Senators or alternates were present. Representatives from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Army ROTC, Chemical Engineering, IWR, Mining Engineering, Graduate Student Council, Undergraduate Student Council.

Absent Senators-at-large: Thomas Grimm, Davis Hubbard, John Lukowski, Madhukar Vable.

III. Recognition of Visitors

K. Lipman (Lode), J. Waber (Physics), E. Frederich (Omicron Delta Kappa), M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), D. Williams (Counseling Services), K. Farrell-Perrini (Housing), T. Snyder (Bio Sciences), W. Shapton (E.S.I.), J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Secretary Asst.).

IV. Minutes

The minutes of Meeting No. 191 were accepted, corrected, and approved as corrected.

V. Senate President's Report

- A. The increased activity within the University implies a lot of work for the Senate.
- B. Janis Coleman-Plouff was introduced as the new Secretarial Assistant for the Senate. The Provost is very close to finding an office space for the Senate and the Secretarial Assistant.
- C. President Tompkins increased the Senate budget from \$3,300 to \$5,000 for 92-93. The increase will pay for correspondence and the Secretarial Assistant's salary.
- D. State of the University Address: Sharik expressed appreciation for the opportunity to sponsor the event, and thanked the Chairs for preparing lists of goals and objectives for 1992-93. The lists had been compiled and edited, and were distributed to the Senate (Appendix A of these minutes). Sharik said and many agreed that the introductions of Senators by name was cumbersome. J. Waber commented that it would be better to print names in a program next year.
- E. Sharik recommended a policy that every Senator serve on at least one Senate Committee; opportunities for committee service will be available.
- F. Creation of New Committees: The Senate does not have a committee to provide input on problems of tenure and promotion, nor is there a Senate committee participating in the University's financial planning process. The Senate should consider establishing such committees.
- G. ESI/Ventures: Sharik is a member of the ESI/Ventures Faculty Review Committee which has produced a final report. The document was distributed to the Senate as its first official public release (Appendix B of these minutes). William Shapton, Vice President of ESI, was invited to give a synopsis of the final report.

William Shapton addressed the Senate: The final report was distributed to the MTU Board of Control and Trustees of ESI earlier in the week. The three major recommendations from the Faculty Review Committee were:

(1) Orderly divestiture of all assets of ESI/Ventures. (2) To review whether or not MTU needs an external entity to support its technology transfer efforts. (3) That, while ESI continues to operate, its members commit themselves to work in an open manner with the public and university. The committee identified two lessons learned from problems of ESI and Ventures: (a) Accountability is critical in the management of public entities. (b) All University policies and initiatives should be formulated only after extensive opportunity for faculty input and public comment.

Three operating companies are left to be sold: Horner Flooring, Pelletech, and Erickson Saw Mill. The sale of Horner should be finalized within 30 days. The situation involving Pelletech is summarized in a recent issue of the Lode. ESI is concerned about the responsibility of possible buyers. Selling to the highest bidder is not the only consideration in disposing of these properties. The availability of Erickson Saw Mill has been advertised, and the property should be sold by January 1, 1993.

Vilmann asked whether there would be income at this point to pay taxes on Ventures land holdings. Shapton said much of the land owned by Ventures has been made valuable by the creation of the National Park, and that ESI hopes to retain ownership in order to place these holdings in the park. Further, some of the properties may have some environmental liability connected with them; ESI does not intend to dissolve itself and pass the liability on to MTU. Income derives from the note from the sale of the hotel, and royalties from the sale of Zimpro. Lands that remain furnish lease income. In addition, lands currently are being sold; ESI plans to increase the rate of disposal responsibly, without dumping it on the market. Artifacts from mining activity are being conserved. Most of "Ventures" will be gone by June 1993.

Julien commented that several early recommendations by the Review Committee had been implemented by the ESI board, including providing of information regularly about ESI/Ventures activities. Julien commended Shapton for informing the Faculty Review Committee. Sharik expressed Senate appreciation for Bruce Seely's work on the Faculty Review Committee.

H. Banner System: Sharik reported that George Fox, Manager of Administrative Computing, had volunteered to explain the new "Banner System" to the Senate at the next meeting. Roblee suggested that the presentation be scheduled for the public as a broader forum, rather than the Senate alone. Heuvers suggested a Tech Tea Time presentation.

I. Sharik reported on the discussion of several topics in his monthly meeting with President Tompkins.

1. Opportunities for Senate action and activities are numerous.

2. Concerning the annuity and life insurance retirement benefits which were not approved by the Board of Control: President Tompkins said the Provost's office will furnish pertinent budgeting and long-range planning information

to the Senate Fringe Benefits Committee. In turn, President Tompkins would appreciate these proposals being brought to the Cabinet for discussion there prior to finalization by the Senate.

3. President Tompkins suggested that other important proposals be submitted in draft form for consideration by the Cabinet. (Previous examples of this include the Senate guidelines for selection of the chief financial officer and the provost, and the governance policies considered last year.) This procedure increases the probability of support from the Board of Control.
  4. The involvement of the Senate in long-range planning is a problem. This was evident during the Cabinet meeting of 12 October, when Sharik presented Senate Goals and Objectives for 1992-93, while the Provost presented a draft of the 1993-94 budget and a 1993-98 Financial Plan. An institutional timing problem is partly involved. Senate officers and committee chairs are installed in the spring, but do not function until fall, which puts them two months behind in University decisions. Constitutional revisions should consider timing of elections.
  5. President Tompkins suggests that the Senate take the lead in the process of considering the proposal for a four-year program in the School of Technology, and also in the analysis of balance between undergraduate and graduate education. Sharik has referred these two matters to the Curricular Policy Committee.
  6. Along with more involvement and responsibility in University governance comes more time spent in these activities. There are often negative rewards associated with time spent in University service. President Tompkins suggested that the Senate develop some policy of remuneration for University Service, including possible release time to departments. Creating an ad hoc committee on remuneration for involvement in University activities was suggested. President Tompkins indicated that if this committee were formed it might want to meet with Deans and Department Heads to discuss policy in these matters.
  7. Luncheon meetings with President Tompkins were discussed. If the Senate favors these, Sharik proposes to set up such meetings on a quarterly basis.
  8. Plans on spousal tuition is being discussed by the Staff Council, and President Tompkins said the Senate Fringe Benefits Committee might want to contact them on this and on plans for tuition breaks for children.
  9. Similarly, Tompkins suggested that a small Senate ad hoc committee might want to contact Bob Hauswirth, SDC manager, regarding the implications of free membership in the SDC for faculty and other employees.
- J. Debbie Lassila, Coordinator of Academic Affairs in the Provost's Office, contacted Sharik about the Faculty Handbook, which their office feels badly needs revision in both style and content. The matter has been referred to Curricular Policy Committee, because the Handbook Committee is inactive and without membership.
- K. Bill Predebon, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, has informed Sharik that the three to five finalists for the position will be on campus in December. That committee would like the Senate to host an open forum focusing on the academic concerns of the Senate constituency. Sharik suggests that an ad hoc committee conduct the forum. Snyder commented that the Search Committee already has the forum scheduled.
- L. Sung Lee, Vice-President for Research, has contacted Sharik

about the formulation of a university policy on scientific misconduct. This will be important in research funding. Sharik suggested that the Senate needs a Research Policy Committee as an analog of the Instructional Policy Committee.

- M. University policy on "shared governance": This has created a dilemma, because such shared responsibility has not carried with it shared authority. There needs to be a formalization of this model within the university, so that both responsibility and authority are shared. The pattern of the U.S. Constitution for division of power has been suggested, e.g. veto power. Sharik referred these matters to the Senate's Institutional Evaluation Committee. Heuvers commented that this is being considered by the Constitution and Constituency Committee.

#### VI. Senate Vice-President's Report

Senate VP Vilmann asked that the members of the Board of Control Liaison Committee contact him to activate the committee. Vilmann announced that Omicron Delta Kappa, a student leadership-&-scholarship fraternity, is sponsoring a forum on effective teaching. He introduced Elaine Frederich, ODK member, who described the forum to be held 9 Dec, and asked for Senate endorsement of the letter of invitation to the forum.

Grzelak moved that the Senate endorse the concept of the ODK teaching forum; motion seconded by Jambekar and Heuvers; passed unanimously. Fynewever suggested that the forum be videotaped and kept on file at the Center for Teaching Excellence.

#### VII. Committee Reports

- A. Election Committee: Chair Heyman distributed a list (Appendix C of these minutes) of nominees of faculty members, for the Presidential Commission on Diversity. The nominations for cabinet alternates and for the vacant at-large Senate seat have been solicited and closed. Balloting will begin soon.

The Senate has been mandated to appoint the members of the Commission on Diversity, one faculty member for each college and school. Because only one nomination had been received for each unit, Heyman moved that the Senate appoint the nominees by acclamation. Julien seconded the motion; it passed without opposition.

Heyman thanked the Senators for their work in communicating election information to their constituents. Heuvers asked about the timing of elections for Cabinet alternates and the at-large Senator. Heyman said the ballots would be distributed in a few days.

- B. Budget Liaison Officer: A. Jambekar reported that the search for a Chief Financial Officer is continuing on schedule.

Julien inquired whether it would be appropriate for the Senate to ask Ron Blevins, the current financial officer, to give a report to the Senate, regarding the status of accounts and the cash-flow problem. Jambekar agreed to invite Blevins.

- C. Curricular Policy Committee: Chair T. Bornhorst reported that the committee has unanimously approved a Certificate

\*\*\*\*\*

in Municipal Management, which will be submitted to the Senate for approval at the next meeting.

Bornhorst referred to Sharik's list of goals (Appendix A).

The committee has considered an honors program, and has temporarily tabled the issue until student input has been obtained. Bornhorst will address the student governing body, requesting student input on an honors program.

The committee has not yet received the official paperwork on the proposal for a four-year program in the School of Technology. President Tompkins has not only suggested that the committee take the lead in considering this proposal, but has offered funding to support advice and study of the proposal by experts outside of the university. Informal polling indicates that the committee will want authorization to perform its study deliberately, with "experts" of its own selection. Involvement of the whole university community, including alumni, is important.

Bornhorst expressed concern about whether or not recommendations of the committee would be followed by the upper administration, considering the effort of such a program review. Heuvers commented that committee reports approved by the Senate go to the President for appropriate action and consideration by the Board of Control. Carstens commented that all committees on campus serve only in an advisory capacity. Sharik commented that this emphasizes the need for a policy on shared governance. Julien commented that the Cabinet is only a sounding board and information dissemination point, and that even the old Academic Council only served in an advisory capacity.

Bornhorst said that the two issues, balance between undergraduate and graduate education, and revision of the Faculty Handbook, are important and should be considered by a separate committee rather than by the Curricular Policy Committee.

- D. Fringe Benefits Committee: No report was given in the absence of Chair L. Leifer.
- E. Institutional Evaluation Committee: Chair D. Hubbard was absent. Keeble reported that the committee had met and had written a draft proposal on departmental governance, which was distributed to the Senate (Appendix D of these minutes). No model charter was attached to the draft proposal.
- F. Instructional Policy Committee: Chair C. Heuvers had no report.
- G. Constitution & Constituency Committee: Chair C. Heuvers referred to the report of the committee (Appendix E of these minutes), and summarized the committee's work on the constituency.

Pilling suggested that the Senate should also now consider New Business Item F, "Petition for Referendum", because the proposed referendum affects discussion of constitutional revisions. The suggestion was discussed. Heuvers completed his summary of the committee's work, including its proposal for a Research Policy Committee. Heuvers also read a letter from the Graduate Student Council, indicating that the Graduate Student Council wished to resign from the Senate.

Grzelak asked about the two lists of constituents; Heuvers replied the two lists are a product of the current voting procedures, and will be combined under the proposed revisions of the constitution. Julien indicated that the Senate can define its own constituency; the constitution only requires a representative of each academic and research department, along with the university President and Provost.

Keen noted that under the current Senate constitution, the Graduate Student Council is also required to elect a representative, and that it cannot simply resign its membership. Fynewever noted that counseling and advising personnel would be included because of their contacts with students; Heuvers replied that this would have to be

considered by the constituency appeal board. Fynewever replied that the committee had explicitly included counselors, and Heuvers replied that the item was not settled.

In summary, Heuvers indicated that the committee was now asking for Senate advice: should they proceed through the usual Senate proposal route, or should the committee prepare a referendum for the constituency. J. Waber asked whether the constituency list was tentative or final; Heuvers indicated the list was tentative. Vilmann reiterated the request for advice before proceeding. Waber questioned the status of coaches in the constituency. Fynewever replied that all coaches are teachers; Vilmann indicated coaches would be part of the proposed definition of faculty. Heuvers indicated that there may be problems with Research Assistants, some of whom may have contact with students. A. Hein indicated that changes in titles may obviate the difficulty.

Bulleit indicated that the problems of constituency need to be discussed relative to the proposed referendum in New Business Item F. Pilling moved that the Senate alter the agenda and consider the item immediately. Jambekar seconded the motion, which was approved.

Keen explained that the item was placed on the agenda by a presentation to him of 80+ faculty signatures on a ballot initiative proposition. The proposition asks that the proposal be submitted to faculty as defined in the proposition. Bornhorst indicated that the Senate rules for a referendum call for a submission to the entire Senate constituency. Keen replied that the faculty governance referendum in the Spring of 1992 was submitted only to the faculty. Heuvers noted that the Senate does have a faculty constituent list, and that this referendum should be sent to that list, not the narrower list defined by the referendum.

Sharik called for a supporter of the referendum to address the Senate. T. Snyder referred to the document (Appendix F of these minutes), and called for the Senate to conduct the referendum. Bulleit asked why librarians and research faculty were not included in the proposal. Snyder indicated that these persons have different job descriptions than academic faculty; in addition the call is for a constitution committee, which may include librarians and persons in physical education that have academic appointments. Roblee indicated that he had never seen the initiative before. Snyder said that the initiative had not gone to every department because of time constraints. Roblee suggested that the supporters of the referendum should work with the current Constitution and Constituency Committee. Julien commented that a Constitution Committee already exists, and questioned the need for another. Snyder replied that the new committee would be composed only of academic faculty. Pilling said many faculty feel that the current Constitution committee is not representative of the faculty, and this proposal would provide an opportunity to establish a true faculty senate. Sharik expressed puzzlement on the need for another committee, because the Senate committees are open to any persons wanting to become involved. George indicated the proposals were clearly distinct. Hein wondered whether a senate of academic faculty only could view research and research faculty objectively. Heyman wondered about the restriction of the referendum to academic faculty only; the referendum would exclude even individuals on the Senate's faculty list. He also wondered about the value of excluding persons who would be affected by the outcome of the vote. Pilling commented

\*\*\*\*\*

that the Senate is now obligated to conduct the referendum with the entire constituency. Roblee said that he would not like to be represented by an academic senate as defined by the referendum proposition. Snyder commented that the university is moving to a different style of internal governance with a strong provost and also with "shared governance". Provost candidates have indicated they would like to work with a faculty senate whose constituency is clear; the current Senate's constituency and concerns are diffuse. J. Waber said that conversations with President Tompkins showed the president favored a faculty senate that likely would not include research faculty. W. Shapton commented that academic faculty have to balance teaching and research responsibilities, and that research faculty view the university differently. Vilmann said that a diversity of opinion was needed to make informed decisions. George commented that a separation is very serious, that a small body is not as strong as a large body. Snyder replied that the academic faculty's concerns are lost in a large senate. Waber said that university administrations try to dilute strong faculty senates with addition of other constituencies. Roblee commented that the strength of a body depends on its activity. Julien noted that the current Senate has been representative.

Bulleit said that the present issue is who is to vote on the referendum. Snyder indicated that the precedent set by last spring's referendum indicated that the Senate could restrict the eligible voters for referenda. Bornhorst indicated that the Senate has to decide who is affected by the results of the referendum, and who must be eligible to vote.

Heyman moved: The Senate shall conduct a referendum based on the ballot initiative proposition. Wording of the referendum ballot is to be based on the ballot initiative proposition: "The faculty of Michigan Technological University shall form...". The ballot shall be yes or no, and placed before the entire Senate constituency.

The motion was seconded by Grzelak and Bornhorst. Bulleit asked about the composition of the list of the constituency. Heyman replied that there is a list used for electing senators-at-large, and said that he put forward the motion to clarify discussion on the constituency, because it is clear that the Senate must conduct the referendum. Keen asked for a clarification of the constituency list Heyman was proposing to use; Heyman replied that he intended the full list be used.

Discussion involved the wording of some of the items on the ballot. Heyman accepted a friendly amendment to note that the library was not an academic department. Heyman emphasized that the import of his motion is the submission of the referendum to the entire constituency. The motion as amended was passed by voice vote.

Vilmann suggested that the Senate provide some accompanying informational material about the proposition. General discussion focused on the appropriate format for this. Heyman suggested that the referendum not be rushed, and that time be allowed for discussion of the proposition. Snyder indicated that the referendum should be conducted within a week to 10 days.

Heuvers moved that the documents produced by the Constitution and Constituency Committee be submitted to the constituency as a referendum for general approval of the direction the Constitution Committee was proceeding - yes or no. Fynewever seconded the motion. Bulleit pointed out that

the documents were not in the form of a referendum. Roblee suggested new wording. Sharik commented that the documents were being forced into a role they were not intended to play, that they were draft documents. Further discussion centered on which administrators might be excluded from the vote on the proposed referendum. The motion was defeated in a voice vote.

George moved: That a single page of pros and cons about the referendum, be submitted along with the referendum, the page to be written by Moore and George. The motion was seconded. Pilling proposed a friendly amendment (accepted), that additional information "pro" be composed by T. Snyder, that information "con" be written by Heuvers, and that a general information sheet be written by Moore and George. Timing of the writing and the balloting was discussed. Roblee said he expected all future Senate referenda to be accompanied by such information sheets. The motion carried without opposition. Further discussion involved the timing of the referendum.

#### VIII. Reports of Affiliated and Ad Hoc Committees

- A. President's Cabinet: Sharik reported that the cabinet had met, and that minutes have been widely distributed. The university is paying attention to the Act on Americans with Disability. This underscores the need for more Senate involvement with the planning process.
- B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force: Chair Vilmann had no report.

#### IX. Old Business

- A. The faculty benefits proposal for spousal tuition was discussed in President Sharik's report.
- B. Salary structure policy: Sharik has asked other universities to send information about the way they structure salaries.

#### X. New Business

- A. Role of the Senate in unionization effort: Sharik has received memos of strongly supporting the idea that the Senate should be involved in educating the constituency about unionization. Some ideas include sponsoring debates between persons for and against unionization, and between competing unions. Julien indicated the Senate has a responsibility to sponsor some informative debates. Discussion indicated a lack of information about the "con" side of the union. Carstens indicated that there should be no problem with Senate sponsorship of debates.

Julien moved: That the Senate sponsor debates or forums about unionization, and that they be timely with respect to election dates. Carstens seconded. The motion passed without opposition. Sharik called for persons to organize the debates or forums. Julien volunteered to convene a debate committee, Bulleit and Jambekar volunteered to serve.

- B. Meeting of Senate with Deans and Chairs/Heads: Sharik asked if the Senate favored such a meeting, based on President Tompkins concern about remuneration or release for persons heavily involved in "shared governance". The idea of the meeting was not supported.
- C. Committee Status for Board of Control Liaison Task Force: Vilmann expressed surprise at the agenda item. After brief discussion, no motion was offered to change the status of the Task Force.
- D. Formation of a Research Policy Committee: Heuvers referred to the memo of the Constitution and Constituency

Committee (Appendix G of these minutes). He noted that important research decisions had been made without Senate input, such as the patent agreement all personnel were required to sign as a condition of their employment. Vilmann moved that the Senate establish a Research Policy Committee. Heuvers seconded the motion. Pilling supported the formation of such a committee. Sharik noted that it would be appropriate for this committee to consider the scientific misconduct policy asked for by Vice-President Lee.

The motion was approved by voice vote. Pilling volunteered to convene the committee. Heuvers indicated that McKimpson would serve on the committee. Waber and Keeble also volunteered to serve.

- E. Proposed Revision of Bylaws: Heuvers referred to the distributed memo titled "Proposed Bylaws Revision" (Appendix H of these minutes). Heuvers moved that the proposed revision be adopted, with the insertion of "chair" as noted. Roblee seconded the motion. Pilling moved that the motion be tabled until results of the referendum are known. Heyman seconded the motion to table. Motion to table was defeated by show of hands. The motion to amend the bylaws passed.

#### XI. Announcements

Sharik announced that the Senate should move rapidly on the numerous items demanding action, including the filling of committees newly created. Shapton announced that the sale of Pelletech and the Erickson Saw Mill were likely to be positive financial transactions for ESI.

#### XII. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Senate Secretary

.