

The Senate of Michigan Technological University
Minutes of Meeting No.193

I. Call to Order

President Sharik called the meeting to order at 6:06 pm on Wednesday, 9 December 1992, in Ballroom B of the Memorial Union Building.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

22 Senators or alternates were present. Representatives from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Army ROTC, IWR, KRC, Metallurgical & Materials Engineering, Physical Education, Graduate Student Council. Absent Senator-at-large: Roblee.

III. Recognition of Visitors

K. Lipman (MTU Lode), P. Joyce (Business Administration), Janis Coleman-Plouff (Senate Secretary Asst.).

IV. Minutes

The minutes of Meeting No. 192 were accepted, corrected, and approved as corrected.

V. Senate President's Report

- A. Senate Constituency: A petition for a referendum for a Faculty Senate was introduced at the previous Senate meeting and was amended by the Senate. On 5 November 1992 the petition was withdrawn by the petitioners in a phone call to Sharik from T. Snyder (Biological Sciences). At the Cabinet meeting of 1 December 1992, President Tompkins stated that he intended to refer to the Senate all petitions to amend the Senate Constituency. (This statement was quoted in the 4 December issue of Tech Topics.) President Tompkins also stated that it was his intent that any constituencies excluded from a reconstituted Senate would be represented in university affairs in some alternative way. Sharik stated that his own remarks concerning constituency quoted in the same Tech Topics were not meant to trivialize the issue.
- B. Shared Governance: In a meeting of Senators with the Michigan Tech Board of Control on 20 November 1992, Board members expressed concern over a lack of clarity in the decision-making processes of the University. The processes involve the Senate, the Cabinet, the central administration, and the Board of Control. The Board suggested that the Senate explicitly formulate the processes, and put them in diagrammatic or flow-chart form.

Bornhorst displayed a current flow-chart for academic programs used by the Provost's Office. Vilmann explained that the Board does not want to deal with multiple and perhaps conflicting proposals from various groups within the University; they prefer that proposals come to them after some consensus has been reached in some university-wide forum. Vilmann stated that President Tompkins had then stated that the Cabinet was now that forum. Julien said that past procedure has been for the University President to forward Senate proposals to the Board with his approval, but that President Tompkins has not wanted to use that procedure.

Thus, the Board wants to know what are the current lines for decisions about proposals from the university community. Heuvers asked what committee should handle the preparation of such a flow-chart. Sharik said that this along with other matters of shared governance should be handled by the Institutional Evaluation Committee and the Constitution & Constituency Committee. Whitt asked where a proposal about lines of decision would go. Sharik thought it first would go to the President, then the Cabinet, then back to the Senate for revisions, and then to the President and Cabinet for final approval before going to the Board. Leifer asked what was wrong with the previous procedure, with proposals from the Senate going to the President, to be forwarded to the Board if the President approved them. He inquired about the specific role of the Cabinet? Sharik and Julien said that President Tompkins does not forward proposals to the Board without Cabinet discussion and approval. Whitt questioned whether the Cabinet needs to be in the flow charts, because the President's prerogative is to consult with whom he will. Leifer asked whether Senate-proposed decision-making procedures would be reviewed by the Cabinet, even if the Cabinet might be excluded from the procedures. Julien replied that the proposals would be certainly be reviewed by the Cabinet. Sharik commented that the Board may insist that the Cabinet be included on the flow charts. Vable questioned whether the Cabinet was a recognized body like the Senate. Sharik replied that it was not. Boutilier said that Sharik's previous comments implied that it was certainly functioning as one, and that its current role was demeaning to the Senate.

Sharik ended the discussion, saying that the Board wanted the procedures formalized and that the Senate was responsible for the task.

- C. Office Space: Sharik reported no office space has been found for the Senate Secretarial Office. President Tompkins had suggested to Sharik that the Senate assist in the process of finding an office. Sharik reported the Library is not available, and asked that suggestions to be brought forward to him.
- D. In-House Committees: There is a need to form a Financial Planning & Policy Committee because the University Financial Advisory Committee is defunct, leaving no avenue for Senate involvement in financial decisions. The Senate Financial Liaison Officer is thus liaison to a non-existent body. President Tompkins wants the university's new Chief Financial Officer and Provost to meet with the Senate Financial Committee.

Numerous concerns about tenure and promotion policies have been communicated to the Senate President; lack of a committee has prohibited the Senate from working in this area. President Tompkins has indicated that the Senate should come forward to address these problems. Bulleit said that the current University Tenure Committee is reviewing procedures, and its proposals must pass through the Senate.

- E. Sharik said that there needs to be an increase in participation in committees, with committees open to the constituency generally. For example there is a need for an ad hoc committee to deal with the problems of remuneration for University service.

- F. Concerning the Senate Research Policy Committee: Sharik reported that there now exists a University Scientific Misconduct Committee. The Senate Research Policy Committee should interact with this committee in some fashion.
- G. Concerning hiring of minorities: Sharik reported that there is an evident University priority for hiring minorities, but the processes for such hiring are not well developed. Positions are available for qualified minority faculty in an unclear way. For example, it appears that an individual faculty member could submit a candidate's name, and the candidate could be hired without the departmental faculty ever approving the hiring. Positions appear to be available on a first come - first served basis. Sharik asked whether the Senate should be involved, perhaps through the Institutional Evaluation Committee. Vilmann commented that there doesn't seem to be enough interest in the problem to warrant committee action. Grzelak commented that if minority hiring is being conducted in this way, it is a violation of University guidelines. Sharik suggested the problem be referred to New Business.
- H. Sharik asked whether the Senate should be represented on the University Executive Council, which consists of the academic deans, and directors of all units. Julien commented that the Senate at some former time was represented on a similar body, but that the senators asked embarrassing questions, so the group was reformed in its current state, without Senate representation. The consensus of the Senate was that the Senate should have representation on this council; Sharik indicated that he would take the matter up with President Tompkins.

VI. Vice-Presidents Report

Vilmann reported that the Board of Control voted to arm the MTU Public Safety division.

VII. Committee Reports

- A. Budget Liaison Officer: Jambekar reported that there is no body to which he may serve as liaison.
- B. Curricular Policy Committee: Chair Bornhorst reported on three items: (1) As directed, Bornhorst met with the Undergraduate Student Government and discussed the Honors Program with these students. The next issue of the Lode will carry an article about the Honors Program. (2) The committee has officially received the proposal for a B.S. in Engineering Technology. The proposal has been distributed to committee members. (3) The Committee recommends that the Senate pass the proposed certificate in Municipal Management (Appendix A of these minutes). Bornhorst moved that the Senate approve the proposed Certificate; Julien seconded the motion. Whitt recommended that there be some additions and deletions to the listed courses in Humanities. The motion for approval was unanimously passed by voice vote.
- B. Elections Committee: Chair Heyman reported that the following results of recent elections: Phyllis Boutilier (Senator-at-Large, term expiring 1994), Susan Bagley (Faculty Alternate to the President's Cabinet, term expiring 8/95), Davis Hubbard (Faculty Alternate to the President's Cabinet, term expiring 8/94), and Jesse Tatum (Faculty Alternate to the President's Cabinet, term expiring 8/93).
- D. Fringe Benefits Committee: Chair Leifer submitted to the Senate a proposal for a sick leave pool (Appendix B of these minutes). He summarized the proposal and recommended that the proposal be examined and discussed within the departments. He suggested that the Senate consider the proposal at its January meeting. Discussion of the proposal concerned the

possibility of the pool's exhaustion, and the permanent loss of sick leave donated to the pool. Sharik suggested having an open meeting to discuss the various questions connected with this issue. A show of hands favored having an open meeting.

Leifer informed the Senate of an error in the 20 percent co-payment of retirement health benefits; it should be 15 percent. Leifer also informed the Senate that since 1 October 1992, the University's contribution to the Michigan State Retirement Fund has been 12.03%, but only 10.55% to TIAA-CREF; this inequity needs to be addressed.

E. Institutional Evaluation Committee: Chair Hubbard indicated there was no report.

F. Instructional Policy Committee: Chair Heuvers distributed a joint report of the Committee and the Center for Teaching Excellence (Appendix C of these minutes). He also distributed a proposal for the Establishment of a Teaching Excellence Honor Roll (Appendix D of these minutes); the distributed proposal included slight modifications of the proposal distributed with the agenda. Heuvers summarized the Teaching Excellence proposal, and moved that the Senate approve the proposal. There were several seconds to the motion. Vilmann said that there is a committee on campus currently revamping teacher recognition. He also said that some of his constituents felt that this proposal would infringe on the confidentiality of their teaching evaluations, and that there is a general feeling that grades impact heavily on teaching evaluations, and that the result of such an award would be further grade inflation. Other comments were: that the proposal was relying too heavily on a single number from the current evaluation process; that this reward process would discourage methods of teaching that challenge students; that teachers would pander to the students to obtain the proposed awards. Bulleit commented that the proposal is not ideal, but the University needs to start rewarding teaching and this provides a starting point. Bornhorst commented that the current methods of rewarding teaching are biased also. Julien said that published analyses of teaching evaluation have indicated that students were the best judges of a teacher's quality. Keeble questioned the sources of these analyses. Heuvers commented that the 4.5 value was a reliable indicator of excellence. Vable said that students are good judges of which teacher is doing a good job. Vilmann noted that lower course levels are associated with lower evaluations. Heuvers said that students are tired of filling out evaluations and not seeing results. Bornhorst noted that major Universities publish all evaluations. In a show-of-hands vote, the proposal passed 13-9.

G. Research Policy Committee: No report.

VIII. Reports of Affiliated and Ad Hoc Committees

A. President's Cabinet: Sharik reported the main issue of direct relevancy to the Senate that had been discussed in the Cabinet dealt with the Senate Constituency.

B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force: Vilmann reported that the meeting with the Board of Control on 20 November went well. The Board of Control now has a better understanding of what is happening in the University, and chances of misunderstanding seem less. The Committee is also working to

inform the Board of faculty activities directly, rather than having information conveyed to the Board through administrators.

- C. Ad Hoc Committee for Discussion of Unionization: Julien reported that before meetings or forums can be scheduled, a date needs to be set for the union election.
- D. Ad Hoc Committee on Provost Search Forums: Sharik reported that the first forum went well. Sharik thanked the panel members who are participating in the forum: Brad Baltensperger, Bill Bulleit, Marilyn Cooper, and Linda Ott.

IX. Old Business

No old business was brought to the floor.

X. New Business

From the Agenda:

- A. Addition of the title "Research Professor" to the Senate constituency: K. Heuvers indicated that the position is occupied by a single person, whose position title was changed at age 65. Heuvers moved that persons with the title "Research Professor" be added to the Senate constituency. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously by voice vote.
- B. Senate appointments to University Committee on Academic Tenure: Sharik indicated that the subject was placed on the agenda as a result of a request from M. Cooper, coordinator of the Academic Women's Caucus. Sharik read the following statement from Cooper, dated 1 December 1992: "As you may know, we are concerned that the University Committee on Academic Tenure this year has no women members. Since this committee not only rules on procedural matters concerning tenure, but also adjudicates formal complaints of sexual discrimination and harassment concerning tenured faculty members, it is especially important this its make up be as fully representative of faculty members as possible. We would like to ask that the Senate reconsider its nomination of Sam Marshall to the Committee, and nominate a woman to the Committee in his place. Let us be clear that we are not assuming that Sam Marshall or any of the other committee members would intentionally discriminate against women in their deliberations. We simply want to assure that women faculty perspectives and experiences, which do differ from those of men faculty, are represented on the committee."

Sharik reviewed the case background, saying the appointment of Marshall as a replacement for MacLennan was based on Marshall's receiving the second highest number of votes in the recent election to the committee. Sharik said he had asked Marshall if he would resign in order to allow the appointment of a woman to the committee; Marshall had indicated his willingness to do this. Sharik had asked MacLennan if she wanted to return to the committee; she had replied that she could not serve on the committee.

Julien said that the request for replacement also ought to be directed to the administration, which is responsible for appointing two of the five committee members. Heuvers pointed out that the missing member had been one of the committee that was appointed by the Senate. Boutilier said she had a request by a woman faculty member not to remove Marshall from the committee. Julien reiterated his suggestion that the administration, rather than the Senate, should be asked to select a woman as one of their appointees to the committee, considering his experiences with the administration appointees. Whitt asked whether this was passing the buck, and said that the spirit of the letter was that a woman ought to be on the committee, but that the fairness of current members of the committee was not in any way impugned. Bulleit

volunteered to resign his own current position on the committee, but said that the recent Senate appointee was the logical point to suggest replacement with a woman. Further discussion concerned procedures for restructuring the committee, the representation of other minorities on the committee, and whether there was a motion on the floor.

XI. Recess and Adjournment

At this point in the discussion, a motion was made and seconded to recess the meeting to permit the presentation of the Senate Forum for a Provost Candidate. The motion passed without opposition. President Sharik declared the meeting recessed at 8 pm.

The meeting was not reconvened at the close of the Forum because of the lack of a quorum. At 10:10 pm, President Sharik declared the meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

.