

The Senate of Michigan Technological University
Minutes of Meeting No. 196

I. Call to Order

At 7:08 pm on Wednesday, 17 March 1993, President Sharik called the meeting to order in Room 105, Memorial Union Building.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

26 Senators or alternates were present. Representatives from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Computer Sciences, KRC, Graduate Student Council. Absent Senator-at-large: Boutilier.

III. Recognition of Visitors

J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Secretary Asst.), J. Caron (President of MTU Undergraduate Student Government), J. Glime (Biol. Sci.), M. Goodrich (MTU Tech Topics), K. Lipmann (MTU Lode), W. Scheuerman (State University of New York-Oswego).

IV. Special Report on Faculty Unionization

President Sharik announced that a special report would be presented before passing on to the regular Senate business. Sharik introduced William Scheuerman, who was appearing as a result of the Senate's request for a union representative to discuss relationships between faculty unions and university senates.

In his presentation, Scheuerman pointed out that faculty are unionized at first-rate universities, that the job of administration is to serve the faculty, and that unions insure that this occurs. He reviewed his personal experiences with unions, saying that unions strengthen faculty governance, and that union contracts may include senate by-laws, which can put teeth into senate decisions.

Hubbard asked about the organization of the SUNY union. Scheuerman replied that the SUNY system is unusual, with a single union having chapters on each campus with autonomous leadership; some union leaders are elected statewide. Carstens asked whether Scheuerman's turn toward unionization was gradual or the product of an administrative "atrocitity". Scheuerman said that it was combination of the two. Glime asked whether unions resulted in improved relationships between administrators and faculty. Scheuerman said that it did, providing examples from his personal experience at SUNY. He said a faculty union was a craft union, not an industrial union.

Sharik asked about salary structure and unionization. Scheuerman described the procedures for the SUNY system, including across-the-board raises, merit raises, various awards, and union participation in the budgeting process. Whitt asked Scheuerman to address concerns about local union autonomy and affiliation with national union groups. Scheuerman replied that the local unions are autonomous, although the SUNY situation is somewhat unusual with its 32 local chapters. He said their national group, the American Federation of Teachers, obtains a percentage of local dues and operates on issues at the national level. Glime asked how

merit pay worked under the union, to permit department heads flexibility. Scheurman replied that the issue of merit pay would be the subject of local bargaining, and that if the status quo was satisfactory, it could be continued.

Mullins asked how the SUNY unions handled the problems of salary contraction like that occurring at MTU, and whether the SUNY unions had ever gone on strike. Scheurman replied that the concept of a strike in higher education was absurd; other methods are more effective. He said also that tight budgetary periods had occurred in New York, that the administrative response before unionization was to cut faculty, that the current procedure for layoffs requires due process, and that the administrations cooperate with the unions in maintaining job security. Sharik asked whether the unions in SUNY had worked with Total Quality Management (TQM). Scheurman replied that they had, although the faculty helped set the goals of the program through their unions. Leifer asked whether the unions had any input in setting salaries of administrators. Scheurman replied that the unions did not have such input, and did not want to have it; however, the unions did make note of large administrative salary increases, and made these a point of future negotiation or of local publicity.

Sharik thanked Scheurman for his report, and called a 5-minute recess.

V. Minutes

The minutes of Meeting No. 195 were accepted and corrected. Keen noted that pagination of the minutes of Meeting 195 were incorrect as distributed, but would be corrected for the official record. Leifer moved that the minutes be approved as corrected; Grzelak second the motion. The motion was approved without opposition.

VI. Senate President's Report

- A. Senate Office: Sharik reported that the University Senate phone number was 487-3331, with office hours approximately from 2 to 4 pm.
- B. Sharik conferred recently with President Tompkins. Tompkins was concerned that the faculty had yet to evaluate his performance, even though he had specifically requested such evaluations every six months. Hubbard mentioned that institutional evaluations last spring only included deans and department heads.
- C. Sharik reported that the SPIN system, a tool to search for funding sources for research and other academic projects, was

not being repurchased by the Research Office because it was little used. Sharik indicated that he had information on less expensive alternate plans for maintaining the system.

- D. Sharik had received a note of thanks from Ellen Horsch for distributing the minutes to a wider audience.
- E. Board of Control matters: Sharik noted that the Board of Control now has a local representative, Dr. Kenneth Rowe. Sharik spent 1.5 days with Rowe in a workshop. Sharik had asked Rowe to transmit the Senate's regrets at not being able to attend this week's Board meeting in Detroit. Sharik also asked Rowe to invite the Board's opinion on the draft constitution.

F. Sharik indicated that as Senate president he was appointed a member of the TQM/TQE Steering Committee, along with the vice-presidents and S. Bowen, chair of the University's Planning and Vision Committee. The Steering Committee has participated in a workshop conducted by the 3M Corporation. Sharik said that a TQE representative will be invited to address the Senate to clarify the concept of TQE.

Sharik said that he has warned the Steering Committee that TQE must not be seen as being a top-down imposition on the faculty. Whitt asked whether the process was in fact a top-down decision, because the Senate was never consulted about whether the program should be instituted. Sharik replied that her statement was correct, and that if people did not participate in TQE, then it does not work.

G. The Senate has had \$500 added to its budget to deal with printing the mailings about the constitutional revision. The source of the funds is President Tompkins.

H. Sharik announced that in the spirit of collegiality, the Senate meeting would adjourn to the Ambassador Restaurant.

VII. Vice-President's Report

Vice-President Vilmann reported that he was not going to attend the meeting of the Board of Control in Detroit because of lack of funding. He said that he had looked through their agenda, and had found two interesting items. The first was a recommendation that retirement medical co-payment not be reduced from 20 percent to 15 percent; Vilmann had forwarded a copy of their documentation to Leifer, Chair of the Senate Fringe Benefits Committee. The second item was a report on University finances. No supporting documentation was attached to the agenda.

Leifer said that the document on the medical program recommended continuation of the program.

VIII. Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy Committee. S. Beske-Diehl read a report from Chair Bornhorst: "The Committee expects to soon receive a revised proposal from the School of Technology on establishment of a B.S. degree. Upon receipt of the revised proposal the committee will continue its review."

B. Constitution and Constituency Committee. Chair Heuvers reported that copies of a draft revised constitution (Appendix A of these minutes) had been circulated to all constituents, to prospective constituents, to the administration, and to the Board of Control. He stated that the proposed constitution would expand the constituency and authority of the Senate, and summarized the main points of the revision. Heuvers announced that an Open Forum on the revision would be held on April 24.

C. Elections Committee. Chair Heyman said petitions would be circulated for nominations for Senators-at-large, the Committee on Academic Tenure, the Athletic Council, the Sabbatical Leave Committee, and the General Education Committee.

D. Fringe Benefits Committee. Chair Leifer reported that after the Senate's unanimous vote in January favoring the retirement benefits package, the Committee sent a letter to Provost Powers with copies to the other vice-presidents, requesting a meeting to incorporate the remainder of the benefits package in the 1993-94 budget. The administration is costing out the package with various insurance and actuarial companies; the Committee hopes to have their report by 1 April.

Leifer also commented that there was an inaccuracy in Provost Powers statement at the previous Senate meeting that the health benefits package at Northern Michigan University

was not as good as MTU's. Leifer said that MTU personnel can accrue 132 days of sick leave but that NMU personnel can accrue 195 days, with 50 percent of the unused sick leave paid at retirement.

Grzelak said that NMU's faculty enjoyed a larger contribution to TIAA-CREF retirement, and suggested that over the long term this was important. Leifer replied that the Committee was looking at this.

- E. Institutional Evaluation Committee. Chair Hubbard said that the Committee's report (Appendix B of these minutes) was attached to the agenda, and showed how policy might be established at Michigan Tech under the proposed constitution.

Sharik asked whether the document answered the expressed concerns of the Board of Control about the flow of proposals through the University, or whether it dealt only with flow through the Senate. He asked whether the Committee was concerned with some sort of higher group like an executive council that brought together aspects of Senate decision-making with the Student and Staff Councils for example. Hubbard replied that the flow-chart showed how the input of these groups interacted with Senate committees. He said that the expanded Senate was envisaged as the central body in the decision-making process.

- F. Instructional Policy Committee. Chair Heuvers said there was no report. Vilmann asked about the status of the teaching honor roll that the Senate approved some time ago. Heuvers replied that the Center for Teaching Excellence had at first said the development of the honor roll was a minor item, but now reported it to be a major problem involving much paperwork.

Heuvers said that the Center was now asking individual faculty to submit photocopies of their evaluations if they

Page 3774 Minutes of Senate Meeting 196 17 Mar 1993

qualified for inclusion on the Honor Roll. Sharik commented that S. Bowen, head of Biological Sciences, had informed the Center in a memo that departments and individual faculty should not be involved with Honor Roll identification, that faculty would be reluctant to reveal their evaluations. Heuvers said that the Center has a severe shortage of resources. Glime commented that Bowen had refused on principle to handle even the paperwork the Center was asking of the departments. Whitt asked whether the faculty were going to be notified of the proposal for self-identification. Sharik said the entire problem needs elaboration.

- G. Research Policy Committee. Chair McKimpson said the Committee was continuing to review the scientific misconduct policy, and would report to the Senate with its recommendations. The Committee is still expanding, and is looking for a member from the College of Engineering. McKimpson distributed a letter (Appendix C of these minutes) asking Senators and constituents to provide the Committee with input on areas of concern. McKimpson specifically asked for feedback about the problems created by removal of the mainframe computer.

Whitt asked whether the Committee was or should be involved in the problem with scientific misconduct in the University recently reported by the student newspaper. McKimpson replied that the Committee's input would be confined to a review of the procedures with which such cases would be

managed in the future. He said that the case was being dealt with by a separate committee not connected with the Senate, which was appropriate.

Moore said that a major problem with removal of the large computer was that the library will not be able to operate its catalog, and that finding and funding a replacement system has been a problem. Sharik said that he had received a letter from Phyllis Johnson of the Library, asking to make a presentation to the Senate on the subject of its choice of replacement.

- H. Financial Planning & Policy Committee. Chair Jambekar said the Committee was still looking for members, because only four were currently serving. He referred to the request for members (Appendix D of these minutes) circulated with the agenda.

Whitt inquired about the diversion of academic funds as a part of the retirement package approved last year. It seems that departments with MPSERS retirees have been losing six months of the retirees' position salaries, and the diversion of academic funds to support non-academic activities like retirement seems extraordinarily bad precedent and practice. Jambekar said he would bring up the issue with the University's Financial Officer in an upcoming meeting. Leifer referred to the recent Board of Control document that explained the situation. Whitt read the passage: "The assumption was made that the MPSERS lump sum payout on retirement would be paid from departmental funds realized by not filling vacant positions for a period of six months." Whitt wondered whether the Board of Control had made that assumption. Leifer said the assumption had been made by the now-defunct University Financial Advisory Committee and by Bert Whitten, and that the charge of the Fringe Benefits Committee is to develop a satisfactory fringe benefits program, while the charge of the Financial Planning and Policy Committee is to implement it in an adequate way, and if they do not consider this adequate then they can make whatever funding arrangements they want.

Heyman said that the issue is important, and that small departments especially can be significantly impacted in personnel, finances, and union problems. Whitt said the issue was one of principle and of dangerous precedent. Hubbard said the policy was the result of an attempt to make MPSERS and TIAA-CREF retirement plans equitable, which was very difficult. Sharik said the problem was not one of disparity, but of fund diversion. Heyman said the issue was one of trying to do it cheaply. Diebel said the current policy can lead to a department head considering age as a factor in lay-off. Leifer said that Heads/Chairs were asked by Bert Whitten if they could accommodate this method of funding; they had replied that replacement of faculty would take at least six months, and that temporary replacements could be hired to cover other positions. Leifer agreed in principle that the funds should not come from academic areas. Moore said that the Library was hurt particularly because three-fourths of its personnel was covered by the MPSERS plan, and that numerous retirements were going to occur soon.

Heyman said that the Senate should consider going on record as opposing having academic and similar units pay for MPSERS retirements out of their budgets. Jambekar said the money had to come from somewhere. Heyman said that the issue of principle needed to be considered immediately, and the study of the source of money could be taken up later. Roblee asked from where the money was to come for the health plan. Leifer said it was to come from funds set aside for that purpose. Roblee asked why the MPSERS funds could not be

covered the same way. Leifer replied that particular question would have to go to the administration. Leifer said that the problem should be thought through well, and the motion written out. Sharik said the spirit of the motion could be an expression of Senate concern, that the Senate had no input to the decision to divert academic funds.

Whitt moved that the Senate express its concern about the diversion of academic funds to cover the MPSERS retirement benefits and that the Financial Planning & Policy Committee propose a motion addressing the issue. Leifer seconded the motion. Sharik said the motion was a long one. Jambekar said that the Committee could do little more than report back to the Senate about the issue, because the decision has already been made. Keen read the motion from notes, "that the Senate expresses its concern about the diversion of academic funds to cover the MPSERS retirement and that the Financial Planning and Policy Committee is to study and report back to the Senate on the problem." Whitt said the latter part of the reading made the motion more general than her original statement, but that it was appropriate. Jambekar expressed satisfaction with the reading. The motion carried by voice vote without opposition.

IX. Reports from Affiliated and Ad Hoc Committees

A. President's Cabinet. Sharik reported that President Tompkins' cabinet met on February 23rd. There were two items of interest to the Senate.

First, Provost Powers told the Cabinet that he had presented the budget at a number of open forums and now it is

Page 3775 Minutes of Senate Meeting 196 17 Mar 1993

ready to go to the Board of Control on March 19. He stated that the draft will be discussed at the Board meeting and will come back to campus for further discussion.

Sharik said that the Cabinet had taken no vote on the budget, and that he was asking Jambekar to obtain some documentation of the changes that had occurred in the budget as a result of all the discussions. Jambekar said that without comments from the forums, there could be no changes. Sharik said that some pretty strong comments had been made in the Senate relative to the balance in academic spending, but that had not resulted in any changes in the budget presented in the Cabinet.

Second, J. Galetto presented a report to the Cabinet on enrollment management and the relationship between general engineering program and engineering technology. Galetto had said he will be getting together with T. Collins, and will be sending a letter to rejected engineering applicants asking them to consider the option of engineering technology.

In addition, the Cabinet had discussed the vice-presidential car allowances. Some Cabinet members had pointed out that the amount about equalled the total of new acquisitions for the library. Employee recognition awards had been given a budget of \$36,000. The Cabinet had discussed whether faculty should be included in the award program. Sharik had agreed to bring the question back to the Senate. Sharik said the question fell between the cracks of existing committee areas, and asked the Financial Planning & Policy Committee, and the Fringe Benefits Committee to decide among themselves which committee ought to deal with the question.

Whitt asked about the nature of Cabinet meetings, and whether the Cabinet actually made any decisions, or whether it only discussed decisions that were presented to it. She expressed concern about the potential for manipulation of such discussion. Sharik said that the Cabinet never voted on issues brought to it. Whitt asked whether anybody on the Cabinet ever asked for a vote. Sharik replied that nobody had, to his knowledge. Sharik said that the Cabinet served to provide feedback to other bodies, acting in an advisory capacity. Whitt said that when serious issues, such as the automobile allowance, are brought to the Cabinet, apparently there is no way of expressing the collective concern of the body, and she found this distressing. Sharik said that it was possible for the Senate to recommend through his advisory capacity that the Cabinet function in a specific way, that it vote on issues, for example. Whitt said that because the Cabinet was not recognized on the flow-chart proposed by the Institutional Analysis committee, it might not be wise to alter its function. Hubbard said the Cabinet was off-line in the flow-chart, because in making policy the Senate should have the direct line through the President to the Board of Control and because the Cabinet was too diffuse to be a decision-making body. Hubbard also said that the automobile allowance was a Board of Control policy, and the Cabinet or any other body could do little about it. Sharik said that the Cabinet was advisory only, not a decision-making body.

B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force. Chair Vilmann reported that Sharik had arranged a luncheon with himself and Ken Rowe, a new member of the Board of Control.

C. Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Policy. Lukowski summarized the report of the Committee (Appendix E of these minutes). Mullins asked whether this Committee or some other could follow the long-term effects of the recent enrollment cap. Bulleit said that Mullin's term "cap" referred to the high GPA and ACT scores required for admission to various engineering programs, and the reason for such criteria is to reduce enrollment in overloaded programs by the only permissible mechanism. He commented that this was inefficient, but that a true cap based on numbers was not permitted in the University, and that a limit to enrollment was needed to ensure a quality education for students. Whitt asked why caps based on numbers are not allowed. Bulleit said that he did not know. J. Caron commented that the reason given in the Cabinet for the no-cap policy is to avoid discouraging potential applicants. Grzelak said that part of the problem is the difficulty of predicting actual enrollment from numbers of applicants.

Sharik said there is a continuing interest in the problem, and asked whether enrollment policy should be examined further by this Ad Hoc Committee or by the Instructional Policy Committee, for example. Mullins said the Ad Hoc Committee should be retained, that he was amazed that a major academic policy has historically had no Senate input, and that this seemed an obvious area for the Senate to set policy as well as advise. Sharik said that this Ad Hoc Committee could be made a standing sub-committee within the Curricular Policy Committee. Vilmann said that enrollment policy had little to do with Curricular Policy and that a standing committee was needed. Mullins said the Senate should be leading the way on this matter. Sharik asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee would bring to the next meeting a report on the creation of a new committee, to be named the Enrollment Management Committee. Lukowski said that the current method of enrollment capping is poor policy, because the applicants qualified under stringent admission guidelines were qualified for much more

prestigious universities, and that a smaller percentage of such admissions were likely to appear on campus; he suggested that the effect might be a deficit of three or four hundred students.

- D. Ad Hoc Committee for Discussion of Unionization. In the absence of Chair Julien, committee member Whitt said that the visit by Scheurman was part of the committee's efforts to promote discussion and that another speaker would be presented at the next Senate meeting. The Committee has yet to hold a meeting. Discussion among members has involved formats for future presentations. Hubbard asked whether it might be possible to have a representative from an institution more like Michigan Tech; the SUNY system with 10,000 faculty members seems atypical. Whitt said she did not know whether there were any unionized faculties like Michigan Tech, with a strong engineering program. Bulleit suggested the University of Maine.
- E. Public Safety Advisory Board Liaison Person. Fynewever said the Board has been meeting every two weeks, and has been addressing the image of Public Safety. The Board's consensus had been for the officers to improve their communications by getting to know RAs better for example, and to convey an image of professionalism and service. The officers are going through sensitivity and first aid/CPR training. Public Safety is looking at a name change. The Board's next task will be development of policy covering when sidearms may be drawn.

Page 3776 Minutes of Senate Meeting 196 17 Mar 1993

X. Old Business

There were no requests from the floor to consider any old business. Sharik called for a short break of 5-minutes.

XI. New Business

- A. Agenda Item - Discussion of Draft Constitution: Sharik introduced USG President J. Caron and asked for his comments on the draft constitution. Caron addressed the subject of liaison positions. The Draft lists three such positions from USG, Graduate Student Council, and the Staff Council, all non-voting members of the Senate. He cited his experience that such non-voting members rarely work, and rarely become as involved in the process as voting members. Caron suggested the creation of a standing Senate committee consisting of the presidents of the Senate, USG, GSC and Staff Council, who would meet on a regular basis to provide some coordination between the groups outside of the Cabinet. Proposals could be developed jointly among the groups, and each group could forward proposals to the administration, with a resulting greater weight.

Glime said that the rationale for including students as liaison members of the Senate was to permit student input on issues that occur during Senate deliberations. Caron repeated his point that the liaison persons do not become involved, and that there is likely to be little interest in individuals serving in the position. Sharik said that Caron's comments were a good example of valuable input from a liaison sort of position. Caron said that the undergraduate position had not been used that way in the past. Glime said that the liaison persons should report at each Senate meeting, just as Senate committees report. Heuvers said such reports should come at the beginning of the meetings so the liaison persons did not

have to sit through entire sessions. Glime replied that their input might be valuable at any time pertinent subjects were raised on the floor. Heyman said there were two implications in Caron's proposal, and the first problem was that of the liaison. The second implication was that initiative would be forwarded from the meeting of the four groups, possibly modified from initiative passed by the Senate. This is a problematic change from the current Draft. Caron replied that this interpretation was reversed from his idea, which was that ideas would come from the meeting of each of the four groups, and be forwarded individually by each of the four groups. Heyman said he was glad that this had been clarified.

Grzelak said that he and the majority of his constituents favored an academic faculty senate, that the proposed senate was too diffuse, and that its deliberations would take too much time. Glime said that the reasoning for the proposed structure was to provide the possibility of immediate input from non-faculty groups, although the faculty will retain the majority of votes. The service groups are more likely to follow through with senate proposals because they will be aware of faculty thinking on the issues. Mullins said that the proliferation of committees on campus resulted in little being done as a result of referrals among committees. He said this was an effective management technique to keep the Senate from accomplishing anything. Heyman said that two of the issues considered in the current meeting provided a practical illustration of the importance of a broader Senate: the impact of the MPSERS retirement policy on the Library, and the problems of enrollment. Sharik said that there was a mechanism for deciding on who would vote on particular issues. Grzelak said the same mechanism can lead to problems, such as arguments on who can vote on what issues; the proposed senate lacks unity of purpose. Heuvers said that academic faculty would be in the majority in the proposed senate. Hubbard said that the proposed senate would consist of only two groups, the whole senate and an academic caucus, and that splintering within the whole body would not be a problem. Beske-Diehl said that making the body larger would make it smarter and stronger, that a broader body would avoid passing proposals that were vetoed because they were not enforceable.

Whitt said that Grzelak's constituency should attend the forums on the new constitution, and that problems were inevitable with any new proposal. However, between the diffusion that is current and the proposed alternative, the choice seems clearly to favor the new constitution. Heuvers said that written comments from Vable included a suggestion that the broader senate meet at least once per quarter, with the academic portion of the senate meeting more frequently. Diebel said that the Institute of Wood Research had worked hard at blurring the distinction between academic faculty and research faculty.

Keen said he had a problem with the definitions of academic faculty in the draft Bylaws, particularly with the inclusion of the adjectives "visiting" and "adjunct", and said individuals whose home institution was not Michigan Tech had no business being constituents of the proposed senate. Heyman said they were not on the payroll, and hence could not be considered constituents. Keen replied that point was irrelevant, since the bylaws did not make such a distinction. Glime said the intent of the wording was to permit "some cases" to be members of the constituency. Mullins said that the word "adjunct" was not on the list of adjectives. Keen replied that "adjunct" was an adjective and was not excluded from the sample listing. Mullins said that the designation "visiting" included full-time faculty on tenure track who had

not received their green card, and that adjunct faculty were rarely salaried employees. Keen asked how much salary a faculty member had to earn to be a constituent. Mullins said that adjuncts frequently were jointly listed among departments. Beske-Diehl said that the wording should be taken under advisement to indicate persons clearly departmental members. Sharik said the point clearly needed to be addressed.

Beske-Diehl noted that Geology was the incorrect name for her department. She inquired about the ballot initiatives described on page 11 and 6 of the Draft, particularly the wording that "20% of the eligible senators can request a Ballot Initiative". She said that 20% represented only 8 Senators, and that her department wanted this figure changed to 50%. Hubbard said that this was an error, and should be 20% of the eligible constituents. Heuvers said that it was not an error, and the committee was presenting the Senate with a proposal for 20% of the senators. There was further confused discussion of the point, then it was agreed to delete the reference to 20%.

Whitt referred to Section D on page 16 and asked for the rationale behind the change in wording between subsection

Page 3777 Minutes of Senate Meeting 196 17 Mar 1993

A, "Responsibilities and Authority" and subsection B, with omission of "Authority". Sharik said it represented a division of matters over which the proposed senate was to have real authority. In one part the senate will "initiate and establish" policy; in the other part it will "participate in" the formation of policy. Whitt suggested a rewording, to which Heuvers agreed.

Diebel referred to Section 2-B on page 18, and asked if this indicated that only research faculty were to have input on matters like the allocation of research resources, etc. Heuvers said that the intent was to include both academic and research faculty in this listing. Sharik said the wording was unclear. Heyman said that the document might include comments indicating legislative intent.

Bulleit referred to page 2, Article III, section A, the sentence "The Senate is the representative body for its constituents and speaks for them on all matters of concern to them or under their jurisdiction", and asked what the latter part of the sentence meant. Heuvers said that, in the case of academic departments, it referred to academic matters. Bulleit said that "matters of concern" included this. Mullins said that "their" referred to the senators' jurisdiction. Bulleit said that this interpretation was precluded by the "or". Mullins said it should be the "Senate's jurisdiction". Glime said that the sentence might be reworded to read in that way. Bulleit said it should be reworded to have meaning. Hubbard said persons had concerns other than academic, for example personal or marital. Glime said that the items of concern was intended to refer to those of the whole constituency. McKimpson asked if it were to be worded "...all matters of concern to these constituents or under the jurisdiction of the Senate." Mullins said he did not recall that this was the committee's intent, and it might better read "...all matters of concern to them under Senate jurisdiction". Sharik said his interpretation was that "matters of Senate jurisdiction" were clearly defined, but that "matters of

concern" were less clear and allowed Senate consideration of matters they might want to address but which were not clearly defined. Moore suggested this might include something like automobile allowances.

Bulleit referred to page 3, Section 3, "veto power", and noted there exist about 8 days at the end of the Spring quarter and the beginning of Fall quarter, in which essentially the same conditions exist as in the summer, which the Draft is trying to avoid. Sharik suggested using the wording "Summer Session". Hubbard suggested using "academic year". Discussion generally shifted to the rationale for using "six months". Whitt suggested that six months was too long, that three months was sufficient. Glime said that six months was allowed in case legal studies were needed, so that the veto could be a final decision. Previous administrative vetoes had taken much longer than six months. The discussion settled on "three months of the regular academic year".

Vilmann suggested that the full departmental name be used rather than ME/EM. Whitt said that the confusion on research persons originated in Section E-2 on page 4. Hubbard suggested that items 4-C-2-c and d on page 10 be deleted; the items appear meaningless. Sharik said that there was confusion among his constituents about the meaning of titles of deans and directors of schools as used in the Draft.

Whitt referred to page 12, line 3, and asked about the reason for limitation to two regularly scheduled meetings. Heuvers said the limitation was due to the senate time frame. There was discussion of the continual footnoting of "Head/Chairs" throughout the document and alternatives.

Sharik reminded the Senate of the open forum on March 24, and said the committee would meet soon thereafter to redraft the document for presentation and voting for adoption. Heuvers reviewed the adoption procedure, which required submission of a draft constitution as an amendment to the current constitution. He said the Senate would have to vote for acceptance at two separate meetings, and then it would be voted on by the constituency with a two-thirds majority needed for acceptance. Heuvers said the votes could be completed by the end of the Spring quarter. Keen asked to which constituency was the constitution to be submitted. Heuvers said it would be the full constituency. Keen said the current constitution required submission to the academic faculty. Heuvers replied that the current constitution was unclear, calling for "submission to the academic faculty", with voting by the "general faculty". Sharik said the spirit called for submission to the constituency. Heuvers said this meant the full constituency.

- B. As an informational item, Sharik said that all presentations to the Senate needed to be scheduled through himself.
- C. Vilmann distributed copies of a memo (Appendix F of these minutes) written by Dean Watwood to Heads/Chairs of engineering departments concerning teaching evaluations. Vilmann said the sense of the memo is to make any teacher with an evaluation below 2.5 a "problem teacher". Vilmann said that the figure is arbitrary, and the entire memo runs counter to the spirit in which the evaluation program was initiated. He said the Senate should consider rescinding its approval of the evaluation system if it is going to be employed in this fashion.

Whitt asked if the move was unilateral, or if the deans had been directed to do this. She also asked how this would be viewed in the light of TQE. Vilmann said the memo represented an ill-considered position. Heyman said this was a first step toward putting the numbers of the evaluation in stone, even though the meaning of the numbers is not clear.

Keen noted that the Senate knows that 4.5 represents a "master teacher" because it had voted this number. Heyman said he was suspicious of this fact. Grzelak asked if the memo indicates a violation of the confidentiality of the evaluation, which is supposed to go only to the individual faculty and to the heads/chairs. Heuvers said the data also go to the deans, to be used in promotion, tenure and salary decisions. Heyman said that the memo might better have asked for a brief report on the particular situations.

Sharik asked if the matter should be referred to the Instructional Policy Committee. Vilmann said the report should appear quickly, because there was concern that it might be institutionalized in his department. Mullins said his concern was with tying the evaluations to TQE.

D. Grimm said that Vable had asked him to inquire whether anything was being done about the evaluation of administrators. President Tompkins has requested an evaluation of his own performance. Hubbard said that the Institutional Evaluation would handle it.

Page 3778 Minutes of Senate Meeting 196 17 Mar 1993

XII. Adjournment

Sharik asked for a motion to adjourn. Grimm moved that the meeting adjourn. There was a majority of seconds. President Sharik declared the meeting adjourned at 11:10 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

.