

The Senate of Michigan Technological University
Minutes of Meeting No. 197

I. Call to Order

At 7:04 pm on Wednesday, 7 April 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. Senators or alternates from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Computer Sciences, Graduate Student Council. Absent Senator-at-large: Vable. KRC was represented by C. Green. President Sharik welcomed the return of P. Boutilier to the Senate.

III. Recognition of Visitors

J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Secretary Asst.), T. Collins (Sch of Tech), J. Glime (Bio Sciences), M. Goodrich (MTU Tech Topics), R. Heckel (Met & Matls Eng), M. Kilpela (Sch of Tech), J. Jamar (Sch of Tech), P. Johnson (Van Pelt Library), K. Lipmann (MTU Lode), D. Poplawski (Ctr Exp Comp), P. Tampas (Sch of Tech), J. Waber (Physics), W. Weingarten (Sch of Tech).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Sharik referred to the Agenda (Appendix A of these minutes) and noted that Item 11.A should include "other related matters", and that there should be added a new item, "11.C Senate appointee to computer executive committee". Sharik also indicated that Item III, Approval of Minutes, would be omitted because the minutes of Meeting 196 had not been distributed.

V. Message from the Provost

Sharik invited the new University Provost, Fredrick Dobney, to address the Senate. Dobney said that if shared governance were to become a reality, relationships between the administration and the Senate would have to be closer than in the past, requiring goodwill and open lines of communication from both parties. Dobney said he had initiated biweekly meetings with the Senate officers and administrators as part of this effort. Citing a need to expose the Senate to the campus and community to help them understand its significance, Dobney suggested that the Senate videotape its meetings and broadcast them on a public access cable channel. Dobney said this was done at Washington State University, where the audience was surprisingly diverse and numerous. He said he would be willing to underwrite the cost of the project, and that it would be a valuable means of communicating with the Senate's constituency.

Asked if he planned to attend Senate meetings regularly, Dobney replied that it was not likely, unless the Senate wanted to ask him about specific plans.

VI. Special Report on the Library

Sharik introduced Phyllis Johnson, Director of the Van Pelt Library, for a presentation about the library. Johnson discussed the library's automation project, which has objectives of bringing the on-line catalog into conformity with the rest of the campus system and of increasing functionality. The opportunity for this is a product of the removal of the IBM main-frame computer. From

four options the library selected a move to the Unix-based NOTIS system, requiring purchase of appropriate hardware. This option will allow access to the full library facility from the campus network. MTU will be an early-release site for the NOTIS software, resulting in increased support during installation. The software is used at many major universities in Michigan, and conforms to ANSI standard Z39.58. Functionality will be improved with an ability to access not only the MTU library's holdings list, but various on-line databases and external library systems. Installation and switching to the new system will occur in January 1994.

Initial questions and answers involved the possibility and the mechanics of accessing various databases, including catalogs of other Michigan libraries, Chemical Abstracts, Science Citation Index, etc. In response to a question about the cost of conversion, the budget for the new system was distributed (Appendix B of these minutes). Johnson explained that most of the expenses were going to be only continuation of current spending. Provost Dobney also responded to the question, saying that some of the expenditure was a one-time expense, and would be paid with some funds that were available on a one-time basis as a result of conservative estimates of the university's budget. Dobney also explained that the University does not have a good budget control system, but it appears that there is a slight surplus that can be used for the library. Johnson said that the budget for book acquisitions is \$90,000, but that journal subscriptions represent 93% of the total acquisitions budget. Other questions involved the library's plans for purchasing various databases.

Sharik thanked Johnson for her presentation and called for a 5-minute break.

VII. Senate President's Report

A. Sharik said that as Senate President he was a member of the Steering Committee for the Total Quality Management (TQM) program. Rebecca Christianson had been scheduled to make a presentation about the program to the Senate, but was out of town and would speak at the next Senate meeting. Sharik said the program is not intended to change the vision of the University, but to use the techniques of TQM to realize the vision. Sharik listed the items on which the Committee had focused in prioritizing TQM objectives: (1) establish enrollment management; (2) develop a performance-appraisal system for all MTU employees based on TQM considerations; (3) develop a five-year plan incorporating all Total Quality

Page 3809 Minutes of Senate Meeting 197 7 Apr 1993

Education (TQE) goals, objectives and measures; (4) improve governance and decision-making; (5) develop a professional-development program for all MTU employees; (6) coordinate departmental graduate program administration for improved efficiency. Sharik said that each member of the Steering Committee had been assigned one of these objectives as a sponsor; the Committee consisted of the MTU vice presidents, the Senate President, and the Chair of the University Planning Committee. Sharik said he was the sponsor for the fourth objective, and that one of the first activities with the TQE approach is to put together a project team to consider the area of governance.

B. Sharik said that on March 29, he and Vilmann had met with Dr. Ken Rowe, a new member of the Board of Control from the local area. Besides opening up avenues of communication with the

Board, the purpose of the meeting was to obtain feedback on the revised constitution. Rowe indicated he had not received any major criticism of the revision, based on initial readings by the Board.

- C. Sharik said that the Senate Council was beginning to meet regularly with Provost Dobney at his request, with the agenda for these meetings open. A. Jambekar, chair of the Senate Financial Planning & Policy Committee, has been asked by the Provost to join these meetings. Other committee chairs may be brought in as the agenda warrants. At the initial meeting, topics included (1) the budget & long-term planning of the budget, including the need for early Senate involvement; (2) the revised Constitution & Bylaws, and the Provost's concerns with these; (3) fringe benefits, with further meetings planned between the Provost, the Fringe Benefits Committee, and the Senate Financial Planning Committee; and (4) the four-year technology program.
- D. Sharik said that if any Senate committee is missing numbers or diversity, its chair should contact the officers.

VIII. Vice-President's Report

Vice-President Vilmann said he had nothing to report.

IX. Committee Reports

- A. Curricular Policy Committee. Chair Bornhorst referred to the Committee report (Appendix C of these minutes) distributed with the agenda, and said the Committee was recommending that the full Senate approve the Proposal for the Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering Technology. Bornhorst noted that the proposal had generated a lot of rumors. An early version had been reviewed by the University Direction & Planning Committee. Bornhorst said the proposal received in December 1992 had since been rewritten, and that the current proposal was in fact new and much different. The issues of need, resources, linkage, and approach had been examined carefully in the original proposal, and the Curricular Policy Committee had asked the School of Technology to make major revisions of the proposal. The Committee had passed the revised proposal with a 7-2 vote.

Bornhorst said that controversy about the proposal turned on two basic issues. The first involved the need of the State of Michigan for the proposed program, and the merit of the program. Bornhorst said the seven positive votes in effect affirmed the need and merit. The second issue involved questions about the appropriateness of the proposed program to the mission of Michigan Tech, including the emphasis on graduate education. These considerations had provoked the two negative votes. The persons voting negatively had written a minority report. Bornhorst distributed copies of the proposal (Appendix D of these minutes) and of the minority report (Appendix E of these minutes).

Sharik called for general questions about the proposal. Mullins asked if the "mission" mentioned by Bornhorst referred to the "vision statement". Bornhorst replied that the vision statement was pretty broad, and that he had implied not only the statement itself, but also connotations invoked in individual imaginations. Roblee said that the vision statement was so broad that it could be interpreted to suit any individual's purpose. Sharik asked about the preferred timetable for handling the proposal. Bornhorst replied that a discussion and vote on the proposal should occur at the next meeting; if approved, the proposal would be implemented in Fall 1994. Mullins asked if there were a written majority report of the Committee. Bornhorst replied there was not, but that the minutes of the meetings were available, and that the

proposal itself represents the majority opinion. Bulleit said the usual practice was for proposals to come from committees merely with a report recommending approval or disapproval, and that the minority report is the unusual feature of this Committee report. Mullins said there ought to be a majority report. Roblee suggested that Mullins read the report. Bornhorst said that the general approach in the revised proposal had been recommended by the Committee, and that the Committee had even edited the wording of the original proposal. Mullins said he would like to see more information about the favorable decision. Bornhorst replied that he could send Mullins copies of the Committee minutes.

Heyman asked for a five-year projection in the enrollment in the proposed program. Collins said they were proposing a no-growth limit of 25 students per year per program, or a total of about 100 students. Heyman asked about the no-growth assumption. Bornhorst said the Committee had asked for and received a detailed analysis of teaching loads in the School of Technology. Heyman asked whether the analysis included the impact outside of the School of Technology, and said that the projected increase of 50 students per cohort would have minimal impact on his department. Bornhorst said that the projected impact depended heavily on the total enrollment in the University.

B. Constitution and Constituency Committee. Chair Heuvers reported that a Third Draft of the revised constitution (Appendix F of these minutes) had been circulated to the Senate with a cover memo from President Sharik. The memo indicated that the full Senate ought to decide the location in the proposed revision of some important sections concerning which subset of the proposed senate was to have authority over certain matters. Sharik commented that these sections had been left in the same position in the Third Draft as in earlier drafts. However, a majority of the Committee now thought they should be relocated. Sharik called for a motion concerning the shifting of the indicated sections.

Roblee moved that items III-F-1-a-5 and III-F-1-a-6 be shifted to fall under part III-F-3-a [i.e., admissions and the academic calendar be shifted from academic to general concerns]. Vilmann seconded the motion. Bulleit asked what the

phrase "and prerequisites" meant in item 5. Vilmann said he assumed it meant high school preparation. Grzelak said he supported the present location of both items as exclusively matters belonging to the academic faculty. Heyman said that part of the concern with the academic calendar lies in previously proposed changes to the semester system. Whitt said that she had read "prerequisites" as meaning course prerequisites within the University.

Whitt said she wanted to hear the committee's reasons for moving these items. Heuvers said the committee did not unanimously favor moving these items. Glime said that admission standards are now set outside of the academic faculty by the administration, and that the shift to consideration by the full senate would maintain the experience and provide for the input of those now handling the problem. She also said the shift in the calendar item would allow for the input of persons concerned with co-op programs and athletics. Whitt said the shift of these items involved two

different issues: the first is associated with the input of information needed to make a decision, and the second is involved with the normative question of what should the standards or calendar be. Whitt said the latter may be an exclusively faculty issue.

Sharik asked Roblee if he would accept a friendly amendment that the items be considered and voted on separately. Roblee said he would. Sharik called for comment on the admissions issue only. Vilmann asked if the item could be clarified by rewording to read "prerequisites for admission", or just deleting "and prerequisites". Roblee accepted a friendly amendment by Vilmann to delete "and prerequisites". The amended motion to shift item III-F-1-a-5 (admission standards) to III-F-3-a passed with a show-of-hands vote, 15-10.

The amended motion to shift item III-F-1-a-6 (academic calendar) to III-F-3-a failed with a show-of-hands vote, 6-16.

Heyman moved to shift items III-F-1-b-2, -3, -4, -5 & -6 to fall under III-F-3-b, with separate votes on each item. Hubbard seconded the motion. Sharik called for separate debate on each item, with admissions procedures to be considered first. Hubbard asked how "procedures" were distinct from "standards", which the Senate had already voted to shift. Grzelak said that the two should be grouped together. Vilmann said that the item covering "standards" involves the establishment of policy, while the item about "procedures" involves only recommendation of policy. Glime said that the problems with procedures are typified by the experience this year with the School of Technology's drop in enrollment. Grimm said that he did not favor having differing responsibilities and voting rights for different members of the Senate, and that the judgement, intelligence, and interests of Senators should be trusted regardless of the individual affiliation. The motion to shift item III-F-1-b-2 on admission procedures passed 20-3 with a show-of-hands vote.

Sharik asked for discussion of shifting item III-F-1-b-3, "student financial aid and scholarship". Grzelak inquired whether it should read "scholarships". Heuvers said that it should. Sharik asked whether it was necessary to include "and scholarships" and Heyman accepted the deletion as a friendly amendment. The motion to shift the amended item passed 16-4, with a showing of hands.

Heyman said that he was opposed to shifting any of items III-F-1-b-4, -5, and -6, because these are concerned with direct administrators; the academic tenured faculty are a collegial body, who stand aside from these administrators in a different way than the hired staff. Glime said that moving item III-F-1-b-3 would bring the constitution in line with current hiring practices for these positions. Heuvers said that these items were put into the academic faculty list to bring the constitution into line with the recent faculty governance proposals. Sharik said the search procedures had been broadened from the governance proposals. Moore said that as a librarian, falling outside of the defined academic faculty, she would like the items to be considered by the whole senate, so that she could have input into who her boss, the Provost, would be. Whitt said that any arguments for confining these items to the academic faculty would have to be based on a presumed special expertise of the faculty. Whitt said she failed to see that the faculty have any such expertise in selecting administrators. Heyman said that he was basing his position not on grounds of expertise but on relative independence. He said that tenure-track and especially tenured faculty have historically had the ability to stand aside from the administration as other groups of

employees have not. Julien said the location of the item made no difference, that the discussion concerned selection of the candidates who were to represent the Senate on search committees for administrative positions. Whitt asked if the current location precluded the representatives who were not academic faculty from making recommendations. Sharik said that it did. Bornhorst said that the current location keeps one group from being represented on these matters, because Staff Council will have their input apart from the Senate. McKimpson said the recommendations should come from a group as broad as possible, that is, the full Senate.

Sharik said that Ken Rowe and the Provost found the new constitution attractive because it did have a broader constituency with less partitioning of the decision-making process. The motion to shift item III-F-1-b-4, selection of university-wide administrators, passed 17-4 with a show-of-hands vote.

Sharik called for discussion of the motion to shift item III-F-1-b-5 on administrative procedures. There was no further discussion. The motion to shift item III-F-1-b-5 passed 20-3 with a show-of-hands vote.

Sharik called for discussion of the motion to shift item III-F-1-b-6 on evaluation of administrators procedures. Bulleit asked if the item meant "university-wide" or "all" administrators, including department heads. Sharik asked the Committee to comment. Moore said she thought it meant university-wide administrators, and proposed a friendly amendment to reword or clarify the item in this way. Heyman said this would require another item to provide for evaluation of administrators who were not university-wide, for example the college deans. Heuvers said the item was based on the governance proposals. Sharik said the item concerned not the process itself, but review of the procedures for evaluation, and that the intent of the committee was to include all administrators. Grzelak said it appeared that evaluations based on the governance procedures distinguished between different levels of administration. Sharik said they did, but that the range of governance procedures covered all administrators. The motion to shift item III-F-1-b-6 passed 19-5 with a show-of-hands vote.

Sharik asked for further comments on the revised constitution. Whitt asked about the input Sharik had received from

a lawyer consultant and from the Provost. Sharik said the Provost was concerned with item III-F-1-a-14 (page 6), which weakened all the previous statements. That is, it is such a general statement that it means anything anyhow, so why specify the other items. Whitt said she did not see the reason for that thinking, that item 14 merely says there might be other matters that the faculty has not thought of that need to be brought up. Sharik said that this appeared to be the intent of the Committee. Keeble said that he wished to propose an amendment, and asked if this was the appropriate time for it. Sharik said amendments should be deferred to Old Business, but that the floor was open for general discussion of the revised constitution.

Referring to item 14, Hubbard said the first 12 items were specific items, that item 13 allowed the Board of Control to give further authority to the Senate. Item 14 gives the

academic portion of the Senate authority to give itself authority, which gets pretty far afield from kinds of authority established in the previous items. Whitt agreed that the item leaves things open, but said she felt strongly that it should remain in place. Without it the senate is relying on the imaginative powers of the Committee to list everything over which the senate would like to have authority; the item allows the senate to add such things to the list. Bulleit said he agreed with Whitt, that our predictive capabilities are limited. Julien suggested changing "other" to "additional to these". Heuvers said that the item might be reworded to allow matters normally handled in the department to be brought before the senate. Grzelak suggested rewording to read "other appropriate matters referred to it by the academic faculty". Jambekar said the document would not remain static, but would evolve. Sharik said the bylaws would certainly change.

Vilmann said the item in previous drafts included "other matters as defined in the Bylaws", and wondered what had happened to that statement. Heuvers said that this item was originally in the bylaws, and had been reworded in moving to the body of the constitution. Glime suggested that the meaning of item 14 might be clarified by simply swapping places with items 13 and 14, with the clear intent of confining the authority to matters similar to those of the first 12 items. Bornhorst said that the item might be reworded to include "other matters usually decided at the department or college level"; this would coincide with the Committee's intent, and would be different from the present open-ended statement. Keen said that a Board of Control lawyer would be insane to recommend approval of a constitution with a provision allowing the faculty to establish policy on any matter whatsoever. He said that the statement guarantees that the document will not be approved by the Board, and that the statement should be deleted if the Senate wants the revised constitution to be approved by the Board. Whitt said this would be caving in to their criticism before there was reason to, and that the elimination of the item would severely limit the areas over which the senate would have authority. Heyman said that even if the senate were able to act on any matter, it does not assume the final authority, which rests with the President and the Board of Control; the proposed authority merely holds them to a more formal structure than the present. Heyman also said that the item could be worded more acceptably, and suggested an alternative. Sharik said new wording as an amendment would have to wait for Old Business on the Agenda.

Heuvers moved that item III-F-1-a-14 be reworded to read "Other matters normally under the jurisdiction of the department referred to the Senate by the academic faculty of the department", and that items 13 and 14 (as reworded) be interchanged. Bornhorst seconded the motion. Mullins said he thought this was a somewhat arcane way to do it, and that the wording used in previous drafts was preferable. Hubbard asked whether this amendment should be proposed under Old Business. Sharik said that it should be.

Hubbard also referred to Section II-D (page 2), concerning election of senators-at-large, and said that senators-at-large should be elected at-large by the whole constituency, not just the academic faculty. Sharik said that the wording is taken from the current constitution. Heuvers said it reflects current practice. Hubbard said that this did not mean that it is correct. McKimpson said that the designation is incorrect and should properly be "faculty senators-at-large" to be consistent. Hubbard said that everybody should be

eligible to be a senator-at-large and that everybody should be able to vote for them.

Sharik introduced some comments about the revision made the day before by Provost Dobney in a meeting with Senate officers. Sharik said that the President, the Provost, and the Board of Control had been given a draft of the revision two weeks before the Senate's meeting in March, and that these comments are the first feedback, negative or otherwise. Sharik said that Dobney was concerned with the addition of authority, which could create confrontation with the Board of Control. The request for authority could put the Board in an awkward situation. Sharik said the officers argued vehemently against this position, and reminded the Provost that the current constitution only allows the Senate to make recommendations on academic matters, and that the Senate is ineffective under such conditions. Sharik said that the Provost seemed to come to appreciate the Senate's position, including the provisions for the president to veto proposals and for the Senate to go directly to the Board. The Provost and the officers had disagreed whether the proposed revision was true shared governance.

Vilmann noted that the Provost had said finally that the revision was something he could live with. Vilmann also said that the Provost was concerned that the authority provision would cause the Board to reject the revision, furthering the confrontational attitude between the Senate and the Board. Whitt said that without the authority, we really didn't have anything. Vilmann said that this was what the officers had told the Provost. Sharik said that the officers also reminded the Provost that the Board retained ultimate authority.

Sharik read from parts of a letter (Appendix G of these minutes) faxed on April 6 to Sharik by attorney Mark Cousens. The Constitution & Constituency Committee had decided to seek a legal opinion of the revised constitution, and Sharik had sent a copy to Cousens, who had agreed to review it without charge to the Senate. Sharik said that the Senate should realize that Mark Cousens had been approached through the American Federation of Teachers, and that Cousens advises on union matters. Hubbard said the lawyer's opinion, that the Board may not be able to delegate authority, leaves open the possibility that the law can be changed; that is, the legislature might allow the Board such delegation.

Page 3812 Minutes of Senate Meeting 197 7 Apr 1993

Sharik said that the Committee did in fact realize that the Board retained ultimate authority, that the revision represented a compromise between a contract and the ability merely to recommend on only academic matters, and that it was written in the spirit of community and of shared governance and shared responsibility. Heuvers said that he agreed with Sharik's assessment. Waber said that it was desirable to have the document outlining the authority, that otherwise we are left with the former situation where we only talk about things, and that without the ability to approach the Board we are left with almost nothing. Whitt said that the alternative to the revision is the status quo, but that the Senate should have no illusions about the legal standing of the revised constitution. Fynewever asked how the document might be affected by the future possibility of unionization. Hubbard said that the constitution could be made part of a union

contract. Whitt said that this had occurred at other institutions. Sharik said that the letter from attorney Mark Cousens argued this point exactly. Heyman said that if there were any conflict between a Senate policy and union contract with the Board, the contract would be a much stronger legal document than the Senate policy, which is essentially a recommendation to the Board of Control. Julien said that inclusion of a Senate constitution in a union contract makes the constitution a much stronger document. Heyman said the Senate is not legally capable of interfering with a union contract. Boutilier said that inclusion of a constitution in a union contract would have to be bargained.

Sharik called for a 10-minute break at 9:40 pm.

C. Elections Committee. Chair Heyman reminded the Senators that he had sent out nominating forms for Senator-at-large and for membership on the University Committees on Academic Tenure, Sabbatical Leave, and General Education. Heyman said that Sharik had been notified by Sam Marshall that Marshall intends to leave the Committee on Academic Tenure, and a replacement is needed. Heyman reminded the Senate that Marshall had been appointed to serve in place of MacLennan, who had resigned. Heyman had talked with MacLennan, who said that her initial letter of resignation (Appendix H of these minutes) had requested replacement for the 1992-93 academic year, and that she would like to return to serve her third year, 1993-94. Heyman suggested that the Senate ask MacLennan to serve. Sharik said that if there were no objections, MacLennan would be considered a Senate appointee to the Committee on Academic Tenure.

D. Fringe Benefits Committee. Chair Leifer announced four items for discussion. First, the cost analysis is late for the remaining two-thirds of the retirement benefits package. As soon as the analysis arrives, the Committee will meet, analyze the results, and report to the Senate.

Second, the sick leave pool proposal was presented to Provost Dobney on April 7. The Provost seemed to be in favor of the proposal, and was giving it to CFO McGarry for a rapid analysis. The Provost said it might be presented to the Board by their May meeting and implemented as soon as June or July.

Third, Leifer referred to a proposal for supplemental health benefits package (Appendix I of these minutes) distributed to the Senate. Leifer said that the package put together last year unintentionally excluded two classes of TIAA-CREF participants who are not covered now. The number of these individuals are few, so the proposal is a low-cost item. As an illustration of the first class, Leifer cited the example of Harold Lord, who died last year with a total of 79 retirement points. His spouse would not have been able to obtain retirement health benefits. The second class includes individuals on long-term disability who have used up their allotment of sick leave. The supplemental benefits package would pay their health care; the cost is probably low, in any individual case, because the individual is likely to either die or return to work. Leifer said that this benefit also addresses the needs of younger faculty, not retirees.

Fourth, Leifer addressed some comments he had heard that Bill McGarry had made. Leifer said that McGarry's estimates of "millions of dollars" for the costs of certain programs does not mean an up-front cost. Rather, the requirements of the FASB, the Federal Accounting Standards Board, are that the funds for the program be set aside yearly, so that over time a considerable sum will be built up and may become a self-sustaining program. Hence, an announced \$20 million cost estimate for a program does not indicate an up-front or an annual cost.

Heuvers asked about the "Patient Advocate" brochure and new imprint on the pocket card recently distributed by Traveler's to MTU employees. Leifer said that it represented no change in the MTU program, despite the imprint on the Traveler's card. Leifer explained that the program was mandatory for all Traveler's participants except MTU, and that using the standard cards saved the University the cost of printing special cards with a different message. The brochure circulated with the new cards indicated the program was not mandatory.

Roblee asked to address a comment to Leifer. Roblee said that what had happened with fringe benefits was not quite fair to individuals on the MPSERS retirement plan. The particular issue was the two percent given in lieu of the MPSERS retirement health package. Roblee said that Leifer's statement, that employees with MPSERS have health insurance coverage at retirement, is not necessarily true. Roblee said MPSERS works by allowing health benefits to accumulate at 10% per year after 20 years on MPSERS; after 30 years of employment an individual would have 90% coverage. Thus the statement's last comment, that "the above request is already met by MPSERS participants", is not quite accurate. Roblee said Leifer should look into the MPSERS plan a little bit more. Leifer replied that the Committee had looked at this, that MPSERS individuals with 10 or 15 years of service have this coverage, and that this can be checked with Ingrid Cheney. Sharik said that Roblee should bring the problem to the Committee if it does exist.

- E. Institutional Evaluation Committee. Chair Hubbard said the Committee is still working on the departmental governance problem, and will have a proposal ready soon. Sharik commented that the governance proposals passed by the faculty last year had been submitted to the administration, and had been returned to the Senate for clarification. Hubbard said the matter was one of terminology connected with deans and directors.
- F. Instructional Policy Committee. Chair Heuvers said the Committee had no report.
- G. Research Policy Committee. Chair McKimpson said that the Committee had been asked to look into the fringe benefit rate increases. The recent increases should not affect current projects funded at the old rates, but project managers should check their accounting statements closely.

McKimpson also called upon Senators to report negative impacts of the removal of the mainframe computer to the Committee. Vilmann said these problems are also being considered by the Computer Advisory Committee.

- H. Financial Planning & Policy Committee. Chair Jambekar said the Committee had been formed, with members Baillod, Boschetto, Gale and Pickens. The Committee is likely to become involved in the discussion of funding of the proposals of the Fringe Benefits Committee. Jambekar said he had met with McGarry three times, and had discussed three issues. The first was the automobile allowance for the President and Vice-Presidents. These allowances were written into employment contracts, based on cost estimates from a AAA consultant. Whitt asked for a clarification: were the individuals not actually provided with an automobile, but with extra salary

to cover the expense? Jambekar said that was correct. The allowance was a policy established by the Board of Control. Sharik said that changing the allowance would require a change in policy structure. Vilmann suggested that they all be furnished with Escorts. Jambekar replied that perhaps a second-hand car might be appropriate.

The second issue discussed with the administration was diversion of academic funds to support obligations to retiring personnel on the MPSERS plan. Jambekar said the administration told the Committee that every unit was affected by this, not just academic units. The plan had been presented to the Board as a no-cost item and accepted as such, based on 6-months non-replacement of the retiring individual; the plan had been developed by Bert Whitten. Jambekar said that McGarry was trying to identify the long-term financial obligations of the University, and that auditors from the Michigan Attorney General's office were auditing MTU's books. As soon as McGarry has a firm picture of the long-term obligations, he will make a presentation to the Senate.

The third issue had been raised in the meeting of the Senate officers with the Provost and CFO McGarry, and related to the involvement of the Senate in financial planning, an infraction of Board policy. As far as Dobney and McGarry are concerned, Senate involvement is permissible. Carstens posed a general question: who makes policy for the Board of Control and why can't they be changed? Jambekar referred to the page from the Board's Procedure Manual he circulated at previous meetings regarding the possible conflict with Board policy [Meeting 195, Appendix I]; Jambekar said that page had been signed by Bill Lucier. Sharik said the single source of proposals to the Board has been through the administration, and that is what the constitutional revision attempts to change. Julien said that during the change in titles last year, the Board by acclamation changed more policy in a half-hour than in several previous years; the Board changes policy when it wants to.

Roblee said that he was still concerned with the academic departments having to fund part of the retirement of MPSERS personnel; this can have a significant long-term impact. Jambekar said that McGarry was merely implementing Board policy, which McGarry had inherited. Roblee asked if the Committee could check into how the policy was accepted. Leifer said the policy was adopted in the July 17, 1992, meeting. Roblee asked if the policy was adopted on the basis of the academic and other departments having to make the payments. Leifer said that this could be checked from the Board minutes. Leifer added that he understood the concern being expressed, but that he also understood the practicalities. Leifer discussed at length the various ways that departments could recover the cost of MPSERS retirements of administrative aids and faculty members. Sharik said that the fundamental policy needed to be addressed. Jambekar said the Committee will consider it. Whitt said that the issue is really important, that the diversion of academic funding is unacceptable, and that for some departments it represents a serious blow. Whitt added that discussion of the ease with which the cost might be covered is beside the point; academic departments cannot be allowed to pick up costs for non-academic plans of the University. She said the plan may have been presented as one of no-cost to the Board, but that the academic units are feeling the cost; the approach is less than fully honest.

Jambekar said that McGarry should be given a chance to get his facts together, and that the Senate should appreciate McGarry's probable current dilemma.

X. Reports of Affiliated and Ad Hoc Committees

- A. President's Cabinet. Sharik said the Cabinet had met on March 23. The 4-year program of the School of Technology had been discussed, with the School of Technology acknowledging the heavy input of the Senate's Committee to the formulation of the proposal. A second point concerned the remote computing labs of Computing and Technology Services. Ted Soldan had made a presentation about CTS plans that had provoked extended dialogue. The upshot of the discussion was an announcement by the Provost that the whole situation made him uncomfortable in terms of decision-making and that he would like to see broader campus involvement. Dobney intended to meet with Collins and Soldan to discuss the problems.
- B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force. Vice-President Vilmann said the Task Force had nothing to report.
- C. Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Policy. Lukowski reported that the Committee had met, had decided to remain an ad hoc committee for the time being, and was looking for more members to increase its breadth. The Committee was investigating rumors that the Dean of Engineering was trying to force General Engineering into a first-year program by certain manipulations. The Committee had encountered opinions by policy-makers on campus that the Senate has no authority in enrollment policy.
- D. Ad Hoc Committee for Discussion of Unionization. Chair Julien said the Committee had not met, and that he was waiting on a voting date before calling meetings. Whitt said that a union representative would make a presentation at the Senate meeting in May.
- E. Public Safety Advisory Board Liaison Person. Fynewever reported that the PSAB was meeting every two weeks. The board was trying to help Public Safety improve their image and relate to students. The officers have gone through sensitivity training, and have participated in a first-aid course with the residence counselors so that they can cooperate in case of emergencies. Some of the officers have completed firearms training; officers will begin wearing sidearms in the

summer.

Fynewever reported that Public Safety is considering a name change that will include "police"; their reasoning is that the officers are in fact police, and the new name should increase the respect accorded officers as opposed to being a security force. They were trying to decide whether the name change should accompany the carrying of sidearms. Public Safety was asking for the input of the faculty. Heyman asked what were the arrest powers of the officers. Fynewever said they worked on campus, but they had full police powers. Glime asked why they wanted to be called "police" if they really desired to reduce the "us versus them" problem. Grimm said that a name like "campus security" was more appropriate.

Grimm said he was also disturbed by the adoption of 9mm semiautomatic handguns, which require significantly more training than other types of sidearms, such as revolvers. Fynewever said that they were supposed to be competently trained. In response to other questions, Fynewever said the decision to carry sidearms was not negotiable or reversible, and that the officers were making a concerted effort to

interact with the community. Heuvers commented that the officers ought to consider using patrol dogs to improve community relations. Another senator suggested that horses were friendlier. Sharik said that although the hour was late, the meeting need not go to either the dogs or horses.

XI. Old Business

Agenda Item--Amendment of Senate Constitution: Vilmann asked Heuvers to define the amendment procedure before considering the proposed constitutional revision. Heuvers referred to the Constitution printed in the Academic Faculty Handbook, saying that there were some problems with the editing of the current printing of the Constitution. Sharik read Article VIII of the Constitution, which stated that amendments would be adopted by two favorable votes in the Senate and ratification by a two-thirds majority of the general faculty. Heuvers said that the Constitution & Constituency Committee was recommending that two votes be required after Senate approval: one by the academic faculty, and one by the remainder of the constituency. Vilmann said that the votes would be taken simultaneously, and counted separately. Heyman asked how this was to be done; Vilmann suggested different colored ballots.

Heuvers moved that the revised constitution and bylaws be accepted as rewritten. Vilmann seconded the motion. Sharik said that discussion had been plentiful, and called for amendments. Heuvers referred to his motion made during the report of the Committee, and proposed adoption of his motion to change the wording of item III-F-1-a-14 and the order of items 13 and 14. Sharik asked Heuvers if separate votes on the rewording and reordering were acceptable; Heuvers said they were. Keen reread Heuvers' motion: that item III-F-1-a-14 "Other matters...", be changed to read as "Other matters normally under the jurisdiction of a department referred to the Senate by the academic faculty of a department." Whitt said the amendment restricts and narrows the scope of the Senate, and that she was concerned about matters that normally might not be under a department's jurisdiction, but that the Senate might wish to consider. Mullins said that the wording was bad and conflicted with the "home unit" statement in the heading of section F. Heyman said that he intended to propose an amendment to reword item 14 in a rather different way. The motion was defeated 4-14 in a show-of-hands vote.

Heyman moved that item III-F-1-a-14 be altered to read, "The above list shall not preclude the Senate from adding responsibilities for review or establishment of policies in the Bylaws." Sharik confirmed that Heyman was trying to follow the wording in part III-F-1-a, and agreed that the amendment should include "policy and procedure". Vilmann and Carstens seconded the motion. Glime asked if Heyman had intended to include "and authority", which was also in part III-F-1-a. Heyman said he would be happy to include this as a friendly amendment. Whitt asked for a clarification, wondering if anything a department brought up would be acted upon by using the bylaws. Heyman said that was his intention, and that he wanted the Senate to have to consider whether it wanted to take action rather than acting in ad hoc fashion each time. He added that the clause is an "out" for the entire range of activities that the Senate might consider, and not just those from academic degree-granting departments. Sharik commented that the item might well be included in the itemized list for the full senate, and also asked about the possibility of a vote on the reversal of the two points. Heyman said that the current item 13 presented no difficulties for his amendment. He accepted another friendly amendment,

that the item as amended be included in the listing under part III-F-3-a. Hubbard said the amendment gives the document a sense of orderliness that had been lacking. In a show-of-hands vote, the amendment passed without opposition.

Hubbard moved that paragraph IV-A-5 be reworded to read "Six members elected at-large by the Senate constituency", and that the second parenthetical sentence in section II-C be deleted to conform with the rewording. Bornhorst seconded the motion. Heuvers said that there may be other places in the constitution that this amendment affects. Hubbard said that his amendment should include rewording needed anywhere else in the document to be consistent with the idea that senators-at-large are to be elected by the whole constituency. Mullins asked if the intent were to have the senators-at-large represent the entire constituency. Hubbard said it was. Heuvers said there was a mention of representation of senators-at-large under research. Mullins said the Committee had discussed this point quite a long time ago, and that the election of senators-at-large from only the academic faculty was intended to satisfy concerns of some faculty about the make-up of the senate. However, the proposed amendment would satisfy the concern of other groups that the new senate would be only an academic faculty senate. Heuvers said the original provision was to satisfy larger departments who were concerned about an imbalance with purely departmental representatives. Whitt said that faculty would dominate the senate by weight of numbers, that this provision only covers nominations, and that most of the at-large senators would be faculty. Heyman said that there was early conflict in the senate between factions wanting a faculty-only senate and those wanting a broader representation, and that Glime's proposal of interlocking senate groups represented a breakthrough in solving this problem. Heyman said that the current draft was a desirable compromise among the various concerns of both groups, and his own concern was that this proposed amendment might upset the compromise. Grimm said there was no need for a compromise, that there should be no subdivision of responsibility. In a show-of-hands vote, the amendment passed 13-11.

Grimm moved to amend the proposed constitution by placing all of paragraphs III-F-1 and III-F-2 under III-F-3, and adjusting the remainder of the constitution to reflect a lack of distinction among voting groups, so that there is no consideration of who is or is not worthy to vote on particular issues. The motion was seconded by Kawatra. Glime said that this would defeat the entire compromise nature of the revision. Bulleit said that the amendment would take the entire constitutional revision process back to square one. Whitt said that the question is not one of who is worthy, but is rather one of responsibilities, with faculty having responsibilities in certain areas, and professional staff having other responsibilities. Whitt said that the document did not consider any group less worthy, and that she would not support it if it did so. Grimm said he disagreed, that the staff had the same interests as faculty, that they were intelligent and educated people who would vote responsibly in an academic environment. Julien said that he would like to agree with Grimm, but that an occurrence in his department changed his mind: when the head of his department was

evaluated the staff voted favorably 11-0, the faculty 4-11. Julien said that the position of the staff differs with respect to the administration, and that they will respond differently on particular issues. Mullins said that the draft represents a compromise that is acceptable to the faculty in its present form, but the proposed amendment would make it unacceptable. Sharik said the revision will be submitted in a separate vote to the academic faculty and the non-academic group, with both having equal opportunity to reject the revision. Grimm said that in his department, the staff vote was more to be trusted than the faculty, and the staff had a healthier perspective overall. Whitt said her earlier statement did not imply that staff had no place or position in academic matters. McKimpson said the current revision represented a viable solution, speaking from his position as a non-academic faculty member. Diebel said he too supported the current revision, also from the viewpoint of a non-academic faculty member representing a non-academic unit. By show-of-hands, the motion failed, 3-23.

Keeble introduced an amendment written by Waber: the proposed bylaws should have a new Paragraph 7 added to Section A to read as follows: "Department Heads/Chairs, despite their additional status as faculty members, shall not serve as Senators nor vote, nor shall they be constituents of the Senate." Roblee seconded the motion. Bulleit said he agreed that the heads/chairs should not serve as senators, but he disagreed that they should not vote as constituents. The University is working toward having departmental chairs rather than heads, with chairs as advocates for faculty. In this case, why disenfranchise them? Waber said he would be happy to have this as a friendly amendment, to delete the pertinent wording. Waber said his concern was that the revision and bylaws nowhere mentioned heads/chairs, and that the current Senate had already passed his proposed amendment as part of its current bylaws. Mullins said he agreed with Bulleit. Bornhorst said that in the draft constitution there is implied a move toward charters for departments. He suggested that the new report from the Institutional Evaluation Committee might be included as a bylaw. This would then require only a single vote from the constituency. Waber said that the changes might not occur in time. Sharik said that heads still exist. Whitt asked if the proposed wording belonged under section II-D of the revised constitution. Heuvers said placement in the bylaws was preferable because bylaws could be more easily changed. The amendment reading "Department Heads/Chairs, despite their additional status as academic faculty members, shall not serve as Senators", passed with a show-of-hands vote, 21-2.

Sharik called for further discussion. Keeble asked why the three separate non-academic units listed in Section C of the revised bylaws could not be amalgamated into a single unit. Heuvers replied that they represented three quite distinct groups. Diebel commented that an editorial change was needed in part A-4-d, in which Dean of Forestry should be "Dean of Forestry and Wood Products".

Heuvers said that there remained some necessary changes in the bylaws, and referred to part C-2-b. Heuvers moved to delete the titles "financial aid advisor" and "financial aid officer" from the list of titles. Heyman seconded the motion. Glime said Joe Galetto had indicated that individuals with these titles were not in decision-making positions. The motion passed without opposition in a show-of-hands vote.

The question was called, and Sharik asked for a roll-call vote. The motion [to accept the proposed Constitution and Bylaws as amendments to the present Constitution under current

amendment procedures, additionally stipulating that it be submitted to and approved by 2/3 of the whole constituency] passed 23-2.

XII. New Business

- A. Agenda Item--Representative to a new Committee on Targeted Hiring, and related matters: Sharik said he had written to William Goodman of the Detroit law firm of Goodman et al., asking for a legal opinion of the Policy on Hiring of Minorities and Women. Sharik had received a reply, stating that the firm was working on the matter. Sharik had also received a request from Walter McCoy for a member for a new committee, The Policies and Procedures Committee for the Selection of Exceptional Faculty. The request said that "the Committee's agenda will include a discussion of innovative procedures for responding to the challenges and opportunities as presented by the quest for excellence and diversity within our community. In short, we will begin to discuss strategies for recruitment and retention of difficult-to-fill under-represented groups and positions."
- Sharik asked for a volunteer to serve on this committee as the representative of the Senate. Grimm said he would like to volunteer, but had a class conflict with the meeting time. Sharik said that perhaps the Committee would change its meeting time. Glime also volunteered to serve on the Committee. Sharik called for the Senate to select one of the volunteers by ballot. Glime and Grimm made short statements. The Senate elected Janice Glime as the Senate representative to the Policies and Procedures Committee for the Selection of Exceptional Faculty, with Thomas Grimm as the alternate. Sharik agreed to ask the committee to accept both Glime and Grimm as Senate representatives.
- B. Agenda Item--Appointment to the Computer Advisory Committee: Sharik introduced David Poplawski of the Computer Science Department. Poplawski said there existed on campus a Computer Executive Committee and a Computer Advisory Committee. The advisory committee makes recommendations to the executive committee. On the Computer Executive

Page 3816 Minutes of Senate Meeting 197 7 Apr 1993

Committee there are two at-large positions selected by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee met and decided that one of these two positions should be filled through the Senate, for a two-year term. The two current members are W. Perger and G. Fox. Sharik commented that the Senate's choice really should be a member of the Senate Research Policy Committee. Vilmann asked whether the Senate selection should be a Senator. Poplawski said that the Advisory Committee wanted the person to be a direct liaison with the Senate; the position would need to be filled on July 1st. Sharik said the matter would be considered by the Senate's Research Policy Committee.

- C. Agenda Item--Academic Costume: Referring to a memo he had received (Appendix J of these minutes), Sharik introduced Richard Heckel to discuss an item that had been around for a while. Heckel said the issue is whether MTU should follow the guidelines of the American Council on Education in regard to the academic costume worn by its doctoral candidates. Michigan Tech does adhere to the guidelines in regard to the costume worn by its master's candidates, and it cites the guidelines in its printed graduation program. However, the

University departs from the guidelines for the costumes worn by the Board of Control, and for the hood given to graduating doctoral candidates. Heckel said the problems with the gowns worn by the Board are minor. However, the trim on the doctoral hood is appropriate for a Doctor of Engineering degree. Heckel thought it inconsistent that MTU confers a PhD degree with a DEng hood. Heckel said that Proposal 5-82 is now 11 years old, and the easiest way for the Senate to handle the problem is simply to forward the proposal again, where it may receive a better reception with the new administration.

Sharik asked about the timing of the proposal: was it too late to change the costume for this year's commencement? Heckel said he had asked about the Board's costume and had been told it was the same gold-trimmed robe. A general discussion ensued of differences in academic garb. Sharik asked if there were any danger in suggesting a change to conform with the guidelines. Heckel said he would have to check his pay stubs to establish that. Sharik asked for a sense of the Senate about the matter. Vilmann said it should be brought up at the next regular meeting, and also perhaps mentioned in the officers' meeting with the Provost.

Hubbard asked about changing the wording on diplomas, which was mentioned in Heckel's memo. Heckel said that this had occurred as a result of an effort to match the wording on the diploma with the trim on the hood. The doctoral diploma simply reads "Doctor of Philosophy" without being "in" anything. Hubbard said that there had been a unilateral change resulting in diplomas reading "Doctor of Philosophy in Something". Heckel said he did not think they were worded in such a manner. Hubbard said that one of his foreign graduate students had encountered problems because his MTU diploma was printed "Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry".

XIII. Announcements

Sharik announced that the next meeting would be a special meeting on April 21 to consider only two issues - the Constitution and the proposal for the four-year program in the School of Technology. Sharik also announced that the Institutional Evaluation Committee would introduce a flow-chart for faculty governance at that meeting.

XIV. Adjournment

Sharik called for a motion to adjourn. Bornhorst moved that the meeting adjourn. There were many seconds. Sharik declared the meeting adjourned at 12:08 am.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

.