

The Senate of Michigan Technological University  
Minutes of Meeting No. 198  
5 May 1993

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a presentation on TQM/TQE,
  - (2) approved minutes of Meeting 197,
  - (3) received a report on faculty salary equity at MTU,
  - (4) deferred an administrative evaluation until next fall,
  - (5) defeated a resolution to publish the teaching honor roll in Tech Topics and the MTU Lode,
  - (6) passed a motion to award honor roll teachers a certificate,
  - (7) heard a report on hiring "exceptional" faculty,
  - (8) agreed to defer Proposal 2-82 on academic garb to a meeting between Senate officers and the Provost,
  - (9) tabled a supplemental health benefits proposal,
  - (10) reworded Proposals 2-92 and 3-92 on faculty governance in response to a request for clarification from the Provost's office,
  - (11) modified and approved Proposal 2?-93, a flow-chart of the MTU decision-making process,
  - (12) reviewed Proposal 16-92 on faculty governance,
  - (13) heard a proposal from the Graduate Student Council for medical coverage for graduate teaching assistants and voted to support the efforts of the GSC in working with the Senate.
- 

I. Call to Order

At 7:04 pm on Wednesday, 5 May 1993, President Sharik called the meeting to order in Room B37, Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

29 Senators or alternates were present. Provost Dobney was present. Senators or alternate representatives from the following units were absent: IMP, Met & Mat Eng, Undergrad Student Govt. Absent Senator-at-large: Vable.

III. Recognition of Visitors

The following visitors were recognized: J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Assistant), J. Glime (Bio Sciences), B. Richter (Grad Student Council), Rebecca Christianson (TQE), W. Predebon (ME-EM).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Sharik referred to the agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and said that the scheduled presentation by the Provost would be replaced with a presentation on Fringe Benefits by Financial Officer McGarry, an additional item of New Business would be scheduling of Senate meetings, and W. Predebon would address the Senate under Agenda Item 8-b. Leifer announced that McGarry had told him there would be no presentation because some recent information on benefits was incorrect.

V. Presentation on Total Quality Education

President Sharik introduced Rebecca Christianson, coordinator

of MTU's Total Quality Management/Total Quality Education program. Christianson described TQE as a philosophy and a process differing from traditional top-down management. TQE requires a common understanding of quality, but not necessarily a common definition. Defining "customer" is a problem with TQM in university management. TQE does not provide a stepwise approach to management. MTU started with an industrial model provided under contract with 3M Quality Management Services; this model has not proven appropriate for university situations. MTU will work with 3M in a summer workshop on bringing TQE into the classroom.

Heuvers asked what other universities were involved in TQM programs. Christianson said that Stamford University in Alabama has been moving TQM into the classroom. Provost Dobney cited Texas A&M as another example.

Sharik stated that there was widespread concern that TQM was being implemented from the top down; he asked Christianson to address this point and also to comment on the role of the Senate in TQE at MTU. Christianson replied that TQM had to start someplace, and that administrative commitment to the process was important. She described two current TQM projects mandated by the administration, and said the Senate role in TQE was unclear. Whitt stated that the message from TQE was contradictory: the idea behind TQM is self-involvement, but the program originates from the upper administration. Whitt asked for an explanation of the "common understanding of quality". Christianson said that TQM would be at MTU as long as President Tompkins was on campus. She noted that the usual TQM definition of quality as "consistent conformance to customer expectation" was a problem in universities. Sharik suggested that Senate involvement could begin with the summer 3M workshop, and said that the idea of empowerment of individuals within the university is the important issue.

Whitt said that, speaking as a philosopher, TQM does not qualify as a philosophy, but is a management technique. Jambekar said that he had taught TQM for 20 years, that it was indeed a philosophy, and that it was an excellent program. Grimm said that the identification of campus needs must come from all levels, and that TQM is a process of common sense involvement of people. Provost Dobney said that he would like to see a more humane environment emerge from TQM; the petty bitterness and mistrust in human relations at MTU is unique in his experience. Hubbard said that the TQM session he attended was valuable. Heyman said that procedures enacted recently by the Senate for administrative evaluation were extraordinary, and expressed his concern that TQM would bypass these procedures. Julien suggested that Christianson should present TQM to faculty as an opportunity to participate and not as a mandated program. Carstens said that top-down TQM was impossible. Boutilier said that TQM requires patience to work well, usually over a period of years. Dobney said that 50% participation at MTU in 5 years would be good progress toward TQM. Sharik thanked Christianson for her presentation.

#### VI. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of Meeting 197, held on 13 March 1993, were accepted and corrected. Leifer moved that the minutes be approved as corrected; Grzelak seconded the motion. The motion was approved without opposition.

#### VII. Report of the Senate President

Sharik commented on the activities of the 92-93 academic year. He noted that the increase in numbers of standing and ad hoc committees indicated a significant increase in Senate activity, particularly in the areas of research and financial planning. He said that the revised constitution and the 4-year Technology Program would be important to the university, as would the revised departmental governance proposal.

Sharik thanked Janis Coleman-Plouff, the Senate assistant, Secretary Keen, and Vice-President Vilmann for their assistance during the year. Sharik also thanked the committee chairs for their work, and said that a memo would soon be sent asking for their year-end reports.

VIII. Report of the Senate Vice-President

Vice-President Vilmann said he had no report.

IX. Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy Committee. No report.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3911 Minutes of Senate Meeting 198 5 May 1993

B. Constitution & Constituency Committee. Sharik commented that the referendum vote on the revised constitution [Appendix B of these minutes] was scheduled for 6-13 May. The early deadline would allow the vote to be completed before the May 14 meeting of the University President's Cabinet. Review of the amended constitution at this meeting would allow the revision to be placed on the agenda for the Board of Control meeting for May 21. Heyman asked whether it was realistic to expect ballots to be returned on such a tight schedule. Sharik said that the original schedule had a May 14 deadline, and asked whether one day less would be critical. Heyman asked for volunteers to help count the ballots on the evening of May 14.

Sharik said that some departments had raised serious questions about the proposed constitution. Sharik introduced Bill Predebon, an involved non-member of the committee, who had talked with these departments. Predebon said that three issues emerged from the departmental discussions. A first concern was whether any university actions or policies contradicted the proposed constitution. Heuvers said that there were no policies that went counter to the proposed constitution. Predebon replied that the concern was with possible contradictions of previous Senate proposals and constitutional provisions for precedence. Sharik said the constitution was written with due attention to the governance proposals. Whitt said the new constitution could be amended if necessary.

Predebon said a second question involved the statement in III-F-2-a regarding the establishment of policy in the distribution of resources for research: Why was there not a corresponding statement for allocation of resources in academic matters under III-F-1-a and III-F-1-b? Heyman said that there was general agreement that the problem could be handled in the bylaws. Dobney said that his initial understanding was that Board of Control policy prohibited discussion of resource distribution with the Senate. The current administration is working to change this policy, but this policy may explain its absence from the proposed constitution. Heuvers said that this point had been raised in committee discussion, and the provision regarding academic resources had been omitted from the proposed constitution because it was a direct violation of Board policy. Predebon said that it still did seem odd to him personally, that the statement was included in the research portion, but not in the academic part. Dobney pointed out the allocation of resources in fact was covered in III-F-3-b-3, and hence the allocation of resources was to be the concern of the entire senate, not just the academic portion.

Predebon said the final concern was with the grey areas between the defined regions of responsibility in Section III-F, and which

group would be responsible for the assignment of proposals to the various areas. Sharik said that the full senate would hold that responsibility, and cited the example of the Senate last year voting to submit the governance proposals to a referendum of the academic faculty only. Sharik thanked Predebon for his efforts on behalf of the Senate.

Heuvers said that in similar departmental discussions, a question had been raised about the constituency of the academic deans, who cannot be senators. The Constitution and Constituency Committee was of the opinion that the academic deans would not be constituents. Heuvers asked whether the referendum would be for the proposed constitution and bylaws or only for the proposed constitution. Keen said that Heuvers' original motion was for the Senate to accept the proposed constitution and bylaws as amendments to the current constitution, but that there had been no motion for submission of the amended constitution to the constituency. Heuvers said the wording of the ballot had been worked out in a meeting of the Senate officers after the special Senate meeting. Keen said the wording on the referendum ballot would indicate that only the proposed constitution was being approved.

Heuvers said that the title of affirmative action officer needed to be added to the list of constituent titles in paragraph C-2-c of the proposed bylaws. Sharik asked about the inclusion as constituents of the several positions with the title of "coordinator", including Rebecca Christianson for example. Heuvers said the listings could be changed after the adoption of the proposed constitution. Heuvers noted further that the phrasing of the Bylaws Section B-5 might be clarified by adding the phrase "who are also not constituents of the Senate", to include clearly the two academic deans in the list of non-constituents along with the central administrators mentioned in Section II-A of the proposed constitution. Sharik noted that these changes in the bylaws could be voted after acceptance of the proposed constitution.

C. Elections Committee. Chair Heyman announced that Robert Filer and Janice Glime had been elected as Senators-at-large by the academic faculty, and that James Gale was elected to the Committee on Academic Tenure [Appendix C of these minutes]. Chair Heyman then distributed ballots for selection of Senate nominees of three faculty to each of three university committees: the Sabbatical Leave Committee, the General Education Committee, and the Athletic Council. He asked for additional nominations from the floor; there were none. Heyman called for Senators to submit their ballots to him.

Keen announced that the administrative records office in charge of the constituent mailing list had altered the list unexpectedly and inexplicably. A list of constituents who were scheduled to receive ballots for the constitutional referendum had been distributed to each Senator just before the call to order. Keen asked that the lists be checked carefully, and said that the Senate would maintain its own voting lists in the future.

D. Financial Planning & Policy Committee. Chair Jambekar reported that Chief Financial Officer McGarry had asked for names of faculty for membership in the investment committee being formed. The Committee intended to submit the names of two of its members, James Gale and Jim Pickens; Jambekar called for other volunteers.

Jambekar said he had received a Report on Faculty Salary Equity at MTU by Paul Nelson [Appendix D of these minutes]. Jambekar asked for instructions on its disposal. Sharik commented that as President of the Senate he had received a copy of the document, and had forwarded it to the Committee. The report was an interesting analysis of faculty salary equity at MTU, and was produced by Prof. Nelson under contract with the central administration. Sharik said that perhaps the best disposition was to provide a copy to each

Senator for distribution to the constituency. Leifer asked about the source of the document. Dobney said that his office had received the report from Paul Nelson under contract from MTU, for which Nelson had refused payment. The report addressed the question of whether women faculty members were discriminated against in salary at Michigan Tech. Dobney said that the report indicated that being female was not a significant factor in salary discrimination and that salary differentials were explained by other variables. Dobney said however that Nelson was rerunning some analyses in cooperation with women's groups on campus, and a couple of departments may have problems. Beske-Diehl said that the problem is difficult to define with the small number of women in engineering departments. Whitt asked whether Nelson volunteered or was asked specifically to do the analysis. Dobney said that the Office of Human Resources had asked Nelson for the analysis on the basis of Nelson's expertise in this type of analysis. Jambekar read from the report that Nelson had been requested to proceed with the analysis in October 1992. Boutilier commented that some statisticians on campus were questioning some of the procedures used in the report. Dobney said that Nelson seemed willing to work with various groups in discussing the report.

Jambekar said that the Committee had also received a copy of the Auditor General's report on the university and was unsure of its proper disposition. He commented that it was 30 pages long and made agonizing but interesting reading. Mullins asked whether the report was available. Jambekar said the report was

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3912      Minutes of Senate Meeting 198      5 May 1993

a public document, but was not sure where copies were available. Sharik said that copies should be in the Library.

E. Fringe Benefits Committee. Chair Leifer reported receipt of the initial documents from the Wyatt Corporation and from Alexander & Alexander, but that corrections were evidently going to be made to these. The university's chief financial officer, Bill McGarry, had told Leifer that these corrections would be available in a week. The Committee expected to analyze these, and hoped to produce a decent benefits package soon. Leifer said that his statement on the sick leave pool was in the previous minutes.

F. Institutional Evaluation Committee. Chair Hubbard said that Senators had received a package of documents from the Committee. These included a revised proposal on departmental governance, Proposal 16-92 [Appendix E of these minutes], to replace the proposals that had not passed in the spring referendum. The revision was a single proposal, simplifying and combining several of the referendum proposals, including departmental charters, search procedures, and leadership evaluation. Hubbard said that a separate proposal would be produced later for college governance.

Hubbard also presented the Committee's material that had been attached to the agenda, including the informational flow chart [Appendix F], a letter regarding the referendum Proposals 2-92 and 3-92 from Provost Powers [Appendix G] and a memo of response [Appendix H], and a memo from the Committee on evaluation procedures for the Administration [Appendix I of these minutes]. Sharik said that these items would be considered under old business.

Hubbard said that the Committee considered evaluation of senior administrators to be important, and that their self-evaluations should be performed and published before the evaluation occurred.

The self-evaluations should address the goals formulated by the trade-off committees and the long-range planning committees. Sharik asked when the Committee thought the requested evaluation of the President might take place. Hubbard said that a perfunctory evaluation of the department heads and deans had been performed last year, and the mechanism was in place to perform further evaluations. Heuvers commented that the College of Sciences & Arts was following the evaluation procedures already. Glime said that the self-evaluation with respect to goals was needed because heads have been given various charges when they were appointed, and that evaluators needed to be aware of the administrators' priorities. Julien said that the Department of Chemistry had followed successfully the recommended governance procedures in evaluating their head and searching for a new one.

G. Instructional Policy Committee. Chair Heuvers reported that the Committee had gathered the necessary materials for the teaching excellence honor roll [Appendix J of these minutes]. Heuvers distributed these to the Senate, stating that the Committee had decided to ask the Senate how the results were to be made public. Sharik said that the original motion for the honor roll had made it clear that the Center for Teaching Excellence was to distribute the results. However, the Center's director said the honor roll was sufficiently controversial to require more feedback on the distribution mechanism. Sharik said possibilities included publication in Tech Topics or the Lode, or display in the Library. Heyman said that his department had received a memo from the Center stating that the honor roll calculations would not be compiled for the Spring quarter because the program was a Senate experiment. Sharik said that the problems of distribution and of continuation should be handled separately. Fynewever said that the program should be extended to teachers not on tenure track. Heuvers said that the listing covered all persons for whom evaluations had been received by the Center. Bulleit said that the listing covered those persons who had submitted their evaluations to the Center for inclusion on the honor roll. Predebon said that the Center was performing the selection without waiting for the submission, following Senate instructions. Several senators said that resubmission of evaluations was required. Sharik said that there was initial confusion because the Center said it did not have the resources for compiling the honor roll. Predebon said that the Center now understood that it was to compile the information without the cooperation of the instructors. Heuvers said the original Senate motion was for the Center to identify qualified instructors as class evaluations were received and to notify eligible instructors by letter. Unless the instructors responded negatively, they would be listed. Heuvers said that the Center had originally said the honor roll identification would be easy, but had then discovered that it would require a lot of resources. The honor roll for the Winter Term was developed with stop-gap procedures. The Center had asked departments for assistance, but this had been refused by some. Dobney said he had asked Bill Powers to put together a committee on instructional effectiveness, which would work with the Center on this problem as well as a range of other issues. Sharik said the problem was a lack of resources at the Center.

Heyman said that he was concerned that the honor roll procedures glorifies or reifies the class evaluation scores. His concern was that hard, demanding, and skillful instructors were unlikely to be recognized by the current evaluation procedures with the 4.5 barrier. Sharik said that the mechanism had been voted by the Senate after similar points had been made in debate. Julien said that ratings appeared to be independent of class size.

Sharik asked about the issue of publishing the honor roll. Heuvers moved that the list be released to the Lode and to Tech

Topics, and that the list be placed in the Library. Julien seconded the motion. Predebon asked whether the listing was of persons agreeing to be listed. Heuvers replied that the list included only those who submitted their scores for the roll. Predebon said that the listing should be published with a statement that others may have qualified for the listing, but had chosen not to be listed. Vilmann said that the publication of the honor roll was asking for trouble, and that it oversimplified the evaluation of good teaching, and that persons not on the list might be construed by students as not such good teachers. This might affect student attitudes, which would provide negative feedback into the teaching and evaluation process. Vilmann said that the best move would be to send certificates to the teachers on the honor roll, and not to release the list to the public domain. Vilmann said he favored putting all evaluations into the public domain, but not discrete lists. Grzelak said that the honor roll made too much of single question on a multi-question form. Sharik said that the publication of the list must be accompanied by a statement of its development. Richter commented that student evaluations may identify poor teachers, but may not distinguish between good and excellent teachers. The motion was defeated 11-15 in a show-of-hands vote.

Mullins said that this preliminary and crude test of the system should not be widely publicized. Hubbard moved that each person on the honor roll be sent a certificate of acknowledgement. Richter seconded the motion. Bulleit said that he was on the list, but did not want a certificate. Carstens asked who would pay for the certificate. The discussion of this question was confused. Whitt asked whether the Senate could prevent publication of the honor roll, because it had been distributed. Sharik said that it probably could not. Dobney reminded the Senate that its proceedings would be televised next year. The motion was passed by a show-of-hands, 19-5.

Heuvers asked whether the Senate should consider continuing the policy. Sharik said that this was the next issue for consideration: whether the procedure should be followed in the spring term. Hubbard said that some stigma would be attached to faculty whose names were not on the list. Beske-Diehl said that no stigma was attached to non-appearance on the list. Carstens asked whether the concept of an honor roll, or any

of a public or peer-group award or reward, was compatible with TQE. Jambekar said that the reward was anti-TQE, in a way. Roblee said he had doubts about the process, but that anything that emphasizes the importance of good teaching is a positive action. Bulleit said that proper reply to arguments against selective publication is to release all the evaluations. Julien said that arguments against universal release of evaluations paralleled those against the universal release of salary information a few years ago. In practice, few look at the information after it is released. Bulleit said that if all evaluations were released, the students would realize that the only significant numbers were those below 1 and above 4.9. Grimm said that the evaluation topics needed re-examination, that Georgia Tech's evaluations were more comprehensive, for example. Predebon mentioned the history of the current evaluation, with five common questions used for promotion and tenure decisions, and with the majority of the evaluation used for feedback to the instructor. Predebon added that any revision should consider the purpose of the evaluation.

Sharik suggested that the Committee allow the honor roll process to continue through the Spring Term, and then revisit the issue in the Fall. Heuvers agreed.

H. Research Policy Committee. In the absence of Chair McKimpson, Keeble reported the Committee's activities. The Committee had been discussing the university's scientific misconduct policy, had dealt with the Inquiry Committee, had looked at details with the Investigating Committee, and was to meet with the Ad Hoc Investigating Committee to discuss the operation of that part of the policy. No conclusion was expected before summer. The Committee had been charged with naming individuals to the search committee for CTS, and was submitting the names of Don Leuking of BioSciences, and Panos Charalambides of ME-EM. The Committee was submitting the name of David Reed in Forestry for the Computer Executive Committee.

Sharik called a five-minute break in the meeting.

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

A. University President's Cabinet. As a member of the Cabinet, Sharik reported on its April 23rd meeting. Dobney had made a budget presentation similar to that given the Senate at the May Special Meeting, and had discussed the employee's educational assistance program. Sharik had given the Cabinet a presentation on the Senate's proposed constitution and bylaws, and on the four-year Technology program. Sharik said that both these items were to be discussed at the Cabinet Meeting on May 14th, and that some members of both the Curriculum Committee and the Constitution & Constituency Committee of the Senate should be present for the Cabinet's discussion.

Sharik added that it was made clear in the Cabinet meeting that the Cabinet was not an executive committee, but was a body advisory to the university's president. It does not vote on issues. All cabinet members could speak on the issues.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Policy. Lukowski said that two proposals were being discussed around the university. Dean Watwood of Engineering had submitted a proposal to Powers on March 15th, suggesting that engineering departments limit their incoming freshman to a number less than their carrying capacity. The proposed mechanism was a cutoff limit of an ACT score of 30 and the top five percent of the graduating class. All the rest of the applicants were to be invited to enroll in general engineering. Lukowski said this was the dean's effort to force General Engineering to become a first-year program.

Lukowski said the second proposal by Tom Ellis and Jim Kerr was submitted directly to President Tompkins. The proposal was that no one be accepted to engineering departments who had less than an ACT math score of 27 and an overall ACT score of 27. The students below this standard were to be directed to attend their local two-year colleges, and were to be invited to reapply when they had enough engineering credits for evaluation. Lukowski said the main point is that enrollment policy is not established by any one person or committee. There exists a 25-member admissions liaison committee, which meets infrequently with poor attendance. Lukowski reiterated that there is not a single admissions policy source, and cited Board of Control Policy 16-6 that the Senate is to make recommendations on enrollment policy at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Sharik asked Provost Dobney about the current admission policies. Dobney said that he was unclear about the mechanism of current decisions, but that he planned to defer policy decisions to the Senate. He said he had seen one fairly hare-brained scheme,



and asked whether the Senate wanted to be the campus receptacle for such schemes. Mullins asked for more detail about the Board policy. Lukowski said that Policy 16-6 stated that one of the functions of the Senate was to prepare suitable recommendations on the standards of admission on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Dobney said it was incumbent on the administration to seek the Senate's advice. Lukowski said that the problem stems from most enrollment management policies being set during the summer, when the Senate does not meet. Dobney said that the Senate needs to interact with Joe Galetto and with departmental representatives to develop suitable goals, and then to leave the implementation to the admissions office.

C. Ad Hoc Committee on Discussion of Unionization. Chair Julien said that the latest information was that the election could not be held until October. Whitt said that the judge's decision on the determination of the faculty unit was expected in June, which would mean an early fall election.

D. Public Safety Advisory Board Liaison Person. Fynewever reported that the MTU Public Safety Department will retain that name; the Senate's comments were important in this decision. The Advisory Board is now working on a policy governing when weapons can be drawn; the current premise is that situations must be life-threatening to the officers or others. The training of officers will include scenarios to help officers make the proper judgements. Fynewever said there were no current plans for the department to use horses or dogs.

E. Policies & Procedures Committee for the Selection of Exceptional Faculty. Glime reported as one of the Senate's selected representatives to this Committee. She said the Committee's initial discussion had focused on defining and identifying the category of "exceptional" faculty. Glime had proposed a lengthy document that had not yet been discussed. One proposal involved awarding positions to departments who needed faculty from under-represented groups. A position would be funded by the program until an opening occurred in the department in the usual course of events; at that point the department would begin to support the person hired under the program. This procedure would avoid long-term university commitments for supporting any individuals hired initially with these funds.

Sharik asked whether a document on policy would be produced for Senate review. Glime replied that there should be, adding that at the start of the program the guidelines had been very unclear. The Committee had discussed the qualifications of the departments; it seemed unfair that departments that had been discriminating against minorities or women in the past should be "rewarded" with extra positions. Whitt said that at some point the policy on hiring would need to be reviewed by legal counsel and suggested that the Committee not use university counsel at that point. Whitt said that the curriculum might be enhanced to encourage the recruiting of exceptional faculty, for example by instituting courses in Afro-American studies.

Sharik said that the Senate had asked for a legal opinion on the MTU minority hiring policy and guidelines from Attorney Bill

an opinion would be produced in mid-May. Sharik also said that both Glime and Grimm had been accepted as Senate appointees to this Committee.

Heyman asked about the rationale for requiring that the additional positions under this program be self-extinguishing, with departments eventually assuming the cost. Glime replied that this prevented the university from having to absorb costs of extra positions forever. Julien said that during a position search in his department, the search committee had discovered a university list that showed the proportion of women in several departments were out of line with the proportion of women available in the field, and that positions in these departments were available. Further, some of these departments were filling these positions although their availability was not known generally, even to department heads. Julien said this constituted a non-level playing field. Sharik asked whether the Senate could have access to the list. Dobney acknowledged that the list was available in the Affirmative Action office. Julien commented that his department could have three new positions immediately according to the list.

Dobney said that a criticism of the program is that departments are hiring exceptional persons just because the funds are available, which means they may be taking people who are not fully qualified for a position at MTU. The approach described by the Committee forces departments eventually to assume ownership of the positions. It also prevents departments from taking the money for the position, getting it entrenched as a line in the departmental budget, and then firing the person after six years and hiring a white male. Whitt commented that once the policies and procedures are adopted, they have to be presented carefully to the community. She recommended that the Committee look carefully at the literature on preferential hiring when they reach that point. It is especially important because recent presentations of the the program to the university community have been done badly.

F. Board of Control Liaison Task Force. Vice-President Vilmann said that the objective of the Task Force is to maintain contact with the Board, with the most important issue being the proposed constitution. Vilmann asked Dobney about the best way of selling the proposed constitution to the Board. Dobney replied that it was important to be at the Board meeting, and that he had been trying to convince the Board members that the proposed constitution was a reasonable document. Dobney said that it was likely the Board would eventually approve it, especially with the support of both President Tompkins and himself.

## XI. Old Business

A. Evaluation of Administration. Hubbard referred to the memo from the Institutional Evaluation Committee [Appendix I of these minutes]. He said the self-evaluation of the administrator is an important part of the procedure, and added that the process needs to be organized, which is probably not possible in the time remaining in the Spring Term. Hubbard said an evaluation of the senior administration had been performed in the Spring of 1990 based on Proposal 2-89, with the results compiled over the summer; the task was formidable. A perfunctory evaluation would not be useful, but a thorough evaluation required an initial self-evaluation. Hubbard said his Committee had no guidance, except the request from President Tompkins to be evaluated.

B. Videotaping of Senate Meetings. Sharik said that Provost Dobney had proposed videotaping and cablecasting of Senate meetings. He invited Patty Lins to address the Senate on the subject. Lins said that the present meeting in the studio was a rehearsal for the taping, and commented on the room arrangement and possible changes.

She said only the first two hours of the current meeting had been taped; the tape was available for senators to review. Sharik said one of the issues was cost; the projected cost was \$280 per meeting. Sharik asked for a straw vote for those thinking the studio environment was acceptable. Julien commented that the tiers of rows was stifling, and asked whether a round table format was possible. Sharik thanked Lins for her comments.

C. Proposal 5-82 on Academic Costume. Sharik said that the previous deliberation had concluded with a recommendation that the Senate officers discuss the proposal with the administration. Sharik said that the scheduled meeting had been canceled, and suggested that the proposal be tabled. Roblee said that the point was trivial, and asked why it was occupying Senate time. Sharik said this was the reason the problem had been referred to an officers-administration meeting. Mullins said that consideration of the problem was appropriate and that considerable discussion had occurred in departmental meetings. Sharik said that the problem would be considered in a meeting with the administration.

D. Supplemental Health Benefits Package. Sharik called for discussion of the proposed benefits. Boutilier referred to the proposal prepared by the Fringe Benefits Committee [Senate Minutes, p.3879], saying that the intent of the proposal is to cover two groups of people on the TIAA-CREF plan that fall through the cracks in current packages. Bulleit asked whether the costs of these programs had been examined. Boutilier said she did not have the actual cost, but that very few people would qualify for coverage under the proposal, so that the cost should be minimal. Bulleit said that the impact of the whole series of benefits packages should be made clear. Vilmann said that the last sentence, "the above requests are already met for MTU MPSERS participants", was relevant if it was true, and made the proposal an equity issue. Roblee said that there had always been an equity issue between the TIAA-CREF and MPSERS plans. The initial choice between the plans involved a number of trade-offs. Dobney cautioned the Senate against passage of any proposal before the cost was known, and cited the current and future costs of the benefits package that was recently passed. Whitt said that the issue of the department's being expected to pick up costs of benefits needed to be explored.

In the absence of a motion to adopt the proposal Sharik asked for a sense of the Senate: that the Fringe Benefits Committee should work with CFO McGarry to address the issue of costs, and to bring forward the motion with cost information. There was no objection to this proposal.

E. Sick Leave Plan. Sharik asked whether Boutilier was ready to speak to the proposed sick leave plan. Boutilier replied that she had no information on it. Dobney said that he supported the concept, although he had not been informed of the costs involved. Keen said that the item had been put on the agenda because the Senate in a previous meeting had approved Leifer's request to pursue a sick leave plan. However, the Senate had not voted a blank check of approval of whatever Leifer managed to negotiate, nor had a sick leave plan ever been presented to the Senate for a vote. Grzelak said that a plan was being looked at by other groups on campus. Dobney said he had assumed the Senate had passed a proposal. Several plans were possible, and he said he needed to know the Senate's ideas on the plan. Sharik said the matter needed to be referred to the Fringe Benefits Committee.

F. Proposal 2-92 on Faculty Governance. Hubbard referred to the memo from Provost Powers [Appendix G of these minutes]. Hubbard said the memo concerned two proposals on faculty governance that were approved by a constituency referendum last year. Before

implementing the proposals, Powers was asking for clarification of the status of some Deans and Directors. Sharik noted a typographical error in the Senate memo [Appendix H of these minutes], that 2-92 as passed should include the words "and schools". Hubbard noted the possible rewordings indicated on the

\*\*\*\*\*

Page 3915 Minutes of Senate Meeting 198 5 May 1993

Senate memo. Hubbard said that the Institute of Materials Processing (IMP), the Keweenaw Research Center, and the Library are not covered under the proposed rewording of Proposal 2-92. Hubbard said the Institutional Evaluation Committee was seeking the Senate's guidance on this problem, and asked whether these units should be included in Proposal 3-92. Vilmann said that the original proposal made no distinction, and clearly included these units. Moore said that Provost Powers had given the director of the Library a choice of being considered an academic director, or an administrative director and hence not covered by this proposal. Vilmann said that the proposal did not give the Provost that discretion. Provost Dobney said that there were many directors who were not "academic" and who had administrative appointments and served at the pleasure of the higher administration without term appointments. Vilmann said this was the point of the referendum--that these directors should have term appointments. Dobney asked whether the Director of Financial Aid should have a term appointment. Vilmann said the Committee had considered the Dean of Students, and had decided a four-year appointment was appropriate. Heuvers said that the proposed constitution listed a number of directors of small units, and asked if the intent was to include all of these positions within the provisions of Proposal 3-92.

Hubbard said that the Senate needed to instruct Sharik on the reply to Powers memo, and asked if the proposed rewording of 2-92 were acceptable. Provost Dobney said he was really confused by all the clarification, and asked if the Senate intended to distinguish deans of schools from deans of colleges. Sharik said this was correct, that the proposed constitution treated deans of schools as department heads. Vilmann said that the deans of schools function much like department heads. Heuvers said that the treatment originated in the current Handbook for Academic Faculty. Sharik asked if the insertion of "academic" made the proposal unclear. Hubbard replied that it did not. Grzelak said he was a member of the ad hoc committee that originally wrote the proposal, and that the only concern was with academic department heads. Sharik asked if there were any objection to the inclusion of the word "academic" in the proposal. Carstens asked whether directors were included in 2-92. Sharik said that 2-92 dealt with department heads and with deans and directors of schools. Hubbard said "supervisor" was taken to mean department heads and the Deans of the Schools of Forestry and of Business, and the Director of the School of Technology. Thus, the Director of the School of Technology is a supervisor of an academic department. Diebel stated that the Director of the Institute of Wood Research, who functions under a Dean as an academic department head of the Wood Science program, in addition to his research responsibilities. Diebel asked if this person were included in Proposal 2-92. Hubbard said the Committee's opinion was that a unit functioning as a college ought to be called a college, and that Forestry & Wood Products should be named a college to be consistent with university practice. Keen said that IWR was not an academic department. Diebel said that in fact the director of IWR supervised several academic faculty. Sharik said that such hybrids would have to be

treated individually. Heuvers moved to accept the proposed rewording of Proposal 2-92. Roblee seconded the motion, which passed without opposition with a show-of-hands vote.

G. Proposal 3-92 on Faculty Governance. Sharik called for discussion of Proposal 3-92. Mullins said he was not comfortable with the omission of "directors" from the proposed rewording, and he did not understand why the Dean of Students or other directors should be exempt from the term limit. Heuvers said the small size of some of the units precluded use of the evaluation procedure. Mullins said that the proposal addressed the term of appointment only. Dobney said he hoped that terms of appointment would not be applicable to administrative directors. He suggested that secure 4-year terms might hamper efficient functioning of administrative officers. Sharik said that tenure modified the security of academic deans. Mullins said he conceded the argument for administrative directors.

Vilman said the concept of regular evaluation coupled with term appointment was important, even for administrative directors. Dobney replied that regular evaluation of administrative directors was possible and desirable, but need not be tied to term appointments; these directors serve at the pleasure of supervisors. Vilman said that this would still be the case with term appointments. Dobney replied that the legal grounds were shaky for early firing of an individual with a term appointment. He explained that administrative directors have no tenure in their position, but get two weeks termination notice.

Mullins suggested that the wording for Proposal 3-92 be "...all academic deans and directors...". Sharik asked who were the academic directors. Dobney replied that the Director of Education and the Dean of Students were examples. At Hubbard's prompting, Dobney included the Director of the Library. Moore said that a memo from the former provost indicated the Library Director was an administrative director. Dobney said he would have to disagree with the former provost because the Library is an academic unit with tenured faculty. Hubbard asked whether the wording "...academic deans and directors..." would include the directors of IMP and KRC. Dobney said that these were on soft money, and performance would be meaningless if the money went away.

Vilman said that the suggested changes were altering the substance of the referendum as originally passed by the faculty; the discussion before the referendum vote included the directors of the Library, KRC, etc. Hubbard said that the point of the discussion was to find a response to Power's memo and the Senate was effectively failing to do this. Mullins said that adding the word "academic" does not alter the proposal substantially; the research units would be included just as in the proposed constitution. Vilman pointed out that the research groups are separated from the academic groups in the proposed constitution. Sharik said that a motion for rewording was needed.

Hubbard moved that the wording remain as originally passed by referendum. Vilman seconded the motion. Heyman said that it should be made clear in the wording or in the record that 3-92 excluded the deans and directors mentioned in 2-92. Mullins asked if there were a quorum present. A hand-count showed that there was. Heyman proposed an addition, accepted by Hubbard as a friendly amendment, to make the proposal read "The term of appointment for all deans and directors (exclusive of those deans and directors covered in 2-92), shall be for a maximum of four years renewable". Whitt said that senators should be sure that this meaning was shared by the faculty who voted in the referendum. Grzelak asked if the wording now covered all the deans and directors, not just the academic ones. Sharik said that it did. Glime asked if the origin of the proposal in a faculty governance committee implied to the voting constituency that the issue was an

academic one, and asked further if anybody besides faculty voted on the proposal. She stated that this made it implicit that the application was only to academic deans and directors, and that this was her own understanding when she voted in the referendum. Sharik stated that the Board of Control would probably not approve a proposal that included administrative directors. Whitt stated that the Senate had to consider what the faculty thought when they voted for approval, and that she thought it applied only to the academic deans and directors when she voted. Grzelak said that the clear implication had been these were academic governance issues. Keeble said that adding the interpretation of administrative directors would make his constituents upset and angry. Bulleit said that his constituents would consider him an idiot if he voted to interpret the proposal to include administrative directors. Mullins said that the discussion in his department focused on the academic deans and that it was unfair to administrative directors to include them in the proposal when they were not allowed to vote in the referendum. The motion failed in a show-of-hands vote, 4-18.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3916      Minutes of Senate Meeting 198      5 May 1993

Mullins moved that the wording be "The term of appointment for all academic deans and directors (exclusive of those deans and directors covered in 2-92) shall be for a maximum of four years renewable". Beske-Diehl seconded the motion. Heuvers asked to whom the proposal referred. Sharik said that the Senate could leave it in a nebulous state. He also said that if this wording were a substantive change, as argued by Vilmann, then the proposal might have to be returned to the constituency for another referendum vote. Heuvers asked if the proposal now referred only to the Deans of Engineering and of Sciences and Arts. Hubbard said it now included the heads of the Library, of Continuing Education, and the Dean of Students. Vilmann asked if it would be clearer simply to list these positions. Hubbard said the proposal's application should be left to the discretion of the administration, in this case the provost. Mullins said that there would always be exceptions to any listing.

Roblee asked Provost Dobney what the term of appointment would be for the new Dean of Engineering and whether the maximum four-year recommendation from this proposal be followed. Dobney replied he did not know. Sharik commented that the term of appointment for the former dean involved several degrees of freedom. Hubbard said that the former provost had in fact accepted Proposal 3-92 and was merely seeking clarification; there was no question that the position of Dean of Engineering was covered by the proposal and that the search should be proceeding with a maximum term of appointment of four years. Dobney said the new dean would not be offered an appointment for more than four years. Vilmann said that until the proposal was approved by the Board of Control a ten-year appointment was possible. Dobney promised that such a term would not be offered. Hubbard commented that Provost Powers had said the proposal could be implemented without action by the Board. Whitt said that any future similar proposals should have explicit lists of positions, because many had voted in the referendum without a clear idea of their application.

Mullins referred to Power's memo, asking how the Dean of Students could not be an academic appointment. Provost Dobney said that he had defined it as academic. The motion passed in a show-of-hands vote, 20-2.

H. Proposal 2?-93: Developing Academic Policy. Sharik called for consideration of the flow chart [Appendix F of these minutes] included with the Agenda. Vilmann moved the acceptance of the

proposal. Heyman seconded the motion. Sharik said the President and the Provost had suggested the following modifications: (1) that the Provost/Executive Vice-President be included in the "President Box", because Senate proposals will go to that person; (2) that a dashed arrow be provided between the "President/Provost Box" and the "Senate Executive Council Box" (with the Council representing the Senate officers and chairs of all the Senate standing committees), to indicate the possibility of direct communication between the upper administration and this Senate body; (3) that the heading be reworded with the addition of the phrase "as specified in its Constitution and Bylaws".

Whitt asked about the appropriateness of including the Cabinet on the flow chart. Sharik replied that the Cabinet was only an advisory body to the President, and that other advisory bodies were included. Hubbard said that the Cabinet did not originate policy. Dobney said the box on the chart was informational, to show what input the President receives before making decisions on policy. Sharik said the four-year technology degree program was a good example of policy that is going to be presented to the Cabinet by the President. Glime said that she was aware of a policy decision on tuition reduction for part-time staff that was presented directly to the Cabinet, and was going next to the Board of Control. Sharik said that the policy did not originate in the Senate. Glime replied that it originated in the Cabinet, and said that the Cabinet appears to have some decision-making ability. Sharik said this was equivalent to saying the President had decision-making abilities outside of the Senate, and that any formal proposals must originate or pass through the Senate. Dobney said that this was an example of the sort of recommendation that comes to the President from administrative directors; however, the Cabinet has no power to decide anything.

Mullins said that the meaning of the dashed and solid arrows on the flow chart were not intuitively obvious. Hubbard said the solid arrows represented mainstream decisions, and the dashed arrows represented advisory functions. Whitt asked whether the Cabinet could tinker with and change a proposal passed by the Senate, and would the altered proposal be presented to the Board of Control. Beske-Diehl said that an altered proposal should be returned to the Senate. Sharik said that the Senate must look at any altered proposals, and could in fact go past the President to the Board if the Senate disagreed with the altered proposal. Whitt said that it still seemed possible for the Cabinet to alter a proposal to which the President and Provost had no objection originally. Sharik said that the President was free to alter his opinion of a proposal based on the Cabinet's input. Dobney said that if changes were made in a proposal as a result of Cabinet input, the proposal had to be returned to the Senate. Sharik said that the removal of the Cabinet from the flow chart would make no difference in the flow of proposals, that the President would be free to consult or ignore his Cabinet. Whitt said its inclusion in the flow chart in fact acknowledges the Cabinet as part of the process. Mullins asked again about the dashed and solid lines. Vilmann, Bulleit, Hubbard, and Mullins agreed that the solid lines represented mandated paths of proposal flow, and the dashed lines represented consultation, advice and information flow.

Carstens asked whether the proposal for the 4-year curriculum in the School of Technology would follow the proposed flow or the existing path, whatever it may be. Dobney replied that the existing path resembles the flow chart closely. The motion passed in a show-of-hands vote, 20-0.

I. Proposal 16-92: Departmental Governance. Sharik called for discussion of Proposal 16-92 [Appendix E of these minutes], saying the constituency had not had sufficient time to review the document and that it should be revisited in the fall. Keen asked if the

vote on the proposal would take place in the Senate, or be sent as a referendum to the constituency. Hubbard said it should go out as a referendum, because it replaces three of the faculty governance proposals submitted for referendum in Spring 1992. Heuvers said that it need not be sent out as a referendum. Hubbard said that it probably should go out, to avoid having the faculty think that the Senate was trying to pull a fast one after the original proposals were not passed. Vilmann said that the requirement of a charter is a major issue for departments, and that a referendum is appropriate.

Carstens that some other questions might be included in the evaluation questionnaire (p.15), including "How well has your department head fostered a positive climate for women and minorities?", and "Has your department head made efforts to improve diversity in your department?" Vilmann said that some of his constituents had raised the same questions.

Mullins said that the referendum should take place early in the fall, and that consideration of important proposals such as this should occur early in Senate sessions, rather than at 11:30 pm after a lot of trivial business. Sharik said that the problem of Senate meetings was fundamental, and that the present consideration of the proposal was only advisory. Mullins said the proposal should be sent out as soon as possible. Hubbard asked if the proposal could be distributed via Tech Topics. Keen replied that Tech Topics will distribute curriculum changes and constitutions, but that routine proposals probably were not welcome.

## XII. New Business

A. Graduate Student Medical Coverage. Sharik called for Brian Richter, a representative of the Graduate Student Council, to address the Senate on the subject of medical coverage for graduate

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3917 Minutes of Senate Meeting 198 5 May 1993

students. Richter distributed a handout [Appendix K of these minutes].

Richter read from a graduate student petition with more than 300 attached signatures: "We, the undersigned graduate students of MTU are petitioning the University to provide health insurance for all graduate students enrolled at MTU. More specifically, we are asking the University to provide graduate students the same policy or a comparable policy to the one currently being offered by the undergraduate student government. We ask that this policy be provided at no cost to the graduate students, and at a fifty percent cost to their families. In light of our research into graduate student health care at other midwestern peer universities, we feel that the above insurance package and payment system is a rather meager request to the University."

Richter said the only policy available to graduate students is the undergraduate policy available at \$360 per year, which is expensive for graduate students. He referred to his handout on information from other schools' graduate student health care, which indicated that all MTU's peer institutions provided better health care plans. Richter asked the Senate for their feedback, their support, and a vote of support if possible.

Dobney said that he had encouraged Richter to speak to the Senate because the problem was important, but also because the faculty needed to consider where the matter fit financial priorities. Sharik asked about fringe benefit rates at the other universities, and suggested that this information would be helpful in making a decision. Heuvers said that in mathematics the



graduate students serve essentially as faculty, and it would make sense to offer them similar coverage. Vilmann said that the coverage would be about \$200,000 per year. Dobney said that the university was looking at several options for student health care, including discussing some options with Portage View Hospital, but that meantime there was a real problem. Dobney added that the graduate student report failed to mention that the coverage at most of the peer institutions was only for people who were on appointment, such as RAs or TAs. Richter said that treatment varied among universities. At some, TAs were considered staff. Richter said that the graduate students without appointments were the least able to pay for the current student health plan. Dobney said this would defeat the purpose of insurance, which was to reward those persons providing service to the institution. Sharik said that the graduate students could present the plan as a proposal for Senate consideration, assuming the proposed constitution is supported in the referendum. Carstens wondered whether the Senate should provide a vote of support for the health plan. Sharik thanked Richter for his presentation, and asked for a vote showing support. The voice vote was unanimous.

#### XIII. Announcements

Sharik asked for additional feedback for ideas for Senate meetings. He announced that there was no need for special meetings, so that the adjournment would be for the summer.

#### XIV. Adjournment

Several senators moved to adjourn the meeting. President Sharik declared the meeting adjourned at 12:20 am.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Senate Secretary

.