

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
Minutes of Meeting No. 200
29 September 1993

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) approved a Resolution of Respect for Past President Sharik,
 - (2) designated the three Senate officers as the new Board-of-Control Relations Committee,
 - (3) amended Proposal 4-93, Policy Flow Chart, to include "normally" for consistency with the constitution,
 - (4) amended and approved Proposal 16-92, Departmental Governance,
 - (5) voted to submit Proposal 16-92 to a referendum of Senate constituents,
 - (6) postponed selection of a representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee
 - (7) decided not to replace a representative position on the Search Committee for a Director of Information Technology,
 - (8) agreed to discuss a Special Hiring Initiative plan,
 - (9) consented to the reformation of Senate committee structure by the Executive Committee*.
-

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 29 September 1993, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 26 Senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternate representatives from the following units were absent: Army ROTC, Humanities, Non-Academic Groups 1, 2, & 3. Absent Senators-at-large: Boutilier. Absent liaison persons: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, Computer Technology Services, Undergraduate Student Council, Graduate Student Council, Staff Council.

III. Introduction of New Senators

Keen referred to a list of senators [Appendix B of these minutes] circulated with the agenda, and noted some recent additions from elections and from the constitutional reorganization.

IV. Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were Provost Dobney and Marcia Goodrich of Tech Topics.

V. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst announced that meetings would be held to two hours, which required tight control over the agenda. Senators should notify the officers when they wished to appear on the agenda, and committee reports would be placed on the agenda selectively. Referring to the circulated agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], Bornhorst announced that Old Business would also include a short report on special hiring.

VI. Report of the Senate President

A. Resolution of Commendation. Bornhorst said the Senate owed Past President Terry Sharik a formal recognition of his service, and asked Vice-President Moore to read a resolution prepared by the new officers:

"Whereas Professor Terry L. Sharik has provided service to Michigan Technological University as President of the Senate for the year 1992-1993, above and beyond the call of duty through countless hours of unstinting devotion to Senate responsibilities; and

Whereas, as a result of his efforts in undertaking the roll of self-appointed watchdog to the myriad Senate committees, the Senate can point with pride to a year of accomplishment; and

Whereas through all this Professor Sharik never lost his sense of purpose, his sense of grace, and his sense of humor;

Be It Resolved: That we, the new University Senate, accord to Professor Sharik this record of respect, and enter into the minutes a permanent reminder for generations to come of an acknowledgement of his achievements and recognition of the new heights to which he raised the office of University Senate President. The University Senate and its constituents offer forth their most profound thanks."

Heyman moved that the resolution be adopted, and Glime seconded the motion. The motion was adopted without objection.

B. Comments. Bornhorst said that as the new president, he would try to facilitate open debate in the Senate, and to represent the Senate fairly. He said that the new constitution expands the Senate's role in shared governance, and that the administration is serious about that role. Some recent signs of this: (1) the Senate president was invited to share the platform at the Fall Convocation with administrators; (2) actions at the recent Board of Control meeting; (3) a recent meeting with Provost Dobney.

Bornhorst said the Senate should be serious about its role also, to be effective and respected. Bornhorst promised to help the Senate exercise its responsibilities and authority. As a part of this, the committee structure of the Senate needs to be revised in light of the new constitution, and each Senator and Alternate should serve on at least one standing committee.

C. Announcements. Bornhorst said the officers had been busy since their election and had met several times. The officers also had met recently with Provost Dobney, CFO McGarry, and Linda Ott, Assistant to the Provost. Bornhorst said that certain items from these meetings, and also some other matters should be presented to the whole Senate:

- (1) Tenure and promotion policies need revision. Provost Dobney has said that he intended to submit to the Senate any changes of tenure policy from the Committee on Academic Tenure. Bornhorst said that the Senate Executive Committee will work with the Academic Tenure Committee on a mechanism for joint review of the current policy.
- (2) Revision is also needed in Board of Control Policy 16.6 which prohibits faculty input on issues of university finance. The Provost and the CFO have said they will work to have this policy amended.
- (3) The Provost will implement Senate Proposals 2-92 and 3-92 on terms of appointments for directors of departments, schools and colleges.

- (4) A proposal to create a Department of Fine Arts has been referred to the Curricular Policy Committee of the Senate, with copies to be available at the Reserve Desk in the Van Pelt Library.
- (5) There has been progress toward hiring a half-time Senate Assistant. Bornhorst said that several well-qualified candidates had been interviewed, and recommendations would go soon to the Affirmative Action Office.
- (6) Bornhorst said that because of the Banner System change-over, midterm grade report forms would not be available this Fall Term.

D. Committees. Bornhorst announced that the Constitution and Constituency Committee was discharged. He also asked the chairs of the active committees to be prepared to report on the plans for committee activities at the next meeting.

Page 3997 Minutes of Senate Meeting 200 29 Sept 1993

VII. Reports of Affiliated, Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

A. President's Cabinet. Bornhorst said that as Senate President he was the Senate representative to the University President's Cabinet. The Cabinet met this term before Bornhorst was elected. However, Bornhorst had received material handed out at the latest cabinet meeting. This material [Appendix C of these minutes] had been distributed to the Senate with the agenda. Bornhorst drew attention particularly to the material on the budgeting process.

B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force. Bornhorst referred to the notes [Appendix D of these minutes] on the May and July Board meetings prepared by former Senate V-P Vilmann, and distributed with the Senate agenda. Bornhorst said the Board met on September 24 and he had represented the Senate at that meeting. Bornhorst summarized some significant points of the meeting:

- (1) One of President Tompkins' first statements to the Board was the introduction of Bornhorst as the new Senate President.
- (2) Dobney told the Board that the new Senate constitution was in effect, and acknowledged the new officers.
- (3) Dobney noted the need for numerous policy actions by the Senate, including revision of the faculty handbook.
- (4) The Board passed the proposal for a 4-year program for the School of Technology; it next goes to the academic officers of the State of Michigan before coming back to the university.
- (5) The financial status of the university was reviewed - the balance sheets show improvement.
- (6) The Board approved a sick-leave-pool proposal, and a change in accrual of vacation time for non-exempt employees.
- (7) The Board approved a modified investment policy for endowment funds and retirement health-care funds. Among other changes, it mandates a campus investment group with Senate representation.

Bornhorst stated that the Board of Control Liaison is very important. Bornhorst said the current Executive Committee* therefore recommends that the Board of Control Liaison Task Force be dissolved, and that it be replaced with a new standing committee. The committee is to be called the Board of Control Relations Committee, and is to be composed of the Senate President as chair, with the Vice-President and Secretary as members. Bornhorst asked if there were objections to this change in policy.

Heyman said that the change could be in the form of a motion. Hubbard asked if this would be the whole committee. Bornhorst said it was his intent. Hubbard said that the Task Force previously had

included the chairpersons of the other committees. Bornhorst said that he did not object to including more people, but that most functions would be performed by one person. However, this did not preclude other senators meeting with the Board. Glime commented that the function was mostly to report on Board actions, because the individual merely attended as a reporter for the Senate. Bornhorst said that there were two functions: reporting to the Senate, and speaking as a Senate representative.

Bornhorst asked whether a motion was needed. Hubbard said it could be placed under New Business. Bulleit said that the Task Force in the past had breakfast with the Board, and suggested that such activities might include other members of the Senate. Bornhorst said that the Committee would be responsible for ensuring that a Senate representative was at Board meetings.

Heyman moved that the Board of Control Relations Committee consist of the three officers. Bulleit seconded the motion. The motion passed in a voice vote without opposition.

C. Financial Planning and Policy Committee. Bornhorst referred to the June report of the Committee [Appendix E of these minutes] attached to the agenda. Mullins commented that Jambekar was no longer a Senator, and that a new chair of the Committee would have to be elected. Bornhorst said that this would be considered under New Business with an item on Senate committee structure. Heyman said that this raised the general problem of getting new senators onto committees. Bornhorst agreed, and said that this would be considered in detail later.

VIII. Old Business

A. Proposal 4-93: Policy Flow Chart. Bornhorst called attention to the Policy Flow Chart [Appendix F of these minutes] attached to the agenda. Bornhorst said that a motion was needed to amend it, to make the heading sentence consistent with the new constitution. Specifically, the word "normally" needed to be inserted to correspond to the wording of Article III, Section C, which had been approved at the previous meeting. Hubbard moved that the word "normally" be inserted to make the sentence read "All policies relevant to the MTU Senate constituency, as specified in its constitution and bylaws, must normally be approved by the Senate." Heyman seconded the motion. Hubbard asked what the sentence meant. Bornhorst replied that Hubbard had made the motion. Heuvers said it now agreed with the constitution. Hubbard said it meant nothing there either. Bornhorst said at least it was consistent. There was no further discussion and the motion passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Mullins said that the Senate Executive Council was now identical with the Board of Control Liaison Committee, which could make the chart confusing if the arrows were redrawn. Bornhorst noted the Board of Control Task Force is now called the Board of Control Relations Committee, and said that the flow chart might best be left without specifying the identity of the Senate Council and the Board of Control Relations Committee; the Senate might wish to separate these again. Hubbard said the work load for these individuals might be too heavy. Heyman said it should be left as it stand, because the role of the Board of Control Relations Committee is only advisory, and not part of the flow of authority.

B. Proposal 16-92: Departmental Governance. Bornhorst referred to the copy of Proposal 16-92 [see Minutes p.3949-3960 (Mtng 198, Appendix E)] attached to the agenda, and asked for a motion. Hubbard moved that Proposal 16-92 be adopted, and Mullins seconded the motion.

Arici asked about the meaning of "dean senior from outside" on p.3 under Item 1, Search Committee. Hubbard said the sentence

should read "One member ... from outside the department is appointed by the dean." Arici next referred to the evaluation procedure described on p.6, specifically the "...meeting of all members of the department..." following distribution of the report, and asked if "all members" included the chairperson. Hubbard said this would be up to the individual department, because this is part of procedural guidelines. Bornhorst said it would be appropriate for the department chair to be present for clarification and questions.

Roblee asked whether chairperson included directors, for example of the School of Technology. Hubbard said this was covered in the second paragraph of page 1, in which schools were equated with departments. Hubbard said that the person in the leadership position of these units were regarded at the same level as a departmental chairperson. Mullins said that the only substantive, well-defined part of the proposal were the first three paragraphs, and the remainder was made up of general guidelines to help model the charter. Hubbard said the charter for the School of Technology would refer to "director" rather than "chairperson".

Mullins said that the proposals submitted to the referendum in Spring 1992 were very specific, and that this proposal represents a remolding, without specificity other than having a charter for governance, for searches, etc. Bulleit said that everything after the Guidelines heading seems like an example. Hubbard agreed.

Heyman asked whether there was any way to know when a

Page 3998 Minutes of Senate Meeting 200 29 Sept 1993

department had adopted a charter. Hubbard said that something like this ought to be included. Bulleit said that nothing in the proposal prevented a department head from writing a charter and saying "We're done". He said this does not seem like faculty governance. Mullins said that the version submitted to the referendum spelled this out. Beck asked whether there was a provision for filing the charter in the library, because this was one mechanism for knowing when a charter has been written. Heyman asked whether a line might be inserted, reading "The departmental charter shall be valid after it is approved by a simple majority of Senate constituents in the department." Bornhorst asked whether adoption should be reported to the Senate. Heyman said it should be, and asked whether "Senate constituents" was the desired wording. Heuvers wondered whether deans and the provost should receive a copy, just as they do for promotion and tenure guidelines. Glime said that the departments should decide who votes for the charter. Beck said that somebody would have to make the initial determination about who decides; this could be the head. Glime said that it might be at least the Senate constituency. Hubbard pointed out that this is covered in the guidelines. Bornhorst said that these were only guidelines and covered future charters, but that the initial choice is unclear. Beck said that there should be a minimum group specified in the proposal itself, and that the minimal group could decide to include others in the department if appropriate. The point is to avoid a one-person initial decision. Diebel said that the full constituency would be appropriate in IWR, which is one of the unusual units.

Heyman moved an amendment to the motion, to insert a second paragraph: "The departmental charter shall be valid after it is approved by a simple majority of the Senate constituency of that department." Beck seconded the motion, but said he would like to see some sort of filing of the charter. Heyman said he wished to add to his amendment, "A copy will be on file in the library. Passage of the charter will be reported to the Senate, the Dean and

the Provost." Glime suggested that the motion read "... and any others as determined by that constituency." Heyman said this was acceptable.

Keen read the entire amendment: "The departmental charter shall be valid after it is approved by a simple majority of the Senate constituency of that unit, and any other members as determined by that constituency. A copy of the departmental charter shall be placed on file in the library. The Senate, dean and provost shall be notified." There was no further discussion; the amendment passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Lowther asked about the extent of the guidelines. Bornhorst said that all the materials after the first (now) four paragraphs were guidelines. Lowther asked whether this might be made more apparent. Bornhorst suggested that the guidelines might begin on a separate page. Hubbard said that the separateness of the guidelines seemed adequate from the wording of the proposal. Dobney said that the intent would be clearer if "suggested" or "recommended" were attached to "guidelines", because guidelines might be more strictly interpreted than just recommendations.

Heuvers moved that the proposal be amended to read "suggested guidelines". Arici seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the amendment passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Keen asked whether the Committee intended the "Name" blank on page 10 to be filled with the evaluator or with the evaluated person. Hubbard said this was not clear, and that the evaluatee's name was to be inserted. Bornhorst suggested that the reading be "chair".

Glime asked whether a deadline for the development of a charter needed to be recommended. Bulleit said the deadline was up to the department. Leifer said it might be appropriate to suggest that the deadline be one academic year or quarter. Keen asked what would be the consequences if the departments do not follow the recommended deadline. Bornhorst said that it was possible theoretically for a blank charter to be submitted. Mullins said that if true faculty governance was desired, a deadline would have to be set instead of leaving it open-ended. The enforcement of the deadline would be up to the administration. Roblee said that if a department decided it did not want to be involved in governance, they would not write a charter. Hubbard said that if the Board of Control accepts the proposal and implements it, then each department will be required to write a charter; the Board could set whatever deadline it pleased. Bornhorst suggested a deadline of one year after adoption of the proposal by the Board. Heuvers said that if the Senate does not set a guideline, then the administration might.

Leifer moved that the proposal be amended to begin "Within one year after adoption of this proposal by the Board of Control, ..." Grzelak seconded the motion. Fynewever asked why a deadline needed to be set if a blank sheet might be submitted. Bornhorst said that the proposal did not specify the form of a charter, nor did it say that it had to be 500 words or any arbitrary length. Bornhorst expressed doubt that the administration would accept a blank charter. Fynewever said that if the Senate did not mandate something, some departments would do nothing. Bulleit said that the proposal stated the charters could be as simple as the department wanted. Bornhorst said the guidelines were to make the departments' job easy. There was no further discussion, and the amendment passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Bornhorst asked for further discussion of the amended motion. There was none, and the motion for adopting the amended Proposal 16-92 passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Bornhorst asked whether the proposal needed to be sent to the faculty as a referendum. Hubbard said that it did; otherwise the Senate would be seen as pulling a fast one, having previously submitted similar proposals to referendum in which they were

defeated. Mullins said they were not exactly defeated. Hubbard said they were defeated under the rules the Senate set for the referendum (majority of eligible voters).

Hubbard moved that Proposal 16-92 should be submitted to the faculty as a referendum issue and that the issue be decided by a simple majority of those voting. Heuvers seconded the motion. Roblee asked whether the motion should be sent to the Senate constituency rather than only the faculty. Hubbard said that it should. Goodrich asked whether the issue was to be submitted to the academic Senate constituency, or the entire constituency. Bornhorst said it was to go to the constituency as now defined. Heuvers said the statement of the decision of a simple majority was not needed because the referendum procedure was now defined in the constitution. Bornhorst said that this change constituted an editorial change. Without further discussion, the motion passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Keen asked when the referendum was to be held. Bornhorst said it should be sent out as soon as possible, but that it should not occur before senators have an opportunity to inform their constituents. Bornhorst said that the Executive* and Elections Committee will schedule the referendum. Keen said that senators would be responsible for distributing copies of the proposal and guidelines to their constituencies. Lowther asked whether there was provision for making electronic copies of the material, for example on the Gopher System. Bornhorst replied that this was a goal of the Senate office, and that the candidates for Senate Assistant had been asked about their familiarity with e-mail.

C. Proposal 2-94: Supplemental Health Benefits. Bornhorst drew attention to the proposal [Appendix G of these minutes] attached to the agenda. He asked Leifer, Chair of the Fringe Benefits Committee, for his comments. Leifer pointed out that the Sick Leave Pool adopted by the Board, and this proposal, are not retirement benefits. Leifer said that Proposal 2-94, which was tabled at the May Senate meeting, was needed because two categories of employees were overlooked when the health benefits proposal was adopted the previous year. Leifer said that the Committee had obtained the cost estimates from the university's accounting and actuarial consultants in July. The estimates were based on a self-funding model required by the Federal

Page 3999 Minutes of Senate Meeting 200 29 Sept 1993

government. Leifer distributed copies of these estimates [Appendix H of these minutes]. Leifer said that the model results in the proposal being self-funding in 20 years from the amounts set aside annually for that period. Leifer said the two amounts initially were one-tenth of one percent of the university's budget, and the percentage will decrease. Leifer said the proposal was humane and affordable. He proposed that a codicil be added to make the plan retroactive to the time of adoption of the health benefits plan, which was October 1992.

Arici moved to adopt the proposal, and Carstens seconded it. Bornhorst asked Provost Dobney to comment on the larger funding picture involved in adopting the proposal. Dobney said that the health benefits package was \$600,000 this year, and the supplemental proposal is more modest at \$117,000 in the first year. Dobney said that Leifer was correct in the estimates of 0.1 percent of the budget, but said that these funds for benefits would come off the top of any new monies for new faculty or salary increases. Dobney said that he agreed with the intent of the proposal and that if the policies are not approved, he would make exceptions and

cover the people who would have fallen under these policies. Dobney said one of the ways of looking at the proposal is that it costs two faculty positions. Leifer replied that, if the university cannot take care of the faculty already here, then what is the point in bringing in new faculty.

Roblee said that Leifer had made the assumption that a person on long-term disability would get well or die; however, a third and much more expensive alternative is that the person could remain on disability for a long time. Roblee also pointed out that the proposal covered only persons participating in the TIAA-CREF option, and that MPSERS personnel are not included. While persons covered with MPSERS already have the benefits included in the proposal, they also lack some of the other benefits enjoyed by employees covered under TIAA-CREF. Roblee noted that MPSERS persons were also omitted from last year's significant increase in retirement benefits. Roblee said that the proposal's statement is true, that MPSERS participants already have these benefits; however, they have given up others. The persons selecting MPSERS at the start of employment gave up some retirement benefits; however, other benefits would be greater. Roblee said that the proposal now asks the university to supplement the TIAA-CREF plan to make up the difference between MPSERS and TIAA-CREF in some other areas.

Leifer said that this was not a retirement plan. Roblee said that it involved differences in benefits packages. Leifer said that TIAA-CREF was chosen because the benefits were portable. Roblee said that this was a benefit that MPSERS participants do not have. Leifer said that the proposal only covered individuals after 10 or 15 years of service. He added that faculty should not present the administration with a MPSERS versus TIAA-CREF argument. Leifer said that the proposal was developed by a Committee with MPSERS personnel on it. He said the two programs differ fundamentally, one having a defined contribution, the other having defined benefits.

Grzelak said that the comparison becomes more difficult because the programs have both changed with time. Roblee said that the Committee should consider the legality of supplying benefits to one group of employees that are not supplied to another. Hubbard said that the proposal required funding even if there is no person receiving benefits. Dobney said that this is the reason why he has promised to make exceptions to provide the proposal's benefits without a formal policy statement, for minimal cost.

Bornhorst said that the 15-year figure was arbitrary, and wondered why it was not 14 or 13. Heyman asked whether the long-term disability coverage might obligate the university to provide million-dollar-per-year coverage. Dobney said that there was a stop-loss mechanism in the university's insurance coverage. Leifer said that these benefits were initiated because the retirement program before Dobney arrived was atrocious. If the administration liked you, you got a golden parachute. The aim of the retirement benefits packages was to level the playing fields.

Fynewever asked how employee was to be defined, and asked about the 15-year limit. Leifer said that the definition in the proposal included full-time employees at 30+ hours per week. He added that the proposal was written to exclude the possibility of double dipping by persons with other coverage. Bornhorst said this was irrelevant because the funds had to be accumulated whether or not they were used. Heuvers asked whether the proposal would be affected by establishment of a national health care package. Bornhorst said that this problem would be faced with all benefits packages.

Grzelak asked whether the university would pay the entire coverage for the surviving spouse, or should the plan shift to the retirement plan with a co-pay provision when the deceased faculty member would have accumulated 80 points, for example. Leifer said

that they would fall under the prevailing university policy, including co-payment provisions.

Bradley said that the proposal needed more discussion, and moved to table the motion. Grimm seconded the motion. Leifer said that the motion had been tabled at the Senate meeting in May because of a request for detailed annual costs, and that the Committee had provided the information. Roblee said that the legality of inequality needed to be considered. Mullins said the Senate would meet next week and the proposal could be considered then. Leifer said that somebody could die before the proposal could be put into effect. Bornhorst said that the Board of Control had established a precedent for making benefits policy retroactive with their adoption of the vacation accrual proposal.

The motion to table Proposal 2-94 passed 14-8 in a show-of-hands vote.

D. Selection of Senate Representative for SBEA Dean Search Committee. Bornhorst said that the administration had asked the Senate to select a representative to serve on the Search Committee for a new Dean of the School of Business and Engineering Administration, and that there had been no volunteers or nominations at the previous meeting. Glime asked about the gender distribution on the current committee. Bornhorst said the committee was 100 percent male among the faculty. Dobney said the alumni representative was female. Glime asked whether the individual selected by the Senate needed to be a senator. Bornhorst replied that the representative need not be a senator, and that it would be appropriate if the individual were not. Goodrich volunteered to run an notice in Tech Topics requesting a volunteer. Hubbard said that the Senate could try again in one week.

Lowther asked about the purpose of a Senate representative if the individual was not a senator. Bornhorst said this enabled the Senate to choose how it wanted to be represented. The individual selected by the Senate could be asked to report to the Senate on the activities of the committee. Heyman said this was moving to a model in which individuals from outside a unit served on search committees for the unit leadership, and follows the guidelines of the departmental governance proposal for search procedures.

E. Selection of Replacement for Search Committee for Director of Information Technology. Bornhorst said that the Senate had selected two individuals, one of whom dropped out. Moore said that the Committee was in the process of conducting phone interviews of eight finalists for the position. Bornhorst asked whether the position should be filled or left vacant, and commented that Moore was serving as the representative from the Library, not from the Senate.

Lowther asked about the identity of the unit called Information Technology. Moore replied that the Director of Information Technology would be more than the director of the current CTS. The Director would also be asked to play a larger role, for example in making recommendations to the Provost about directions in computing, information technology, distance learning, etc. Lowther asked about the current membership of the Search

Committee. Moore listed the members. Carstens asked what has happened to CTS, which used to be ACS. Dobney said it was still CTS. Grimm said that there seemed to be sufficient numbers on the

Committee. Mullins said that the process was so far along that a new member would find it difficult to catch up. Bornhorst recommended that the position would be left unfilled; there were no objections.

F. Scheduling of Senate Meetings. Bornhorst referred to the list of meeting dates [Appendix I of these minutes] attached to the agenda. He said the officers were recommending the "Sharik model" of the first and third Wednesdays of each month, and that the schedule would hold at least through the Fall quarter. Roblee said that he preferred a single meeting of four hours to two meetings of 2 hours. Leifer said that the consensus from the previous year was the bi-weekly schedule. Grimm said that an active Senate needs to meet frequently. Carstens said that the bi-weekly meetings must be held strictly to the two-hour limit.

G. Special Hiring Initiative. Glime moved that senators bring to the next Senate meeting comments and suggestions on the special hiring proposal (presented at the previous meeting), and that at least 30 minutes be given to a discussion of the proposal. Glime said she would invite other members of the Special Hiring Committee to the next meeting. Heyman said he thought there was to be an open forum on the issue. Bornhorst said that it was important for the Senate to provide the initial input into the formation of any proposal, and that the Senate could recommend a forum. Arici asked if Glime would like to see the comments received by some senators. Glime said the preference is the open Senate discussion. Grzelak asked if visitors would be welcome. Bornhorst said that visitors were always welcome.

Bornhorst said that there was no need for a motion for bringing comments. Hubbard asked whether this had a proposal number. Bornhorst said it did not. Keen said that if it is adopted or involves policy, it will come through the Senate with a number. However, no document had been submitted to the Senate officers or Executive Committee* as a proposal. Glime said that the matter needed an open discussion before formal submission of a proposal.

IX. New Business

A. Structure of Senate Committees. Bornhorst said his personal view was that the Senate had to take control of its own committees as outlined in the new constitution. He said the current system has some problems, for example that senators may serve a maximum of six years, but that non-senators may serve without limit on committees. He stated that the previous committee system developed haphazardly.

Bornhorst suggested (1) that standing committees and their areas of responsibility be linked to the list of authority given in the new constitution, (2) that terms of non-senators be defined, (3) that committee chairs must be senators or alternates elected by the committees, (4) that there should be elected vice-chairs, and (5) that there are academic committees based on the responsibility list and these should have only academic members. Bornhorst said the Executive Committee* was requesting Senate approval to develop a plan for defining committee areas, as required in the Bylaws A.1.d. Bornhorst said the plan would be brought to the Senate for discussion.

Glime moved that the Senate give approval to the Executive Committee* to develop committee organization. Kawatra seconded the motion, which passed without opposition in a voice vote.

Bornhorst asked for discussion on the desired number of members of standing committees. Bulleit said that this could be determined best when the number of major standing committees had been set. Heyman said the optimal number for a committee was six, but that five or seven members were needed to avoid tie votes.

Bornhorst asked for comments about the number of faculty and staff other than senators and alternates that should be on committees. He stated that the Senate should set up a procedure so that the structure of committees is plain. Glime said that number would vary depending on the committee charge. Leifer said that committees should have a diverse constituency. Bornhorst said that current committee structure is chaotic and based on volunteerism, and that committees can be stacked instantly with a group of volunteers. Heuvers said that technically, the Executive Committee can prevent this based on the Bylaws.

XIV. Adjournment

Leifer moved to adjourn. There were many seconds. President Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

* In the context of this meeting, "Executive Committee" is synonymous with the Senate officers; cf. minutes of Meeting 201.