

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 202
20 October 1993

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a presentation on revision of the Faculty Handbook,
 - (2) approved two amendments to the responsibilities list of Senate standing committees,
 - (3) approved a procedure for the constitutional limitation of voting to subsets of senators,
 - (4) received a provisional list of committee assignments for senators and alternates,
 - (5) approved Proposal 3-94, Establishment of a Department of Fine Arts,
 - (6) elected a Senate representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee.
-

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called Meeting 202 to order at 5:35 pm on Wednesday, 20 October 1993, in Room B37 EERC.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 28 senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternate representatives from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Library, Mining Engineering, Non-Academic Group 2. Liaison members Max Seel (Dean of Sciences and Arts) and Eric Little (GSC) were present. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Undergraduate Student Government, CTS, Staff Council.

III. Introductions

President Bornhorst introduced the new Senate Assistant, Marilyn Hay, and said that Marilyn would be in the Senate office each morning and that she could be reached at ext. 3331. Fynewever commented that campus phone operators do not have the Senate phone number. Bornhorst added that the mailroom was sending Senate mail to a former Senate president, and that both problems will be corrected.

IV. Recognition of Visitors

The following visitors were recognized: Linda Ott (Computer Science), Milton Olsson (Humanities), Cynthia Selfe (Humanities).

V. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst said he had no adjustments for the agenda [Appendix A of these minutes] and asked for adjustments from the floor; there were none. Bornhorst asked for objections to approving the agenda; there were none.

VI. Presentation on Academic Faculty Handbook

Bornhorst said that in his first meeting with Provost Dobney, revision of the Academic Faculty Handbook was set as a business item of high priority. The current Handbook is dated October 16, 1989, and urgently needs revising. Provost Dobney had given the

Senate officers an outline for a democratic and stepwise procedure for revision, and had proposed that the changes should go through the Senate.

Bornhorst said that the revised Handbook would be in looseleaf form to make it easy to revise and update. To identify the areas needing work, Provost Dobney had appointed a Steering Committee, consisting of Linda Ott (chair), Ellen Horsch and Debbie Lassila as representatives of the administration, and three faculty. The Provost had asked Bornhorst to appoint the three faculty members. Following the Provost's suggestions, Bornhorst had appointed himself as Senate President, Keen as Senate Secretary, and the Chair of the Academic Policy Committee because that Committee would deal with most of the policy changes. As Interim Chair of the Committee, Bulleit would serve at least temporarily on the Steering Committee. Bornhorst then introduced Linda Ott for a presentation on the Faculty Handbook's revision.

Ott said that the Provost is interested in revising the Faculty Handbook this year and had asked her to chair the Steering Committee for the revision. The Committee has representatives from the administration and the faculty. Ellen Horsch, the Director of Human Relations, is familiar with employment policies, and Debbie Lassila from the Provost's office is familiar with faculty procedures. The Committee will determine which policies in the Handbook need revision, and will appoint task forces to do the revision. These task forces will act as subcommittees of appropriate Senate committees. Policy recommendations will go to Senate committees and then to the Senate. The Steering Committee is to oversee the progress of the revision, keeping track of policy overlap and consistency. Any group on campus may bring suggestions for revision to the Steering Committee or to the appropriate Senate committee.

Ott said the revised Faculty Handbook is intended to be a living document in notebook form so that updates can be sent out periodically. It may also be on-line for easy access in updated form. Ott emphasized that the Committee is a steering committee and not a policy setting committee.

Mullins asked for the date and compiler of the last Faculty Handbook. Ott replied that it came out in 1989, apparently from the 5th Floor of the Ad Bldg, and that it contained policy revisions not reviewed by the faculty. Bornhorst noted that it contained editorial revisions of the Senate constitution.

Grzelak said that there had been a Senate committee for the Faculty Handbook, and asked about its involvement in the 1989 revision. Ott said she thought there had been no Senate involvement. Bornhorst said he understood that this time the Senate will deal not only with individual policies, but also with the entire document. Boutilier said that a Senate committee on the faculty handbook existed in 1989. Heuvers said that Allen Hambley was chair of that Senate committee.

Bornhorst said that Debbie Lassila recently had attended a conference on faculty handbooks, and the Provost's office now has outlines and models of good faculty handbooks. Ott said that Lassila also is gathering handbooks from peer institutions for comparison. Mullins asked if the finalized handbook would come to the Senate for approval. Ott replied that the Committee had not yet met, but her idea was that policies and procedures will go to Senate committees and the Senate individually, and then come to the Senate as a completed handbook. McKimpson asked whether a timetable had been set. Ott replied that the goal for completion is the end of the academic year. Bornhorst commented that some policy changes may carry over to next year, but that major changes should be completed this year. Ott said the advantage of a living document is that changes may be incorporated as they are made. Heuvers said that the Senate minutes should be checked to find recently revised policies. Ott replied that this was to be one of

the Steering Committee's first steps.

There were no further questions. Bornhorst thanked Ott for her presentation. He commented that the revision would be a major task for the Senate, so the process should be understood and generally agreed to early.

VII. Approval of Minutes

Keen said there had been difficulties in obtaining an assistant to handle routine Senate work, and the officers had decided that Senate memos had priority over minutes. Keen said that minutes of several meetings would be available soon, and that a synopsis would be added to the minutes of each meeting.

Page 4041 Minutes of Senate Meeting 202 20 Oct 1993

VIII. Report of the Senate President

1. Proposal 4-93, Flow Chart for Policy Decisions, has been sent to the Provost for approval and transmittal to the Board of Control.
2. The current Affirmative Action Officer will step down at the end of October. The Provost has assembled a Search Committee for an Interim Affirmative Action Officer, with Bornhorst representing the Senate.
3. The University President's Cabinet met on October 7, with Bornhorst present as the Senate representative. A major topic of that meeting was a joint retreat by the Board of Control and administration. The Board cares about Michigan Tech and wishes to improve it. The Board and administration now appear mutually supportive. Dale Tahtinen had reported that there was some movement in Lansing to rethink University funding and the reasons why universities exist. The Cabinet learned that the catalog will appear before November 15th. Its delay was caused by a switch to desk top publishing, which should save money in the future.
4. Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer McGarry has appointed a University Investment Committee. The Senate is represented on the Committee by Jim Gale and Jim Pickens.

Leifer asked whether Jim Gale was a Senator. Bornhorst replied that Gale was not a Senator but that he could represent the Senate, just as there are Senate representatives on numerous campus committees. Current policy of the Board of Control also requires Senate representation on the University Investment Committee.

Boutilier asked what the Committee was supposed to do. Bornhorst replied that the Committee was charged by the Board of Control with overseeing all investments of university endowment funds and other monies. The university took a loss during the 1987 stock market crash, and Board policy since then had prevented investments in stocks. Now the Board will allow the university to invest in mutual funds but not in individual stocks. The Committee is to oversee that process. The university has hired an investment council to put together a portfolio for the university. Pickens reports the investments are conservative. The purpose of this Committee is to advise McGarry and to oversee the investment process.

Leifer asked for the names of the Committee members. Bornhorst said the Committee consisted of Gale and Pickens from the Senate, Dan Farrell from IDS [an investment company], Dale Zschoche from the Michigan Tech Fund, Acting MTU Comptroller Mike Abbott, and Barry Fay from the School of Business. Boutilier asked why IDS should be on the committee. Bornhorst replied that McGarry wanted an advisor from outside

the university, and that IDS will handle none of the investments. Davutyan asked who selected the Committee.

Bornhorst said that it had been selected by McGarry. Grzelak commented that Farrell was serving also as an alumnus member.

5. The Senate needs to select a faculty member to serve as a full voting member of the Memorial Union Board. The membership of a faculty member is required by the MUB Constitution. Bornhorst called for the Senate to find a volunteer.
6. A proposal for a new option in the MS program of the Math Department has been sent to the Curricular Policy Committee for consideration.
7. The Senate procedure for changes in an academic program is based on Senate Proposal 10-70. This is relevant to the proposal for a 4-year program in the School of Technology. It appears the Senate only votes once on such items and makes its recommendation to the administration; the administration is then to report to the Senate on the disposition and implementation of the proposal. The Senate is not to vote again unless the Board of Control or the academic officers downstate change the proposal. The administration has been notified that their current flow chart does not conform to this procedure.
8. A handbook for senators should be assembled to include such things as the Senate constitution, the responsibilities and membership of Senate standing committees, responsibilities and members of other committees, lists of representatives on various committees and boards, and perhaps other items. An important part of such a handbook would be a list of committee priorities and activities in progress. All senators and their constituents need to understand what the Senate is doing. The activities list should be updated regularly, perhaps quarterly.

Heuvers said that it would be excellent to have the handbook put online for senators, so that it could be updated and printed out easily.

IX. Reports of Committees

A. Executive Committee. The report was given by Committee Chair Bornhorst.

1. Bornhorst distributed a list of Senate standing committees [Appendix B of these minutes], and noted that it was the list approved at the previous meeting. Bornhorst said that the Senate Executive Committee recommended two amendments to the list.

Heyman MOVED that the responsibilities of the Election Committee be amended to read "Ballot initiatives, Senate and university wide elections". Roblee seconded the motion. There was no discussion; the motion PASSED by voice vote without dissent.

Heyman MOVED that the Academic Policy Committee Item 5 - All matters pertaining to the academic calendar, be shifted to the Instructional Policy Committee. Roblee seconded the motion. Bornhorst commented that the Executive Committee felt that it was more appropriate to have this item as the responsibility of the Instructional Policy Committee, although the calendar did affect responsibilities of most standing committees. There was no discussion. The motion PASSED in a voice vote with no opposition.

Bornhorst distributed a second list of Senate standing committees and responsibilities [Appendix C of these minutes], noting that this list had been prepared anticipating passage of the two amendments.

2. Bornhorst said the Executive Committee had recommended that the Senate President employ the following operating procedure during Senate meetings: The Full Senate will vote on all

issues unless any senator or alternate requests the vote be limited to a subset of Senators under the constitution. The request need not be seconded. The request for a subset vote will be debated and voted on by the Full Senate, before any vote on the main motion.

Bornhorst said there had been no close votes to date, but there may be votes in the future in which a limited subset would make a difference.

Beck said that the constitution identified some areas as the business of the academic side only, and in these cases the constitution had precedence and there should be no vote on a request. Bornhorst replied that the chair faces the problem of deciding whether a limited vote is appropriate. Bornhorst said that he did not want to make the decision himself, but wanted the Senate to decide. Beck said the constitution clearly identified certain issues as belonging to the academic side, and these should be not be open to a vote on limiting the vote. Bornhorst said he was trying to get a sense of how the chair should operate.

Hubbard said the same point had been covered during debate over at-large senators when the constitution was being approved. Hubbard asked whether there was any time when the non-academic persons would like to vote by themselves. Bornhorst replied that this was not in the constitution.

Heuvers commented that the operating procedure was fine, but where the constitution specifically indicates an area is limited, then it should be sufficient for a senator to point this

Page 4042 Minutes of Senate Meeting 202 20 Oct 1993

this out. McKimpson suggested that the same procedure be used for research issues as defined by the constitution. Grzelak said that he agreed with Beck's view, that the constitution should be clear on this as well. Bornhorst said it was apparent that the Senate wanted the chair to make a recommendation on the voting units before voting on an issue.

Heyman said that the Senate should be guided by the constitution, but for ambiguous cases there should exist some decision-making mechanism and the suggested one seems fair. Roblee said that most issues that come to the Senate floor will be in the grey area. Beck said that if the constitution is completely gray, then it is a poor document. Beck also said that records should be kept of decisions made on this point, to set precedent and maintain consistency of treatment of similar policies in the future. Bornhorst said he had brought this problem to the Executive Committee because there had already been a vote or two that arguably should have been limited, although nobody objected and the votes were unanimous. Bornhorst said he needed to know how to proceed when a limited vote might make a difference.

Roblee MOVED to accept the suggested procedure of the Executive Committee. Jobst seconded the motion. Heuvers said the motion should be amended so that the constitution is followed when the area is clearly defined. Beck asked that the motion be amended so that a historical record be kept to establish precedent for future consistency. Bornhorst stated the motion with amendments and asked for discussion.

Grzelak said the procedure should consider the constitution first, and then if the issue is not clear there would be a vote on limited voting; the constitution should take precedence. Bornhorst asked if the present wording did

not do this. Grzelak said the current reading of the motion did not appear to give precedence to the constitution. Bradley said that a vote would be necessary to decide whether the issue was clear in the constitution.

Keen re-read the motion at Bornhorst's request: The Full Senate will vote on all proposals unless there is a request from the floor or the matter is clearly defined by the Constitution. The limited vote will be debated and voted upon and then the matter will be voted upon. A historical record of all such actions will be kept.

Bradley said the big question was who decides what is clear in this constitution? Bornhorst said that Senate has to decide, and that this is the problem. Bulleit said a prospective example of the difficulty may arise in considering a switch to semesters; the constitution reserves matters of the academic calendar to the academic degree-granting departments, but allocation of human, fiscal and physical resources are the purview of the Full Senate. Bulleit added that changing to semesters would fall within both areas, and the Senate would then have to decide who are the eligible voters.

Heyman said that parts of the constitutional list can be played off against other parts, but the standard reading of legal documents is that the more specific clause takes precedence over the less specific clause; in this case the politics of writing the constitution required inserting the specific clauses. Heyman added that he had flowcharted the logic of the motion as it had been read, and it was clear that it is not possible for a request from the floor to override clear constitutional provision. The motion does not allow a vote against a clear constitutional provision. It is always possible to vote contrary to the constitution, and only embarrassment prevents this.

Heuvers said the entire motion was implicit in the constitution, because certain items were clearly listed as belonging to the academic faculty, and the whole Senate was to vote on other items. Heuvers added that the whole motion was unnecessary. There was no further discussion. The motion PASSED without opposition in a voice vote.

3. Bornhorst said the Executive Committee had agreed on a procedure for handling proposals when they come to the Senate officers: When the disposition of a proposal is clear to the Senate President or officers, the proposal will be sent to the proper committee; when the disposition is unclear the proposal will be circulated to the Executive Committee for a recommendation either to send it to committee or to the floor of the Senate.
4. Bornhorst said he wanted to make several points before any discussion of the preliminary committee assignment list [Appendix D of these minutes].

First, there was no intent to exclude anyone who wants to work on academic policy or other Senate business, and sufficient work existed to keep everyone busy all the time. The Executive Committee envisioned the formation of subcommittees to handle the necessary committee work. Senate subcommittees could draw widely from the constituency and the university community. Bornhorst said that, for example, work on a scientific misconduct policy should continue with the same personnel working as a subcommittee of the Research Policy Committee, and that a campus-wide benefits committee proposed recently by the administration could work as a subcommittee of the Financial Policy Committee.

Second, inclusion of all senators and alternates insures broad participation in Senate activities, and minimizes the possibility of over-influence of a few people who might serve

on several Senate committees. Bornhorst said it was necessary that everybody should be aware that there is broad participation in discussion of all issues.

Third, committee members should elect a senator or alternate as committee chair and report the results to the president between October 28 and November 2.

Fourth, the Executive Committee is scheduled to meet on November 2.

Fifth, to increase awareness of committee activities among all the senators, copies of committee documents and memos should all be copied to the Senate president. These copies will be sent immediately to the Senate Office and filed there. These will be available for anyone in the constituencies or the university community.

Bornhorst referred to the list, saying that the names of Kawatra and Bradley should be swapped between the Finance and Research Policy Committees. Bornhorst opened the floor for discussion.

Arici asked whether service on two committees would be a problem, and if a trade was required to accomplish this. Bornhorst said that a trade was not necessary, but the Committee had suggested trades to keep number of members balanced to avoid having one committee with twenty people and another with two. He added that the trading and the election of chairs should be accomplished within a week or two, and that the interim chairs should be informed of trades.

Carstens MOVED that the preliminary committee assignments stand as written in the document. The motion was seconded. Leifer asked how the motion will affect the trades. Bornhorst replied that it would have no effect. Several senators asked why a motion was needed. Bornhorst replied that the motion was not necessary, but it was on the floor. Carstens said he wished to WITHDRAW the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to withdrawal of the motion; there were none.

B. Ad Hoc Committee for the Fine Arts Department Proposal.

Bornhorst referred to the agenda attachments for Proposal 3-94, Formation of a Fine Arts Department [Appendices E, F, and G of these minutes]. Bornhorst said that the former Curriculum Committee had been dissolved, but had been reformed as an Ad Hoc Committee to deal specifically with the proposal for a Department of Fine Arts.

Committee Chair Bulleit said the Committee had voted to report the proposal to the Senate, with six in favor of the proposal

Page 4043 Minutes of Senate Meeting 202 20 Oct 1993

and one ambivalent. Bulleit added that the Committee felt the proposal was a good one, but had agreed to the limitation of approximately \$20,000 given in Dean Seel's accompanying memo. Boutilier asked whether the committee accepted the \$20,000 as an initial expense, or as a continuing expense. Bulleit replied that it would be an annual expense. Leifer said that the proposal filed in the library indicated a \$450,000 budget. Bulleit said there were four budget scenarios appended to the original proposal, but the accompanying memo from Seel indicated that only the \$20,000 scenario was acceptable; the Committee had passed the proposal based on the \$20,000 scenario. There was no further discussion of the Committee report.

X. Old Business.

A. Proposal 3-94, Establishment of a Fine Arts Department.

Bulleit MOVED that Senate Proposal 3-94, Establishment of a Fine Arts Department, be approved. Jobst seconded the motion.

Heuvers said that in item F-1-b of the new constitution, the motion should be voted on only by academic degree-granting departments. Carstens asked whether the new department was to be a degree-granting department. Bornhorst said it was not, that under the new constitution the proposed department is an other course-offering unit, like Physical Education.

Boutilier asked whether the proposal had been discussed with the heads of departments in the College of Sciences and Arts. Seel replied that the proposal had been endorsed by the College Council, which is made up of the department heads.

Carstens said that the \$20,000 for the annual operation of the new department was coming from somewhere, and asked who was going to be short the \$20,000. Seel replied it was necessary to review the background of the proposal to understand the funding of the new department. The Humanities Department had evolved into a PhD-granting unit, with a Division of Fine Arts that played an important role for the full campus. There were continual budget conflicts within the department over hiring of temporary help for fine arts performances. Some of the \$20,000 was to be used for a tenth month plus incentive pay for the department head. The rest will be for SS&E, including part-time help that has come from the Humanities Department previously.

Heuvers distributed a photocopy [Appendix H of these minutes] of a page from the undergraduate catalog, and said it described the Athletic Department. Heuvers said there was an analogy between athletics and the proposed fine arts division, that only structural changes were needed for fine arts, and that creating a new department would not solve their problems. Fine arts needed to be separated from academic departments and given status equivalent to that of the athletic department, possibly with a separate budget. The academic course-offering part of fine arts should stay in Humanities, with ticketed performances handled possibly through a fine arts center, possibly housed in the Walker center. Heuvers said the proposal needed to be rethought and some further committee work done before jumping into forming a new department.

Olsson said that Heuvers' proposal already had been considered thoroughly, and had been rejected because the fine arts are part of the academic community at almost every university. The fine arts personnel would be faculty members with terminal degrees, active in creativity and research. The academic component is a vital part of fine arts, which is more than performance. Bornhorst asked if the proposed department anticipated becoming a degree-granting department in the future. Olsson said this was a possibility, but the group was making one step at a time.

Seel said he wanted to clear up a misconception about the Athletic Department and the Department of Physical Education. Physical Education is an academic department just as Mathematics. Seel said he did not understand Heuvers' point that fine arts had become like the Athletic Department. Heuvers said that almost all the coaches in athletics have appointments in PE as instructors, teaching courses offered through PE. The teams and other activities involved with the Athletic Department are separate. This is how the performance part of fine arts might be viewed. Academic credit might be given for performance, just as people that play hockey or football get credit. Heuvers added that the proposed funding might help fine arts more if it went directly into fine arts, instead of enhancing salary for a department head.

Olsson replied that the purposes, goals and objectives of the fine arts division were separate and unique from the purposes and goals of the Humanities Department. The Humanities Department is committed to a graduate program and to one of the largest STC

programs in the country, with support for the fine arts necessarily diminishing. If the fine arts are to continue contributing to this campus, their governance must be separate from the Humanities Department.

Seel said he wished to clear up the analogy with athletics and physical education. Coaches do have part-time appointments, and part of their duties is teaching for PE. However, there are tenure-track and tenured faculty and a department head in PE. Seel said he was not sure why Heuvers was drawing a parallel to Athletics' coaches rather than to PE where they have tenured faculty.

Fynewever said that after next year there will be only one tenured faculty in PE. Further, it was very clear that no one would ever again be hired in PE on the tenure track, and the only reason tenure existed was because of grandfather clauses. Seel said that there was a department head and a tenured assistant or associate professor in PE, and he did not know if one of them would retire or step down a year from now. Fynewever said it was clear that no one would be hired on a tenure track in the future.

Bornhorst asked Seel to comment on the budget of the proposed department. Seel said that the information on salaries in Tech Topics was confusing, but that little of the \$20,000 would be used to enhance Olsson's salary as head of the new department.

Jobst said he could not see a strong correlation between PE and the fine arts program, that traditionally on other campuses fine arts was an academic program. Individuals in these departments have pressures like those in other academic departments: they are critiqued, they go before promotion and tenure committees, etc. Jobst said pressures on individuals in PE programs were different, although still considerable. Jobst added that there were difficulties in defining appropriate criteria for evaluating individuals in fine arts, which contributed to the desire of the fine arts to split off.

Selfe said that the proposal that had been considered carefully by the entire faculty of both Humanities and the Division of Fine Arts. Fine Arts had operated to an extent as a separate division for a long time, with their own tenure and promotion guidelines. Their curriculum included both academic and performance components, and some courses would be shared with Humanities. Selfe said the Senate should be aware that this was a happy proposal, with the Department and the Division separating on good terms and wishing each other well. Selfe said the Department of Humanities very much recommended this proposal to the Senate.

Boutilier said the problems with tenure and promotion were understandable, but that there was concern with the future of the proposed department and the mission of Michigan Tech. Forming a non-degree department now could lead in several years to a proposal for a degree-granting Department of Fine Arts of questionable value to the State of Michigan and to Michigan Tech.

Arici asked whether the Senate's decision on the proposal's budget would be binding on the administration. Bornhorst said that nothing prevented the administration from increasing the proposed budget. The Senate did have the constitutional ability to make recommendations to the administration, but the final decisions rested with them.

Arici said that he resented the statement in the accompanying memo from Seel, that there was a need to prevent education from becoming one dimensional. Arici said he did not think that Michigan Tech was a one-dimensional university, and that he did not see himself as being one-dimensional, even though he was in

the College of Engineering. Seel replied that he had not intended to imply that our education was one-dimensional, but had wanted to say that fine arts has a very important role at Michigan Tech, and that the proposal would make the arts more effective.

Replying to Boutilier's statement, Seel said that the proposal now asks for a non-degree-granting department. However, any department on campus could come forward with proposals for curriculum enhancement. The proposal does not imply that a fine arts major is needed, but the future cannot be foreseen for any department. Seel added that the \$20,000 figure is not a guaranteed amount, but will be included in College budget proposals and in discussions with the Provost. A vote for the proposal is not a vote for the \$20,000 budget.

Bulleit said that formation of the department should be separated from the possibility of granting a degree, because any proposal for a degree would have to be approved by the Senate.

Heuvers said that part of the reason for his handout was that the Athletic Department was granted a full page in the catalog, but that fine arts was mentioned as part of a paragraph somewhere. Creation of a performing fine arts center would strengthen recruiting of students and faculty, and enhance the community. Heuvers added that each of the four budget scenarios involved three new positions, and it was clear that the new department intended to ask for these.

Heuvers asked whether a degree in fine arts could be accomplished under the current general liberal arts degree program in the Humanities Department. Olsson said this was not possible because the course structure was not there, and that a new group of courses in fine arts would have to be developed. Bornhorst said that the requests for new positions could be made now through the Humanities Department.

Mroz said that fine arts needed a campus identity, and that the new department would increase diversity at Michigan Tech. Fynewever said that using the PE and Athletic Departments as an alternative to the proposal was not clear, because PE and Athletics were two separate departments with two separate budgets, which was of considerable benefit.

Mullins asked about current staffing of the division and the staffing of the proposed department. Olsson explained the current and proposed staffing. Bradley asked why the questions were necessary. Mullins said that he wanted to be sure the new department consisted of separate staff, not shared staff. Bornhorst said that the picture was complicated further because faculty from humanities would teach some of the proposed fine arts courses.

Glime asked whether the financial needs given in the proposal would exist even if the new department were not formed. Olsson said that without the monies requested in the proposal, programs would have to be cut, with or without a new department. Glime asked whether the main benefit of the proposal was to enhance visibility of the fine arts, and to avoid the distractions of funding problems with humanities. Olsson said this was correct, and that the separation would allow Humanities to pursue its own programs. Selfe said that the proposed department had plans to increase its cooperation with the regional performance center, and that the two units now shared committee work.

Fynewever inquired about the tenure guidelines for the new department, and suggested that the faculty of the proposed department should have to earn tenure in another academic department. Seel replied that the Division of Fine Arts has had separate guidelines since 1991; the teaching and service components were the same for all departments, but the research component was replaced by performing criteria. He added that of the 8.5 persons in the proposed department, 6 were tenured already, and 2 were

tenure-track assistant professors. Sewell asked where the faculty would have tenure under the proposal. Seel replied that tenure would be transferred to the Department of Fine Arts if it was formed.

Mullins asked whether Senate approval of the proposal was an approval of the request for four new faculty positions. Seel replied that each department yearly made proposals to their deans and the Provost. Mullins said that these were not in the form of proposals to the Senate. Bulleit said that last year the proposal from the School of Technology for a 4-year program had arrived initially in the Curricular Policy Committee with no budget. That proposal had been sent back with a demand for budget scenarios. The Ad Hoc Committee had been happy to see the fine arts proposal with a budget, and a proposal without a budget would have been rejected. Bulleit said that Mullins was putting any proposal in a double bind. Mullins said he was asking whether a positive Senate vote implied endorsement of the proposed budgets. Davutyan said that the Senate was spending too much time discussing the proposal. Grimm said he favored the proposal, and that budget allocations would take care of themselves. A healthy department could be expected to want to expand.

Bornhorst said the time for adjournment was approaching. Heuvers MOVED to table the motion for adopting the proposal. Mullins seconded the proposal. The motion to table FAILED in a show of hands vote, 8-14.

Roblee MOVED to end debate. Hubbard seconded the motion. The motion PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 20-1.

Heuvers pointed out that according to the constitution, the issue had to be voted on only by representatives of academic degree-granting departments. Keen said that 23 persons could vote on the motion; the excluded representatives were those from AF ROTC, Army ROTC, IMP, IWR, KRC, Library, Physical Education, and the three non-academic groups. Wells said that he should be able to vote because ROTC was part of the College of Sciences and Arts, according to the first page of the constitution.

Keen said that the Senate Bylaws list of representation units included 17 academic degree-granting departments. The ROTC departments were listed as other course-offering units. He said that the establishment of departments was listed under the responsibilities and authority of academic degree-granting departments only. The constitution was extremely clear that only academic degree-granting departments could vote on this proposal.

Wells said that the bottom of the first page of the constitution, read "throughout this constitution and bylaws the term department (like Department of Military Science) shall apply and should be read as school for the School of Business, etc." Wells said the two pieces of information in the constitution appeared contradictory. Glime said that the footnote was written so that there did not have to be a continual reference to departments and schools; schools were simply defined as departments. For the purpose of voting, the units were subdivided between degree-granting departments versus non-degree-granting departments. Glime said that ROTC qualified as a department where that word was used alone, it did not qualify as a degree-granting department.

The motion to approve Proposal 3-94 was PASSED 13-6 with two abstentions in a show-of-hands vote. Bornhorst said he would forward the proposal to the Provost with the Senate's positive recommendation.

B. Election of Senate Representative to the SBEA Dean Search Committee. Bornhorst announced that Marilyn Cooper of Humanities and Pushpalatha Murthy of Chemistry had volunteered to stand for election as the Senate's representative to the Search Committee. Bornhorst asked for nominations from the floor; there were none.

Bornhorst declared the nominations closed. Ballots were distributed to the Senate.

XI. New Business

Proposal 4-94, Suspension of the 3-Year and Out Policy. Bornhorst referred to the text of Proposal 4-94 [Appendix I of these minutes], and said that the Executive Committee had decided to send this directly to the Senate floor. Bornhorst said that it had been written by the Presidential Commission on

Page 4045 Minutes of Senate Meeting 202 20 Oct 1993

Women, and noted that the proposal contained their explanation of the need for suspension of the policy. Bornhorst said that the suspension was temporary until the Faculty Handbook is revised, at which time the issue can be looked at in more detail, and that the Provost would support this suspension if the Senate thinks it is appropriate. The issue was important and fundamental to the university's situation.

Beck asked whether suspending the policy would make permanent any employee who is now temporary. Bornhorst said that nobody would become permanent if the policy is suspended. He added that the policy was initiated in 1991 by the Board of Control, and that it required the administration to discharge personnel after a 3-year period. Sewell said she was a member of the Presidential Commission and that the reason the rule should be suspended is that it is applied inconsistently and unfairly across campus.

XII. Announcements

Keen announced that Murthy had been elected to the SBEA Dean Search Committee, 15-9.

XIII. Adjournment

Multiple senators simultaneously MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded massively, and PASSED unanimously. President Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Senate Secretary

.