

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 204  
17 November 1993

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) corrected and approved Minutes of Meeting 200;
  - (2) heard that a reworded and amended final exam policy from 1992 was to be forwarded to the administration;
  - (3) heard that Proposal 4-94, Suspension of 3-Year-&-Out Policy, had been sent to the administration;
  - (4) heard that Proposals 2-92 and 3-92 had been accepted by the administration;
  - (5) heard a report from the Presidential Commission on Women;
  - (6) learned that Proposal 7-92, Dean Search Procedures, would be rejected in its present form by the administration;
  - (7) created and appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Administrator Searches;
  - (8) gave the Senate president the authority to appoint a faculty representative to the Memorial Union Board;
  - (9) defeated a motion requiring at least one male nominee for Senate representative on the Search Committee for Affirmative Action Officer;
  - (10) referred to committee the nomination of a Senate representative to an administrative Ad Hoc Committee on Minority and Women Programs.
- 

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm on Wednesday, 17 November 1993, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 28 senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternate representatives from AF ROTC, Army ROTC, and Metallurgy were absent. Absent senators-at-large: Boutilier and Filer. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, Computer Technology Services, Undergraduate Student Government, Graduate Student Council, Staff Council.

III. Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were Fredrick Dobney (Provost), Ruthann Ruehr (Humanities), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed several alterations, including the delay of a financial report by McGarry, and the additions of a report by the Board of Control Relations Committee, an election to the Affirmative Action Officer Search Committee, and an election to the Ad Hoc University Committee on Minority & Women Programs. Bornhorst called for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Bornhorst asked for objections to the proposed adjustments; there were no objections.

## V. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst referred to the Minutes of Meeting 200 circulated with the Agenda to Senators, and called for corrections. A correction was noted by Glime. Hubbard MOVED that the minutes be approved as corrected. Melton seconded the motion, which PASSED without opposition in a voice vote.

Bornhorst said that Heuvers had found an error in Appendix B of the Minutes of Senate Special Meeting 3 of 1992-93. In that meeting the Senate had approved a reworded final exam policy, but had voted [Minutes, p.3376] to delete a paragraph exempting seniors from final exams. However, the deletion had not been made in the Appendix.

Heuvers distributed annotated photocopies [Appendix B of these minutes] of pages 3376 and 3383 of the Minutes of that meeting, showing the necessary corrections. Bornhorst said that this proposal would be sent to the administration for implementation, and commented that similar Senate proposals may be found during the remainder of the year. Bornhorst asked for objections to making this correction. There were no objections.

## VI. Report of Senate President

1. Proposal 4-94, Suspension of 3-Year-&-Out Policy, was transmitted to the Provost on November 4th.
2. The Provost has given written notice [Appendix C of these minutes] of the acceptance of Proposals 2-92 and 3-92, Term Limits for Heads\Chairs and Deans.
3. The degree of B.S. in Engineering Administration is to be renamed B.S. in Engineering Management at the next meeting of the Board of Control. Bornhorst said that he had been contacted about the change, and had decided the change was editorial, not substantive, and did not require approval by the Senate.
4. Chemistry Stores submitted a proposal dealing with purchase of chemicals on campus. The proposal has legal implications, and has been sent to the Senate's Research Policy Committee.
5. The Sick Leave Pool requires donating 3 days of sick leave, which can be earned back. When the Pool is depleted, another request for donations will be made.

Heuvers said the Notice about the Pool indicated that the 3-day donation could not be earned back. Bornhorst said that he had noticed the same thing, and had obtained clarification verbally from Ingrid Cheney, the Benefits Coordinator.

6. Proposal 4-94, Formation of a Fine Arts Department, will be voted upon by the Board of Control in its November meeting.
7. The general approach of the current Senate President: The Senate is a legislative body; it enacts and amends policy but does not enforce it. The administration's role is carrying out and enforcing policy. Committees that are independent of the Senate may propose policy for Senate approval, and may also administer policy. The Senate may propose establishment of such committees. Bornhorst asked that senators let him know if they disagreed with this approach.
8. Proposals submitted to the administration should be worded for easy inclusion in the university manuals on policy and procedures. Otherwise the administration will have to interpret and rewrite the proposals.

Heuvers commented that Senate proposals should be included in university policy. Bornhorst said that the administration has agreed to incorporate past and current Senate proposals in appropriate policy, procedures, and operating manuals, and in Faculty and Student Handbooks. There will not be a separate Senate procedures manual.

Bradley asked whether a general format had been or should be established. Bornhorst said there was no general format,

but the current procedures manual used a logical style that could be imitated.

9. Ballots for the referendum on Proposal 16-92 would be mailed to arrive on the first day of the winter term.

## VII. Reports from Committees

A. Presidential Commission for Women. Bornhorst said that the Commission had two representatives from the Senate, Ruthann Ruehr and Jim Mihelcic. Bornhorst introduced Ruehr for a report on the activities and recommendations of the Commission.

Ruehr said the Commission was set up in May 1992. President Tompkins charged the Commission with improving the environment for women on campus. The membership of the Commission includes representatives from AWC, PWC, UAW, AFSCME, University Senate, Staff Council, USG, and GSC. Recent activities included participating in interviews of upper

\*\*\*\*\*

Page 4086 Minutes of Senate Meeting 204 17 Nov 1993

administrators, and sponsorship of several campus educational activities. Some policy proposals dealing with staff issues had been sent to the administration. The Commission had reviewed other proposals on discriminatory harassment, targeted hiring, and sexual assault, and had developed other proposals including Senate Proposal 4-94. The Commission had sponsored the Take-Your-Daughter-to-Work Day.

The Commission was performing a Climate Study based on an opinion survey of female alumni, undergraduates, grad students, faculty and staff. The survey had been designed and scored by graduate students. The results were not yet complete, but a formal report was expected in May 1994. Preliminary results indicated women's concerns with MTU included lack of female role models, lack of respect, feelings of insecurity, low salaries, unfairness in hiring and promotion, lack of allowances made for family, and a lack of positive institutional response to problems.

Glime asked whether the problem areas were broken out by category such as staff, faculty, alumni, etc. Julien asked what had been used as criteria to define a problem. Ruehr said that the survey was based on questions with a 1-5 ranking, plus open-ended questions. Julien asked whether the problems could be ranked. Ruehr said that her preliminary list was based on problems that seemed near the top for each group. Sewell said that some of the problems were of higher priority for staff and grad students than for faculty and students.

Julien said that it would be difficult to evaluate these results. Similar questions are asked in student evaluations of classes where results can be compared to averages; here there is no standard. Ruehr said that results are available for other universities. Glime asked whether the questionnaire was similar to those used at other universities. Ruehr said that the Commission had looked at other questionnaires, but that the MTU questionnaire was made up separately. Mroz asked whether the Commission had considered sending similar surveys to men as a control group. Ruehr said that such a study would be interesting, but that the Commission's time was limited, and that their focus was determining how women feel they are treated.

B. Steering Committee on Academic Faculty Handbook. Bornhorst said this Committee had met, and that Handbook revision would be an open process requiring a lot of Senate action. Policy changes are to be approved by the Senate, and the Senate is to approve the entire handbook. Bornhorst said that the Steering Committee has

considered several matters of procedure, including the following items.

1. Development of a new organizational outline for the Handbook: Several model outlines are available to the Steering Committee.
2. Identification of major/most important areas needing revision or formulation of policy: For each of these areas task forces are to be created, each reporting to appropriate Senate committees and to the Steering Committee. Members of these committees are to be on each task force to facilitate this communication. Other members are to be selected to provide diversity.
3. Formation of task forces: The process is to begin early in the winter quarter.
4. Examination of current policy: After the task forces are set up, the rest of the procedures and policies in the Faculty Handbook will be reviewed to identify other policies needing revision or development.
5. Modification of the Handbook: The revision of the Handbook is to be continual, so it will be published as a living document, probably in loose-leaf form.

Bornhorst asked for questions. Jobst inquired how the Steering Committee was getting input on areas that need revision. Bornhorst said the Committee had identified four areas from the current Handbook that seemed obviously to need work. He cited the example of grievances not related to tenure, which are not mentioned in the Faculty Handbook.

Bornhorst said that a list of issues would be distributed to the Senate soon, and emphasized that the Steering Committee is only an organizing group for the revision.

C. Board of Control Relations Committee. Bornhorst said that the Committee of Senate officers, along with senators selected at the last meeting, would meet with the Board of Control at breakfast on November 19.

#### VIII. Old Business

A. Guidelines for Search Committees. Referring to the guidelines [Appendix D of these minutes] for the Search Committees for the Chief Financial Officer and for the Provost, Bornhorst said that these search procedures were not formal policy. President Tompkins had expressed his approval of the search process, and had agreed with Bornhorst that the search procedures should become part of the university policy manual by way of a Senate proposal. Formal adoption of the guidelines as policy would ensure that the procedures would be followed in the future.

Bornhorst said that the only real difficulty with the guidelines was in Section 3.2. This section requires the election of the search committee chairs by ballot. Bornhorst said that it might be wise to require the chairpersons to be tenured faculty. Bornhorst asked the Senate for input on the issue of adopting the guidelines as policy.

Carstens asked about the Senate approval indicated on the guidelines. Bornhorst said that these were approved only as guidelines, not as policy, so the university president was not obliged to follow them. Bulleit said the chairs of the Provost and CFO Search Committees should comment on the guidelines, because they would know whether the guidelines were workable. Carstens asked whether an ad hoc committee should be put together to write the procedures. Glime said any committee should look also at positions that have university-wide impact, for example the Affirmative Action Officer and Director of Information Technology.

Carstens asked whether a motion to establish an ad hoc policy committee was in order. Bornhorst said it might wait until the

next item on the agenda.

Melton said the various policies could be combined into a general policy for positions in the upper administration. Bornhorst agreed, stating the only real difference in the two guidelines was in committee composition. Glime said the suggested requirement of tenure might exclude well-qualified persons, for example newly-hired senior faculty. Julien said that qualified but non-faculty persons from alumni or community groups would be excluded by the tenure requirement. Melton said that the issue of tenured chairs should be considered by the committee writing the policy.

B. Discussion of Proposal 7-92, Dean Search Procedures. Bornhorst referred to the text of Proposal 7-92 [Appendix E of these minutes] attached to the agenda, and said that the Proposal had been passed both in the Senate and in a referendum of the faculty. The Proposal involves searches for only two positions: the Deans of Engineering and of Sciences & Arts. Bornhorst said the Senate officers had discussed the Proposal with Provost Dobney, and had agreed that there were problems with the wording of the Proposal. The principles were acceptable, but the organization needed work.

Bornhorst said the officers were suggesting to the Senate that the Proposal be rewritten to be consistent with the guidelines for the Provost and CFO. The rewritten proposal would be included in the university policies manual. Bornhorst said that the rewritten proposal need not be returned to the faculty for a referendum, and that the matter was not currently pressing.

Heuvers suggested that some subset of members of each of the recent search committees should form an ad hoc committee to write the search policy. Beck said that one or two senators should

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4087 Minutes of Senate Meeting 204 17 Nov 1993

be included on the ad hoc committee. Hubbard said an alternative plan would be the development of a college governance proposal to parallel the departmental governance proposal. Search procedures for college deans would be included in such a proposal.

Mullins said any ad hoc committee must be very sensitive to the fact that Proposal 7-92 had been approved by the faculty, to avoid the appearance of making a mockery of the referendum. Bornhorst said the intent was not to change the substance of the proposal. He added that Proposal 7-92 was likely to be rejected by the administration in its present form.

Hubbard asked whether a college governance proposal would be developed. Bornhorst said that in his opinion such a proposal should wait on acceptance of the departmental governance proposal in the upcoming referendum.

Bradley asked why Proposal 7-92 would be rejected by the administration. Bornhorst said that the details would be provided by the administration when the proposal is rejected. Bradley said that Bornhorst should have some idea of the reasons for rejection. Bornhorst asked Provost Dobney if he cared to reply.

Dobney said that some parts of 7-92 seemed not to have been fully considered when it was developed, and that it should be compared to the search procedures he instituted for the SBEA Dean. Some specific problems with 7-92: (1) the student and alumni representatives do not vote; (2) the chair should be appointed by the Provost to avoid problems with tenure; (3) the chair should hold a significant university position to emphasize the importance of the search; (4) the chair should have a staff available to handle the search; (5) the negotiation of salary in item 9 of 7-92 should be a statement of principle, because there has to be some

latitude in negotiation to avoid losing good candidates. Dobney said he did not disagree with the principal idea of the Proposal, which is that the faculty should have a major role in hiring.

Bornhorst said that the salary formula in the Proposal could be manipulated to avoid the principle of a reasonable salary when an administrator gave up a position. Beck said that Dobney's position on appointing the committee chair was inconsistent with the CFO and Provost search guidelines. Dobney replied that he did not agree with the guidelines.

Hubbard said that altering selection of committee chairs in 7-92 would be a substantive change, and would require re-submitting the proposal to referendum. Bornhorst agreed, and said that the changes contemplated by the officers had not been along these lines. Grzelak said that the salary formula could be manipulated to defeat its purpose. Dobney said it was clear that the intent of the formula was to avoid the current situation of vice-presidents returning to a department with 9/11ths of a VP salary. He added that he would prefer a statement of principle. Grzelak said the formula was developed to be consistent with the proposals concerning heads/chairs.

Carstens said the changes seemed substantial, and would require resubmission in a referendum. Mullins said that the salary item in 7-92 stated that salary exceptions could be negotiated with the Provost. Dobney said he was concerned with the perceptions involved in the procedure. He also said that Bornhorst had disagreed with the appointment of search committee chairs, and wondered whether the Senate would volunteer its assistant to serve as the staff for searches. Bornhorst said that his own preference was for the Dean of Engineering's staff to support searches for Deans of S&A, and vice versa.

Grzelak said that some safeguards were needed in the search process because some searches had been controlled by one committee member. Melton said the Senate was spending too much time trying to do the work of an ad hoc committee.

Beck said that written comments on search procedures should be solicited from the administration and the original proposal should be rewritten minimally as a reaction to such concerns, before being sent out for a referendum vote. Bornhorst said that 7-92 was not as clear as the search guidelines for the CFO and Provost although the principles were similar, and that development of consistent guidelines would require rewording of 7-92.

Hubbard MOVED that an ad hoc committee be formed to examine searches. Grzelak seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the motion. There were none, and Bornhorst declared the motion to be PASSED.

Bornhorst asked for names of persons to serve on the committee. Melton suggested that the committee be made up of Senators. Bornhorst named Greuer, Glime, Grzelak, Hubbard, Melton and Mullins to the committee. Hubbard agreed to serve as interim chair.

C. Election of Representative to Memorial Union Board. Bornhorst asked for nominations for a faculty member to serve on the Memorial Union Board. There were none. Bornhorst asked for authority to appoint a person to serve.

Heuvers MOVED that Bornhorst be given the authority to appoint a person to serve. Glime seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion; there was none. The motion passed without opposition in a voice vote.

D. Senate Meeting Dates. Bornhorst referred to the list of meeting dates [Appendix F of these minutes] attached to the agenda, and said that the dates for the winter and spring quarter had been approved only tentatively.

Bradley MOVED that the published list be accepted as final for the remainder of the year. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bornhorst

called for discussion; there was none. In a voice vote the motion PASSED without opposition.

E. Election of Representative to Search Committee for an Affirmative Action Officer. Bornhorst said the Search Committee for the interim AAO recently had met with the Provost, and had determined that the Search Committee for the permanent AAO would have these duties: (1) Define the position of AAO at Michigan Tech. (2) Advertise for the position, beginning at the end of January 1994. (3) Begin interviewing for the position in March and April of 1994. Bornhorst said the Senate needed to select two representatives, and suggested that nominations be brought to the next Senate meeting.

Glime MOVED that at least one of the Senate nominees should be male. Heuvers seconded the motion. Keen asked whether this motion resembled a quota system. Julien said that a couple of years ago the Senate tried to ensure that a woman served in such capacities. Bornhorst referred to the search committee guidelines considered earlier in the meeting, and cited their provision that "the Senate should strive for balance of gender, race and disciplinary focus in its elected committee members". Sewell said that not all the members of the Search Committee had been selected and it was premature to conclude that females would numerically dominate the committee. Glime said that of the 15 committee members, only 2-5 could be males.

Melton MOVED that the motion be amended so that the Senate is encouraged to elect at least one male representative of the Senate. Jobst seconded the amendment. Grzelak asked whether this whole discussion was necessary. Julien said that the Senate had gone through the discussion 2-3 years ago, and that the Senate would reasonably try to maintain a balance in its selection of representatives.

Bulleit said both the requirement and the amendment were unnecessary. Bornhorst asked for further discussion; there was none. In a show-of-hands vote, the amendment FAILED, 8-16.

Glime said the intent of the original motion was to ensure that there were some male nominees from which the Senate could choose. The motion FAILED in a show-of-hands vote.

F. Selection of Senate Representative to Ad Hoc Committee on Minority and Women Programs. Bornhorst said that the Committee had been formed by the administration with the objective of improving awareness of minority and women programs

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4088 Minutes of Senate Meeting 204 17 Nov 1993

on campus, and to improve and develop such programs. The membership consisted of C. Anderson (chair), E. Lumsdaine, M. Seel, W. McCoy, F. Dobney, M. Janners, G. Melton, J. Galetto, T. Mallette, and N. Byers-Sprague. Bornhorst said the Committee had decided that faculty membership was needed, and had asked the Senate to find an additional committee member.

Melton nominated the Senate President. Bornhorst declined the nomination. Bulleit asked whether representative might best be a member of the Senate Institutional Planning Committee.

Mullins inquired about the purpose of the Committee. Dobney replied that it had been formed as a result of a sudden 20 percent drop in minority enrollment in the fall term, after 5 years of modest increases. The Committee is being asked to determine the reasons for the decline, and also is to look at recruiting of women. Glime suggested that the decline in minority enrollment was caused by the primary recruiter of minorities having to remain on

campus to serve on the Provost Search Committee. Dobney said that a new recruiter for minorities had been hired, but that a review of overall strategy would be profitable anyhow.

Heuvers asked whether any of the minority students on campus were involved in minority recruiting. Glime said that minority students should be on the committee. Dobney agreed with the suggestion. Mullins said that the Institutional Planning Committee could try to provide candidates for selection at the next meeting of the Senate. Bornhorst asked for objections to referring the matter to that Committee. There were no objections.

#### IX. Announcements

Bornhorst said that ballots for the referendum of Proposal 16-92 would be distributed on 29 November, and that senators should encourage their constituents to vote. Hubbard asked whether the text of the proposal would be distributed with the ballot. Bornhorst said that the three paragraphs of the proposal itself would go out with the ballot, but the several pages of charter guidelines would not go out.

Heuvers asked that one copy of Proposal 16-92 with the guidelines be supplied to each Senator, for distribution to their constituents. Keen said this would be done.

#### X. Adjournment

Grzelak MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Heuvers seconded the motion. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Secretary of the University Senate

.