

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 213
6 April 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) learned that Proposal 2-94 had been approved for funding by the administration;
- (2) learned that Proposals 12-94 and 14-94 had been submitted to the administration;
- (3) heard a presentation from the Conflict of Interest Committee;
- (4) amended and approved Proposal 16-94 Smoke Free Campus;
- (5) approved a petition for constituency status for M. Lambert in Non-Academic Unit Group 3;
- (6) interpreted the constitutional provision of Terms of Office for senators and alternates;
- (7) received Proposal 21-94 and approved it for consideration as an emergency proposal;
- (8) approved Proposal 21-94 Recommendation for a Professional Staff Handbook;
- (9) received Proposal 19-94 Attendance Policy;
- (10) received Proposal 20-94 Optional Retirement Furlough;
- (11) received Proposal 22-94 University Senate Administrative Evaluation.

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm on Wednesday, 6 April 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 29 senators or alternates were present. S. Gruenberg was present as the representative of KRC. AF ROTC was unrepresented. Absent senator at-large: T. Grimm. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, Grad Student Council, and Staff Council.

III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were R. Christianson (Human Resources), T. Collins (Technology), E. Horsch (Human Resources), and B. Seely (Soc Sci).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the circulated agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and asked to postpone correction and approval of the minutes of Meeting 212. He noted that election progress would be reported, but not by the Elections Committee. He proposed considering Proposal 21-94 as the first item of New Business. Bornhorst asked for adjustment proposals from the floor; there were none. Irish MOVED to approve the adjusted agenda. Grzelak seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

V. Report of Senate President

1. A copy of a memo from Provost Dobney to President Tompkins concerning Proposal 2-94 Supplemental Health Benefits has been received [Appendix B of these minutes]. The funding of the proposal will be considered during next year's budget deliberations.
2. Proposal 12-94 Plant Sciences Option for the BS in Biological Sciences has been submitted to the administration [Appendix C of these minutes].
3. Proposal 14-94 Recommendation on ESTR Program has been sent to the administration [Appendix D of these minutes]. As a recommendation, the administration does not need to approve or reject it.
4. A proposal for a non-departmental PhD Program in Computer Science & Engineering has been received and has been sent to the Curricular Policy Committee for review.
5. The provost has informed the deans that President Tompkins expects departments and schools to have charters established by the end of the 1994-95 academic year. He also informed them that D. Beck is the chair of a Senate committee that will provide aid in developing charters.
6. The Graduate Council has been reconstituted, and the Senate will have an ex-officio member. Selection of one of the Senate officers for this position may be appropriate.
7. The proposal for the BS in Engineering Technology was approved unanimously by the State Academic Officers on March 30, 1994. The proposal will go to the Board of Control for final approval in May.
8. The Senate officers met with Provost Dobney on April 5. Important informational items: (a) MTU is now classed as Carnegie Doctoral II [Appendix E of these minutes]. (b) The Harassment Policy was discussed further. (c) Candidates for the Dean of SBEA are being interviewed.
9. The Committee on Academic Tenure has informed the Senate that there is a potential need for alternate members of the Committee, to avoid conflict of interest with current members on several cases. Individuals nominated last year but not selected might be used as alternates: M. Cooper, E. Flynn, G. Lewis, and J. Wood.
(Bornhorst asked the Senate for discussion of his proposed solution. Heyman suggested that the alternates be selected in the order of descending vote. Bornhorst called for objections to the suggestion. There were none.)

Bornhorst asked for questions on his report. Heuvers asked how long the alternates on the Committee on Academic Tenure would serve. Bornhorst replied that they would serve only for one case. Heuvers said that a policy should be developed for the selection of alternates as part of the election process for members of the Committee.

Arici asked whether the Ad Hoc Committee on Charters was to inform departments officially that charters were needed. Bornhorst replied that the official announcement would come from the deans. Beck said that the Committee would attempt to circulate information soon.

VI. Reports from Committees

A. Faculty Handbook Steering Committee. Bornhorst reported that the Lab and Classroom Safety Policy has been sent to the Research Policy Committee. The policies on grievances and on separation are nearing completion by their respective task forces, and will be forwarded to the appropriate Senate committees. The revision of the tenure and promotion policy will not be completed by the task force until fall.

Heuvers asked whether that task force could provide a report to the Senate. Bornhorst said that he would ask D. Nelson to give

a short report to the Senate at a meeting soon.

B. Committee on Conflict of Interest. Bornhorst introduced Bruce Seely (SS) for a presentation on the progress of the Committee.

Seely said that he had given the Senate a statement of operating principles in December. Since then the Committee had worked on draft policies for several areas. Financial disclosure will be important. NIH and NSF soon will issue requirements for conflict of interest policies for universities and agencies receiving their funds. These requirements will impose reporting guidelines and thresholds, including reviews by a conflict-of-interest committee for any proposal.

Seely said the Committee's principles of action were:

- 1) Individuals are responsible for disclosing any difficulty that might be, or might appear to be, a conflict of interest.
- 2) The intent is not to police, but to lay out guidelines for

individuals.

- 3) Clearer guidelines will require changes from current practice in some areas at MTU.
- 4) Guidelines will provide protection for individuals.

A major concern is conflict in the commitment of faculty time. All faculty are expected to engage in professional service activities and research activities. Responsibilities are divided among students, professional organizations, and outside funding agencies. Individuals are vulnerable to alteration of guidelines that may be changed at one individual's whim. Clear, fixed guidelines protect faculty, and protect the university from actions of individuals.

Specific guidelines will be developed for textbook adoption, supervision of relatives, purchasing, etc. The Committee hopes to bring a set of recommendations to the Senate by the end of Spring Quarter.

The recent meeting with the Board involved some specific areas of concern. One of these is the disclosure of financial relationships. Other universities have rigid requirements for disclosure; MTU has none now. Any policy must be based on public disclosure of relationships. In most cases of conflict, disclosure is sufficient. The Committee believes that if the Board does not accept a policy, the University as a whole cannot be expected to accept it. The Board's position about public disclosure is not yet clear. The Committee is proceeding without Board clarification of this issue, and will follow the normal channels for policy approval; final approval will rest with the Board.

The Committee would like to provide guidelines, not policy details, but some areas will require more specifics. Where individuals chose not to follow the guidelines, there will be more rigorous standards, including reviews. Reviews should occur at the lowest levels possible, but there will be federal requirements for a university-level review. Establishment of a standing committee is probable. Departmental charters might well include provisions on conflict of interest.

Although the guidelines are not intended to be restrictive, some individuals may discover they cannot proceed as they have been. The objective is to protect individuals. An important Committee activity is education; there is little understanding of conflict of interest on campus. MTU's recent history has confused the issues; e.g. a Board member believing it is acceptable to bid on campus construction while serving on the body making final decisions on construction. Conflicts are probably unavoidable,

including commitments of effort not best serving the University. There will be disagreements about the guidelines that will be included in the policy to be forwarded to the Senate. However, these disagreements will serve an educational purpose.

Heuvers asked what the policies were at other universities, like the University of Michigan. Seely replied that other universities were ahead of MTU with policies in place, but that the policies were very diverse. The policy at the Univ of Minnesota was the Committee's principal model. Michigan State and Wayne State have policies that have been also useful. Univ of Missouri-Rolla has a list of thou-shalt-nots, to prevent conflict; this seems not feasible. Seely noted that the other Committee members are S. Kauppi (interim AAO), W. Melton (SS), R. Peterson (FR), J. Soper (EE), C. Selfe (HU), K. Pelc (BA), and T. Collins (TC).

Beck said the Committee should examine purchaser-vendor relationships, which range from meals to consultancies resulting from major purchases. Seely replied that the Committee is close to having a policy in this area, based on the code of ethics of the National Association of Purchasing Employees. A requirement may be that each purchase order will require a check-off indicating relationships between purchaser and vendor. Seely said that the responsibility must be individual; a policing apparatus cannot be established.

Leifer said that a textbook written for a particular course is a problem if the author requires it to be purchased for that course. The author appears to make money on the adoption. However, the instructor-author really cannot be expected to adopt a text written by another author. Seely said that the Committee was considering a review procedure so the choice is not the author's alone. Another requirement may be donating royalties to the Tech Fund so that the author receives no financial gain for requiring the text in MTU classes. Glime commented that there is a state law requiring a review of an author's textbook adoption by two members of the department. Seely said the Committee's concern is to protect the faculty member from charges of profiting by adoption of the text, and to protect the faculty member from the appearance of conflict.

Heuvers said the Faculty Handbook has rules regarding an author's adoption of his or her own text. Seely said the Committee has had problems with the dispersion of MTU policies among different locations and with an out-of-date handbook. The reporting of conflicts is divided among several officers. The Committee hopes to consolidate the location of policy, and the reporting of conflicts.

Sewell said the professional staff welcomed the work of the Committee. She added that the situation of the staff was different, with their possible conflicts involving contracting with hospitals, private practice, and teaching. She asked whether the Committee needed more staff input. Seely replied that the Committee was being served by Sherri Kauppi in this area, and that the Committee intends to create the policy for the university, not just for faculty. Carstens commented that the appearance of conflict in textbook adoption far outweighs any financial gain.

McKimpson asked whether the US Dept of Defense, in addition to NSF and NIH, might impose regulations on universities. Conflict of interest was a major area of concern for DoD. Seely said that no information had been received about this, but did not seem to be a source of concern. McKimpson said he was concerned with provisions in DoD contracts. Seely said that the publicity of the \$700 hammer already had made DoD adopt rigorous reporting guidelines.

Bornhorst thanked Seely for his presentation.

C. Executive Committee. Committee Chair Bornhorst said that the Committee had met on March 28, and had voted to send Proposal 20-94

directly to the Senate floor. If time to discuss this proposal at the next meeting is not sufficient, a special meeting would be called for April 27. The Committee had voted also to send Proposal 21-94 directly to the Senate. The Committee had discussed terms of office, and the procedures for election of officers.

Bornhorst called for questions. There were none.

D. Elections. Bornhorst referred to the Election Memo distributed at the previous meeting (Minutes, p.4374), and noted that the first four items had been completed. The notification of departments about election or re-election of Senators was delayed pending determination of the constitutional meaning of terms of office. Bornhorst said the Elections Committee needed to gather the information necessary for election of members of various university committees.

Bornhorst called for questions. There were none.

VII. Old Business

A. Proposal 16-94 Smoke-Free Campus. Bornhorst called for consideration of Proposal 16-94 circulated with the agenda of Meeting 211 [Minutes, p.4383]. Heuvers asked if there were constitutional problems with a ban on smoking. Heyman said that there had been no Supreme Court decision regarding smoking bans by a variety of municipalities and corporations. Heuvers asked about visitors on campus. Heyman said that advertisement of cigarettes was prohibited on TV. Sewell said that smoking and the sale of smoking tobacco was banned in most hospitals, even for visitors.

Boutilier MOVED the adoption of Proposal 16-94. Sewell seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation on voting units. There were none. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Page 4388 Minutes of Senate Meeting 213 6 Apr 1994

DeVisch asked whether the designation of residence halls included individuals rooms. Boutilier said the Institutional Policy Committee intended to ban smoking in the residence halls unless there were separately ventilated rooms. Bulleit asked if married student housing were covered. Sewell said the housing units were separately ventilated.

Brokaw said the School of Business seemed opposed to the proposal because of the ban on sales of a legal product. Only two of his constituents favored the proposal. Bulleit said the proposal seemed close to infringing on the rights of smokers, particularly when students pay rent for the dorm rooms. Banning a legal activity in a private room seemed extreme. Arici said that drinking was also prohibited. Miner said that 21-year-olds can drink in the residence halls. He added that the University can make rules and regulations that go beyond strict provisions of state law. Drinking could be banned from campus, for example.

Roblee said the proposal might be construed as obligating the university to provide separately ventilated areas for smokers. He asked whether the proposal could be amended so the university is not required to spend any money. DeVisch said that the proposal infringed upon students' rights to smoke in their own rooms. The prohibition of tobacco sales also was an overstepping of university bounds; the sale was legal, and the university profited by the sales.

Carstens said that the furnishing of special ventilated areas would be expensive, and that the stench from the ventilated smoking room in the administration building indicated that separate ventilation was not effective. Fynnewer said that if smoking were

allowed in dorms, some areas ought to be smoke free. Miner said that smoke free areas exist now in the residence halls, and that students are asking for more areas. Few students living in residence halls are smokers, and the halls are moving to a smoke free status independently of the proposal.

Sewell said that she has talked with several non-smoking students who want a smoke free policy. Moving out of a dorm room is always a hassle. Further, the expense of smoking should be considered as a health issue since the university is self-insured.

Heuvers MOVED to amend the proposal by striking the sentence, "The university should also prohibit the advertising and sale of tobacco products and smoking paraphernalia on campus". Bulleit seconded the motion.

Heyman said that the logic of the amendment was inverted, that it was easier to discourage smoking in younger people by making it difficult to buy cigarettes than by prohibiting smoking. A policy that would be effective in lowering health costs would keep the sentence in the proposal. Beck said the Committee discussed using "discourage" rather than "prohibit" in the sentence. Heuvers said tobacco was sold close to campus, and that a prohibition of on-campus sales would lead to stocking-up purchases off-campus. Sewell said that any difficulty placed on continuing the addiction, the more likely was the discouragement. Filer said that ventilation need not be included in the proposal, that smoking can be done outside buildings.

Carstens said that the sentence sends a message to smokers. Glime said that prohibiting smoking while selling tobacco was hypocritical. Grzelak said that free distribution of cigarettes constituted a form of advertizing. Carstens agreed.

Bulleit said that he failed to understand the logic behind a coupling of a building prohibition and the sale of tobacco. Boutilier said that the prohibition on sales was sending a message. Gruenberg said that if the policy was aimed at smoking areas, then the sentence involving sales was unnecessary. He stated that the banning of legal substances was perhaps not the message a university ought to be sending.

Diebel said his concern was university involvement in passing judgement on products; the Senate should not go this direction. Sewell said it was not a moral question, but a health question; there was enough research to support this. Bulleit said that using health questions as an argument should result in the banning of all foods on campus with fat content higher than 30% of calories. DeVisch said he understood the health question for employees, but students did not fall under the university's health insurance. Miner said that smoking was the most common complaint in dorms, and that smoke from closed rooms went throughout a hall.

Galetto asked whether the proposal title of "smoke-free campus" meant that smoking outside buildings was prohibited. Bornhorst said that the proposal did not specify this. Heyman said that the relationship between smoking and health problems was much more significant than for diet. He added that there are many problems with governments passing unenforceable laws; the only real regulation possible would be a prohibition on sales. Carstens said that the argument on legality was poor because the federal government was slow in banning harmful substances; the university should not wait given the strong cause-&-effect link with health.

Bornhorst called for further discussion on the amendment. There was none. The amendment FAILED in a show-of-hands vote, 10-19.

Bornhorst asked for discussion on the full proposal. Glime said that MTU might have to make special provisions for entering student smokers, and permit them to live off campus. Roblee said that the policy should not restrict the dorm residents. The dorm administration might do the restricting.

Roblee MOVED to amend the proposal by striking the words

"residence halls and" from the first sentence of the proposal.

Carstens seconded the motion.

Miner said that the residence hall administration would favor retaining the words. DeVisch said that he had lived in dorms, that smoking was a problem there, but it should be resolved in the dorms and not by the Senate. Sewell said that second-hand smoke had an impact on non-smokers who also could not choose where to live. Glime asked whether one wing of dorm could be designated a smoking wing.

Miner said that there were not enough smokers to warrant a whole wing; there are 5 smokers in 600 residents. Brokaw asked whether the debate was over nothing. Grzelak said the students should make the decision in the dorms. Bornhorst said that the proposal was a recommendation only, and that even if passed it would require no administrative approval or action. Carstens said there was a lot of smoking in EERC, and asked where the smokers were coming from. Sewell said that the number of smokers may be underestimated from the enrollment form check-offs. Bulleit said that, in the spirit of shared governance, the students should decide the dorm issue. Bornhorst said it would be appropriate for Staff Council and USG also to vote on the proposal.

There was no response to Bornhorst's call for further discussion. The amendment PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 17-12. Bornhorst said that the constitution required a two-week interval between amendment of a proposal and final approval. He asked for objections to continuing to debate the original motion. There were no objections.

Heuvers MOVED to amend the proposal by striking the word "visitors" from the second sentence, and rearranging to read "... and administration". Kawatra seconded the motion.

Sewell asked whether the amendment meant that a visitor could enter her office and smoke. Boutilier said that the Univ of Michigan Hospital banned smoking completely, including visitors. Vanek said that he did not want 400 recruiters smoking in his office.

There was no response to Bornhorst's call for further discussion. The amendment FAILED in a voice vote.

Gruenberg asked about the situation in the Union Ballrooms and the Wadsworth Dining Hall for wedding receptions. Bornhorst said that visitors to the Union had to leave the building to smoke. Miner said he did not know about the policy in the dorm.

McKimpson asked which buildings on campus were smoke free. Lins said that EERC was smoke free but smoking still continued, which raised questions of enforceability. Moore said the library was smoke free. Beck said that the buildings of the College of Sciences & Arts were smoke free. Keen said that the smoking ban

written by Dean Seel should be entered into the permanent record [Appendix F of these minutes].

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to adopt Proposal 16-94 as amended PASSED in a voice vote.

B. Constituency. Bornhorst read a petition [Appendix G of these minutes] received from Vanek requesting constituency status for Mark Lambert in Non-Academic Unit Group 3.

Vanek MOVED to approve the petition. Sewell seconded the motion. Vanek said that Lambert did a considerable amount of teaching, which made him the type of individual who should be included in the Senate constituency. Heyman asked if Lambert were moving out of Staff Council. Vanek replied that he was. Keen

asked for Lambert's title. Vanek replied that it was Coordinator.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without opposition in a voice vote.

Bornhorst said that he had spent much time over two months considering constituency issues, that he wished to make some comments, and then ask for guidance from the Senate. He stated that the issue is clearly complicated. The constitution was a compromise so that the constituency now includes faculty and research units and some non-academic units. These latter include student-related service managers. Bornhorst asked about the eligibility of people in decision-making roles dealing with research, and dealing with faculty. He cited the examples of the current manager of sponsored programs, the current director of Human Resources, and the managers of Computer Technology Services.

Bornhorst said he had been approached by several individuals in staff positions, and asked whether he should encourage them to petition for membership in the Senate constituency. Bornhorst said he disliked encouraging them to apply if the Senate were to deny the petitions. Further, the administrative units represented in the current Senate Non-Academic Groups were likely to be reorganized in the coming summer. This would require some reorganization by the Senate.

Carstens asked where the line was to be drawn for representation. Bornhorst said this is what he wanted to know.

Heyman said that the Non-Academic Units were not very robust. They had few members, and recruiting senators was likely to be difficult. Heyman said that if more people were to be included from the staff area, then they should be kept as three non-academic groups, to increase their robustness. Sewell said that the constitution was a good start, but a lot of gaps exist even within covered areas. A task force of both staff and faculty should be appointed to review the constituency question and bring recommendations to the Senate.

Leifer said that Bornhorst's discussion was a good speech favoring a faculty senate. He added that the impacts of deans and department heads on faculty were also significant. Bornhorst said that the heads were constituents now, and that the deans were liaison members. Leifer said that former debates had included discussion of the presence of the provost. He asked why Bornhorst was asking to bring in groups that were excluded previously. Bornhorst said that the criterion used to select the Non-Academic Groups was student-related service, particularly people in decision-making, managerial positions. However, the boundaries were not clear, and some answer needed to be given to potential petitioners.

Bulleit said the decision should be made after the petitions are submitted, and that Bornhorst should not be expected to predict the outcome of the petition. The Senate does not lose credibility should the petitions be denied. Heuvers said that the constitution requires the Executive Committee to review petitions and make recommendations to the Senate. Roblee said that the Senate had become more active and powerful, that more people would be drawn to it, and that the broader the representation the more effective the Senate would be. Filer said that the discussion involved fine-tuning of the represented groups.

Carstens asked whether the Senate were more diverse now than previously. Bornhorst said that it was less diverse, that previously it had included a lot of lower-level research personnel. Currently, the groups included more managerial positions. Carstens said the Senate now was less a university senate than previously. Bornhorst said this was true only in some respects.

Heyman said that the Senate had excluded the upper administration from its constituency. The Staff Council had emerged as a body representing some staff, but the remaining professional

staff were unrepresented. He added that it was not necessary to bring in some person just because they influenced the conduct of teaching and research; it is easy enough to consult with these people in the course of Senate deliberations. Bornhorst said that if two bodies exist, the border between them will always be fuzzy.

Boutilier said that Human Resources had feet in both camps. The office serves the entire university. She asked if they were to be represented on both Staff Council and in the Senate.

Leifer said that the inclusion of staff in the Senate made no difference on the easy issues. On the hard issues, with the administration and faculty on opposite sides, the presence of administrators could intimidate staff. People should not be put in the position of jeopardizing their careers. Bornhorst said that the constitutional provision for secret ballots would protect such individuals. Grzelak said that open and honest discussion was important, not just voting. Sewell said that two issues were involved. One was the boundary problem; the other was general housekeeping. In the latter category, the director of counseling services was not a constituent.

Bornhorst said that his conclusion was that the Executive Committee would deal with the requests before sending them on to the Senate.

C. Terms of Office. Bornhorst read from Article IV.A.1 of the constitution, "One member elected from and by each degree-granting department...", and from IV.A.4, "An alternate member shall be elected...". He then read from IV.B, "The term of office of an elected member shall be three years...".

Bornhorst said that a literal interpretation of the constitution would mean that service for three years as an alternate and then three years as a senator would make a person ineligible for re-election to another term as senator. Bornhorst asked the Senate to decide whether service as an alternate affected eligibility for election as a senator. He noted that previous practice counted only service as a senator.

Heuvers MOVED to continue the practice of counting only service as a senator in determining eligibility for re-election as a senator. Glime seconded the motion.

Heyman asked whether the motion would go into the bylaws if passed. Bornhorst said that the bylaws would need revision eventually, but that the vote would serve to clarify the current election process. Keen asked why the constitution included a provision for a one-year break in Senate service, if an individual could alternate indefinitely between serving as a senator and an alternate. Continuous service may mean continued presence on a committee.

Leifer said that under the old system a person serving as a senator for six years would have to skip a year before being elected as an alternate. Bornhorst said that this was not correct. Heuvers said that committee membership could be adjusted by the Executive Committee. Heyman said that although he agreed with Keen that the service load might continue indefinitely, he did not understand why this would be a problem. The possibility of obtaining continual service from a limited pool or persons may be desirable.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

VIII. New Business

A. Proposal 21-94 Recommendation for a Professional Staff

Handbook. Bornhorst referred to the text of the proposal attached to the agenda [Appendix H of these minutes], and noted that it was only a recommendation to the administration. He said the proposal was the result of numerous discussions with professional staff, and of deliberations of the Faculty Handbook Steering Committee. Bornhorst said that Provost Dobney supported the proposal, and had stated that a staff handbook would begin to be assembled after completing the Faculty Handbook. Bornhorst asked that the proposal be considered as an emergency proposal, because the agenda for the next meeting was full.

Vanek MOVED to take up Proposal 21-94 as an emergency proposal. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Hubbard said he was against emergency proposals in principle; all but two PhD proposals had been adopted as emergency proposals. Bornhorst said that the proposal was only a recommendation, not a policy needing administrative approval. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Heuvers MOVED that Proposal 21-94 be approved. Sewell seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the recommended voting units. There were none.

Roblee asked who would be responsible for the committee work. Bornhorst replied that the provost would assemble the committee, and that it would probably be made up of professional staff. The Faculty Handbook would probably serve as a guide for the committee, with numerous policies being adapted easily.

Carstens asked for a definition of professional staff. Horsch replied that it included non-faculty, non-hourly staff. Bornhorst noted that the subset of employees mentioned in the text of the proposal was not identical with the definition of professional staff. The vagueness was intentional, and represented an issue to be resolved when the professional staff handbook was written.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve Proposal 21-94 PASSED in a voice vote without opposition.

Roblee asked why the proposal was presented to the Senate. Bornhorst replied that the Senate included three non-academic groups as representatives, and that research units contained some personnel that might be affected also. Sewell said that staff had concerns about policies in the faculty handbook and their application to the staff.

B. Proposal 19-94 Attendance Policy. Bornhorst referred to the text of the proposal attached to the agenda [Appendix I of these minutes] and noted that the proposal would be considered at the next meeting. He asked Heuvers for comments on the proposal.

Heuvers said that the proposal was based on a revision of the attendance policy that Dean of Students Janners had prepared several years ago for the Student Handbook. The Faculty Handbook was not updated then, although the policy had gone to the Senate's Instructional Policy Committee. The proposal represents a revision of the current policy as given in the Student Handbook.

Sewell asked if Dean Janners had been involved in the discussion of the proposal. Heuvers said she had been. Sewell said that the proposal as distributed needed other changes based on current practice. Bornhorst said that modifications should be brought by the committee to the next meeting. He called for further discussion. There was none.

C. Proposal 20-94 Optional Retirement Furlough. Bornhorst referred to the proposal circulated with the agenda [Appendix J of these minutes] and noted that the proposal would be considered at the next meeting.

Bornhorst read a memo received from Provost Dobney [Appendix K of these minutes] stating that the proposed program would apply

only to tenured faculty.

Bornhorst said that Provost Dobney had stated in a meeting with Senate officers on April 5th that, as a result of discussions with Leifer, a modified payout schedule was acceptable. Under this schedule, the entire half-year salary for the furlough could be paid before December 31 of the furlough year. This would allow retirement pay and Social Security to be started in January.

Leifer said that Provost Dobney favors a group rate for retiree life insurance, but that the numbers have not yet been received from the actuaries. Glime said she was concerned with the requirement for 10 consecutive years of service. Service with NSF for a year would benefit the university, but would interrupt the continuity of university service. Bornhorst said that this was a special case, along with those of current long-time instructors who might be given special consideration on a case-by-case basis.

Hubbard said that the phrase "not counted" in II.A.3.a was ambiguous and unclear. It may mean that approved leaves of absence without salary are regarded as an interruption in continuity, or that they are not included in the 10-year count.

D. Proposal 22-94 University Senate Administrative Evaluation. Bornhorst referred to the Proposal circulated with the agenda [Appendix L of these minutes]. Bornhorst said that he had met with Provost Dobney and Administrative Policy Committee Chair Heyman on March 25 to discuss the proposal. Neither Provost Dobney nor President Tompkins had objections to the proposal. Bornhorst asked Heyman for comments.

Heyman said that the proposal should be discussed with constituents, and that questions should be directed to him. He thanked the members of the Committee for their help.

X. Adjournment

Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Leifer MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Bulleit seconded the motion. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:28 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen
Secretary of the University Senate

.