

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 222

2 November 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard a report from the University Space Committee.
- (2) Discussed the chair position of the Senate Finance Committee.
- (3) Passed an amendment, a substantive change, to Proposal 1-95 and thus could not vote on the final proposal.
- (4) Began deliberation of Proposal 3-95, recessed for a week, then passed the proposal.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:33 pm on Wednesday, November 2, 1994 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from Business & Engineering Administration, AFROTC, Education, KRC, and NaGrp 3. Absent Liaison Members were Lumsdaine, Seel, Cross, and a representative from Staff Council.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors were F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President), and M. Goodrich (Tech Topics).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst made no agenda adjustments.

[Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting 221

Whitt corrected comments on the proposed health plan ascribed to her, and Arici MOVED to approve the amended minutes, with Irish offering the second.

Whitt's corrected comments: Whitt said some local physicians are not on the list of those "networked," and we should hear their views at a forum. There was no further discussion, and the motion to approve the minutes passed on a voice vote.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. SPECIAL SENATE MEETING

Bornhorst reminded the Senate of the Special Meeting next Wednesday, November 9, with no additional meetings until November 30.

B. HEALTH CARE

The Senate Assistant distributed three handouts containing more specific details on the alternative health care plan (Wausau Insurance's PPO) [Appendix B]. Bornhorst reminded the Senate about the forum on this topic, scheduled for Tuesday, November 8, 1994 from 4-6:30 in Fisher 135. The forum will be transmitted over Bresnan Channel 8 by tape delay.

The University has received an extension of one month on the current health plan.

C. DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE

Provost Dobney has discharged the University Direction and Planning

Committee, arguing that the Senate provides a mechanism by which their topics may be covered [Appendix C].

D. PROPOSAL STATUS

Proposal 17-94: Policy on Academic Freedom has been sent to the Administration [Appendix D]. The Statement on Faculty Absences has been sent to the Instructional Policy Committee. The Institutional Planning Committee will continue working on the draft document on Separation.

E. SENATE OFFICERS MEETING

The Officers and Provost met on Friday, October 28, and they discussed several topics, of which the only highlight is the change of name: from Department of Geological Engineering, Geology and Geophysics to Department of Geological Engineering and Sciences [Appendix E]. The Dean, Provost and President have agreed to this, but the Provost wanted the Senate to know. Bornhorst asked if there were objections to the name change. No one responded.

F. ACTIVITIES LIST

The Senate Assistant, Jeanne Meyers, distributed a handout describing the various, current activities of Senate standing committees [Appendix F]. Bornhorst reminded Senators who were committee chairs to keep him abreast via e-mail or hard copy of topics they are discussing in committee. Bornhorst, in turn, passes this information along to the Senate Assistant to file in the Senate office so others may learn of Senate business status.

G. AMENDMENTS

Bornhorst recommended that Senators give the Senate Secretary any proposal amendment wording before meetings, whenever possible, so the Senate could consider such amendments expeditiously.

H. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DOCUMENT

Bornhorst said this document was now on the Gopher System, and Bruce Seely requests that Senators consider it. Keen said University personnel may reach this document through the MTU Campus Information menu, then to the University Senate menu, where the proposal awaits readers.

I. APPRECIATION

Bornhorst thanked Tech Topics for highlighting the last Senate meeting on Health Care, and Provost Dobney for the Senate reception.

J. FINANCE COMMITTEE CHAIR CONTROVERSY

Bornhorst read a statement:

"I will end my President's Report on the issue of the Chair of the Finance Committee. My ruling referred to 'all members of the Senate approved Finance Committee for the purpose of electing a chair.' The word all was used to insure that a meeting could not be scheduled when one or more members could not attend. Several members of the Finance Committee requested the opportunity to have mail-in ballots. On October 20, 1994 the Senate office sent a ballot to all members of the Finance Committee for return to Rudi Greuer, Chair of the Elections Committee, by 5:00 pm on October 26, 1994. Five ballots were returned. The results were Jim Pickens: four votes; and Les Leifer: one vote. If a quorum of ballots for the eight person committee is needed, 2/3 of eight is 5.33 persons, which equates to a quorum of six, then not enough persons voted. Most ballots

rely on a majority vote of those cast. Even if the three non-voting persons voted for Leifer, the vote would be a tie requiring the full

Senate to elect a Chair.

"The Senate has the right to control its Standing Committees. Thus, the Senate needs to decide how to proceed. It seems that either, we let the majority ballot stand or we elect the Chair by ballot here tonight.

"What is the pleasure of the floor?"

Mullins asked why this topic was not covered under "New Business." Mullins, continuing, said he has found nothing in the constitution stating that only Senators and Alternates can be on Senate Standing Committees.

Leifer said that the Senate should know that late in the fall quarter the interim chair held a meeting at which six of eight members were present, plus some "volunteers." One of these, Gary Agin (Physics), was a volunteer from last year; the other was Dick Brown (Chemistry). Pickens conducted the election, and the results went to Bornhorst, who subsequently declared the election invalid. This vote was the same as last year, when volunteers also voted, and the committee ran well. Leifer said he could not see why a second election was necessary. Some members did not vote this time, Leifer explained, because they felt the second election was illegal.

Regarding the difference in the situation between the two years, Bornhorst said "Last year no one complained. If no one complained this year I would have done nothing, but since they did I had to make a ruling."

Heyman said that he feared the packing of committees if anyone is allowed to join without approval by the Senate. Committees do indeed run better when they include people with specialized skills, Heyman said, but the present system allows the attendance of non-members.

Mullins said that passing Proposal: 3-95 might well clarify this issue, and he MOVED to table discussion of this issue until 3-95 could be voted on. Arici seconded.

Kawatra asked what would happen in the Finance Committee if 3-95 is approved. Leifer said that if 3-95 passes, from that point, only Senators and Alternates are voting members. The next question, Leifer continued, is whether the proposal's requirements would be retroactive. The Senate decided to hold off further discussion until later in the agenda. The MOTION CARRIED on a voice vote.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

A. UNIVERSITY SPACE COMMITTEE

Bornhorst introduced Bill McGarry (University Treasurer/ Chief Financial officer) who introduced the topic of University space. McGarry said the Space Committee has been reconstituted in the last six months, from a large group to a smaller one consisting of Deans and other administrators. He then introduced Doug Stuart, who was pulled from retirement, McGarry said, to assist in handling University Space. His report describes where the committee stands.

Stuart discussed a list of factors that has diminished the amount of currently available University space:

1. Increase of faculty by 24 in last 2 years, with long term relief not arriving until 1998-99 with the new Environmental building.
2. Increase of graduate student population.
3. Increase in research activity. Stuart said the University needs an up-to-date space inventory. Numerous physical changes have occurred in the past five years, and in many cases the University was unaware of how space allocations had changed.

Some time ago the committee asked the campus departments/programs for space allocation updates: Office space is 17%; Study is 4%; Lab is 11%; classroom is 6%, and Support space is 7%, with residential space at 30%, General Use is 11%, and Special use is 14% [Appendix G].

Stuart called attention to the 6% that is classroom space, and implied why this figure can be problematic. This is the easiest category to define, he said, and the number is relatively low. The State Legislature likes to compare Tech to Wayne State or other urban universities which use their classrooms from 8 am to 9 pm; their student

population, however, is considerably different from Tech's.

Stuart argued that a properly-maintained facilities inventory is a key to good, long-term facilities management. The figures are useful for planning of construction, renovation, and maintenance. Plus, the figures are necessary when contending for state or federal funding.

Building data is important because older buildings tend to lose usefulness for current programs. In the future we should know immediately when a room, say, "changes departments."

Mullins asked if the committee was aware of space used by the administration. Stuart said the committee does not know this information now, but it could be determined in the future.

Mullins expressed his suspicions about Space figures, explaining that the last set of figures he had seen showed Metallurgy with extensive holdings, and they, in turn, received a new building. Politics, he said, seemed to drive space considerations.

Many factors, Stuart admitted, did play a role, and he listed several apparent anomalies. The Mineral Museum, for example, is currently housed in a building predominantly used by the Electrical Engineering department. This occurred because the museum had been housed in a building slated for demolition, while, simultaneously the EERC building was going up. The museum had to go somewhere, and the EERC was the best location at that time. Similarly, the ROTC building on "rotten row" remained when the University realized that the state would not be sympathetic to a plan placing the federally-funded ROTC program, in the state-funded SDC. While ROTC remained where it was, we now have music rehearsal rooms in the SDC, and Biology in the Mechanical Engineering building.

Dobney said that some departments do get more space than others: Physics, for examples, must pack numerous Ph.D. students into an office, while another department, with MS students, enjoys two per room. The Space Committee's goal is to make the space more equitable.

Glime asked about any current attempt to compare Tech space use to those of benchmark institutions. Stuart said that could be done in the future.

Stuart ended by saying that many factors can explain why some departments have more space than others, such as enrollment patterns, types of programs that have run in the past, personnel considerations, empire/power builders and political expediency.

Beck suggested the committee determine space sizes themselves instead of relying too heavily on departmental statements.

Page 4749 Minutes of Senate Meeting 222 2 & 9 Nov 1994

Bulleit asked who was ultimately responsible for space allocation. Answer: the Space Committee, and McGarry emphasized that space belongs to the University, not to any individual group.

B. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE NOMINEES/ APPOINTMENTS

Bornhorst reminded Senators of the need for nominees of several committees. These are identified in the agenda.

Bornhorst then skipped several minor concerns in this section so the Senate could discuss major issues in Old Business.

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 1-95: CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY [Appendix H].

Bornhorst reminded the Senate that when last we considered this proposal, an amendment was on the floor to delete sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 from the proposal's Guidelines section. Reed argued that deleting these segments would encourage more faculty to take sabbaticals, but Roblee said other factors were more significant than, say, writing a short report. The

motion to amend by deleting four sections of the Guidelines FAILS on a voice vote.

Mullins MOVED to change the compensation, thereby raising the percentage of annual salary a faculty member would receive for a year-long leave. Mullins' new equation would change the current multiplication number from .25 to .15. Arici seconded the amendment.

Roblee said this would place more pressure on the departments, which would subsequently have less funds with which to pay for covering classes of missing faculty member's classes. Filer supported this argument, stating that department chairs would thus allow fewer sabbaticals.

Mullins admitted that remaining faculty may have higher teaching loads when colleagues take sabbaticals, but they themselves can then go on sabbatical.

Carstens asked what departments did with funds remaining when a faculty member went on sabbatical. Answer: some departments hire visiting professors, while others pay grad students, when available, to teach the classes.

Mullins said his amendment is not out of line with what other schools do.

The MOTION to amend CARRIED on a voice vote.

Arici said our system should encourage young faculty to take a sabbatical early in their careers. Mullins asked if a faculty member could take several sabbaticals in a row if enough time had accrued. Jobst and Lewis, both on the Sabbatical Leave committee at one time, replied "No."

Bornhorst ruled that the amendment was a substantive change to Proposal 1-95. Since there were no objections to the ruling, the Senate will consider the entire proposal again at a future Senate meeting.

B. PROPOSAL 7-95 WITH ATTACHMENT

Keen asked that this proposal and amendment [Appendix I] be introduced to the Senate so that the body may move on this issue at a future Senate Meeting. Done.

C. PROPOSAL 3-95: VOTING ON STANDING COMMITTEES [Appendix J]

Bornhorst said the constitution currently gives to the Executive Committee the power over Standing Committee membership.

Keen MOVED to approve Proposal 3-95. Bulleit seconded.

Leifer argued that it was healthy to include more people on standing committees; excluding them would diminish a committee's resident expertise.

Bulleit pressed for a compromise and MOVED to amend the proposal so that the wording would say "...members shall be approved by the Senate. Mullins seconded.

Roblee thought this would add more business to the already overworked Senate, but Bornhorst reminded the Senate that it currently votes on committee membership anyway.

Jobst said conceivably every regular member of a committee could come in with a list of ten more people: Fisher 135 would not hold them all.

McKimpson remarked on the irony of the situation: in the past the Research Policy Committee had to coerce people into joining, but the Finance Committee has just the opposite problem. McKimpson said he has reservations about the amendment, but "it's a risk we must take." Whitt agreed.

Kawatra reiterated a fear that committees might still be packed, and Dobney cautioned that if any committee, such as Finance, became a single interest/single issue group, it will have little effect. "We need a Finance Committee," he said, "not a retirement committee."

Pickens said the committee's actual vote this fall would be four to four if everyone had participated, and he encouraged the Senate to make a decision on the Chair.

As the hour grew late, Keen MOVED to recess but continue the debate

on this issue, beginning at 5:30 the following Wednesday. Roblee seconded. There was no discussion.

9. RECESS

Bornhorst declared the meeting in recess at 7:32 pm.

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 222 (Reconvened)
9 November 1994

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst reconvened meeting 222 at 5:32 pm on Wednesday, November 9, 1994 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were Senator-at-Large Roblee, representatives from Chemical Engineering, AFROTC, Army ROTC, and Education. Absent Liaison Members were Lumsdaine, Seel, and a representative from Staff Council.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors were F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President), and M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources) and Pauline Moore (Library).

Page 4750 Minutes of Senate Meeting 222 2 & 9 Nov 1994

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENT

There were no agenda adjustments. Carstens MOVED to approve the agenda; Kawatra seconded. As there was no discussion, Bornhorst declared the agenda approved [Appendix K].

4. PROPOSAL 3-95: VOTING ON STANDING COMMITTEES

Discussion continued on the proposal's amendment to allow non-Senators/Alternates voting status on Standing Committees after each has received Senate approval.

Grimm said the Senate should get as many faculty involved as possible, but Irish said his constituents in Fine Arts feel voting should be limited to Senators. Keen said the key phrase is "reasonable approval," and he suggested that committees look within themselves to see if they harbor a hidden agenda.

Bulleit said the concern with packing is a risk the Senate must take, and he cautioned on the risk of keeping interested participants out of the loop. Beck said the Senate could also pack committees--with selectively picked Senators.

Leifer argued that the Finance Committee is a one issue committee: money. "We get better representation," he continued, "when we have volunteers." At this point, hard copies of e-mail from Dick Brown (Chemistry) to Jim Pickens (Forestry) were distributed.

VOTING

Discussion ended, and the Senate first voted on the amendment. Voting constituency was the full Senate. Senate Assistant Meyers distributed slips of paper as ballots. Results: 15 to 15. Motion to amend 3-95 FAILS.

Since there was no further discussion on the issue, the Senate took Proposal 3-95 to a vote. Paper ballots were again distributed: 20 yes; 10 no. Motion to approve Proposal 3-95 CARRIED.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Carstens MOVED to adjourn; Kawatra seconded. Bornhorst asked if there were objections: one senator objected. Bornhorst declared reconvened meeting 222 adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Jack Jobst
University Senate Secretary

.