

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 238

3 May 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Passed Proposal 22-95: Revision of Senate Bylaws
- (2) Rejected Proposal 35-95: Support of Continuing Financing of Self-Funding for the TIAA-CREF Retiree Medical Coverage
- (3) Passed Proposal 36-95: Scientific Misconduct Policy.
- (4) Passed Proposal 30-95: A revision of 17-94: Policy on Academic Freedom.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 6:10 pm on Wednesday, May 3, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from Chemical Engineering and Math Science. Liaisons in attendance were Brian Whitman (Grad Student Association), Aaron Dufrane (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Marie Ryding (Registra's Office); Harold Evensen and Dave Nelson (ME-EM); Rebecca Christianson (TQE); Mike Gilles and Anita Quinn (Research Services); Dee Vincent (IT); Phyllis Johnson (Library); and David Henke, Jennifer Klein, Gordon Erdelean, and Nicole Wertime (USG); along with M. Goodrich (Tech Topics); and F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst added to "6." a "C. Sabbatical Leave Survey Results" offered by the Provost. He also recommended we move item "7.A. Proposal 22-95" to the next item on the agenda after adjustments. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Vanek MOVED to accept the adjustments, with Roblee's second. Bornhorst said if there were no objections the agenda would stand as adjusted. There were none.

[Section moved by Agenda Adjustment]

7. A. Proposal 22-95: Revision of Senate Bylaws

Wells MOVED to change "ROTC" to "Army/Air Force ROTC," and Bornhorst said in his opinion this was an editorial change, and he asked if anyone objected; no one did.

Keen MOVED to amend 22-95, adding the statement from a memo sent to Senators [Appendix B]. Beck seconded. The amendment stated that Proposal 22-95, if passed by both the Senate and affected staff, would be reconsidered in a year. Grimm spoke against the amendment, and Beck said it would satisfy those with reservations about the proposal. Grimm replied that the Senate should make changes when a system proves unworkable, not beforehand. Glime said the one year allows time to work out the plan and allows staff to make any necessary adjustments. Heyman said that if the amendment helps the new constituency to work together, then he supports it. Next year, Heyman continued, the Senate will see that the Staff has made major contributions.

The Senate voted on the amendment to 22-95 by secret ballot: 14 yes to 17 no, the motion FAILS.

Keen argued that Proposal 22-95 is unconstitutional, and he quoted Article II which lists constituents. "The proposal," Keen said, "drops them from the list."

Beck called for a referendum on the Proposal. Grimm said the proposal will enrich the Senate, but Beck argued that the proposal would allow voting by staff who could be swayed by the administration. He said that there was no necessity for the Senate to join with staff since special meetings could be arranged to debate issues of common concerns, such as health.

Filer said that at present we have an us versus them situation, but with the proposal passed, we will have only us.

Keen said the proposal violates the compromise which established the current Senate. Vanek MOVED to reintroduce the amendment to 22-95, asking for a reconsideration after one year. Bradley seconded. Bornhorst asked Keen about the challenge on grounds of unconstitutionality, and Keen replied that he would not raise the issue, but in a year, the Constitution would have to be changed to accommodate the proposal.

With discussion at an end the Senate by written ballot voted for a second time on the amendment to 22-95: with 16 votes for and 14 against, the motion CARRIED.

Irish asked for arguments against 22-95: "Why is this [legislative body] called the 'University Senate?'" he asked, "rather than the 'mostly faculty Senate?'" Bornhorst replied that the correct name is "'Senate,' not 'University Senate.'"

Bradley stated that his constituents were opposed to the proposal because it places the staff in a second class position.

Discussion ended, and on a written ballot, the Senate, which needed a 2/3 vote or 21 votes in favor of the constitutional change, voted 23 to 8 in favor of the proposal: 22-95 CARRIED.

Bradley MOVED to send the vote to referendum with current constituents.

Keen seconded. This proposed vote would occur at the same time as the vote among the staff. Glime argued against this measure, suggesting that the Senate wait a year and see what problems needed to be worked out. The Senate voted ten in favor and 21 opposed; the motion for a referendum FAILED.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Meeting 234

Page 5448 contains the sentence: "Glime suggested Bert Whitten be invited to discuss this issue since he was on the original committee which suggested the pre-pay method." The phrase in italics should read "worked with the Board of Control..."

Leifer said that his remarks about the retirement health pre-pay plan did not appear in the Minutes. [Checking revealed that his comments actually occurred at a later Senate meeting, and they will appear in the Minutes to Meeting 236.]

Heyman MOVED, with Mroz' second, to approve the Minutes of Meeting 234, as amended. On a voice vote, approval of the Minutes CARRIED with dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

A. GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Proposals 13-95 and 34-95 have been sent to the administration [Appendix C].

Bornhorst has responded to the Presidential Commission for Women Climate Study [Appendix D].

interaction with the University attorney, and they decided to avoid discussing any issues not already discussed previously by Senate committees. Bornhorst read a memo outlining the committee's decision [Appendix E].

B. REQUESTS FOR SENATE ACTION

1. Distance education requirements have been sent to Curricular Policy [Appendix F].
2. Student Conduct in Classroom, and Drop Fee have both been sent to Instructional Policy [Appendices G and H].

C. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

The Executive Committee will meet on Thursday next week to pull together a preliminary list. The committee will make assignments as in the past, giving first priority to personal choice, and avoiding the placement of members from the same unit on the same committee.

F. FINANCE COMMITTEE RESIGNATIONS

Committee chair Pickens has resigned from the committee, and Bornhorst read his resignation memo [Appendix I]. Brokaw and Kawatra have also resigned. Bornhorst read a memo from Brokaw [Appendix J]. The resigning group said that the committee is unable to function because of factionalism; it cannot respond to the administration with its present membership. A faction of the committee, they said, should not be able to undercut issues. They recommended that the Senate reconstitute the committee.

Roblee MOVED to reconstitute the Senate Finance Committee so that no current members or volunteers are members next year; Bradley seconded. Sloan said that one of the committee members wrote the memo of resignation during a period of major stress, and replacing everyone will produce a committee of all new people who must begin from scratch, without guidance.

Arguments for keeping selected committee members were discounted, and with discussion at an end the Senate voted 21 to ten in favor; the motion CARRIED.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

A. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT

(USG)--INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION BOOKLET

Visitors Henke, Klein, Erdelean, and Wertime from USG made a presentation on the recently-published Instructor Evaluation Booklets, stating that it had three purposes: to promote a change in the system with a publicized version of teaching evaluations; to emphasize teaching as an important part of campus life; and to allow students an opportunity to express to other students their opinions of campus teachers. The USG leaders explained how they collected and evaluated the feedback [Appendix K].

Bulleit said that Senate policy currently forbids regular evaluations from being made public, but the committee on teaching, which he heads, will offer proposals next year on this issue.

Heyman asked the group if it was fair to obtain classroom evaluations outside the class from a small number of people. The group responded that they wanted participation from a large number of classes, and not every teacher participated by distributing forms in class. Bornhorst suggested that Senators with suggestions for improvement send e-mail to USG.

B. LIBRARY

Phyllis Johnson reported on the Electronic Library Project. She said the Library is currently testing a new computer software system, under Patricia Moore's leadership. The target date of completion is June 12. Department computer servers must be reconfigured before they can access the library cardfile.

C. SABBATICAL LEAVE SURVEY

Provost Dobney said the major issue on why faculty have not taken sabbaticals was clearly financial, and he also acknowledged that many responses contained useful suggestions, such as continue TIAA at 100% of salary while a faculty member takes a sabbatical. He also noted the

different plans people suggested, such as a 6-4-2 or 9-6-3, which means that the longer one waits to take a sabbatical, the higher the salary offered during the sabbatical [Appendix L].

The Provost said he did not think the Board of Control (BoC) would accept a more expensive sabbatical leave plan, but the other feedback on revising sabbaticals are helpful and deserve further consideration. He will forward the proposed policy at the current compensation schedule (50/75/ 100%) and eliminate the March 15 deadline.

7. OLD BUSINESS

B. PROPOSAL 35-95: SUPPORT OF CONTINUING FINANCING OF SELF-FUNDING FOR THE TIAA-CREF RETIREE MEDICAL COVERAGE [See Minutes, p.5585.]

The Provost, using prepared transparencies [Appendix M], announced that everyone who retires under the current TIAA-CREF medical plan should be guaranteed a future in it. He then outlined two options: the first is to continue as is, agreeing to Proposal 35-95 and placing large blocks of funds into the plan. Among the drawbacks here is that salary increases next year could not exceed 2% because a sizable portion of available funds must instead go into the pre-funding pot.

A second option is to discontinue the prefunding and consider a more comprehensive retirement medical plan. Furthermore, if the allotted moneys are not spent on the pre-funding, the University could consider a raise of 3 1/2 to 4%.

Bornhorst asked how other schools were faring with the 2.6 % ceiling on tuition increases. The Provost said that apparently only those schools which had received the higher-than-inflation increase from the state were going to keep their tuition increases at the State-recommended ceiling rate.

Beck asked about the \$1.9 million currently in the pre-funding pot, and Dobney said it would remain there as a standby for emergency use.

Keen MOVED to delete from 35-95 those words indicating the proposal is relevant only to the Finance Committee, and instead he suggested changing this to the "Senate." The proposal's first line thus should read "The ... Senate unanimously supports continuation of the retiree health benefit self-funding plan . . ." In paragraph 2 the words "Finance Committee" would be deleted, but "Senate" would be retained. In Paragraph 3 the word "committee" would be changed to "Senate." Bornhorst said he would rule these changes editorial unless someone objected; no one did.

With discussion at an end the Senate voted on Proposal 35-95. The vote was 13 Yes to 17 No; the proposal FAILED, and thus the Senate makes no recommendation on whether or not to end the pre-funding method.

Page 5605 Minutes of Senate Meeting 238 3 May 1995

[NOTE: The Senate considered the following two proposal in the order they appear below.]

D. PROPOSAL 36-95: SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT POLICY STATEMENT [Minutes p.5583]
Huang MOVED to approve 36-95, with Keen's second. Without discussion, and on a voice vote, the motion CARRIED without dissent.

C. PROPOSAL 30-95: REVISION OF PROPOSAL 17-94: POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM [Appendix N]

This proposal is virtually the same as 17-94 but with a sentence added which extends the concept of academic freedom to students as well as faculty.

Keen MOVED to approve 30-95; Heyman seconded. Without discussion and on a voice vote the proposal passed with dissent.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Miner MOVED and Huang seconded to adjourn. Motion CARRIED. Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate