

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 245
1 November 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) defeated Proposal 24-95, Academic Calendar: Homecoming.
- (2) elected members to the University Inquiry Committee, the Presidential Commission for Diversity, and the Administrative Evaluation Commission, approved nominees for University Committee on Academic Tenure, and nominated three persons for President Tompkins to select one for the Sabbatical Leave Committee.
- (3) discussed shared governance.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 1 November 1995, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large senators Robert Filer and Dave Reed, representatives from Physics and KRC. Liaisons in attendance were Yadu Dar (GSC), David Henke (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Fred Dobney (Executive Vice President and Provost), and students Stephen Lee, Jennifer Klein, Eric Schelter, Gordon Erdleean, John DeVol, Adam Lindquist, Megin Agostinelli, Jeremy Hendges, Kedar Klix, Scott Houston, Stacie Ball, and Bill Binder.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Bornhorst stated that Proposal 9-96 was not ready so item 8D would be omitted from the agenda. He also requested that the Senate would go to item 8E, Discussion of Shared Governance, at 7 p.m. Heyman MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to accept the agenda as modified. The motion PASSED by voice vote. [Appendix A. NOTE: only the official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of the appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 243

Senator Pegg suggested that the minutes be altered to replace "lucid" with a more appropriate word in item 4, last sentence of paragraph 1. The secretary has amended the sentence to read, "The secretary will provide more complete minutes in the future."

Carstens MOVED and Caspary seconded the motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

5. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 24-95, ACADEMIC CALENDAR: HOMECOMING [See minutes, page 5807, for a copy of this proposal.]

The motion to approve Proposal 24-95 was on the floor from the close of Meeting 244. Senator Arici opened discussion by stating that his department (ME-EM) opposed the proposal. President Bornhorst stated that one member of the University community had suggested to him that a holiday be added to spring term instead of the half day for Homecoming. USG liaison Henke stated that there are more labs on Wednesday than Friday and

that the student proposal to eliminate Wednesday as a possible K-Day would provide more class days. A student stated that our location made it more important to be able to enjoy a holiday in the fall, not winter when the weather is bad. Senator Heyman stated that we need to devote time to education, particularly under the pressure of the quarter system. Vice President Walck pointed out that non-academic developmental activities are important. Senator Chavis stated, in response to the suggestion of making a half-day holiday for Martin Luther King Day instead, that Martin Luther King Day is a memorial, not a day of fun, and would not be an appropriate substitute for the Homecoming holiday. Senator Keen stated that most other schools do not give any time off for Homecoming. Senator Fynewever stated that a vote for this proposal might push students toward recognizing the value of semesters. Heyman stated that more class time permits teachers to explain more and rely less on the text for student learning; students tend to learn more from teachers than from the text. Senator Soldan stated that the students are paying good money and should be asking for more class time. A student guest stated that we're not like other universities and that's why students came here. Henke stated that cancelling the holiday for Homecoming sends the wrong message to students and indicates that students should not participate. A student stated that students don't want more classes for their money. Soldan stated that Homecoming takes away from those who want class. Senator Way told the Senate that the alumni don't like change. Senator Barna said that the students work hard and they need social development. A student stated that students are forced into a path of only studying and need a break. Fynewever MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to amend the proposal to add "but there shall be no obligatory exams or tests that afternoon." A student stated that the amendment would not change the students' perspective. Keen stated that if the exams wouldn't matter, then we should be able to have exams during Winter Carnival Week as well. Students said that the amendment would still send conflicting signals to the students. The vote on the amendment FAILED 10 yes to 11 no on a show of hands vote.

A student suggested a roll call vote on the motion. The President stated that he had already planned a roll call vote. Walck stated that employers say that students have plenty of technical education but that they need more

Page 5810 Minutes of Senate Meeting 245 1 Nov 1995

social skills. A student stated that students need time to unwind, relax, and get better communication skills; Homecoming permits opportunities for this. Sandberg CALLED for the question, Keen seconded. The call for question was APPROVED on voice vote with dissent. The motion to cancel the Homecoming holiday FAILED 9 yes:13 no on roll call vote. Votes for the motion were Glime (at large), Keen (Biol. Sci.), Sweany (Computer Sci.), Pegg (Humanities), Greuer (Mining Eng.), Heyman (Social Sci.), Carstens (Technology), Goldstein (Fine Arts), Fynewever (Phys. Ed.). Those opposing the motion were Evensen, Walck, and Whitt (at large), Brokaw (Business & Eng. Admin.), Leifer (Chemistry), Barna (Chem. Eng.), Sandberg (Civil & Env. Eng.), Sloan (Elec. Eng.), Gopal (Math. Sci.), Arici (ME-EM), Thayer (Met. & Mat. Eng.), Manninen (Air Force/Army ROTC), and Moore (Library).

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that he had written a memo to the Humanities Department regarding their questions [Appendix B].

Provost Dobney has written memos stating charges for the three task forces (Sabbatical Leave, TIAA/CREF, and Graduate Tuition). [Appendices C, D, and E]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 4-96, Conflict of Interest Statement for the Board of Control, already approved by the Board of Control. [Appendix F]

President Tompkins has rejected Proposal 23-95, Conflict of Interest.

[Appendix G]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 26-95, Undergraduate Academic Progress, with one change. He changed the 5 calendar days for appeal to 10 business days. [Appendix H]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures, and 34-95, Grievance Policy Statement, for one year, to be reviewed at that time, with amendments. [Appendix I]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 36-95, Scientific Misconduct Policy Statement, with amendments. [Appendix J]

The Senate Assistant will mail the Senate Committee list, names of chairs, and tasks in progress to Senators and Alternates.

Senator Leifer asked if Senators will get a copy of altered proposals, particularly the status of the Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedures. Bornhorst responded that Senators would receive the original proposals with changes as required by the Bylaws; the Board has approved the proposal minus the amendment. Provost Dobney clarified for Leifer that the proposal requires disclosure of all conflicts of interests, but that no signatures are required except to disclose possible conflicts when submitting proposals. Dobney stated that we are currently operating on the rejected procedures. The Committee on Conflict of Interest, chaired by Bruce Seely, will revise the procedures for subsequent review by the Senate.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

Election of University committee representatives:

Three members and an alternate are needed for the University Inquiry Committee. President Bornhorst presented a slate of nominees. There were no further nominees from the floor. Sandberg MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to close the nominations. The motion to close PASSED on voice vote. The President ruled that the voting units would be the full Senate. There were no objections. Faith Morrison received the highest number of votes for a three-year term, Carol MacLennan next for a two-year term, and Pat Joyce next for a one-year term. John Johnson was next and will serve as alternate. Tom Snyder was fifth and will be next in line if one of these four is no longer able to serve.

Three members are needed for the Presidential Commission for Diversity. President Bornhorst presented Anand Kulkarni (Electrical Engineering), Krishna Podila (Biological Sciences), and Bill Sewell (Humanities). Carstens MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to close nominations. The motion to accept PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

For the University Committee on Academic Tenure, one member must be elected by the tenured and tenure track faculty and one will be selected by President Tompkins. Arici MOVED and Heyman seconded the motion to close the nominations based on the slate presented by Bornhorst. The motion to close PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. The entire list will be sent to the faculty for the election. After the election, the Senate will decide on the list of suggestions to send to President Tompkins for his choice.

Three members are needed for the Administrative Evaluation Commission. Senator Remali pointed out that Dave Strong had volunteered for the committee and is very interested in serving on it. Mroz MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to close the nominations. The motion to close PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. David Strong received the most votes, Nancy Johnson second, and Sharron Paris third; Laura Bulleit and Andrea Soumis were fourth and fifth and will serve if one of these elected members is unable to serve.

The Senate needs to provide nominees to President Tompkins for the Sabbatical Leave Committee. Soldan MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to close the nominations as presented by President Bornhorst. The motion to close PASSED on voice vote. Senators questioned why the President chooses one of the members. Keen stated that when the rule was made, the president of the Senate was the President of the University. Senator Whitt stated that the rule should be updated. Senator Brokaw stated that the Sabbatical Leave Committee looked at the process and philosophy of the sabbatical leave, but not at the composition of the committee. Heyman MOVED and

Sandberg seconded the motion that the Senate vote on three and send the top three vote-getters to the President. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Debra Bruch and Ashok Goel tied for the most votes. Larry

Page 5811 Minutes of Senate Meeting 245 1 Nov 1995

Lankton received the next highest number; these names will be submitted to the president. Diana George received the next highest.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposal 6-96, Revision of Senate Bylaws. The proposal was introduced as new business. [Appendix K]

B. Proposal 7-96, Revision of Senate Bylaws. The proposal was introduced as new business. [Appendix L]

C. Proposal 8-96, Revision of Senate Bylaws. The proposal was introduced as new business. [Appendix M]

Whitt MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion that the appropriate Senate committee re-visit issues of membership of committees when the University President chooses any committee members. The motion CARRIED by voice vote with no dissent.

E. Discussion of Shared Governance

1) President Bornhorst presented the functions and responsibilities of the Senate as outlined in the Senate Constitution. These include the A list wherein the Senate has responsibility to approve and the B list in which the Senate can only recommend.

2) Senator Whitt stated that she had been asked to speak. She stated that we need to study the issue so that we can make informed decisions; she proposes the formation of an ad hoc committee that should survey other institutions that have shared governance and find out how they carry it out.

3) Senator Leifer stated that the Provost has suggested that three task forces be created. The Senate already has committees that could investigate these three issues; we shouldn't need more. He reported that President Tompkins' idea of shared governance is that we should take an opinion poll. If our shared governance is not in the true spirit of shared governance, we should not call it that. We should study what it is. The title for the Tech Tea should have been changed to ask whether good teachers are made or born or destroyed.

Senator Arici asked whether this committee would work on changing or on defining our form of shared governance. Whitt stated that we need to investigate other institutions and recommend to MTU. Senator Heyman stated that MTU has 2 issues: the relationship with the administration (both the structure and the people); the relationship with the Board of Control. The University of Wisconsin faculty have power that at MTU the Board of Control has; there clearly is no sharing of control with the Board. Senator Thayer stated that this institution has survived a long time; a university is the interaction of the students and the faculty; the faculty should be making the decisions. Provost Dobney said that if this ad hoc committee is made of only faculty, who then decide what the shared governance should be, then this is not shared with the administration; in reality, shared governance is only what the administration chooses to share. Senator Mroz asked what we would expect to get from this ad hoc committee. Senator Diebel stated that our peer institutions have a different legal structure and would probably not be effective models; the situation here is improving; other issues need our time. Faculty don't have shared accountability, such as budgeting; the power is invested in the people who are accountable. Senator Sloan endorsed the formation of a committee - it would gain insights; there are 4 proposals coming back to us that the administration

has modified; students need input into the development of shared governance. Whitt stated that the committee is not a referendum on the current administration; nothing in the proposal rules out administrative input. Stephen Lee (USG) suggested that it would be good for students to have input into the discussions of shared governance. Senator Heyman stated that it would be difficult to alter the language or our responsibilities and recommendation powers in a way that the Board of Control would accept. Vice President Walck stated that volunteers could investigate the shared governance concept and that we would be remiss if we disallowed this. Senator Greuer stated that the AAUP would be able to help with this process. Secretary Glime stated that the Constitution Committee had investigated shared governance at other schools and that various policy making committees had contacted the national AAUP for help in forming policy guidelines that have come to the Senate as proposals and in carrying out MTU policies. Thayer MOVED and Greuer seconded the motion to establish an ad hoc committee on shared governance.

Brokaw MOVED and Leifer seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.