

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 246

29 November 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) voted to form an ad hoc committee to learn more about shared governance.
- (2) heard a report from Jim Riehl on campus safety and environmental health.
- (3) heard a report from Paul Nelson on progress of administrative evaluation.
- (4) selected Barry Kunz, Mike Irish, and Ann Maclean as the three Senate nominees from which President Tompkins will select one for the Committee on Academic Tenure.
- (5) defeated the motion to accept the administrative amendment to Proposal 26-95, Undergraduate Academic Progress, that would have extended the appeals period from 5 days to 10 business days.
- (6) approved Proposal 32-95, Ph.D. Program in Mathematical Sciences.
- (7) defeated the motion to accept the administrative amendment to Proposal 36-95, Scientific Misconduct Policy Statement, that would strike the due process clause.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 29 November 1995, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were representatives from Electrical Engineering, Army/Air Force ROTC, and Student Affairs/Educational Opportunities. Liaisons in attendance were Max Seel (Dean, Sciences & Arts), Steve Batzer (GSC), David Henke (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Executive Vice President and Provost), Al Baartmans (Chair, Mathematical Sciences), Anant Godbole (Mathematical Sciences), Donald Kreher (Mathematical Sciences), Paul Nelson (School of Business), Jim Riehl (Chair, Chemistry), and Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Soldan MOVED and Caspary seconded the motion to accept the agenda. The motion PASSED by voice vote with no dissent. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETINGS 244 and 245

Mroz MOVED and McKimpson seconded the motion to accept the minutes of Meeting 244. The motion PASSED on voice vote.

Secretary Glime stated that the minutes of Meeting 245 should have an insertion on p. 5811 after New Business item C to read: "Whitt moved and Lutzke seconded the motion that the appropriate Senate committees re-visit issues of membership of committees when the University President chooses any committee members. The motion CARRIED by voice vote with no dissent." Senator Heyman asked that the wording of Agenda item 8E, paragraph beginning "Senator Arici," line 5 be amended to read

"stated that MTU has 2 issues:" instead of 2 problems. Senator Whitt stated that item 8E, column 2, line 7, beginning "Whitt stated that the committee" should be changed from "it won't be effective without administrative input" to "nothing in the proposal rules out administrative input." Lutzke MOVED and Soldan seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 245 as corrected. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. OPEN MOTION ON FORMING AN AD HOC COMMITTEE DEALING WITH SHARED GOVERNANCE

Discussion opened on the open motion from Meeting 245, "to establish an ad hoc committee on shared governance." Senator Leifer stated that he wanted to see what shared governance is at other universities and study it. Senator Bradley asked what is the goal of the committee. Senator Whitt stated that its goal is to understand better what shared governance is. Senator Soldan stated that the motion needed more definition than just to establish a committee on shared governance; the charge "to find out what it means" should be clarified. Senator Filer stated that it is early to do this - we have only had shared governance for a short time. Whitt said that we can learn from others. Senator Bradley stated that this is a time of limited resources and time should be spent elsewhere for research, better teaching, etc. Senator Thayer stated that we do not have shared governance, only shared blame. Senator Mroz stated that time, energy, and focus are valuable commodities. Senator Heyman suggested that the commission to evaluate the upper administration could ask these questions of other schools as part of the evaluation of the success of the administration in accomplishing shared governance. Soldan and other senators expressed surprise that anyone would not want to set up this committee and suggested that if people are interested in doing it, we should do it. Whitt stated that the administrative evaluation committee has enough to do and that assigning this to them would overburden them. Senator Greuer stated that accreditation parties require a summation of the success of shared governance.

Page 5862 Minutes of Senate Meeting 246 29 Nov 1995

Senator Leifer requested a roll call vote. The motion PASSED by roll call vote with 26 yes, 6 no, and 2 abstentions.

Evensen - no	Filer - no
Glime - yes	Reed - abstain
Walck - yes	Whitt - yes
Keen - yes	Brokaw - no
Leifer - yes	Shonnard - yes
Ott - yes	Mroz - no
Pegg - yes	Gopal - yes
Arici - yes	Thayer - yes
Greuer - yes	Beck - yes
Heyman - yes	Carstens - abstain
Goldstein - yes	Moore - yes
Fynewever - yes	McKimpson - yes
Diebel - no	Bradley - no
Remali - yes	Lutzke - yes
Ouellette - yes	Soldan - yes
Little - yes	Vichich - yes
Caspary - yes	Kitalong - yes

The President asked that senators who wish to serve on this shared governance committee so indicate by email.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that the following proposals were

submitted to the Administration on 27 October 1995: 7-94, Scheduling of Evening Examinations, 10-94, Amendments to Final Exam Policy, 33-95, Research Statement, 5-96, Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development. [Appendices B, C, D, and E]

President Tompkins approved Proposal 29-95, Department of Education. The President also enthusiastically approved Proposal 37-95, Statement of the Value of Interdisciplinary Scholarship and Teaching. [Appendices F and G]

The Senate has received a proposal for an MS degree in Environmental Policy now designated as Proposal 10-96; this proposal is in review by the Curricular Policy Committee.

Last year the Athletic Council changed its structure. Recently, with the help of the Senate Assistant, the President has determined that the role of the Senate in selecting faculty members was inadvertently changed. This will be corrected so that the Senate will again select faculty members.

The Space Committee of the University has met several times this term. President Bornhorst represents the Senate.

The Conflict of Interest procedures are nearly ready for Senate review, according to Bruce Seely.

The Provost and Officers met on 20 November and discussed the status of the pending proposals and work in progress on Separation and on Promotion and Tenure.

The Senate office computer is being upgraded. This may result in a carry over expense into next year's SS&E for the Senate.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Presidential Committee on University Safety and Environmental Health - Jim Riehl

Jim Riehl, Chair, reported on their charge and topics they have considered, including such items as safety at the ski hill and walking across campus. He stated that the students had been particularly influential in suggesting improvements for safety in walking around the university. Student Jennifer Klein had suggested placing one phone on every floor of every building; this has been approved by President Tompkins with money to come from what is left from a senior gift several years ago dedicated to campus safety issues. One goal of the committee is to make concern for safety a part of the MTU culture. The safety program for teaching and research labs has been approved and will come to the faculty soon. The committee is working on training. An incentive program for cleanup of hazardous waste is being discussed, with the possibility of offering a one-time free disposal of hazardous waste materials; subsequently, that cost must be built into the departmental structure. Another concern is making everyone aware of the number to call (123) about safety issues. For any emergency or safety hazard, a team of trained personnel will be on call if you dial 123.

Senator Ott stated that the Graduate Student Council is concerned about the lighting and phone access on campus. Riehl commented that the GSC has not provided a representative to the committee this year and needs to do that. Senator McKimpson asked about the status of central purchasing for chemicals. Riehl replied that the chemistry personnel are not qualified to handle some kinds of toxic materials such as hazardous bacteria, so instead of one, there would probably be several centers. He pointed out that the Provost has provided for a bar code package that permits used chemicals to be returned to a central place and easily located when needed, saving lots of money by providing more efficient use of these chemicals. [Appendix H]

B. Board of Control Relations Committee

President Bornhorst reported on his activities as Board of Control liaison. He reported to the Board of Control on 4 items during the 17 November meeting: administrative evaluation activities, the center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development, evaluation of teaching, and the academic calendar and homecoming. The Board of Control approved the revised faculty definitions and the sabbatical leave policy. President

Tompkins announced a workshop to be held 15 January 1996 on charter schools, to include representatives from other schools with charter schools, members of the governor's office, and a discussion of liability. The Board also discussed the escrow of funds for the new building.

Senator Leifer asked what the current sabbatical leave policy is and Bornhorst reported that the percentages (of salary) are the same as they have been in recent years the remainder is as passed by the Senate last year.

C. Administrative Evaluation Commission - Paul Nelson

Paul Nelson, Chair, reported on progress of that group. He provided a report of background, membership on the commission, self-evaluations, and use of outside sources for evaluation input. [Appendix I] The use of outside sources was particularly important for persons such as the Vice President of Government Relations whose primary role was off campus and whose effectiveness there could best be evaluated by those with whom he interacted there. Outside help is also being used for benchmarks and examining the processes used by other universities for administrative evaluations.

Nelson requested the help of Senators in getting as many people as possible to respond to the questionnaire. He stated that credibility will depend on the response rate. Senators can help by talking up the evaluation in their units and by serving as a conduit to collect and funnel questionnaires back to the commission as a means of allaying some of the fears of retribution if evaluation forms would reach certain administrators directly. Forms will require identifying yourself with one of five units which consist of 50-150 people. The Commission hopes to distribute the questionnaire in January and to publish the report of the results in May. The Commission is currently considering ways to prevent one person from submitting multiple copies.

Senator Whitt expressed concern about whether people will know what a given administrator is really supposed to do. Nelson responded that each administrator has been asked to provide a brief description of his/her duties to be included with the questionnaire. Job descriptions will also be available in the library. There will be categories for not enough information. The proposal on administrative evaluation states that the committee is supposed to synthesize information. Nelson stated that the Commission considered the questionnaire to also have an educational role relative to job responsibilities and accomplishments. Senator Ott asked if people can see the self-evaluations prior to filling out the form because an administrator might say he/she is doing X, but the evaluator might think that the administrator should be doing Y. Nelson replied that at least in some cases, that would be a breach of confidentiality. Senator Bradley asked if the supervisor shouldn't be writing the description of the job; Nelson responded that the job descriptions are already public documents. Dobney quipped that a good question might be to ask if the "idiot" who is doing the job now is doing a better or worse job than the "idiot" who held that position before.

D. University Committee Representatives

President Bornhorst reported that President Tompkins has selected Ashok Goel to serve on the Sabbatical Leave Committee. David Sikarskie has been selected by the faculty for the Committee on Academic Tenure. The Senate must submit three names to the President for him to select one. Senators discussed the possibilities of ballots, sending the whole list but stating the order of votes, or sending the next three vote-getters in the faculty election. Senator Soldan asked who could vote on these choices. Heyman MOVED and Thayer seconded the motion that

voting units would be all units with tenurable faculty, but then clarified the wording to be all academic degree-granting departments plus Fine Arts and Institute of Wood Research. The motion PASSED on show of hands with 18 for and 11 opposed.

Brokaw MOVED and Reed seconded the motion to take the top three names from the faculty vote. Senator McKimpson said the Senate should have broader perspectives; the faculty already had provided their choice. The motion to take the top three names FAILED by show of hands, 6 for and 12 opposed.

Heyman MOVED and Thayer seconded the motion to vote and send forward the top three vote-getters of a Senate vote for the position on the Committee on Academic Tenure. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. Barry Kunz, Mike Irish, and Ann Maclean were elected by secret ballot (the same as the top three vote-getters in the faculty election). Bob Zulinski and Bill Gregg tied for fourth place.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposal 26-95, Undergraduate Academic Progress [Appendix J]

The proposal was amended by the Administration to allow 10 business days instead of 5 calendar days to appeal academic dismissal. Senator Carstens objected to the voting units of academic degree-granting departments. Reed MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to expand the voting to the full Senate. A senator stated that this is a common sense issue, not an academic one. Senator Soldan stated that it seems to be clearly academic. Senator Remali stated that it has a strong effect on some non-academic units such as the Registrar's Office. The motion to expand voting units to the full Senate PASSED 10 for and 9 opposed.

Carstens MOVED and Filer seconded the motion to accept the change proposed by the Administration. Senator Remali stated that 10 business days puts us into the third week of classes before a student can get in a class; all classes are dropped from a student's schedule when the student is dismissed. The fifth class day is an important cut-off day for billing, adds and drops, and giving financial aid. Provost Dobney stated that the 10 days sets the maximum; five days might penalize the students who don't recognize the gravity of the problem; this makes it more flexible. Senator Keen stated that if a student waits 10 days that student is at a severe disadvantage. Senator Little stated that the University would get a better enrollment count for reporting purposes with the 5-day limit. Remali reported that after fall of 1995 there were 28 dismissals, only 11 of whom had scheduled courses for winter term, and 5 had appealed by the second day of the term and had gotten back in. Senator Ott stated that 5 days could be a problem in the summer. Dobney stated that the letter sent to the student would encourage a rapid response. Senator Caspary stated that this group was the wrong group with which to grant leniency; furthermore, we cannot prove when a student received the letter. Secretary Glime summarized that what the Senate seemed to favor was giving a limit of five class days in the next term in which the student wished to be enrolled. Discussion ended and the motion to approve the Administrative amendment

FAILED on voice vote with no affirmative votes. The President will be notified of our lack of affirmation with a suggestion to amend the proposal to provide for appeal within 5 class days of the term in which the student wishes to re-enroll.

At the request of the President, Mroz MOVED and Heyman seconded a motion to move to item 8D in the agenda. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

D. Proposal 32-95, Ph.D. Program in Mathematical Sciences [Appendix K]

Heyman MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to approve Proposal 32-95. Voting units are academic degree-granting departments. Senator Bradley objected to the voting units because of the financial implications. No motion followed so voting units remained as academic degree-granting departments.

Senator Moore pointed out that the statement of 12,000 serials was misleading and should more properly be 3,000 printed serials. President Bornhorst ruled this an editorial change. There were no objections so the ruling stands. Moore suggested that the number of volumes be omitted because the number was meaningless. Senator Leifer asked for the cost to implement the degree and employment record for such persons. Dean Seel responded that the TA positions were needed to downsize the section size due to the introduction of the computer lab instruction and therefore were a cost independent of the Ph.D. program. The faculty positions requested would be replacements for positions where vacancies are expected. The library resources would be part of usual library requests, and while important, are not essential. The degree would be of a new type that educates students for industry positions, not just academia as has been traditional in math Ph.D. programs; current students in math Ph.D. programs are being educated for the wrong job. Leifer suggested that the program should be approved provisionally and that we should look at the employment rate in 3-5 years. Seel stated that we could argue the same thing for any department. Dobney asked if the faculty will expect lower teaching loads. Baartmans (Chair, Mathematical Sciences) answered no. Dobney stated that the unemployment of new Ph.D.'s in mathematics is 14 percent, the highest of any discipline. Baartmans stated that the advisory Board recommended this program. One third to one half of the MTU math MS students go on to a Ph.D. program. Some of our numbers now in MS programs might become part of the Ph.D. program instead. The department estimates that a critical mass of 25 graduate students is needed to make the program viable; some students from other departments also take the graduate courses offered by the department. Secretary Glime stated that her graduate student, who had researched mosses, just got a job as an applied statistician because of his peripheral background in statistics and programming; if a student with a degree in another discipline can get such a job, one trained for this purpose should be able to find one. Senator Bradley stated that the cost question had not really been answered. Seel responded that basically the requirements would be the same type of requirements all departments present yearly in the annual budget process; the program can be started with existing resources. Senator Caspary questioned why the proposed positions were advertised in Tech Topics before the program was approved. Seel explained that these positions were replacements for anticipated resignations. Discussion ended and the motion to approve the Ph.D. program in mathematics was APPROVED on voice vote with no dissent.

B. Proposal 36-95, Scientific Misconduct Policy Statement [Appendix L]

Proposal 36-95 was amended by the Administration to strike the last sentence of the paragraph following D, It is imperative that due process be followed and protection be afforded to the rights and reputation of both accuser and accused, collaborators of the accused, those investigating the allegations, any sponsoring agency, any publisher, and the University. The concern expressed by the University lawyer was that this statement afforded due process to persons who are not currently afforded due process within the University. At the suggestion of the officers, two statements were added to try to address the desired protection: to the same paragraph, words were inserted to read "When scientific misconduct is alleged, a thorough and timely process which respects the rights and reputations of all individuals shall take place within the University to provide adequate opportunity for reaching valid conclusions about the alleged misconduct. Individuals found guilty of scientific misconduct are subject to discipline up to and including dismissal." The voting units for the original proposal were academic degree-granting departments, other course-offering, and research units.

McKimpson MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to approve the amended policy. Bornhorst asked for objections to the voting units. There were no objections, so the voting units remained as in the original proposal (academic degree-granting departments, other course-offering units, and other research units).

Senator Brokaw asked who is affected by the lack of a due process clause. Provost Dobney stated that graduate students, non-tenure track faculty, and at-will staff have no due process contract. Senator Ott asked why this policy is a scientific misconduct policy when it also applies, for example, to cases of plagiarism in humanities. Senator Beck responded that it was written to satisfy NSF. Senator Reed asked if this was not already Board Policy and if so, why must we modify a statement that was approved earlier (referring to the administrative changes). President Bornhorst responded that the original policy was never approved by the Board of Control. Senator Heyman stated that the purpose of the policy should be to protect individuals by due process. Dobney suggested that instead of striking the last sentence of that paragraph, instead only the words "due process be followed and" be removed; thus the sentence would read "It is imperative that protection be afforded to the rights and reputation of both accuser and accused, collaborators of the accused, those investigating the allegations, any sponsoring agency, any publisher, and the University." Discussion

Page 5865 Minutes of Senate Meeting 246 29 Nov 1995

ended and the motion to approve the Administrative amendment FAILED on voice vote with no affirmative votes. The President will be notified of our lack of affirmation with a suggestion to amend the proposal with that wording change.

Thayer MOVED and Gopal seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.