

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 252
20 March 1996

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Heard that the proposal to restrict K-Day to Tuesday or Thursday will be implemented fall 1996.
- (2) Heard that President Tompkins has approved the proposal to divide the time between classes, giving the classroom to the incoming person on the hour.
- (3) Heard that the Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures is approved and effective immediately.
- (4) Heard that no action has been taken on University legal counsel.
- (5) Set up an ad hoc committee on retrenchment (to complete the work on the Separation for Faculty, Including Non-reappointment, Termination for Cause, Due Process for Dismissal with Cause: Procedures).
- (6) Elected Gary Agin, Dallas Bates, and Faith Morrison to the Charter School Committee. In addition, President Tompkins has appointed Mike Abbott, Joe Galetto, Dennis Harbour, and Bill McGarry (chair).
- (7) Needs nominees for Senator At-large.
- (8) Heard a report from Paul Nelson on administrative evaluations.
- (9) Heard a report from Chris Anderson on retention.
- (10) Heard arguments regarding the Bylaw change to include professional staff in the constituency

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate Meeting 252 to order at 5:32 p.m. on Wednesday, 20 March 1996, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were representatives from Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, Army/AF ROTC, Library, and Institute of Wood Research. Liaisons in attendance were Steve Hellmann (USG), Yadu Dar (GSC), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Tim Collins (School of Technology), Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office), Chris Anderson (Educational Opportunity), Steve Tyrell (Student Affairs Office), Paul Nelson (School of Business), Kelly McLean (Staff Council), Richard Pelto, (Facilities), Renee Marion (IT), Peggy Gorton (Mining Engineering), and Dee Vincent (IT)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Scott Bradley stated that there was new business in the form of a proposal (18-96) from the Benefits Committee regarding fringe benefits. The proposal was introduced into the agenda so that it could be acted upon at the next meeting. Les Leifer reported that last Wednesday Fred Dobney asked Leifer if he was going to give him a present on Friday. Leifer stated that Friday was the Ides of March and Dobney said it was the third anniversary of the day he started at Michigan Tech. Leifer responded "Now you have lent new meaning to the phrase 'Beware the Ides of March'."

Thayer MOVED and Walck seconded the motion to accept the amended 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 MEETING 251

Senator Carstens inquired about the meaning of "6a" in item 3 of the minutes; Secretary Glime responded that it refers to item 6a of the agenda. Soldan MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 251. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that Proposal 15-96, Sharing of Interval Between Classroom Use, has been submitted to the Administration; Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures, with editorial change and concurrence with Provost's amendments, has been submitted to the Administration. [Appendices B and C]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 12-96, Academic Calendar: K-Day, for implementation in the 1996-97 academic year. [Appendix D]

President Tompkins has approved Proposal 15-96, Sharing of Interval Between Classroom Use. [Appendix E]

The Administration has approved Proposal 7-94, Scheduling of Evening Examinations, with amendments. This amended version will be on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

The Administration has accepted Proposal 13-95, Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures, with the Senate's editorial change. This procedure will be effective immediately through Winter Quarter of 1996-97. [Appendix F]

President Bornhorst was pleased to announce that President Tompkins has approved the first Departmental Charters for Biological Sciences, School of Forestry and Wood Products, Chemistry, Geological Engineering and Sciences, and Physical Education. [Appendices G, H, I, J, and K]

President Bornhorst has referred the report of the Faculty Development/Sabbatical Leave Policy Task Force to the Academic Policy Committee for action and urged them to take action so this issue could be resolved by the end of Spring Quarter. [Appendix L]

President Bornhorst forwarded to the Instructional Policy Committee a request to investigate [informing faculty of] student athletic absences from class and exams. [Appendix M]

President Bornhorst had lunch with President Tompkins on 14 March and discussed various issues, including the University legal counsel and several topics brought to his attention by the Finance Committee.

The Officers met with the Provost on 18 March. They discussed the status of Senate approved proposals needing

Administration approval. The Provost indicated some concerns regarding thematic studies. The officers agreed to initiate review of the general education requirements with focus on thematic studies. This issue is being referred to the Instructional Policy Committee.

Last year the Institutional Planning Committee brought forward a Policy on Separation for Faculty, Including Non-reappointment, Termination for Cause, Due Process for Dismissal with Cause: Procedures. The proposal was withdrawn after it was recognized that it must include reconfiguration in cases of program elimination or financial exigency. No progress has been made this year. The Senate Officers and Faculty Handbook Steering Committee have discussed this situation. President Bornhorst recommended that the Senate empower the officers to create an ad hoc committee. Clearly, this cannot be resolved this year. So to deal with this issue, a committee with continuity from this to next year seems appropriate. The results from this Senate ad hoc committee should come directly to the Senate. This

is an important matter which should be of concern to all of us.

Senator Brokaw stated that he remembered a policy that was developed while Dale Stein was president. President Bornhorst responded that it was never approved by the administration. Provost Dobney stated that if there is a crisis and there is no policy, then he and the President would make decisions; it would be better to have a policy while faculty are "disinterested," [i.e., while there is no particular case]. Senator Beck stated that he would like to hear from the committee that worked on the policy (last year's committee). Horsch (Human Relations) stated that last year's committee, with Bruce Pletka as chair, worked hard on non-reappointment and termination for cause.

Vice President Walck asked what the current Chair said about completing the task; Bornhorst stated that the committee won't meet this year because the Chair is too busy. Senator Keen asked if the completed part could come to the Senate as a proposal. The interconnectedness of the parts made this seem inadvisable. Pro tem Vice President Soldan stated that the Senate should appoint an ad hoc committee. Senator Bradley commented that the committee structure changes yearly so that Senate committees have to re-invent the wheel; he suggested that we should have a report from out-going committees. Beck stated that if a policy-making committee is responding to a crisis, they could configure the proposal so they are the last to be retrenched. Walck asked what should happen if a committee chooses not to work. Senator Carstens stated that the committee should tell the Senate if it is not going to work on its charge.

Senator Thayer suggested appointing a chair who would meet with the present committee. Walck pointed out that the existing committee will dissolve at the end of the term; a task force won't dissolve until the task is complete. Senator Leifer suggested that we ask last year's committee to report. Mroz MOVED and Soldan seconded the motion to appoint an ad hoc committee using as many of last year's members as possible and as many of this year's committee as are interested. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

President Bornhorst reported that the Faculty Handbook Steering Committee met on 19 March; the current plan is to bring the handbook to the Senate by the end of spring quarter. Work on the Professional Staff Handbook is also progressing; President Bornhorst will meet with Ellen Horsch regarding the Professional Staff Handbook next week.

President Bornhorst has appointed Beth Flynn to substitute for At-large Senator Dave Reed while Dave is on sabbatical spring term.

President Bornhorst presented the slate of nominees for the Charter School Committee: Gary Agin, Dallas Bates, Ingrid Cheney, Vernon Dorweiler, and Faith Morrison. The members chosen by President Tompkins are Mike Abbott, Joe Galetto, Dennis Harbour (school superintendent), and Bill McGarry (Chair). The Senate must vote for three representatives. President Bornhorst called for nominations from the floor. There were none; Soldan MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to close nominations. The motion to close PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. In the absence of any members of the Elections Committee, Vice Presidents Walck and Soldan counted the ballots. Those selected to serve on the Charter School Committee were Morrison (28 votes), Bates (27), and Agin (25); Cheney will be alternate (16 votes).

President Bornhorst announced that we need nominees for Senator At-large. There are two seats open but no nominees. Secretary Glime has agreed to run for Senator At-large a second term.

Senator Sloan inquired about the results of talking to members of the Board of Control about the designation of a University lawyer. Provost Dobney responded that the University will continue its relationship with Butzel-Long and Board lawyer Vercruysse will still represent the University on 11 out of 27 open issues. The Board of Control has not discussed the lawyer issue in open or closed session. Dobney advised persons needing university legal counsel to use the services of Butzel-Long or Paul Tomasi. Senator Whitt inquired who decided to continue using Vercruysse for the eleven cases and Dobney responded that it was Vice President Tahtinen in consultation with Board

Chair Ruth Reck. Senator Lutzke stated that this is a delicate issue if the legal counsel is sitting there; the University can't wait until someone [on the Board] does something; we need to push for action.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Administrative Evaluation Commission - Paul Nelson [Appendix N]

Paul Nelson (chair) reported from the Commission. There was a 41% response rate, compared to 42% on the last one, on the recent administrative evaluation questionnaire. However, there were also more evaluations received after the due date and many more submitted as comments in lieu of a questionnaire. He pointed out that the Commission's task was to DO the

Page 6263

Minutes of Senate Meeting 252

20 Mar 1996

evaluation and that the questionnaire was only part of the input. The narrative comments have been transcribed, but the Commission has voted 13:0 not to put the transcribed comments in the narrative in the library, as required by the approved Senate proposal. Before anyone knew the results of the written comments, lawyer Vercruysse called Nelson to explain Michigan liability. In Michigan, the University is liable for any published anonymous derogatory comments. Nelson pointed out that the Commission could ask the administrators to sign a waiver permitting them to publish all comments, but many of the comments named other individuals and groups on campus, involving over 100 entities. Comments addressed such topics as spouses of the administrators, quality of degrees from some departments, and cross-cultural efforts. Nelson concluded with the Commission's arguments for their decision not to make these public by stating that 1) the purpose of the questionnaire was to help the Commission, 2) the report will summarize the comments, and 3) this is a justice issue - if it is viewed by the law as harmful, then it probably should not be done. The Commission will give all comments to the Board of Control and the Board can choose to do what they want.

Les Leifer commented that there seemed to be no consequence of a negative vote for an administrator in the model charter provided by the Senate. Keen responded that it was only a model and not necessarily a good one; however, based on conversations related to the charter for Biological Sciences, Keen determined that if there is a negative vote against a department chair, the department can't force the dean to concur.

B. Retention Study Task Force - Chris Anderson [Appendix O]

Chris Anderson (chair) reported from the Task Force. Jeffrey Bell-Hanson and Mark Plichta were the Senate representatives on the committee. The Task Force has identified the responsible person(s) or group(s) for carrying out each aspect of the retention recommendations. The Task Force gathered information from a wide variety of sources, including considerable reading about efforts on other campuses, data from Institutional Analysis, five student panels comprised of a total of over 50 students, focus groups, phone calls to students who have left campus for non-academic reasons, panels of faculty, and alumni. In addition, chairs provided lists of their departmental retention activities. The phone calls revealed that nearly all students who left were happy with MTU but left for other reasons such as a girl/boy friend elsewhere, lack of the curriculum wanted. In addition, the Task Force had a consultant from Western Michigan University to talk about minority retention and a video on the program at Chicago State University, where new retention programs have been very successful.

Michigan Tech statistics indicate that retention is going down overall and going down faster in the College of Sciences and Arts. The graduation rate within six years is 62% at MTU, whereas the benchmark schools range 48-87%. The Task Force recommended retention goals of 95%

after 1 year, 90% after 2, and 85% after 5. The deans thought these goals were too high, but the Task Force stuck to their recommendation. One aspect of correcting this retention is to do better marketing, i.e., concentrate on attracting those students who are most likely to stay at MTU. They recommended to continue the current programming and to enhance it. They identified five areas to concentrate on for immediate impact: academic advising, orientation, course availability, faculty development with a focus on teaching, and maintenance and promotion of our current programming. The improved advising program is already being implemented through the PAL program that trains students as peer advisors; students surveyed indicated that they got most of their advice from other students. Another suggestion is to provide an advising center with release time for faculty to work in the center for several years.

Senator Whitt asked if the advising center would be only for academic advising or for broader advising; Anderson responded that it would only be for academic advising. Provost Dobney and Tyrell (Office of Student Affairs) added that the peer advising would be broader. Furthermore, faculty would be able to tell students where to go for other types of advising.

Dobney commented that we need to get students connected to the University better and sooner.

Senator Whitt asked about the role of the counselors; Anderson responded that the people working in the center would know who to refer students to but no counselors would be in the center.

Senator Beck suggested that to get data on reasons for leaving we might require students to fill out a questionnaire when they request a transcript. Anderson responded that the Dean of Students Office claims students just leave and do not respond to requests for reasons.

Liaison Hellmann (USG) asked if students had any input into developing the list of questions asked in the surveys; Anderson responded that they did not because there were no students on the task force due to its high level of activity and time commitment. Senator Bradley commented that it was obvious students had no input because one recommendation was to switch to semesters; Anderson responded that 50% of the students stated that they needed more time and that semesters would be better. Senator Melton commented that the benchmark schools are qualitatively different, making it difficult to compare retention rates.

President Bornhorst requested an agenda adjustment to move to discussion on Proposal 17-96 next because the Senate had a number of guests who had come because of that item on the agenda. The Provost had agreed to present his report on the budget at the next meeting. Senator Brokaw asked that we introduce the new business, including Proposal 18-96, so that we can vote on these items at the next meeting; President Bornhorst declared it done.

Provost Dobney interjected, in response to an earlier statement by Paul Nelson, that while he and other administrators may be big and fat, he, at least, tells the truth.

Bradley MOVED and Carstens seconded the motion to adjust the agenda as requested by President Bornhorst. The motion to adjust PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

7. OLD BUSINESS

Proposal 17-96, Reaffirm Approval of Proposal 22-95 [See minutes, page 6260, for a copy of this proposal.]

President Bornhorst requested a motion to approve Proposal 17-96. Whitt MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to approve Proposal 17-96 (regarding constituency and representation).

Senator Leifer stated that the reason to move action on the proposal up is fallacious because we have computers and E-mail to permit us to vote in a short period of time. He stated that he voted no on the proposal to move the date because important issues occur at the end of the year and we should know the impact of professional staff on deciding these issues. President Bornhorst responded that we must elect at-large senators and we need to decide what our constituency is so they can vote. Pro tem Vice President Soldan asked if any tough issues were coming up. Senator Whitt countered by stating that Leifer assumes that staff vote as a block and they don't, nor do faculty.

Bornhorst asked Kelly McLean (Staff Council) to comment on the position of Staff Council. McLean stated that her comments were the product of several Staff Council meetings and had been agreed upon by that group. [Appendix P]

Senator Beck presented his objections. [Appendix Q] Beck contended that the model we seem to be following is like that of the UN General Assembly, with possible disbanding of the Security Council; this could lead to a do-nothing organization. He claimed that currently Staff Council is able to react more quickly than the Senate, and with impact (such as the employee raise issue). The Senate can only recommend policy. He stated that faculty need identity. This bylaw change is a major change in the Constitution and should go to the entire faculty for a vote. He pointed out that there are some distinct advantages to having professional staff input, such as input on committees. Some staff are dissatisfied because they cannot vote on some issues and feel the present arrangement was made to satisfy 1-2 dissatisfied faculty. He suggested that instead of a single body there should be scheduled joint faculty-staff meetings once or twice per quarter with meetings of officers more often. Professional staff should have non-voting membership on Senate committees.

Senator Lutzke stated that the the staff had rejected the idea of voting as a block because there was too much diversity of opinion and those present to hear the arguments should be able to make the best decisions. Staff do not mind being excluded on certain votes because those units voting on those issues are the best informed.

Bornhorst stated that we need to address whether there should be some staff only issues. Pro tem Vice President Soldan stated that as a senator and previously as an observer he had not seen the Senate get bogged down by staff issues; it seems that all participation by staff has been positive.

Senator Bradley stated that his experience has been positive; staff participation has brought new perspectives. Why would we not want the staff? They have done a good job. Senator Flynn stated that she agrees with Beck, that the faculty are receding and we may need a faculty council. President Bornhorst responded that the Staff Council is more free form. It is not a decision-making body, but rather a discussion body.

Senator Remali stated that Staff Council was set up by President Tompkins and staff never voted to create it. When the Professional Staff joined the Senate, it was by vote.

Senator Reed stated that he won't be here for the vote, but he wanted to express that he was very happy with the way things were going, that the contributions of professional staff led to improved decisions. He could not think of one issue where staff participation caused a worse decision.

Beck pointed out that some of our votes were as close as 17:13, that a few votes can swing votes. Faculty are least likely to vote in a block of any group you can imagine.

Bradley said that it depends on the issue; the staff won't vote on issues that don't concern them.

Tyrell (Office of Student Affairs) stated that we should consider how this might be perceived by the Board of Control relative to our stand on shared governance; it seems that we are being contradictory if we do not want staff to participate. His experience from a school where the two groups are separate is that when they are separate, the two

groups go in different directions.

Senator Filer stated that he felt that the Senate was better with Professional Staff. Senator Whitt stated that for a negative impact, she sees no empirical evidence whereas for positive impact the faculty are far better informed when making decisions. The more we speak with a united voice, the stronger we are.

Senator Carstens reported that the only negative comments he has heard regarding Senate decisions was on the grading system (which was decided last year before the current expansion).

Keen stated that he wanted to raise three points and three options. First, he wanted to make it clear that he was not down on staff - he lives in a staff neighborhood, some of his best friends are staff, and he let his daughter marry a staff member. Nevertheless, there are three problems: 1) the Constitution is Board Policy; 2) the Constitution defines who is a constituent; 3) the proposed bylaw changes are in disagreement with the Constitution [which includes professional staff who are in PRIMARY decision-making positions]. Our three options are: 1) We can retreat to last year's Constitution (before 22-95). 2) We can affirm the change, but that leads to problems.

Page 6265 Minutes of Senate Meeting 252 20 Mar 1996

The Bylaws are out of line with the Constitution and Board of Control policy. We can bring the Constitution in line with the bylaw changes, but this would require an amendment to the Constitution. 3) If we are going to change the constitution, we need to do it correctly. The University of Maryland has 5 Senates - undergraduate, graduate, union staff, professional staff, and faculty. No proposal can be implemented without input from all groups. There are extensive committees that cross all groups.

Senator Chavis stated that resistance to the change indicates that staff are not wanted; however, the fact that someone brought up this amendment means that someone must want the staff in the Senate. Lutzke stated that staff can't dilute faculty impact; the staff have a more influential voice in the Senate than not in the Senate. Senator Melton said that he just joined this consideration recently as an alternate and asked himself what's in it for the staff; the staff will not dilute the Senate; when the work is being done, if the faculty are on top of it and doing the work, then they will have their influence. Melton continued that the problems could come in the dynamics of how we work; that work is the responsibility of the committees.

Senator Mroz stated that we have worked efficiently this year; because of our size, we are small enough to act as one unit [unlike the University of Maryland].

Senator Thayer pointed out that other universities have staff in their Senates. Senator Whitt added that based on work done by another committee, it appears that 25% of the university senates have professional staff in them.

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

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Senate

.