The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 358

24 October 2001

Synopsis: The Senate

(1) elected Larry Sutter to the Computer Executive Committee.

(2) approved a slate of nominees to the board of MTEPS for consideration by President Tompkins.

(3) approved a statement regarding the proposed merger of the College of engineering and the School of Technology.

---

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 358 to order at 5:32 p.m. on Wednesday, 24 October 2001, in Room B45 EERC. Keen asked if there were objections to Senator Jim Pickens acting as Senate Secretary due to the absence of Secretary Waddell on business travel. There were no objections.

Acting Secretary Jim Pickens called roll. Absent were representatives from Chemistry, Mathematical Sciences, ME-EM, Mining and Materials Processing Engineering, Keweenaw Research Center, Human Resources and Facilities Management, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaison in attendance was Dennis Taylor Jr. (USG).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS
Visitors included Dickie Selfe (Humanities), Shanen Badenschier (student), David Schwedler (student), Erik Lietz (student), and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Keen presented the agenda and asked for amendments. Dickie Selfe proposed a new item 6.F. Computing Committee. Senator Tony Rogers requested that item 8 (Proposal 5-02) under New Business be deleted to allow more time for the Fringe Benefits Committee to consider this proposal. There were no other amendments. Long MOVED and Pollins seconded the motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion PASSED on a 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 357
Keen presented the minutes from meeting 357 and asked for corrections or amendments. Pickens reported that a statement on page 9303 was made by Senator Dana Johnson not Senator Pam Long and also suggested two minor changes on page 9304. Senator Don Beck also suggested a minor correction on page 9304. There were no further corrections and no objections to the minutes as corrected. The minutes were declared approved as corrected.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT
President Keen reported that he received an October 18 memo from Provost Wray in response to the following senate statement, passed on September 26: "*It is the sense of the MTU Senate that no MTU employee should be making less this year than last year as a result of the combined effect of the 1.5 percent raise and choosing the Family Premium health-care plan.*" Copies of the provost's response were circulated at the senate meeting. **[Appendix B]**

Keen reported that Ron Roblee will substitute for Jerry Taylor on the Distance Learning Implementation Committee due to extended travel by Taylor.

Keen addressed the USG at their October 17 meeting in response to a USG request for information on the function of the senate, particularly with respect to current budget-cutting proposals.

The Budget Advisory Group met on October 18 and discussed the prospects of the Budget Projections Committee, which met today. The House side of the Michigan Legislature did not pass a tuition-tax-credit bill (which proposed revoking the tuition credit) in time for it to go to committee; the Michigan Senate passed its bill. Consequently, Governor Engler could appropriate the several hundred thousand dollars in tuition tax credits that would otherwise go to each of the various state universities.

Keen met with Provost Wray on October 19 and discussed how the senate would handle the various budget-cutting proposals

President Keen and Vice President Christianson met with Provost Wray on October 22 and discussed the timing of the senate's response to budget-cutting proposals, the status of modifications to tenure and promotion policies, and the status of work on the separation policy.

The Benefits Liaison Group met on October 24 and discussed modifications to the health-benefits plan and simplification of the TechSelect form.

Keen reminded senators of the informal meeting with President Tompkins on Thursday, October 25, at 3:00 p.m. in the Red Metal Room.

Keen said that the Budget Advisor Group talked about the possibility of additional budget cuts being imposed by Governor Engler. He called for questions.

In response to Provost Wray's memo about the above-mentioned sense of the senate, Senator Don Beck said that he believed that next year's standard option plan for health-care benefits was not as good as this year's plan, particularly in terms of dental and eyeglass coverage.

Keen said that the standard options for both years include dental coverage.

Pickens said that the plans were exactly the same in this respect except that the old plan allows participants to buy up to enhanced dental and vision coverage.

Beck said that in order to buy up to the premium plan, participants would have to pay an additional $700-$800 per year.

Pickens said that buying up to enhanced dental and vision coverage never was a full-cost-recovery option. The $31 only covered about half of the cost of the enhanced dental and vision. Approximately $150,000 was not covered by the premiums, and approximately $150,000 was raised by the premiums. This year's plan is approximately 2 percent higher on a salary basis than last year's plan because of increases in the cost of medical coverage. Michigan Tech paid $900,000 more this year for medical coverage than last year.

Beck said that the point is that the lowest-paid people cannot get the same quality of benefits for the same amount of money they were paying last year.

Keen said that because the plans are not identical, it is also possible for people to actually pay less out-of-pocket for the same amount of coverage.

Senator Pam Long asked if it was true that a variety of medical costs that are covered completely under this year's plan will be subject to a 30 percent co-payment under next year's standard plan.

Pickens said that this was correct. Nontraditional treatments require no co-payment under this year's plan, but next year, they will require co-payments just like traditional treatments. The same is true for mental-health benefits. The underlying assumption was that no treatments should be free of co-payments because if they were, people would tend to overuse them.

Senator Christ Ftaclas said that as long as healthcare costs increase faster than raises, this will always happen to some group of people. Which salary cut off this occurs at depends on how much of the increased cost the university chooses to pass through.

Senator Bruce Barna asked if the Budget Advisory Group was now meeting regularly and whether their meetings are announced and public.

Pickens said that Barna would have to contact Provost Wray to find out if the meetings are public. The BAG is not meeting regularly at this point. Discussion at the meeting mentioned above (President's Report) focused on the elimination of the tuition-tax credit and the possibility of a 5-10 percent budget recision from the state because of the state's worsening fiscal status.

Senator Carol MacLennan asked who was on the Budget Advisory Group.

Keen said that the Budget Advisory Group changed membership radically after the changes in senior administration. It now consists of Provost Wray (as chair), Dan Greenlee, Pam Eveland, Debbie Lassila, Bob Keen, Jim Pickens, and Larry Davis. Mike Abbott has been recommended for membership.

Pickens said that at the senate's August 29 meeting, some senators were concerned that senators on the BLG appeared to represent the senate but in fact were operating without senate authorization. Subsequently, the senate found a document authorizing the BLG which said nothing about membership. A similar problem exists with the BAG: There appears to be senate representation, but that representation is not authorized by the senate.

Ftaclas asked who senators on the BAG represent in this capacity.

Pickens said that they try to represent the entire university community through shared governance.

Ftaclas asked whether senators on the BAG were bound by terms of confidentiality. He suggested that senators on the BAG should not keep information that could be detrimental to their colleagues confidential.

Keen said that the senate needed to define what was detrimental.

Ftaclas said that it wasn't detrimental to discuss options, but when plans begin to be formulated and decisions begin to be made, people would know what was detrimental.

Pickens said that the BAG didn't make any decisions last year--they only advised. All decisions were and are made by the provost.

Keen said that when the provost has asked for advice on matters that the senators on the BAG believed should be confidential, the senators have told him they should not advise on these matters.

6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS
A. University committee elections
President Keen said that Walt Milligan (Materials Science) currently represents the senate on the Computer Executive Committee. Bernhard Bettig (ME-EM), Ed Lumsdaine (ME-EM), Scott Post (ME-EM), and Larry Sutter (School of Technology) were nominees for the Computer Executive Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. There were no objections to closing nominations. Sutter was elected.

B. Approval of Committee to Review College of Engineering-School of Technology Merger Proposal

Keen said that Peg Gale (School of Forestry and Wood Products), Bob Johnson (Humanities), Terry Monson (School of Business and Economics), Mike Roggemann (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Larry Sutter (School of Technology), and Pam Eveland, Ex Officio (Institutional Analysis) were proposed members of the committee to review the College of Engineering-School of Technology merger proposal. Keen asked if there were any objections to these nominees, all of whom have agreed to serve if approved by the senate.

Barna said that a question raised in the Senate Executive Committee should be addressed by the whole senate: Why isn't this issue being addressed directly by the senate rather than by an ad hoc committee?

Keen said that the issue of combining departments is on the senate's B-list. Keen suggested to the provost that the senate follow as closely as possible the procedure outlined in the separation policy--which has been passed by the senate but not approved by the administration. This policy addresses the combination and elimination of units and includes a reconfiguration committee consisting of faculty, staff, and administration. When a reconfiguration is proposed, the proposal is passed to a program-review committee, which conducts hearings and evaluates the proposal. The committee's recommendation is then submitted to the reconfiguration committee.

Keen said that the provost initially proposed submitting the reconfiguration proposal to the senate and charging the senate with holding open forums. The administration would then make a decision on the proposal. Some senators objected that organizing forums might make the senate look like a handmaiden of the administration. Hence, Keen suggested the reconfiguration-committee model to the provost. The provost accepted this suggestion, but wanted representation from the College of Engineering and the School of Technology.

Ftaclas said that the proposal includes one or two new degree programs and, hence, asked why this proposal was no on the senate's A-list.

Keen said that any new degree program that is proposed as a result of the proposed merger will have to come through the senate.

Ftaclas said that if the proposed merger is a B-list item, any A-list items--such as new degree programs-- should be excised from it.

Keen said that he believed that new degree programs in the proposal are provided only as examples of the kind of programs that might be undertaken by the merged school and college. If the proposal includes new degree programs, they will have to be removed.

Ftaclas said that new degree programs were in fact included in the proposed merger as indicated on page 1 of Provost Wray's October 19 cover letter as well as in the proposal itself. He said that this was an academic integrity issue.

Keen said that this would have to be addressed by the senate. Under the proposed process, the reconfiguration committee would submit its report to the provost for his approval, and the provost would then pass the report to the senate for its approval. The senate's agreeing to a merger doesn't result in a merger until the Board of Control approves the merger. Only at that point would proposed addition or elimination of degree programs be considered by the senate.

Ftaclas said that that would be too late. There are only one or two people [on the proposed committee to review College of Engineering-School of Technology merger proposal] who represent the senate's constituency.

Keen said that all members of the proposed committee (including chairs and associate deans) are constituents of the senate.

Ftaclas said that to prepare for the proposed creation and elimination of degree programs, the senate should do its own parallel study of the proposals.

Senator Steve Seidel agreed: If the Board of Control approves the proposal, the senate's job will be done. If degree programs are described in the proposal, and the board approves it, the senate would be unable to reverse that approval.

Senator Kelly Strong said that there is not a person in the Construction Department who is in favor of a construction management degree. No one in the department would be willing to teach in such a program. This program cannot be imposed on the faculty by the dean of engineering and the Board of Control.

Keen said that in such a situation, the board would be in violation of its own policy.

Strong said that the board could approve the merger and subsequently address the question of new degree programs.

Keen said that that was the plan.

Dickie Selfe asked if the new degree programs were part of the incentive to merge.

Strong said that he believed that the elimination of the associate degree programs was critical to the proposed merger, but he did not believe that the creation of new degree programs was.

Ftaclas MOVED that the Michigan Tech Senate use its normal channels of advisement and passing new curricula and degrees to evaluate the proposed merger of the College of Engineering and the School of Technology in parallel with the evaluation that will be conducted by the Committee to Review the College of Engineering-School of Technology Merger Proposal and develop its own recommendations.

Keen said that he believed that the timing was related to student-recruitment issues. He asked that the motion be delayed until new business.

Ftaclas agreed.

Keen asked again if the proposed membership on the committee was acceptable to the senate.

Strong asked what the committee's charge was.

Keen said that the committee would be charged with making a recommendation on the merger of the College of Engineering and the School of Technology.

Strong said that this committee would then be charged with fact-finding and discovery that in the past has been done through faculty forums. He asked if the committee would be replacing faculty forums.

Keen said that the committee could hold its own forums; it would be a joint committee, not a senate committee.

Strong said that he didn't care who discovered the facts as long as someone discovered them and that the senate's constituency was represented on the proposed committee.

Keen said that the senate makes recommendations on the reorganization of departments but has no standing committee to do that; hence, the senate has assigned this task to the Administrative Policy Committee in the past.

Ftaclas said that the provost's October 19 cover letter says "Although it is not critical that a Senate recommendation be provided to the Board of Control for its consideration and action at its December 14 meeting" He asked if this was in reference to a recommendation of a person or a senate recommendation on the proposal.

Keen said that this would be a senate recommendation on the report of the committee.

Ftaclas said that this meant that the committee would have to meet, write a report, and submit it to the senate. The senate would then have to review and deliberate about the report and prepare its recommendation for the Board of Control all before December 14. He said that he didn't think that this was possible. He asked where such a senate recommendation would come from.

Keen said that it would come from the senate, either endorsing or opposing the committee's report.

Ftaclas said that the senate would not be prepared to make such a recommendation if it had not done any of its own work on the merits and demerits of the proposed merger.

Keen said that if the senate does not have adequate time to review the committee's report prior to the Board's December 14 meeting, the senate will have to inform the Board that this is the case.

Pickens said that the senate's deadline for preparing this recommendation isn't December 14 but December 1, which makes it even less likely that the senate would be prepared to make a recommendation.

Barna said that he believes that the December 14 deadline is stipulated because of the proposed elimination of degree programs, but such eliminations are not part of the merger. The elimination of programs is a separate, A-list item for the senate.

Keen agreed.

Barna said that there is no reason to proceed with the merger as a crisis-management forum unless it is budget driven and expected to save money. Much of what is being done now is being handled in a crisis fashion, and the issues are too important to be handled this way. The problem with Michigan Tech's management over the last few years has been making decisions for the wrong reasons. Strategic decisions should not be made in a crisis mode with inadequate review by the constituents or concerned parties. There is no reason to proceed on this timetable for the merger of two colleges within the university. This is symptomatic of why Michigan Tech is in financial difficulty.

Strong asked if the provost's cover letter meant that the board would vote on this issue on December 14 whether the senate had a recommendation or not.

Keen said that he believed that if the senate does not have a recommendation in time for this meeting, the provost will pull this item from the board's agenda.

Barna said that Provost Wray's October 19 cover letter says that the report of the Committee to Review College of Engineering-School of Technology Merger Proposal will be submitted to him (Wray) and that "The report would then be forwarded with [Wray's] recommendation to Senate for its review and action in accordance with Senate Constitution Articles III.F.1(a)1 and III.F.1(b)1." He asked Keen to clarify the senate's role under those articles.

Keen said that Article III is the senate function; section F is the list of matters of responsibility and authority; paragraph 1 is the matters of academic policies and procedures; (a) says that "The Senate has the responsibility and authority to review and establish policies and procedures in these areas"; and 1 is "all curricular matters including establishment, dissolution, and changes in degree programs"; (b) is "the responsibility to review and make recommendations on academic organization, including the

establishment or elimination of schools, colleges, departments." Hence, this includes both A-list and B-list functions.

Barna said that since these responsibilities are all mixed together, it would be conceivable that the Board of Control could receive one report that would include both the proposed merger and changes in degree programs.

Keen said that he assumed that the senate would not approve a report that did not include detailed degree proposal changes, complete with recommendations from the senate's own committees.

Ftaclas asked if the elimination of degree programs was an A-list item.

Keen said that it was.

Ftaclas said the proposal includes three components: (1) elimination of degree programs; (2) merger of schools; and (3) creation of degree programs. Both 1 and 3 need to be approved by the senate. Hence, the whole process should be the purview of the senate, and the senate should undertake this role.

Keen reminded the senate again that the question is whether or not the senate should approve the proposed committee.

Senator Bill Gregg said section F.1(a).1 of the Senate Constitution refers to "all curricular matters including establishment, dissolution, and changes in degree programs" and asked whether this includes minors and concentrations.

Keen said that it does, but that there are some minor changes in degree programs that can be made by the departments without senate approval, such as degree program options, now called concentrations and any lesser changes.

Barna asked Keen to clarify what the senate was asked to vote on: the composition of the proposed committee or the process by which the proposed merger would be examined and approved.

Keen said that the question posed is whether or not the members of the proposed review committee are acceptable to the senate. He said that the senate could have a separate vote on the process under new business.

Ftaclas asked on what basis the committee members were appointed.

Keen said that the proposed members have been asked and have agreed to serve on such a committee.

Senator Pam Long asked if any of the proposed committee members have opinions on whether or not this merger should take place.

Keen said that two of the proposed members were present.

Senator Mike Roggemann said that he currently had no opinion.

Senator Larry Sutter said that he had a variety of opinions.

Ftaclas asked who had asked the senate to approve these proposed committee members.

Keen said that the provost made this request.

Barna said that this was an attempt by the administration to manage an outcome and not share governance. The process of approving the make-up of the committee and holding the approval of the concept for new business appears to be the same thing. The senate may not get to the new business, and

the committee will be off and running, and it's a done deal. The real question is do we approve of this approach.

Keen offered not to adjourn the meeting until the senate had addressed that question.

Ftaclas said that the provost has the right to create a committee to review the College of Engineering-School of Technology merger proposal; there's nothing the senate can say about it. But the senate should object to the process. This proposal needs more input from the senate. The senate's normal committees should examine the elimination and creation of degree programs and the merger of schools; and on this basis, the senate should produce its own, separate report. In approving the provost's proposed committee, the senate would be approving the proposed process.

Keen said that the senate president only votes in case of a tie vote.

Ftaclas said that it was good that the provost sought the senate's approval of the membership on this committee, but that the senate needed more input into this process.

Barna said that the timetable does not permit the senate to do its job. If the proposed committee submits its recommendations in three weeks, it will be impossible for the senate to respond adequately.

Ftaclas said that the provost's October 19 cover letter reads in part, "I propose that a 5-person committee appointed by me conduct an initial review of the proposed merger and prepare a written recommendation. That recommendation would be submitted to me. The report would be forwarded with my recommendation to the Senate for its review and action in accordance with Senate Constitution Articles. . . ." He said that he didn't see any request for the senate to vote to approve the committee.

Strong MOVED for the following RESOLUTION: The senate appreciates that the provost has made us aware of his intent to form this committee. We are grateful that he has asked our opinion, and we see no reason why the provost should not form such a committee. However, the senate will also process this proposal through normal senate channels.

Keen called for a motion to table the request to approve this committee until new business.

Seidel MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to table the request to approve the committee until new business. The motion PASSED with no dissent.

C. Approval of MTEPS slate
Keen said that the senate would approve a slate of three nominees for the Board of the Michigan Tech Enterprise Smart Zone to present to President Tompkins, who will select one of the three as the faculty representative. Larry Davis is resigning as the senate's interim member of this board. Gary Agin (Physics), Dallas Bates (Chemistry), Al Brokaw (School of Business and Economics), Bill Campbell (Biological Sciences), Soner Onder (Computer Science), Linda Ott (Computer Science), and Kelly Strong (Civil and Environmental Engineering) were nominees for the MTEPS board.

Beck asked if it would be a conflict of interest for someone who would be doing business with the Enterprise Park to serve on the board. He asked if there was at least one person on the list of nominees who might have business with the Enterprise Park.

Keen said that he didn't know. He said that Davis has insisted on a firm commitment to Michigan Tech's Conflict of Interest Policy, which would apply to any MTEPS Board members.

Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. There were no objections to closing nominations.

Keen said that in addition to the senate representative on the board, Michigan Tech would also be represented by Vice President for Research David Reed and Executive Director of Corporate Services

Pete Radecki.

Brokaw, Ott, and Strong were elected as the nominees to be forwarded to President Tompkins.

D. Board of Control Relations Committee
Keen addressed the Board of Control at the board's October 11 meeting. Since there are four new members on the board, Keen explained that the senate operates under a charter (constitution) granted by the board. He clarified the distinction between A-list and B-list items, emphasizing that the board is supposed to act on A-list items only after the senate has processed them. He clarified the distinction between A-list and B-list items on the current budget-cutting proposals, but not on the proposed College of Engineering-School of Technology merger.

Students from the minerals-process engineering option made a presentation to the board. The board urged that those students also be heard by the senate. Keen assured the board that they would be heard by the Curricular Policy Committee and the Finance Committee, which have already met with these students.

The senate officers did not meet with the board.

E. Discussion of Senate processing of budget-cut recommendations
Keen asked that the senate schedule time for presentations on proposed budget cuts by persons other than senators. A number of people have already requested time to be heard on the proposed elimination of the minerals-process engineering degree program and the elimination of sports programs. Previously, people in support or opposed to proposed cuts have been available to make comments but have not presented until asked.

Beck asked if students had been encouraged to first bring their concerns to the Undergraduate Student Government.

Keen said that they had and that he had indicated to the USG that students would have most influence in this process by passing their concerns through the USG rather than through the University Senate.

Beck asked if student concerns might be funneled to the senate via USG representatives.

Keen said that the senate would need some way to manage the time for student presentations.

USG Liaison Dennis Taylor Jr. said that he could help to facilitate USG presentations.

Beck recommended a time limit on presentations.

Keen asked from whom the senate should accept presentations.

Barna recommended allocating a block of time and asking USG to either select the speakers or do the presentations themselves.

MacLennan suggested that the USG coordinate the student responses and allocate time.

Roggemann asked if the senate has any formal role in the ultimate decisions about these programs.

Keen said that the senate's role is to make a recommendation.

Taylor agreed with MacLennan's suggestion. The USG could coordinate presentations, but it would be best for the presenters to be members of the affected groups (e.g., the tennis and Nordic ski teams) rather than USG representatives.

Keen said that that would be fine and asked for recommended time limits.

Strong asked if 30 minutes would be adequate.

The Senate agreed to allow no more than a total of 30 minutes for student presentations.

Barna said that the senate needs to consider an issue with respect to Proposal 4-02. The proposal to eliminate the degree program in mineral processing has been allocated to the Finance Committee and the Curricular Policy Committee. Barna agrees with the elimination of the degree program. However, embedded in this proposal is a reassignment of faculty to the Department of Chemical Engineering. The mineral-processing degree program option historically and presently resides within Metallurgical Engineering, not Mining. Those faculty were originally tenured in metallurgical engineering, and it is not automatic that the elimination of a degree program will result in the reassignment of faculty to another department. Hence, the senate should have further involvement on this proposal to address tenure issues, especially in light of the possibility of financial exigency. The senate needs to clarify whether tenure resides with a program, a department, or the university.

Keen said that he has had extensive discussions with at least five other faculty members on this subject. The tenure and promotion policy does not tie the tenure of an individual to a department or to a program except in terms of processing tenure cases. Neither tenure nor ranks are tied to a department. When the nursing program was eliminated, the one tenured faculty member was retained.

Senator Dieter Adolphs asked if an untenured, tenure-track faculty member would be terminated if his or her department or program was eliminated.

Keen said that that was possible.

Barna asked if the Senate's Academic Policy Committee should review this and related proposals.

Keen said that they could.

Barna suggested that the senate seek a statement from the provost regarding the administration's position on this issue.

Keen offered to ask the provost to submit a written statement to the senate indicating that no tenured faculty would lose tenure as a result of the proposed changes.

Barna asked if reassignment is completely under the purview of the administration.

Keen said that the senate can make recommendations on reassignment, but the assignment of faculty to various departments is on the senate's B-list. The organization of faculty is an administrative prerogative.

Keen said that he and Barna would draft a memo to the provost and circulate his reply to the senate.

Beck requested that the issue be sent to the Academic Policy Committee as well.

Keen agreed.

Sutter asked what provision would be made for non-students who wanted to present to the senate.

Keen asked how the senate wanted to manage presentations by senate constituents (faculty and professional staff) who are concerned with the budget-cutting proposals.

Several senators recommended allotting 30 minutes total for such presentations.

Keen said that in addition, administrators and members of relevant senate committees would be available to answer questions but would not make presentations.

Barna recommended that the Senate Executive Committee screen potential presenters.

Senator Scott Pollins suggested that each senate committee determine an appropriate amount of time for presenters to speak.

Keen said that he would ask the Executive Committee to schedule the presentations.

F. Computing Committee
Senate Computing Committee Chair Dickie Selfe said that he Computing Committee is focusing on classroom technologies. They will bring a proposal to the senate, and in preparation of that proposal, they need feedback from faculty and staff. He distributed a report produced by the Computers in the Classroom Taskforce last year, which the Computer Committee proposes exploring. The report describes three tiers of development: (1) basic infrastructure; (2) an active local area network; and (3) specialized smart-classrooms. The committee also proposes a student-technology-assistant program: people who are trained to help with the development and implementation of technology support in the classroom.

The committee has a funding model, including support from the Michigan Tech Fund and fund-raising efforts of individual departments.

Selfe said that he is concerned that the funding for this program might be tied to the current Capital Campaign, which would be fine in the long run, but in the short run could delay funding until 2005.

Senator Tony Rogers asked who pays to maintain the equipment when a department gets funds for technology classrooms and the classroom is then open to general use by the university.

Selfe said that that concern about that question was why the Computing Committee wants to expand this initiative out of Educational Technology Services because they have a workshop, although it is currently under-funded.

Rogers said that currently such repairs are the responsibility of the home department.

Selfe said that generally within two years of the initial grant, the equipment either needs to be repaired or replaced.

Senator Chris Williams said that in order to cover maintenance costs, some departments are preparing to charge fees for the use of general-use classrooms in which they have installed equipment.

Selfe said that for this reason, many departments will have to develop billing departments.

Ftaclas said that the Center of Integrated Learning originally started out in the physics department, but now there's no room for the physics department in it.

Selfe said that the Computing Committee will soon come to the senate with a proposal in hopes of getting a strong senate endorsement for this to become a major Tech Fund initiative. He asked senators to send comments to him via email.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Keen said that there was no time scheduled for either of the two proposals; hence, they will be addressed at a later meeting.

8. NEW BUSINESS
Proposed Merger of the College of Engineering and the School of Technology
Keen called for a motion on how the senate wishes to approach its response to the proposed merger of the College of Engineering and the School of Technology.

Strong MOVED that the senate take up the matter of the merger within its existing structure while expressing its gratitude to the provost for making the senate aware that he is forming a committee to review the proposal. Ftaclas seconded the motion.

Keen asked that the motion be read again so that senators would know what they were considering.

Pickens said that Strong's previous statement (see item 6.B) was something like "Although the Senate appreciates the provost's request that the Senate approve the committee, the Senate respectfully chooses to review the proposed merger through its own committee structure and proposal process."

Senator Bill Gregg suggested adding "after the proposals are finally submitted by the provost," since the senate doesn't want to say that it is going to address this issue before the proposals to eliminate or change anything are even submitted.

Keen said that the proposals have been submitted and are included as attachments 1-3 to the provost's cover letter.

Gregg said that the provost hasn't sent any proposal to the senate.

Several senators said that the provost might not send any proposal to the senate; hence, because of the December 1 deadline, the senate needs to pursue a parallel review process.

Ftaclas said that in his October 19 cover letter, the provost does not say that he wants to make a recommendation, but that he wants to present the idea to the Board of Control's Academic Affairs Committee at board's the December 14 meeting. Hence, the deadline is simply for providing input on the proposal to the board's Academic Affairs Committee. Additionally, there is no request in the provost's cover letter for the senate to do anything except facilitate this process.

Keen said that there is a request on page 2 of the cover letter: "The report would be forwarded to the Senate for its review and action."

Ftaclas said that that was not a request but a statement--a declarative sentence.

Keen said that with that statement, the provost was asking the senate to review the report.

Ftaclas said that there was no request for the senate to participate in the process.

Keen agreed.

Ftaclas said that this is a disagreement about process. The provost wants to handle this like a B-list item, and the senate wants to handle it like an A-list item.

Keen said that this is new territory because the senate has never before debated program cuts.

Ftaclas said that the senate should play this role.

Keen said that academic programs cannot be discontinued without senate approval.

Ftaclas said that the senate's statement to the provost ought to be that since the proposal involves both A-list and B-list items, it should be handled as if it were an A-list item. It should go through the normal senate procedures. The provost is welcome to appoint whatever committee he wants, but the senate cannot facilitate that.

Rogers said that the provost's cover letter says he proposes that the committee consist of the following persons. He asked if that is what the senate is being asked to approve.

Keen said that it was.

Barna suggested that the motion also indicate that the senate feels that this is an unrealistic timeframe within which to deal with an issue of this magnitude.

Keen asked Barna if he wished to make that an amendment to the motion on the floor.

Barna said that he did.

Keen asked Barna to restate the amendment.

Barna offered the following amendment: "We further wish to express our concern that the timetable proposed for the review and recommendation on this issue is inadequate to address the serious repercussions of such a merger."

Ftaclas asked if this would be submitted as a sense of the senate.

Keen said that recommendations from the senate normally come as proposals, and proposals are normally submitted ten days ahead of time; hence, this must be something other than a proposal. It could be a sense of the senate as long as it's clear that it comes from the senate, not from the senate's constituents.

Strong said that he would accept Barna's addition to his proposal as a friendly amendment.

Barna MOVED and Rogers seconded the motion to amend the motion. The motion to amend PASSED on a voice vote with no dissent.

The motion to forward a statement to the administration PASSED on a voice vote with no dissent.

Keen directed the Finance, Curricular Policy, Administrative Policy, and Academic Policy Committees to review the proposed merger of the College of Engineering and the School of Technology.

9. ADJOURNMENT
Pollins MOVED and Johnson seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell
Secretary of the University Senate