

**THE PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(UNIVERSITY SENATE) OF MICHIGAN  
TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 414  
10 November 2004

**Synopsis:**

- (1) President Monson reported that evaluation of the Dean of Engineering will be put on hold until Provost Wray can get advice from the new university counsel.
  - (2) The Presidential Advisory Committee passed Proposal 8-05, Reinvestment of the R&I Account Reserve Funds in a Balanced Portfolio of Stocks and Bonds
  - (3) The Presidential Advisory Committee discussed changes to the Senate Constitution relative to its constituency representation
- 

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

President Monson called the Presidential Advisory Committee (University Senate) Meeting 414 to order at 5:35 pm on Wednesday, 10 November 2004, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Cindy Selfe and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Education, Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences, ME-EM, Physics, Keweenaw Research Center, and Enrollment Management/OSRR. Liaison in attendance was Becky Christianson (Staff Council). Academic Services – Engineering currently has no elected representative.

**2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Guests included undergraduates Bryan Karl, John Briggs, Matt Kohlmann, and Chris Smith (Institutions class) and Jim Pickens (SFRES).

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Pollins MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion to approve PASSED on 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 413**

Clancy MOVED and Boschetto-Sandoval seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 413. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

1. The Presidential Advisory Committee officers learned that the administrative aide position needs to be reposted, which will occur this week. Applicants most likely will be evaluated in early December. Amie Ledgerwood has agreed to help out until a new aide can begin.
2. The officers met with Provost Wray this past Monday and learned that he has been advised not to initiate the review of the Dean of the College of Engineering until the University legal counsel for collective bargaining has been selected and has had time to review the matter. Therefore, it is unlikely that the dean can be reviewed this year. Provost Wray expressed frustration with this complication.
3. The Executive Committee met to discuss revision of the Senate Constitution. Several members have commented on the draft revision, which will be discussed later this evening.

**6. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Monson, Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, reported that the committee had reviewed the sabbatical leave procedure initiated last year; this report is close to approval. The committee is also developing procedures for the transfer of tenured faculty to other departments within the university.

**7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

A. Proposal 8-05, Reinvestment of the R&I Account Reserve Funds in a Balanced Portfolio of Stocks and Bonds. [See minutes page 11276 for a copy of this proposal]

Bruch MOVED and Sloan seconded the motion to approve Proposal 8-05.

Pollins proposed a friendly amendment to the last sentence of the proposal, stating "The faculty representatives" to "The representatives."

Pickins (Investment Committee chair) responded that there are many administrators on the committee and proposed that instead the wording be changed to "The constituent representatives." This wording was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The proposal with its friendly amendment PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**B. Discussion of revised Senate Constitution [Appendix B]**

President Monson stated that we cannot put together a new constitution in time for the 10 December 2004 Board of Control meeting. [The chair of the Board has asked that all items to be considered by the Board be given to him at least 16 days before the meeting.]

Monson presented a list of issues needing consideration:

1. ARTICLE II: Define voting rights early on in the constitution to ensure that everyone understands faculty and professional staff areas of concern.
2. ARTICLE III: Define Constituents, Representation Units and Membership in one article.
3. ARTICLE III: Expand professional staff representation to no more than 40% of the senators.
4. ARTICLE III: Four faculty at-large senators, two professional staff at-large senators.
5. ARTICLE III: Eliminate term limits?
6. ARTICLE IV: Functions unchanged; we don't know what they will be.
7. REST: The rest of the constitution remains basically unchanged.

President Monson suggested discussing the changes one paragraph at a time. He explained the Preamble as a means to inform the Board of Control of our intentions in the modification process: "This Constitution will allow the University Senate to be reconstituted. It will require later modification to incorporate relevant portions of the employment contract ratified between the University and the Michigan Tech Chapter of the American Association of University Professors."

In email of the Executive Committee regarding Article I, Secretary Glime had suggested adding the wording, further clarified by Senator Sutter: "It shall consist of two bodies: the Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Senate. These two bodies will meet and operate as a unit under a single Constitution and By-Laws, with a single set of University Senate officers and committees. Voting on certain issues may be confined only to one of these two bodies, as defined in Articles II and IV below.

Gotschalk (Student Affairs & Ed. Op.) asked if the new [Article I] wording had been recommended by legal counsel. Monson responded that it had not; it was only from the Executive Committee.

Bruch (Fine Arts) questioned the inclusion of researchers with the professional staff. Monson conceded that we should probably look at that more carefully, but that it was intended to cover future possibilities of additional research-only units.

Mattila (Civil & Env. Eng.) asked why we made the suggestion to refer to the two constituent representation groups as "senate" instead of something like "group." Bruch responded that the word Senate is empowering. Gotschalk agreed with Mattila that the wording could be group instead of Senate.

Williams (Chemistry) stated that his constituents unanimously prefer having a grass roots vote with several choices.

Glime (Biol. Sci.) stated that use of the word Senate made it clear that the faculty have their Senate, but that the University Senate would keep the professional staff who are valuable in making better decisions. Before having the professional staff in the Senate, senators would make decisions that might cost 25 new positions of trained personnel for a period of 10 days surrounding an event like registration because faculty did not realize what was required to make their proposal work. The proposal would be turned down. Since the professional staff have joined the Senate, such unworkable decisions have never been made.

Gorman (Soc. Sci.) stated that this set of amendments seems to be dealing with who gets to vote on what, but we had decided to look at that issue later.

Monson asked if faculty Senators have talked about the university vs. faculty senate with their constituents. Williams responded that the faculty in chemistry favor a faculty senate. Boschetto-Sandoval (Humanities) stated that humanities seem to want both groups to be in the Senate.

Flaspohler (SFRES) wondered if the faculty understand why the faculty and staff are joined into a university senate. Janners (at-large) asked why faculty want a faculty-only senate. Williams stated that he thinks they feel the Senate is weakened because the staff are voting against their superiors. Mattila stated that the few people he had talked to in Civil and Environmental Engineering seemed to prefer the combined senate.

D. Selfe (Academic Services non-engineering) stated that if constituents are given multiple options, probably none of them would get 50% of the votes.

Monson reported that Vable (ME-EM) had asked if the two constituent groups would vote separately and Monson opined that we might need separate votes. Janners stated that if each would approve separately it would give more legitimacy to the Senate.

Bruch suggested that we could poll the constituents instead. D. Selfe added that he was hoping the Committee will have a long educational campaign. Monson suggested that we could have a poll to find out what constituents considered the pros and cons.

D. Selfe asked if voting separately on this revision would mean we would have to vote separately on all future amendments to the Constitution.

Polzien (Res. & Grad School/Univ Rel/Admin Off) stated that we all want the same thing. Why worry about who has better input or who is more important?

Monson reminded the Senate that the President of the University would like as little change in the Constitution as possible in this constituency revision.

Mattila asked if we would be setting a precedent by having separate votes.

Flaspohler said that he understood the intention of the wording would be not to change the functioning of the Senate.

Johnson (School of Technology) asked who we are excluding from the Senate. Monson responded that would be members of the labor unions such as AFSME, police, etc. Christianson (HR & Facilities Mgmt. & VP) stated that people from these groups have to be paid or given release time for time spent on committee work and Senate meetings. Janners added that in areas where the Senate has authority, those people are not involved.

Waddell (at-large) asked if voting as two separate units would be against the charge given to the Presidential Advisory Committee by the University President.

D. Selfe expressed concern about the statement that there were concerns that having staff on the Senate weakens the Senate and asked what kinds of issues generated that concern. Williams responded that one issue was the vote of confidence in the President.

D. Selfe responded that when his department has some tough decisions, only the tenured faculty vote because they are not as vulnerable. Sutter (at-large) reminded Senators that the faculty are always in the majority; he does not know of any vote where the staff voted as a block. Glime added that only one person is needed to call for a secret ballot and then everyone is protected.

Monson stated that Secretary Glime had prepared a statement of the contributions of professional staff to the Senate and asked if Senators would like a copy. He responded to their positive indication by requesting that Glime distribute the statement

through Usenate-L.

#### Article II.

D. Selfe stated that he doesn't support leaving the voting functions as they are [he feels staff should be able to vote on more issues], but he thinks his constituents would prefer to leave them alone.

Monson reminded the Senate that both groups of constituents can vote in committee.

Clancy (Chem. Eng.) stated that the wording of Article II.B.1&2 is not clear. Mattila suggested that the last part of Article II.A. be removed: "The Senate also is the principal forum for discussion of any matters of interest to the university community generally ~~and the academic faculty particularly.~~"

#### Term Limits – should we eliminate them?

Monson reported that there is a history behind the term limits. They are based on one person who appeared to have a personal agenda and who had been either a Senator or alternate for many years. Sloan (Elec. Eng.) stated that the previous constitution had a one-year off-Senate requirement between six-year service periods.

Mattila asked why the change was suggested. Pollins responded that some small units have problems getting senators. Mattila stated that we could get another senator with a personal agenda. Rogers said that individual units could control that. Waddell suggested that we could drop the time served as an alternate. Monson stated that this would not solve the problem for KRC because they have only one person willing and able to serve.

One senator stated that having senator turnover provides the Senate with new ideas. Bruch added that having a term limit gives a person a way to say "no."

Williams stated that we can simply say that after six years as a senator a person can only be an alternate until eligible to serve again. Nordberg (Library) stated that he sees it as a non-issue; if a department is too small we should have a constitution that helps. D. Selfe suggested that we have an appeals clause for a department that has trouble getting a senator.

Pollins suggested that senators who seem to have their own agenda could be assigned to a committee that was not self-serving. Mattila reiterated that he supports term limits.

Milligan, returning to Article I, stated that calling this a faculty senate and professional staff senate is misleading because it is not a separate body. It has only one set of officers.

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

Bruch MOVED and Rogers seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:40 PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime  
Secretary of the University Senate

## ACTION ITEMS

1. Clarify which group includes researchers who have no departmental affiliation
2. Senators should poll their constituents on the kind of senate they want – faculty only or university senate
3. Determine why faculty want a separate Senate and why they think the professional staff weaken it
4. Glime's statement on the roll of professional staff in the Senate needs to be distributed to all Senators to help in clarifying the way the Senate works (sent 11 Nov).
5. Brainstorm on ways to educate the constituency.
6. Decide if these changes should be voted on separately by the two constituencies
7. Clarify Article II.B.1&2.
8. Consider removing "and the academic faculty particularly" from the end of Article II.a.
9. Consider an appeal process to suspend the term limits for units that are too small to change senators and alternates.
10. Determine if there is any precedent for having two organizations (senates) with one set of officers and committees.