

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

Minutes of Meeting 415
1 December 2004

Synopsis:

- (1) The Presidential Advisory Committee passed a resolution of sympathy for Dr. Peck Cho and Dr. Christina Cho on the loss of their son and daughter.
 - (2) The PAC approved changes to the constitution that would define its constituency representation and reinstate the faculty in the University Senate.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Monson called University Senate Meeting 415 to order at 5:33 pm on Wednesday, 1 December 2004, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Larry Sutter and Don Beck and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Computer Science, Geological and Mining Engineering and Sciences, Keweenaw Research Center, Auxiliary Enterprises, Enrollment Management/OSRR, and Finance and Advancement. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council) and David Forel (GSC). Academic Services – Engineering currently has no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

No visitors were present.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Monson added New Business, Resolution for the Cho's.

Waddell MOVED and C. Selfe seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. 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 414

D. Selfe MOVED and Waddell seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 414. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. The Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) officers met with Provost Wray, at which time they learned that several proposals for academic degree programs will be forwarded to the PAC for action. President Monson will pass these on to the Curricular Policy Committee and the Finance Committee.
2. PAC officers have interviewed one candidate for the PAC/Senate administrative position and will interview another on Thursday. It is expected that one of the two candidates will be selected as the new administrative person.
3. The Academic Policy Committee will report on a proposal for an updated sabbatical leave policy that incorporates changes in Board policies that have occurred since the current policy was developed. This will be brought to the first meeting after the holidays.
4. A draft of the reworked Senate Constitution is available on the Senate website. It will be updated as the PAC makes changes.
5. Memos will be sent to the Administration for Proposal 7-05, The Role of Non-Engineering Disciplines at Michigan Tech, Revisions to Proposal 8-04 and Proposal 8-05, Reinvestment of the R&I Account Reserve Funds in a Balanced Portfolio of Stocks and Bonds.

6. NEW BUSINESS

President Monson presented a resolution on the Cho's that had been drafted by the officers, with suggestions from PAC members: "We, the members of the Presidential Advisory Committee / University Senate, offer our distinguished colleague and fellow Senator Dr. Peck Cho and his wife and our colleague Dr. Christina Cho our sincerest and deepest sympathies on the tragic loss of their son Hann and daughter Dani."

C. Selfe MOVED and Vable seconded the motion to approve the resolution. The motion PASSED unanimously without discussion.

Amato-Henderson reported that the Cho's had returned to Houghton the previous evening.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Discussion of Revised Senate Constitution [**Appendix B**]

President Monson stated that the initial issue is to determine if the Senate will continue as a university senate or a faculty senate. He opened discussion on Article II.A., the definition of the senate.

Bruch MOVED and C. Selfe seconded the motion to approve Article II.A. as presented.

Senators reported on their polls of their constituents. Bruch stated that all her constituents (Fine Arts) wanted to continue the Senate constituent structure as it is now. Flynn reported that her constituents (Humanities) voted with 19 in favor of maintaining the Senate as it is and 4 favoring faculty only; 14 felt that the constituent vote on the by-laws should be done separately by the two constituencies and 8 felt the constituents should vote as one body.

Glime stated that Biological Sciences wanted the Senate constituency as it is now. Mattila indicated that Civil and Environmental Engineering would like to continue the Senate as it is. Vable indicated that there was very little support for the present Senate structure in ME-EM and that they preferred two chambers; half preferred two chambers in a university senate and half preferred separated structures. Williams reported that Chemistry wants a referendum of faculty on alternate senate structures that might be adopted so that we would have a clear idea of the feelings of all faculty. Gorman reported that Social Sciences wants to keep it as is.

Flaspohler reported that he heard from only two constituents in SFRES, one for a faculty senate and one for a university senate. Milligan reported that in Materials Science and Engineering the faculty wanted a faculty-only senate and the staff wanted a university senate. Amato-Henderson reported that the Department of Education preferred the Senate keep everyone involved as it has been.

Monson explained that the present proposal would provide for two groups of constituents that meet collectively. There was discussion of two errors in the present version where the words "faculty senate" should have been changed to "senate."

Vable asked if the votes on the constituency would be separated. Monson stated that the officers had discussed that and felt there would be more credibility if the votes of the two constituency groups were separate.

Gotschalk (Student Affairs & Educ. Opportunity) stated that she understands that the University Senate enhances decision making, but asked if there will be any history presented to the constituents with the ballot.

Bruch stated that there are evidently problems with the present motion. She MOVED that we table the motion on Article II.A. until the faculty and professional staff have an opportunity to vote. We can poll the constituents on three different structures. Vable seconded the motion, stating that we need to have a clear direction from the constituents.

Milligan asked what majority would be used for these changes, to which Monson responded a simple majority. Then Milligan asked why this issue required only a simple majority when the constitution requires a 2/3 majority for amendments and Waddell asked for clarification of the required votes. Monson responded that a simple majority would be required for this group and of the constituency of changes to the constitution as if it were a new constitution since the present one is invalid. From then on it would again require a 2/3 majority.

There was discussion on whether we could vote separately within the PAC to represent the two constituent bodies. Monson stated there is nothing in the constitution to allow that.

Sloan called for a point of order; a motion to table is not debatable. The motion to table the vote on Article II.A. FAILED on a show of hands vote, with 11 yes and 16 no votes.

D. Selfe stated that we need to describe why the system we have now does work and this needs to be part of a series of meetings or letters to come from the Executive Committee.

Christianson (Staff Council) said that she would like to hear why the faculty prefer a faculty only senate.

Bruch added that we also need to hear why the current system doesn't work.

Flaspohler said that part of the problem seems to be the perception of how much overlap of interests exist, without constituents knowing the history. Some people feel the faculty interests are fairly distinct.

Vable stated that he had served on the senate when it was a faculty senate. He is surprised at the statement that the faculty senate didn't function; most of the proposals went through. What we are really arguing is a procedural problem. If it is a philosophical problem, then that is a different issue. Staff add tremendous value to arguments, but there are certain places where the faculty need to act separately.

D. Selfe (Academic Services non-Engineering) stated that diversity of specialties allows the Senate to function in a more effective way. People who don't feel a part of something won't care and won't provide useful information or try to make this a better university. You won't get the kind of commitment necessary to get the information you want. He has also found that he was wrong in thinking he was alone in wanting to have a vote in curricular issues. Curricular decisions have a lot of impact on some staff jobs. The philosophy needs to be simple, inclusive, and result in making more powerful decisions.

Williams challenged our right to make a new constitution when the old one still exists.

Monson asked if this body could do away with the current constitution.

Nordberg responded that we could spend lots of time on procedural issues when we could best serve our interests to focus on designing the constitution we want to take to a vote of the constituents. As senators we need to put together the best constitution we think will work and vote on it. First we need to decide if we are going to have a faculty only or university senate. Let's put together what we think is the best university senate constitution.

Janners (at-large) agreed. Our task is to clarify who was in the original senate; we need to clarify the definition of the professional staff and the new wording does that.

Waddell (at-large) asked if we can offer three options to vote on: separate constituencies, previous senate constituency, or a senate with 2 bodies that also meet separately.

Bruch responded that it can be simpler. We can vote on this proposal (Article II.A.). If it passes in the PAC, then we send it out to the constituency to see what they think. If it passes there, the other possibilities are moot.

Amato-Henderson stated that the constituents had already been polled. She called for the question. The call for the question PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Bruch requested a secret ballot on Article II.A.

The motion to approve Article II.A. as presented PASSED on secret ballot with 22 yes and 6 no votes.

Milligan questioned if this was not the same amendment as the one that had failed in the previous constituency vote.

Monson stated that the previous ballot had several issues included. Nordberg stated that we need to tell the constituents what we are trying to do – that we will settle the constituency issue, and then present a new constitution.

Waddell stated that we need to present this issue (of constituents) to the constituents before we go on with other parts of the constitution.

C. Selfe (at-large) asked why, if it had failed before, it wouldn't fail again.

Christianson stated that time was a major factor the last time.

Bruch MOVED and Glime seconded the motion to take Article II.A. to a vote of the constituents.

Vable stated that we need to clarify the constitutional changes. Nordberg stated that if we want it to be useful, it needs to go to the same people who will approve. Gordon responded that we don't want to vote piece by piece. We could do a survey to find out if our constituents want one or two chambers.

Pollins (Information Technology) stated that he prefers to go to his constituents and poll them now more specifically.

Waddell stated that we need to include Article III with what we present to constituents because Article II.A. refers to it. He reminded the PAC that we had already polled the constituents.

Janners stated that the rest of the constitutional changes should be quick so we should be able to do this all in one constituent vote.

Gotschalk stated that other parts of the constitution concern AAUP functions which can't be done now. Janners stated that the rest of the constituent changes are before us and we can act on them now for a constituent vote.

Amato-Henderson stated that we need to include with these changes a preamble that explains that changes to the functions will come later after the AAUP functions are decided. Bruch withdrew her motion and Glime withdrew her second.

C. Selfe MOVED and Amato-Henderson seconded the motion to approve the remainder of Article II as presented. Monson and others corrected several typographical errors: II.B.2.a&b. – "Faculty Senate" should just be "Senate;" II.B.2.c. – "heads" should be "chairs;" II.C.1.b.2) – "Physical education" should be "Physical Education;" II.C.1.b.4) – "not" should be removed.

Christianson expressed concern with Article II.C.1.b.2. It designates two specific units of professional staff and only 10 other units remain. Among these are several large and unwieldy units. D. Selfe stated that items 4 and 6 in the highlights of proposed changes seem to conflict regarding staff representation. Christianson explained that 4 defines how the professional staff constituencies will be determined and 6 defines the numbers of representatives and change in KRC to professional staff.

Vable asked how many professional staff there are. Christianson responded there are 450. The proposed constitutional changes would provide for 12 unit representations and 2 at-large senators. She added that some of the units have constituents all over campus.

Monson responded that the Professional Staff Committee was looking at a different form of grouping, possibly by buildings.

D. Selfe stated that his constituents are also scattered but that he is comfortable with having the committee work out these problems. Amato-Henderson stated that it would be better to have common interest groups grouped together because it would be difficult to determine a consensus with mixed groupings in buildings.

Pollins stated that engineering services constituents were scattered all over campus and it was hard to communicate.

Monson stated that we should leave that issue up to the professional staff.

Vable asked why the Executive Committee had added the 40% upper limit on professional staff representation. Pollins responded that the Executive Committee wanted the faculty to always be in the majority in the senate.

Waddell stated that some faculty have been concerned that they could be out-voted by staff, but that in fact constituent votes on academic issues are by faculty only.

Rogers (at-large) stated that in one case the constituency had changed the vote of the Senate; when there was a tie for the Senate presidency election, the outcome of the constituency vote was quite different.

The motion to approve the remainder of changes to Article II PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Vable cited an example to show that staff structure and interests are very different. When his committee developed procedures for evaluations of chairs, a staff member then said that they wouldn't work for them because staff do not have tenure.

Janners countered that if it was a procedure for evaluation of chairs, then it would have been an academic matter and staff would have had no vote and would not have been affected by the outcome.

D. Selfe disagreed, stating that if there is a change in chairs, staff can lose jobs. Monson responded that this is an academic matter in the constitution.

C. Selfe MOVED and Waddell seconded the motion to accept articles III and IV.

Amato-Henderson pointed out that we (Senate) don't do changes in degree programs (Article III.F.1.). Monson agreed to accept that as a friendly amendment. However, after discussion he withdrew the change and agreed that such changes should be made later.

Waddell MOVED and C. Selfe seconded the motion to approve the remaining changes as presented.

Pollins called for the question. The call for question PASSED on voice vote passed with no opposition.

The motion to approve the remaining changes in the constitution as presented PASSED on voice vote with 2 opposing votes. Monson stated that the next task was to present the new constitution to the constituents.

D. Selfe responded that we should not just take it to the constituents. We need to spend a lot of time educating people.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Williams MOVED and Pollins seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:11 PM.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the Presidential Advisory Committee/University Senate