

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

Minutes of Meeting 426
31 August 2005

Synopsis:

- (1) President Sloan announced that Paige Hackney is our new Senate Assistant.
 - (2) Nominees are needed for a committee to select the new ombudsperson. The Senate will be reviewing policies regarding the role of this position.
 - (3) Senate tentative committee assignments were distributed.
 - (4) The Executive Committee will review the roles and need for university committees requiring Senate appointments.
 - (5) Warren Perger, chair, reported on the Blue Ribbon Information Technology Needs Committee (BRITNC).
 - (6) Decided to invite a representative of the Administration and one from AAUP to make a presentation on their view of the role of the Senate. This will take place immediately after the next Senate meeting – approximately 7 pm 14 September.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Sloan called the University Senate Meeting 426 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, 31 August 2005, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator Larry Sutter and the representatives from Computer Science and Auxiliaries. Liaisons in attendance were Becky Christianson (Staff Council) and Nick Nanninga (Graduate Student Council). Army/Air Force ROTC and ME-EM currently have no elected representatives.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Dave Reed (Provost), Kurt Hauglie (Daily Mining Gazette), Warren Perger (Electrical Engineering / Physics), Jarrod Karau (IT).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Sloan added items E (Waiver on Photograph) and F (Discussion of Governance Presentation) to the agenda. There were no objections.

Soldan MOVED and Helminen seconded the motion to approve the agenda as modified. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. [Appendix A. NOTE: Only senate and library archival copies of minutes will have a full complement of appendices.]

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING

Nordberg MOVED and Clancey seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 425. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

President's Report

1. President Sloan welcomed the 2005-2006 Senate and introduced the new Senate Assistant, Paige Hackney, who has replaced Mechelle Normand who has a new job elsewhere at Tech. She complimented Paige on doing an outstanding job.
2. We already know of a lot of activity for the Senate this year. Early this fall two taskforces will report on their work in the last year or two on professional staff issues and family-friendly policies. President Sloan has learned that there's quite a gap between a task-force report and Senate-ready proposals. We're trying to bridge that gap more rapidly this year.
In addition the Provost has advised us that several departments are preparing degree proposals in fields ranging from biochemistry to mathematical finance and information technology. Also he has set up a group on electronic grade submission with the intent of holding test trials from volunteer faculty in the spring and full-scale electronic grade submission by next fall.
This is the year for the Senate Administrative Policy Committee to evaluate the top administrators, clearly a major responsibility.
The Senate officers plan to have presentations of interest to the Senate at almost every meeting. These presentations will go beyond Senate committee reports to include reports of other committees and offices on campus. Tonight we will hear from Warren Perger on the Blue Ribbon Information Technology Needs Committee. At the next meeting we will have presentations from the Academic Tenure Committee, the Senate Task Force on Career Opportunities for Professional Staff and the special committee on new financial aid.
Later in the agenda we will discuss whether the Senate wants to hear presentations on positions on governance from both the faculty union and the administration at the next meeting.
3. The Senate President has reviewed committee activity for the Senate years from 1994-2005. The workload for committees varies substantially. One committee was involved in just two proposals in those ten years while the Curricular Policy Committee had 115. The Senate Executive Committee will look this year at ways to streamline procedures and better balance the workload. The immediate past chair of the Curricular Policy Committee, Marty Janners, has recommended a way to streamline the handling of certificate programs, which would help that committee's workload greatly. The committee will be charged with investigating and, hopefully, implementing that approach.

Paige distributed (at the end of this meeting) a list of tentative assignments of Senators and Alternates to Senate Committees. We tried to follow senator choices as much as possible. If you are dissatisfied with your assignment, please see if you can find a member of another committee who would like to swap with you and then let President Sloan know.

Each committee—except Elections—has been assigned a convener to arrange the first meeting, at which the committee should elect their chair. Please advise both President Sloan and Paige Hackney of that election.

4. The Senate also appoints, elects, or recommends members to a host of other University Committees. We will deal with one of these tonight, the committee that selects the Ombudsman. President Sloan will be sending Senators an e-mail soon of the openings on other committees so they can consult their constituents about their interests. These emails will come in dribs and drabs as we sort out our current membership. The list of 2004-2005 committees runs to five pages with many openings dating back a few years. Sloan's favorite is a committee whose sole members were appointed in 1995; they both retired from Tech in 2003, and life has apparently gone along well without this committee's contributions. In some cases it isn't even clear whom to contact to find out about the current members and their tenure. Sloan plans to try to determine which of these committees still exist and which might well be sunsetted.
5. The executive committee will review the Senate bylaws this year to help streamline Senate operations. In addition the Provost (thank you) has asked the Senate to review all university policies on the ombudsman – the previous ombudsman had pointed out major inconsistencies in those policies – and that task will fall to the Executive Committee as well.
6. We have been asked to alert you to three performances of the University of Michigan Players on teaching, learning, and diversity on Thursday and Friday, 15 and 16 September. This nationally acclaimed group, which NSF uses for its training, was mentioned in last week's Science Magazine and will perform on the 15th from 3:30-5:30 (followed by pizza), and the 16th from 8:15-10 am and 3:00-5:00, all in the MUB Ballroom. Flyers and Tech Today provide more information.
7. The first candidate for provost, Dr. Marek Dollár, was scheduled to arrive tonight for interviews tomorrow and Friday. The Senate and Staff Council are sponsoring an open forum for him from 5:00-6:30 tomorrow in Dow 641 and another sponsored by student groups Friday from 2:00-3:00 in M&M U-115. President Sloan urged everyone to attend and encourage their constituents to attend this forum and those of three other candidates scheduled later this month. (This fourth candidate just accepted an interview this afternoon.) The Provost Search Committee will phone interview another candidate next Friday and may interview him on campus in late September or, more likely, early October.

Senator Soldan asked who to ask about the committees. President Sloan responded that the officers could answer questions and take nominations.

7. NEW BUSINESS

A. Blue Ribbon Information Technology Needs Committee (BRITNC) – Warren Perger

Perger chaired this committee after its chair, Dave Reed, became Provost. The committee consisted of Perger, Linda Ott, Kevin Raber, and Scott Ackerman. Perger has 19 years of involvement with computers on this campus. The full report of the committee is on the web. This presentation represents a condensation including the most important points.

The committee was charged with reviewing and making recommendations to update the current university computing strategy, to review and make recommendations regarding the role, the membership, and the purpose of the Computing Executive Committee (CEX) and the Computing Advisory Committee (CAC), to review the relationship between the CEX and the CAC to the Senate Computing Committee and any other computing committees (the BRITNC is to make recommendations that will eliminate redundancy among the different committees and improve the efficiency in order to save faculty and staff time), and to review and make recommendations regarding the role of central IT and its relationship to decentralized computing across campus. BRITNC is to make recommendations to the President's Executive Council on the role central IT is to play in supporting the University's strategic goal.

When becoming chair, Perger sought additional data, including computing plans at peer universities, site visits, Educause data, and MTU campus interviews.

The current situation can be summarized with four points:

1. IT has not been considered vital to the MTU mission.
2. Many problems are linked to the lack of synchronization between IT and the strategic plan.
3. There has been an inability to prioritize IT needs/expenditures for the overall campus.
4. Many of the successes are due to grass roots efforts. In particular, the systems administrator council developed from the systems administrators themselves and has been a very effective group.

There has been little integration between central and distributed computing. Therefore, the committee proposed that strategy and policy coordination work with both central information technology and with the distributed IT units, and that these two units also coordinate. Someone has to have the responsibility.

Information technology is our prime communication device both internally and externally, our most widely used research tool, an essential resource for our educational program, an indispensable tool for administration, and a significant source of entertainment for our students.

BRITNC recommendations:

1. Continue both central and distributed IT units.
2. Operating procedures applied to information technology should be consistent with, and where possible identical to, operating procedures applied to the rest of campus
 - 2a. a task force be developed to examine the funding mechanisms for central computing, the balance between general fund support and use fees, and the appropriate use of each to support central computing
 - 2b. retain existing student computing fee structure
 - 2c. procedure for acquisition of computer equipment should require no special approvals
3. Revise the administrative structure, with an emphasis on communication among the three major information technology components, and between each component and the user community. A Chief Information Officer position should be

created to be responsible for an IT strategy consistent with the MTU mission, policy, and prioritization of all campus IT resources.

4. The current advisory committee structure should be revised.
 - a. The CIO should appoint ad hoc advisory committees. Standing committees lose interest.
 - b. University Computing Forums should be held by the CIO once per semester to serve as a clearing house for ideas.
 - c. Retain the Systems Administrators Council and have it report to the CIO.
 - d. Disband the Computer Executive Committee (CEX) immediately.
 - e. Dissolve the Computer Advisory Council (CAC)

The administration has accepted nearly all the recommendations. Tom Van Dam has agreed to chair the task force. However, the recommendation for a CIO is still under discussion. It is time for faculty discussion on these issues.

Senator Gorman asked if this would address the problem of using or getting access to equipment in classrooms. Central University has more than 200 classrooms equipped. Senator Amato-Henderson commented that the equipment is often there, but faculty outside the department are not allowed to use it.

Perger responded that it would mean asking a systems administrator to let another department use their equipment.

Senator Johnson asked if we have considered outsourcing to prevent departmental ownership and territoriality.

Amato-Henderson commented that everyone is reinventing the wheel. Wouldn't it be effective to put all systems administrators together.

Perger responded that if they are all together, they lose the ability to support the specific needs of a department.

Senator Ackerman stated that some clusters are happening, but they can't get too big or they are not responsive where needed.

Senator Beck stated that a lot is due to historical problems. Departments have been asked to pay for everything.

Senator Gorman stated that there is a problem with the student computer fee and how it can be used. It is a special problem for small departments that cannot generate enough in computer fees to hire a systems administrator. Ackerman stated that the current policy is that the computer fee goes back to the labs (department) and has a separate account. Gorman stated that a service department like Social Sciences doesn't get much money. Ackerman commented that some departments charge a computing fee for a course. For example, freshman chemistry may require special software that is only available in the chemistry computing lab and therefore be deemed computer intensive by the chemistry department. Based on this, the current computing fee policy allows them to put a course computing fee on the course to cover the cost of providing computing facilities to a large number of students that aren't chemistry majors. There was discussion that the department could charge a fee for a course like UN2001, which would come back to the department.

[Clarification to minutes from Helene Hiner (Administrative Associate): Individual departments cannot put a computing fee on a UN course section of their choosing. Course fees are proposed for the UN core courses by the General Education Director with input from the Gen Ed Council. Any fee would be charged on all sections and go into a gen ed lab account to be spent however the council/director decided. For example, there is a UN1002 (World Cultures) course fee which covers the course lab expenses. The World Cultures coordinator determines how the funds are spent for the students films, events, etc. It is, perhaps, a fine line difference, but it is important for everyone to know that no individual department can charge a fee by section and that no department can determine a fee for UN core courses by itself.]

[Further clarification from Mary Durfee, gen ed: There is very, very little support in higher administration for more fees. There needs to be a real reason for them, too. There will be a study of computing fees (per the IT report) and this will also be an (NCA)AQIP Action Project proposal on this topic. Rather than piecemeal approaches, we should attempt to solve this in a systematic way.]

Senator Chard asked how other schools are charging. Ackerman responded that Central has a student fee that is distributed. Most universities with shared classrooms are funding them centrally. Ours is mostly piecemeal.

Senator Helminen stated that we have a security fee, but we never got anywhere on getting someone to coordinate and support classroom technology. Ackerman added that in forums with students they seem to be comfortable and understand the computer fees; our fees are lower compared to those at other universities.

Perger commented that charge back system is defended because otherwise some would abuse the privilege. Under the present charge system no one can take it away if the general fund is low.

Nordberg stated that the central issue is how to balance central needs with individual needs, especially in small departments. How can anyone be successful when always fighting for money between central and distributed computing?

Perger stated that the University of Missouri at Rolla hired a CIO and the first department to splinter was in that building. The competition is real.

Helminen suggested that the graduate dean has no one reporting to him but is responsible for the whole campus, so that model might work. Perger warned that the turf wars are strong and would be a challenge for the CIO.

Perger closed by stating that he would like the Senate to consider the idea of a forum. The Senate could be involved in the setup of the forums.

B. Proposed 2005-2006 Meeting Dates

President Sloan presented the proposed calendar [Appendix B]. She presented two possible dates for the 7th meeting, 20 November or 7 December. Senator Wagner suggested that 30 November would be better because it was earlier. There were no objections to that date. Bruch MOVED and Janners seconded the motion to accept the calendar as presented with the meeting on 30 November rather than 7 December. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

C. Proposal 1-06, 2006-2007 Academic Calendar

Bruch MOVED and Nordberg seconded the motion to accept the calendar as presented. [Appendix C]

D. Selection of an Ombudsman

President Sloan stated that the former ombudsperson, Peck Cho, is on sabbatical leave. A temporary ombudsperson was selected and approved by the Senate officers during the summer. We now need a selection committee composed of one Senator, one faculty member elected by the faculty, and one member appointed by the University President. This committee of three must make a unanimous selection of the new ombudsperson.

Senator Gorman asked for an example of a case this person might have to deal with. Sloan responded that there might be a question over a promotion and tenure decision. Students might challenge a grade.

Provost Reed added that the faculty and staff are asked to go to the ombudsperson before going to a formal grievance procedure. Students, on the other hand, must go through the normal process of grievance within the university first. This difference in procedure is one of the issues that should be reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee.

Senator Janners added that the ombudsperson cannot make a decision, only recommend.

Senator Amato-Henderson stated that then this person is charged with conflict resolution.

President Sloan urged the Senators to ask their constituents for anyone willing to serve on the selection committee.

Senator Clancey asked if there were any restrictions on who can serve on the selection committee. President Sloan said she would check. [None are stated and therefore she ruled in an email to the officers that both staff and faculty are eligible, but the faculty must elect them.]

E. Waiver on Photograph

President Sloan stated that the Senate Secretary had suggested providing a roster of photographs of Senators so that they could get to know each other and to help the officers recognize who is speaking. To do this, Human Resources requires a signed waiver.

President Sloan announced that Senators could pick up their committee assignments as they leave the meeting.

F. Discussion of Governance Presentation

Senator Sloan stated that the Senate Secretary has suggested that we invite a member of the administration and a representative of the AAUP negotiating team to present their ideas on the university governance now that we have the AAUP and how this affects the University Senate and shared governance. This would be a very structured session with each side being given the same amount of time to present. The presentation would take place after the Senate meeting and there would be no minutes. There will be no interaction between sides and no questions. It is a chance to see how each side thinks the Senate would operate.

Senator Wood asked if we could adjourn early and President Sloan responded that we are likely to finish our business by 7 pm.

Wood asked why there could be no questions. Sloan responded that there are legal issues involved. The employer is not supposed to communicate on union matters with their employees who are members of that union.

Senator Bruch asked if the TV would be off. Senator Soldan stated that more faculty are likely to be interested in these presentations and we could have an open forum. Sloan explained that only Senate issues would be presented.

Senator Beck stated that this is a strange time for such a presentation. The outcome (of negotiations) could have an enormously wide range. AAUP will have an open forum on 8 September for all faculty.

Nordberg stated that one concern is if the Senate will remain passive and allow the contract to push how the Senate will be affected. The Senate Executive Committee should stand up for what the Senate will be.

Senator Flaspohler stated that the drawbacks to the presentations seemed minor compared to the real benefits.

Someone asked if the Senate has any voice in the negotiation.

President Sloan asked how many thought this presentation was a bad idea. One Senator indicated yes and another stated that it seems to serve no purpose.

Wood stated that some faculty are better informed, but many are not.

Amato-Henderson asked if the role of the Senate is being negotiated. Nordberg responded that it is. The Senate has no representative except as individuals.

Wood asked if we can do this if only one side comes. [We will not.]

Amato-Henderson asked if the two positions could be done in writing instead.

[Putting it in writing again brings up legal issues. This is being done at the request of the Senate and both sides need to agree.]

Sloan stated that there seems to be a consensus to have the presentations.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Bruch MOVED to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.

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