Synopsis:
The Senate
- Proposal 5-11 passed
- Proposal 6-11 passed
- Proposal 17-11 passed
- Proposal 18-11 passed
- Proposal 19-11 passed

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 504 to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, March 23, 2011. The Senate Secretary Marty Thompson called roll. Absent were representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Materials Science and Engineering, Academic Services B, Auxiliaries and Cultural Enrichment, Admissions, Administrative Services and Student Affairs.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost Office), Jackie Huntoon (Graduate School), Bruce Seely (College of Sciences and Arts), Bob Keen (Biological Sciences), Joe Herbig (Accounting Services), Ted Bornhorst (Seaman Mineral Museum), Anita Quinn (Human Resources), Bill Surna (Carl Walker, Inc.) and Matt Inman (Carl Walker, Inc.).

3. Approval of agenda. Luck presented an update to the agenda; asked for a motion to approve. Hamlin moved to approve. Luck called for a vote; the agenda passed unanimously on a voice vote.

4. Approval of minutes from Meeting 503. Luck asked if there were any changes; there being none Luck declared the minutes stood approved.

5. Presentation: “Parking” presented by Carl Walker Inc
Kangas, Institutional Planning Committee, introduced Bill Surna and Matt Inman of Carl Walker, Inc. Inman presented the Project Team, the approach that will be taken, the scope of the services they provide and the project schedule. Luck asked if their services were ever implemented at an institution that had no parking fees. Inman affirmed this but noted there are always fees whether directly or indirectly administered. Luck asked Inman what Tech’s parking fee was. Inman said zero. Donohue asked what the cost was for Carl Walker to perform the stated services. Inman said $35,000 to $135,000 depending on size of the university and specific requests. Hamlin asked how many comments were received from faculty and staff. Inman said they are meeting with faculty and staff while here, but have gotten very little input. Hamlin noted the previous mismanagement and stated now there are no problems. Inman stated Carl Walker Inc. is not coming in with preset plans and each institution is unique. Hamlin noted the lack of comments may be based on the fact that faculty and staff feel the current system works well. Inman noted they also serve to organize and administer parking. Storer asked if previous reports are being considered. He noted the fresh-look report. Inman affirmed they have reviewed that information. Onder asked about the cost for parking structures. Inman stated the costs for different structures. Caneba asked about previous recommendations to academic institutions that did not require fees. Inman said most solutions have an associated cost and provided several examples. Onder noted the consequences of the recent parking changes. Inman discussed the challenges and benefits of parking flexibility. Lemay asked about public transportation and noted the strong resistance of her constituents to charging employees to park at their place of work. She added that if employees are charged for parking, it has been requested that it be implemented in a year with raises. Inman commented on the challenges of cost and public transportation. Herbig noted that parking costs have been taken on by the administration under the general fund as an operating expense. Luck thanked the speaker.

6. Presentation: “Recognizing the Contributions of Dr Robert “Bob” Keen” Presented by Dr. Theodore Bornhorst, Becky Christianson, Dr Martha Sloan, and Provost Max Seel”
Luck reminisced about his first encounter with Keen, noting his encyclopedic knowledge of proposals, bylaws and senate information. He noted that Keen will be replaced by three search engines for electronic documents. Bornhorst noted Keen’s role in drafting bylaws and bringing about the current manifestation of the University Senate. He noted that Robert’s Rules of Order was introduced to him by Keen. Christianson walked down memory lane in detailing Keen’s contributions in the University Senate during a turbulent financial time for Tech. She cited his role in the no confidence vote of past president Tompkins. Christianson summarized a series of difficult times navigated by Senate President Keen. She concluded by noting his ability to recall proposals and expressing an appreciation for his tireless work for the betterment of MTU. Sloan discussed her senate experiences with Keen. She noted Keen’s contribution to the perspectives course and wondered what will become of the website in his absence. Seel offered his personal thanks and noted the difference Keen made at Tech. Keen proceeded to thank everyone and offered some retaliatory praise to those who spoke in recognition of his work. He noted several key turning points including; sabbaticals, shared governance and release time for senate officers. Keen ended by mentioning the excitement of reading the minutes and provided some amusing examples. He concluded by thanking Luck for his thoughtfulness towards him.

7. Report from the Senate President
Luck briefly mentioned the administration has approved proposals 14-11 through 16-11. He reminded everyone there will be an open forum on AQIP on April 7th and no executive committee meeting next week.
8. Report from Senate Standing Committees
Christianson, Staff Council, presented the professional staff survey results. The questions focused on the role of staff senators. She read several comments and discussed the next steps that will be taken.

Onder, Elections Committee, noted the need remains for one faculty senator-at-large position, and nominations for the Sabbatical Leave Committee and Faculty Distinguished Service Awards Committee.

9. Old Business
Proposal 5-11: “Redefining Departmental Governance as Amended by Administration”
Luck asked for comments. Storer moved to include a friendly amendment to Item #8; ‘units may include other policies or practices if they feel that they warrant being included in their charter’. Seel noted there was no intent to remove that type of information and accepted the amendment. Hamlin seconded. Scarlett said this addition reflects intent of Academic Policy Committee. Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none he called for a vote; the amendment passed unanimously on a voice vote. Luck asked if there were any additional comments to the amended proposal; there being none he called for a vote; the amended proposal passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Proposal 6-11: “Proposal to Establish University-wide Procedures to Search for, Hire, and Evaluate School Deans and Departmental Chairs as Amended by Administration”
Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none he called for a vote; it passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Proposal 16-11: “Proposal for Shelving and Eliminating Degree Programs and Certificates”
Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none he called for a vote; it passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Proposal 17-11: “Amendment to Proposal 21-01: Framework for Professional Master of Science Degrees: An Interdepartmental Professional Master of Science Degree With Specific Areas of Concentration”
Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none he called for a vote; it passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Proposal 19-11: “Minor in Music Composition”
Luck read an email from the chair of the finance committee affirming support for the proposal. Luck asked if there were any additional comments; there being none he called for a vote; it passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Proposal 20-11: “Proposal for Shelving and Eliminating Degree Programs”
Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, referenced the passage of proposal 17-11, which permits multiple unused degree programs to be shelved or eliminated. He noted the requirement to shelve prior to elimination. Storer explained that grouping the voting of proposals 21-11 thru 33-11 was to expedite the process. Luck noted that if anyone has a specific comment on a single proposal it would be removed from the list. Barkdoll asked the harm in leaving a degree program on the books. Storer said it could be shelved and would be examined every 5 years. Seel noted that these programs have not been on the books or on the registrar list and it is time to clean up the degree offerings. These programs have not appeared in any official document for many years.

Proposal 34-11 thru 37-11: “Proposals to Shelve Degree Programs”
Storer, Curricular Policy Committee, provided a description of shelving, as opposed to the proposals proposed for elimination, and the five year re-evaluation of shelved degrees. He noted it has been approved by dean's council. Seel said it comes from the binder process. Barkdoll asked if the chairs know about these proposals. Storer said these proposals come from the departments.

Proposal 38-11: “Conflict of Interest Changes”
Barkdoll, Research Committee, noted the conflict of interest (COI) and disclosure implementation plans Reed presented to the Senate on December 8, 2010. He described the tone of the proposal as attempting to be in line with federal COI and disclosure procedures.

11. Adjournment. Hamlin moved to adjourn; Storer seconded the motion. President Luck adjournd the meeting at 6:44pm

Respectfully submitted
by Marty Thompson
Secretary of the University Senate