

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 208

26 January 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) corrected and approved minutes of Meetings 203 and 204;
- (2) returned to committee Proposal 7-94, Evening Exam Policy;
- (3) passed Proposal 8-94, GAs & TAs: Creation, Funding, & Allocation;
- (4) returned to committee Proposal 10-94, Amendment of Final Exam Policy;
- (5) received Proposal 9-94, New Option for the MS Degree in Mathematical Sciences;
- (6) supported a memo asking for notification of exemptions under the 3-Year-&-Out Policy.

I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:32 pm on Wednesday, 26 January 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 30 senators or alternates were present. David Nelson was present as the representative of Mechanical Engineering-Engineering Mechanics. Senators or alternate representatives from Chemical Engineering, AF ROTC, and Army ROTC were absent. Absent senator-at-large: Roblee. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, Undergraduate Student Government, and Staff Council.

III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were F. Dobney (Provost), S. Lee (Vice-Provost), Faith Morrison (Chem Eng), S. Beske-Diehl (Geol), and Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics).

IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed moving Proposals 7-94, 8-94 and 10-94 for early consideration in the meeting. Bornhorst asked for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Vanek MOVED to accept the adjusted agenda. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the motion; there were none, and Bornhorst declared the agenda APPROVED as adjusted.

V. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst referred to the Minutes of Meeting 203 attached to the agenda sent to senators, and called for corrections. Hubbard noted a typographical error. Mroz MOVED to approve the corrected minutes; Heuvers seconded. The motion PASSED with no dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for corrections to the Minutes of Meeting 204, also circulated with the agenda. There were none. Sewell MOVED to approve the minutes; Carstens seconded the motion. The motion PASSED with no dissent in a voice vote.

## VI. Report of Senate President

1. President Tompkin's Cabinet met on January 14. The cabinet heard reports on the ski hill and the environmental sciences building. The cabinet discussed semesters vs quarters, and heard alternatives to these, including the 4-4-1 plan, a winter-quarter delay, and the late-start quarter plan. The Instructional Policy Subcommittee on the Academic Calendar should look at all alternatives to the present calendar.
2. Associate Registrar Ouilette has asked the Senate to review Senate Proposal 4-76, policy on distribution of information on grading practices of academic faculty. This proposal requires the registrar every year to publish a listing of the average GPA by level of class and by department. The request has been forwarded to the Instructional Policy Committee.
3. A memo received from S. Beske-Diehl, the Senate representative to the Affirmative Action Officer Search Committee, has asked for input to the job description for the Affirmative Action Officer.
4. Some constituents have complained about the extension of the drop date by Dean Janners, and have said that "the Senate should have been consulted before a major change was made in policies that it has approved".

(Bornhorst said that the administration should have the ability to deal with extenuating circumstances; perhaps the Senate should have been contacted in advance. Bornhorst suggested that perhaps a protocol needs to be established for dealing with such circumstances, although he preferred to maintain an informal arrangement. He called for comments on the issue.

(Filer said he preferred an informal arrangement; the extreme cold had shut down all the schools and universities in several states. MTU's closure interfered with examinations and prevented students from obtaining information needed to decide on dropping courses. Filer said such decisions did not need to come to the Senate.

(Nelson asked for the rationale behind a one-day closure requiring a two-week delay in the drop period. Dobney said that students who were scheduled for Thursday morning exams would not have been able to take them until the next Tuesday. Winter Carnival would have interfered with the following week. Dobney said he did not favor the current drop policy which encourages students to quit if they are not doing well; however, the two-week delay appeared necessary to accommodate it. Nelson asked how results of Thursday exams were expected to be posted by Friday.

(Keen said that several classes in his department had scheduled combined lab exams for Wednesday evening. Exam rules for Winter Carnival prevented making up these cancelled exams the next week. The two-week delay in the drop date was required because the one-day closure resulted in a two-week delay in the exams. Galetto said that Keen's scenario was correct, and that the Senate also should consider the impact on the Dean's office of not extending the drop date.

(Hubbard said that a Senate policy could not be written to provide for all possible contingencies. Dobney said that passing policy to cover once-in-ten-year occurrences would be counter-productive. Bornhorst said that he had to air issues brought up by constituents.

(Heuvers asked why the exams could not be scheduled at a different time. Boutilier said that it was almost impossible to get another set of rooms for a night exam on short notice, and that a mountain was being made out of a molehill.)

5. The Senate has a limited budget for copying and circulating minutes and proposals. Making copies for committees and

handouts at Senate meetings has to be the responsibility of individual senators.

6. The Senate Assistant position is a part-time secretarial position, not a salaried staff or faculty position. Hence, it is inappropriate to phone the Senate Assistant at home about Senate business.
7. A statement about Shared Governance and the Senate Constitution: On all issues, the Senate and administration must share ideas with trust and mutual respect. However, the Constitution clearly distinguishes two levels of Senate action.

In academic matters, the Senate has "the authority to review and establish policies and procedures". In these matters, when the Senate and the administration do not agree, the Senate can take the issue to the Board of Control.

In other areas, including such matters as finances and

\*\*\*\*\*

Page 4201                      Minutes of Senate Meeting 208                      26 Jan 1994

fringe benefits for example, the Senate has "the responsibility to review, make recommendations, and initiate/participate in the formulation of policies and procedures". In these areas, the administration establishes policy. The Senate can submit proposals to the administration in these areas, but does not have the right to go directly to the Board of Control. In these areas it is important to get advance administrative input, because an administrative veto is final.

## VII. Old Business (Part 1 of 2)

A. Proposal 8-94 (Part 1 of 2). Bornhorst called for consideration of Proposal 8-94, GAs and TAs: Creation, Funding and Allocation [Minutes, Meeting 207, p.4173-4175]; copies of the proposal had been circulated with the agenda.

Hubbard MOVED that Proposal 8-94 be approved; the motion was seconded. Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. There were none, and Bornhorst declared the recommendation to be approved. Boutilier inquired about senators-at-large. Bornhorst said that senators-at-large from academic degree-granting departments could vote.

Beck said some constituents were concerned about the cost of the program. The proposal calls for 85 new graduate assistantships; at a cost of \$20,000 each, the total is \$1.7M. The phasing in of the positions is a short-term view. Once these are phased in, they are locked in. More justification is needed before this amount is spent. Some financial compensation must be indicated. Bornhorst said that the proposal itself contained nothing about the number of positions. The discussion of 85 positions was contained in an attachment to the actual proposal the Senate was considering.

Leifer commented that there were two parts to the proposal. The first was the conversion of GTAs to GAs allocated by the Graduate Dean, and TAs, allocated by the Provost and Deans. This part adds no additional cost. The second part was the 85 additional positions. Leifer said that the second part should be tabled and sent to the Finance Committee for review.

Brokaw said that funding of additional positions was not part of Proposal 8-94. This seemed clear. Only the division of GTAs was being considered, and a vote for the proposal was in no way a vote for additional positions. Bornhorst said that Brokaw was correct. The first page contained the proposal, and the remainder was supplemental material. Hubbard said a budget reallocation was

contained in the proposal. Bornhorst said that this involved no additional funds.

Nelson said there should be concern about the method of allocating GAs. Allocation "to meet graduate school and research goals" was vague and unclear, and more detail needed to be provided. Bornhorst invited Dean Lee to reply.

Lee said that if the allocation method were adopted, the same subcommittee that produced the proposal provide him with recommendations about the allocation of GAs. The actual mechanism is as vague as the current allocation of GTAs. The guiding principle would be to obtain departmental proposals on the need for GAs to relieve faculty members from some teaching obligations to develop their research and graduate programs. The details on percentages of GAs allocated to various departments would be based on committee recommendations.

Nelson asked whether the basis of GA allocation would be research productivity or need for relief from teaching. Lee said that awards would be made to enhance research productivity. The basis would not necessarily be what departments have done, but were development was needed.

Morrison commented that she had chaired the subcommittee that produced the proposal. She said the Graduate Council advises the Graduate Dean on the allocation of GTAs. Departments request GTAs to support both departmental teaching and graduate programs. The Council felt unable to advise on teaching needs. The proposal is intended to separate teaching concerns from graduate program development. GAs and TAs are to have the same duties; they will both be supported from the GTA fund; the allocation will differ.

Leifer asked if the difference between a GA and TA is only in the allocation. Bornhorst said this was correct. Heuvers asked how in a department a GA could be distinguished from a TA. Morrison said this was irrelevant.

Grzelak said GTAs were used in his department for normal lab teaching. His constituency worried about the reduction in numbers of TAs available to meet these obligations. They also thought that graduate assistants to support research should be funded from research contracts.

Jobst said that his concerns were like those of Nelson; the Senate was being asked to vote on the proposal and would be informed later of the details of its operation. His constituents were concerned that they would be penalized because the graduate program in Humanities was less traditional; large amounts of funding are not available. A criterion for awarding GAs based on funding would discriminate against the department. Jobst asked whether there was any assurance that the GAs would be allotted fairly. Morrison said that the same person making the decision now would be making it under the proposed plan. The Humanities department should not lose out therefore.

Bulleit said his constituency thought the proposal to be better than the existing method of allocation. Heuvers said that the Math Department made heavy use of GTAs in teaching, and he was concerned that all the money for the TAs would have to come from the teaching budget, and they would get no GAs at all. He asked what would happen under those circumstances. Bornhorst referred the question to Provost Dobney.

Dobney said that if the graduate program were to grow in accordance with the 5-year plan, there would have to be an investment in graduate students, and that 85 new positions was not an unreasonable goal over a period of years. The number of TAs would become equal to the number of GTAs currently; departments like Humanities and Mathematics would not lose positions. The proposal is philosophically sound, with all teaching resources allocated from the deans. GAs would be allocated in response to departmental proposals for increasing research productivity based on release from faculty teaching. Further allocation would be

based on results from the program, not history.

Nelson asked whether 85 new GTAs would be the most productive use of the \$1M-\$2M needed for their support. If departments are to be held accountable for improvement in research programs, departments ought to be able to have some discretion in spending the extra funds rather than having them specified for use with GAs. For the same amount, graduate graders might provide a greater release of faculty time than GAs. Nelson said he found the proposal confusing, because if teaching loads were to be covered with TAs, what would the GAs be doing? Funds might be used more efficiently hiring graduate students to grade papers at \$6/hr, rather than a GA at \$20,000 per year. Lee replied that the departments would have some flexibility in use of the TA funds from the deans; they could be used for graders or temporary faculty. Morrison said that departments had been surveyed for GTA duties and needs. The diversity of work is broad. The intent of the GA is to free up faculty time for faculty research. Lab teaching falls onto the faculty when GTAs are not available.

Dobney said that the purpose of the GA is to allow release time for faculty. Viewed in this way, the connotation is different than if their allocation is merely another way to get a GTA. Obtaining a GA would permit the department to reallocate faculty time, and permit the faculty to pursue the research that was the basis of the award. Viewed in this way, the GA is an award of free time to the faculty to do research.

Leifer said that he was no longer clear that GAs and TAs were the same. Further, he wanted reassurance that the requested increase in numbers of GAs (35) and TAs (50) was not part of the proposal. Bornhorst said that he had a copy of a memo from Lee to Dobney [Appendix I of these minutes], which was a budget

\*\*\*\*\*

request for the new positions at the numbers Leifer indicated. He also said that the upper division labs in his department were covered mostly by faculty, and that GAs would free up faculty time in these circumstances.

Beck said that some departments already have a tiered system for their faculty, so research faculty don't do as much teaching. The teaching load can be distributed within the current system. The advantages of the proposal to such departments is not clear.

Nelson said that the discussion was confusing. He asked if TAs would be assigned to cover classroom duties based on the requests to the deans, and the GAs would not be assigned to cover any class. Morrison said that this was incorrect, because no differences existed between GAs and TAs under the proposal; the proposal is designed to maximize flexibility in allowing departments to meet their teaching needs. Nelson said he agreed with this idea, but that it would be better to award departments the funds directly, rather than awarding GAs. Accountability should be based on maximum flexibility. Morrison said this was a possibility, that the Vice-Provost could request funds to be used to enhance research productivity. Morrison added that the provost had met with the Graduate Council to ask for their input on spending to meet the university's goals; this proposal was part of the response. The TAs are not seen as particularly directed toward achieving graduate school goals; rather they are meeting instructional goals. Whether to put the money toward GAs or some other means of enhancing research is the decision of the provost.

Bornhorst asked for discussion of the proposal to be halted temporarily to permit Galetto to make some statements on Proposal 7-94. Heuvers MOVED to table Proposal 8-94. Grzelak seconded the

motion. The motion passed without dissent in a voice vote.

B. Proposal 7-94. Bornhorst called for consideration of Proposal 7-94, Evening Examinations; the proposal [Appendix B of these minutes] had been circulated with the agenda of the previous meeting. Heuvers MOVED to approve Proposal 7-94. Carstens seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the recommendation for voting units. Sewell said that the issue covered areas other than academic units. Counseling handles cases of students trying to cope with exams, and encounters scheduling difficulties in helping students. Keen said that the recommendation was based on the constitution's clear definition of examinations as falling within the jurisdiction of academic departments. The senators from academic units were obliged to pay close attention to the concerns of the other units in their deliberations. Bornhorst said that the academic unit representatives only would vote on the expansion of the voting units. Glime MOVED that the non-academic units be added to the voting units on the proposal. Filer seconded the motion. Glime said that the scheduling of all events on campus is affected by the evening exam policy, and all units should have a vote. There was no further discussion and the motion PASSED in a voice vote.

Galetto distributed a handout about the proposed change. He said that the registrar and scheduling area could live with the policy as it is proposed. Marie Ryding, who handles exam scheduling and conflict, had prepared in response to a question at the previous meeting a table showing the number of evening exams and scheduling problems [Appendix C of these minutes]. She had also proposed some rewording of the Proposal.

Keen MOVED to send Proposal 7-94 back to committee. There were problems with its wording as suggested by the memo from Ryding. An instructor could claim that an evening exam is an irregular evening examination, to keep from falling under policy governing regular evening examinations. Another problem involved the recourse available to students when instructors choose to violate the policy. A mechanism should be provided for students to complain of policy violation without fear of reprisal. The action the students might expect should be spelled out if the instructor goes ahead with the policy violation. Glime seconded the motion.

Heuvers distributed photocopies of sections from the Student Handbook [Appendix E of these minutes] and from the Academic Faculty Handbook [Appendix F of these minutes], which indicate the complaint procedures that are already in effect and available to students. Heuvers said that a violation of the university examination policy is a violation of the faculty contract.

Keen said that the problem lies in the channeling of complaints through the department head; students lack confidence that there will be an effective response to complaints, and they fear reprisal from the faculty member.

Glime said that the policy needed careful wording, because it was not possible logistically to schedule all the exams in the week when it was most reasonable to have exams. The few number of rooms holding large numbers of students are over-subscribed. The policy had to be rewritten so as not to restrict the administration of lab exams over several hours with several groups of students. The policy must give priority to the courses with the largest numbers of students.

Grzelak said that publishing the evening exams in the schedule booklet was a problem because instructors often did not know their teaching load when the booklet went to press. Scheduling in the booklet was an impossibility.

Sewell said that instructors frequently place students in a untenable positions by refusing to yield to other evening exams. Also, when students complain to department heads, they often are told to go back to talk with the faculty person involved.

Consistent guidelines need to exist.

Leifer said that previous policy had indicated "precedence will be given to the class with the largest size and the lower level class". The current proposal has dropped the latter phrase; the issue needs to be clarified in case of a conflict between a larger second year class and a smaller first year class. Nelson asked whether the policy applied to take-home examinations. Heuvers said it did not. Leifer said that a take-home exam was not a regular exam. Nelson asked whether the policy would apply to an exam to be given at 6am. Heuvers said that an alternate time would have to be provided for students with conflicts.

Mroz MOVED to halt discussion of the motion. Glime seconded the motion. The motion PASSED in a voice vote.

The motion to send Proposal 7-94 back to committee PASSED in a voice vote.

C. Proposal 8-94 (Part 2 of 2). Bornhorst asked that the matter of Proposal 8-94 be taken up again. Hubbard MOVED to take from the table the motion to approve Proposal 8-94. Huang seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Glime MOVED to amend the motion: to approve Proposal 8-94, but to send to the Finance Committee consideration of how best to spend the funds allocated to additional GAs. Leifer asked that this be changed to GA/TAs. Glime agreed to the alteration of her amendment, and agreed that the provision should be to send finance issues to the Finance Committee. Nelson asked whether the proposal or the motion could be amended. Bornhorst said that in this case the Proposal itself should be amended.

Jobst seconded the motion. Bornhorst said that the motion involved the addition of a sentence saying that budgeting of additional GA/TA positions should be sent to the Senate Finance Committee for consideration.

Boutilier said that amended or not, a proposal that produces oscillating confusion and unconfusion could not be a good proposal. Glime said that the effect of her amendment would be to accept the division of the allocation of teaching responsibility to the Provost, and the allocation of the remaining positions by the Vice-Provost, but would keep separate the budget part of the proposal.

Brokaw said that the increase in funding was not part of the proposal, so that it did not seem sensible to have an amendment having the finance committee look at a part of the proposal that

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4203                      Minutes of Senate Meeting 208                      26 Jan 1994

was not a part of the proposal. Brokaw said the finance committee should be working with the administration on the distribution of various additional requests, and that requests for additional GTAs would be made whether Proposal 8-94 passes or not.

Dobney said that Brokaw had described the way the process would work, and that he would be coming to the Finance Committee in the next month with a copy of the budget, to get their input in prioritizing a variety of budget requests. Heuvers asked what had been planned financially if the proposal were passed. Dobney said that the numbers discussed in the Senate were only a proposal from Dean Lee, and that if no additional allocation were made for assistantships, the GTAs currently allocated would not be reduced. The number would be allocated differently, because they would be allocated by the provost's office to the deans, who would allocate them in conjunction with the faculty lines to meet the instructional needs of the colleges. If GTAs are added, they will go into the GA pool; the number of GAs will depend on the number added. The current level of support for the TA category will not

be reduced, because it would create problems for departments in meeting their current teaching obligations.

Heuvers said it appeared that the amendment was not needed because it would happen anyway. Beck asked Dobney whether there were now 126 TAs and zero GAs, assuming no increase in funding the positions. Dobney said that was his current thinking.

Morrison said that the rough division suggested by the subcommittee was approximately how they are currently allocated between teaching obligations and support of graduate programs. Some departments now receiving GTAs, for example Forestry and Metallurgy, have arguably less need for GTAs than other departments. The GTAs in these departments are in fact GAs. The subcommittee, with equal representation from research and teaching departments, feels that currently there are 74 TAs and 52 GAs.

Dobney said that his misunderstanding of the proposal was the equal of others.

Keen MOVED to halt discussion on the amendment. Mroz seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

The motion to amend the proposal FAILED in a voice vote.

Heuvers MOVED to table the motion to adopt the proposal. Leifer seconded the motion. Keen said that a decision was needed on the proposal so that departments soon could offer assistantships of some sort to incoming graduate students. Bornhorst ruled Keen's comment to be out of order. The motion to table FAILED without dissent in a voice vote.

Mroz MOVED to halt discussion of the motion to approve the proposal. Jobst seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

The motion to approve Proposal 8-94 PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 10-9.

D. Proposal 10-94. Bornhorst said that the Provost had asked for a stronger definition of "final exam week" in the 1992 revision of the final exam policy. The Instructional Policy Committee had proposed the clarifying amendments indicated in the text of the proposal [Appendix F of these minutes], which had been circulated with the agenda. For clarity, it had been designated Proposal 10-94, Amendments to Final Exam Policy.

Jobst MOVED to approve Proposal 10-94. Bulleit seconded the motion.

Bornhorst asked for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Sewell said she had the same objection as in the previous consideration of Proposal 7-94. Glime MOVED that other course offering units and the non-academic units be included in the vote. Bulleit seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion passed in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal. Glime said that the third sentence in the second paragraph was vague. It might be interpreted as allowing courses with laboratory sections to be exempted from the policy; "them" should read "laboratory exams". Glime said the last sentence in the second paragraph needed revision, to allow instructors discretion in scheduling makeup exams. Scheduling make-ups for a Friday final exam can be impossible.

Keen MOVED to send Proposal 10-94 to the Instructional Policy Committee for reconsideration. He said that the policy describes no acceptable method for students to protest a violation of the policy, nor is there any specification of penalty for instructors who choose repeatedly to violate the policy. Sewell seconded the motion.

Heuvers said that if passed the proposal becomes university policy, and violations could be reported to the Senate, to the Undergraduate Student Government, or to the Ombudsman. Heuvers said the procedure should protect the student, and that the reports should be anonymous but should be something that could be



investigated.

Jobst said the committee should be informed of all the problems of the policy so the first revision would be successful. Bornhorst said that comments should be forwarded to Heuvers. Nelson asked why the department head or chair was not the appropriate person to enforce the policy. Keen said that students do not have confidence in the department heads; the students' perception may be wrong, but it did exist, and hampered policy enforcement.

Melton said that final exam policy problems were long-term, and that students could be as manipulative about the policy as faculty members. A university finals-culture has emerged, which has resulted in some faculty giving up on finals week. If there is to be a policy then it should be enforced, and faculty should not be allowed to take the easy way out, which they are under pressure to do. The timing of student evaluations and final exams prompt faculty to cave in to student demands. The university needs to address the issue that finals week is for final exams, not for early dismissal.

Boutilier said Melton was correct, that students manipulate the faculty. She said that Keen was also correct, that students need somebody to complain to about faculty violations of exam policy; the perception of backlash is real, even if the backlash is not. Further, many faculty will find ways not to give a final that is scheduled on Friday of finals week; this policy violation has been going on for years. The current policy has no teeth. The university has to decide that there will be ten weeks of instruction and a week of final exams.

Sewell said that the previous comments were all correct; a policy is needed because there is not now a finals week. The policy needs to include a procedure for waivers because extenuating circumstances do occur. Sewell said that tenth week is the most difficult on campus, involving classes plus finals plus report due dates. Students feel that finals week is a breeze after the tenth week.

Heuvers asked Dobney about possible solutions. Dobney replied that one solution might be the designation of a single person, such as the Dean of Students, for seeing that the policy is enforced. The Dean might also be required to validate excuses for missing a final examination; this would remove the pressure from the instructor.

Carstens said that the discussion showed that the 10-week quarter system was responsible for a lot of the problems of the tenth week and finals. Nelson said that he is concerned about discussions that involve changing the chain of command extending from the faculty through the chair and dean and provost. Altering this for final exams or any other matter is a serious breach of protocol; faculty members should not be answerable to another designated person. Problems should be brought to the attention of the appropriate supervisor.

Little said that as a student, he would not feel comfortable going to the department head; an outside person would be preferable.

Bulleit asked whether techniques for complaining should be put into every policy written by the Senate. The enforcement and complaint procedures should be separate from the policy itself. Sewell said that perhaps there should be a grievance policy developed for students. Heuvers said that the policy should be put into place, and enforcement could be considered as separate issue. Glime said that the committee should include students in

their discussion of the policy.

The motion to return the policy to the committee PASSED in a voice vote.

#### VIII. New Business

Proposal 9-94. Bornhorst asked to amend the agenda to permit the introduction of Proposal 9-94. Vanek MOVED to amend the agenda to go on to New Business. Bulleit seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst referred to Proposal 9-94, New Option in Discrete Mathematics for the MS Degree in Mathematical Sciences [Appendix G of these minutes], which was attached to the agenda. Bornhorst stated that the Proposal would be considered for approval at the next meeting.

#### IX. Old Business (Part 2 of 2)

E. Proposal 4-94. Bornhorst reminded the Senate of the memo [Minutes of Meeting 207, p.4199] received from Provost Dobney in response to the passage of Proposal 4-94, Suspension of the 3-Year-&-Out Policy. Bornhorst read a memo [Appendix H of these minutes] received from the chair of the Presidential Commission for Women. The memo asked that all persons affected by the policy be notified in writing of the possible exemption under the policy. Bornhorst said that no action was necessary, but the PCW suggestion could be considered in any appropriate way.

Dobney said that every temporary person affected by the policy had received copies of the policy with their contracts. Leifer asked for the reasons that Dobney had decided not to implement the suspension. Dobney said that implementing Proposal 4-94 would be a violation of Board of Control policy. Suspension of the policy would require Board approval, which would take until the end of the academic year. This would be unfair to the people involved. Dobney said he would prefer to work under the exception clause, which allowed him to make exceptions to the policy upon recommendation of the dean or director.

Glime said that distribution of the policy with contracts had occurred about a year ago, and that most of the affected persons understood that the contracts were not likely to be renewed after the third year. The PCW memo asks that the affected persons be notified that the provost is willing to consider exceptions to the policy. Dobney replied that it would be inappropriate to say that he would entertain exceptions; no exceptions would be considered without the support of the chair and deans.

Beske-Diehl said that the memo was asking for a letter notifying the affected persons that requests for exemptions could and should be directed to the chairs and deans, not to the provost. The persons need to realize that if the chairs want them to be teaching next year, they could be rehired.

Leifer said the problem of de facto tenure needs to be addressed. Obtaining tenure by means of annual reappointments as a temporary person is unfair to the individuals who have to earn tenure the usual way. Sewell said that the PCW agreed to the provost's handling of the proposal because a Handbook Revision Task Force is working on revision of the policy, addressing its inequities and also the problem raised by Leifer. Beske-Diehl asked whether Leifer's concerns were applicable under Michigan law. Melton said that the current Tenure Policy included a provision for tenure with a reappointment for the seventh year. Nelson said that Leifer's concerns applied only to tenure-track faculty, which are well-defined. Visiting or temporary appointees could not acquire tenure after six years.

Dobney said that he had shared Leifer's concerns when he arrived at MTU and discovered that there were persons on campus who had been instructors for 15 or 20 years. When asked whether these persons had de facto tenure, the university attorney had said

that the letter of tender states that the period of appointment cannot count toward tenure.

Leifer said that the AAUP could take up the case of a person reappointed for 15 or 20 years. The court case would result at least in more legal fees for the university attorney. Whether MTU won or lost in court, the university could be censured by the AAUP. AAUP censure is not needed in addition to the adverse publicity of the last few years.

Bulleit said that a Task Force on Handbook Revision will present recommendations on this issue, with lots of discussion time available then. The PCW has a logical suggestion which the Senate should support.

Bulleit MOVED that the Senate support the memo written by Debra Forsell of the Presidential Commission for Women. Grzelak seconded the motion.

Sewell MOVED that discussion of the motion be terminated. Glime seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent in a voice vote.

The motion of support PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

#### X. Adjournment

Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Carstens MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. Kawatra seconded the motion. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Secretary of the University Senate

.