

## THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 217

11 May 1994

## Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) approved the minutes of Meeting 214;
  - (2) learned that President Tompkins would not accept single nominees for university committees;
  - (3) accepted Proposal 29-94 Approval of Academic Calendar for 1994-95 as an emergency proposal and passed it;
  - (4) reconsidered Proposal 17-94 Policy on Academic Freedom, and returned it to the Faculty Handbook Steering Committee;
  - (5) approved Proposal 28-94 Rescission of Policy on Distribution of Grading Practices;
  - (6) approved Proposal 30-94 Record of Course Drops;
  - (7) amended editorially and approved Proposal 24-94 Faculty Grievance Policy & Procedures;
  - (8) approved Proposal 26-94 Release of Grades - Right to Privacy;
  - (9) approved Proposal 25-94 Course Grades;
  - (10) briefly considered Proposal 27-94 Mid-term Grade Report Policy.
- 

## I. Call to Order

Immediately at the conclusion of Meeting No. 216, President Bornhorst called Meeting No. 217 to order at 5:54 pm on Wednesday, 11 May 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. Senators or alternate representatives from Met & Mat Eng, AF ROTC, and Fine Arts were absent. Absent senator at-large: Filer. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, Dean of Sciences & Arts, and Staff Council.

## III. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors were F. Dobney (Provost & Executive Vice-President), M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), M. Janners (Dean of Students), and D. Ouillette (Registrar's Office).

## IV. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes], and proposed moving the report of the finance committee, adding a report of Instructional Policy Committee, and considering New Business before Old Business. Bornhorst asked for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Grimm MOVED to accept the adjusted agenda. Arici seconded the motion. The motion PASSED with no opposition in a voice vote.

## V. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst referred to the Minutes of Meeting 214 attached to the agenda sent to senators, and called for corrections. Keen noted that the pagination was erroneous. Grzelak MOVED to approve the minutes. Davutyán seconded the motion. The motion PASSED

without opposition in a voice vote.

## VI. Reports from Committees (Part 1 of 2)

A. Finance Committee. Committee Chair Pickens distributed a handout [Appendix B of these minutes] and reported on activities of three subcommittees. The Budget Oversight Subcommittee, chaired by E. Carlson, had spent the year becoming familiar with the budget. The Financial Management & Investment Subcommittee, chaired by J. Gale, worked with CFO McGarry to obtain good returns on some investments including the reserve required for the medical benefits for TIAA-CREF retirees, to refinance the bond debt on the Memorial Union, and to upgrade professional services including auditing and banking.

Jobst asked whether the medical benefits began immediately. Pickens replied that the benefits were immediately available to retirees, but that funding the benefits was divided between a long-term endowment and short-term payment of benefits.

## VII. Report of Senate President

1. President Tompkins has asked the Senate to submit the required three nominees for the Sabbatical Leave Committee, Athletic Council, and General Education Committee. Only one nominee was elected for each committee in Meeting No. 215. The problem will be addressed early in the fall term.
2. A clarification of a potential misunderstanding from the previous meeting: There will be only one Scientific Misconduct Policy for the entire university, including graduate students.
3. The Senate officers and Provost Dobney met on May 10. No action has been taken on Proposal 19-94 Policy on Class Attendance, Proposal 20-94 Recommendation on Optional Retirement Furlough Program, and Proposal 22-94 University Senate Administrative Evaluation. However, the Provost will recommend that the funding for the administrative evaluation be funneled through the Senate.

Bornhorst opened the floor to questions. There were none.

## VIII. Reports from Committees (Part 2 of 2)

B. Ad Hoc Committee for Search Guidelines for Major University Administrators. Committee Chair Hubbard reported that the Committee had met regularly and had written a proposal based on a revision of Proposal 7-92. Another parallel proposal for searching for officers other than deans has been prepared also. This will be discussed in a meeting on May 12 with the Committee, Bornhorst, and the provost. The proposals should be ready for Senate action in the fall.

C. Task Force for Tenure & Tenure-Track Policies. Bornhorst introduced Task Force Chair D. Nelson for a presentation on Task Force progress. Nelson reported, using a series of overhead displays [Appendix C of these minutes]. Nelson said that the revision of policies was part of the rewriting of the Faculty Handbook, and involved a four-part charge. The Task Force was taking a clean sheet approach rather than trying to patch existing policies. Policies of peer institutions and recommendations of the AAUP Red Book were being considered as models. A principle of the Task Force is that departments and schools are to be allowed substantial latitude in defining standards for tenure and promotion.

A draft policy will be presented to the Senate by mid-autumn. The Senate-approved policy must be submitted to the Committee on Academic Tenure, which will conduct a vote of the faculty, probably during the Winter Quarter.

Heyman asked whether the Committee on Academic Tenure would mark up the version approved by the Senate. Nelson said that the presence of Committee members on the Task Force allowed enough

communication to avoid this, unless the Senate were to modify the proposal substantially.

D. Board of Control Relations Committee. Bornhorst reported as Committee chair, and stated that the busy schedule of the May meeting of the Board of Control prevented holding a breakfast with Senate representatives. However, the Senate would be given a chance to report to the Board as part of the academic report given by the provost; the report would be by the Senate President. This Senate report is intended to be a regular part of the meetings of the Board of Control.

\*\*\*\*\*

Page 4559                      Minutes of Senate Meeting 217                      11 May 1994

E. Instructional Policy Committee - Calendar Subcommittee.

Subcommittee Chair Jobst reported that Subcommittee membership included Glime, Boutilier, and Devisch from USG, and that they have met regularly to consider a change to a semester calendar. The membership has attended and participated in campus forums, has interviewed faculty on both sides of the issue, and has polled chairs of departments. Conservatively, about 60 percent of the faculty support a change to semesters.

The opposition to quarters is focused on the interrupted winter quarter. Arguments for a semester calendar include a longer time for class work on topics and projects, and more faculty knowledge of students. Over the summer the subcommittee will develop a proposal for change to a semester system for consideration by the Instructional Policy Committee and the Senate in the fall.

IX. New Business

- Proposal 29-94 Academic Calendar for 1994-95. Bornhorst noted that the proposal [Appendix D of these minutes] had been circulated with the agenda, and said that the Senate had been asked to approve the Academic Calendars for 1994-95, 95-96, and 96-97. The Senate officers decided that only the next year should be considered. Bornhorst asked whether the Senate wished to consider the proposal immediately.

Heuvers MOVED that the Senate take up Proposal 29-94 as an emergency proposal. Diebel seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Dobney said that the first line of the calendar should read ". . . re-enrolling former students". Boutilier asked whether approving the next year's calendar was pointless. Bornhorst said that the approval was really a rubber stamp, but that the next two years' calendars would be considered early next fall. Hubbard noted some misspellings in the calendar.

Bornhorst called for further discussion of emergency consideration. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Heuvers MOVED to approve Proposal 29-94. Jobst seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. Sewell asked whether the scheduled fall orientation for re-enrolling former students was a new event. Janners said she did not understand why there was any orientation scheduled.

Bornhorst asked for objections to the statement of voting units. Sewell stated that she objected. Glime MOVED that the voting unit be expanded to the full Senate. Grimm seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without opposition in a voice vote.

Sewell restated her question about the new orientation. Ouillette said that re-enrolling former students had been asked the previous fall to arrive on campus for scheduling and registration

with new students. Bradley inquired about the wording of the activity. Bornhorst said the Senate was approving only the dates of the activities, not the activities themselves. Keen said the Senate in the past had been concerned with dates of the winter break period, and this proposal was intended to avoid such problems.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve Proposal 29-94 PASSED in a voice vote without dissent.

## X. Old Business

A. Proposal 17-94 Policy on Academic Freedom Bornhorst noted that a motion to approve Proposal 17-94 [Minutes, p.4470] had been on the floor at the adjournment of Meeting 215, and called for a motion to continue consideration of the proposal.

Grzelak MOVED to take up the motion to approve Proposal 17-94. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst noted that the Senate had voted previously to expand the voting units to include the Other Course-offering Units. He then called for discussion on the motion to approve the proposal.

Moore said that the Senate had editorially removed the word "faculty" from the first line of the proposal in the previous meeting. Bornhorst agreed. Grzelak asked to what "members" referred if "faculty" was missing. Bornhorst said it should probably should read "members of the university". Hubbard MOVED to amend the proposal so that the first sentence would read "...the right of all members of the university community". Heuvers seconded the motion.

Heyman said that this wording was so vague as to make the policy useless, and would create many boundary problems. The urge to broaden the was laudable, but a better reading might be "faculty, librarians, and research staff".

Dobney said that the change was important. The policy was intended to protect the freedom of professors in the classroom to delve into controversial issues. The policy covers more than freedom of speech. All members of the university community have freedom of speech. Academic freedom has a special meaning, covering individuals who teach, including staff who have faculty appointments for purposes of instruction, and covering researchers in their areas of research. Broadening the coverage is a withdrawal to a different level.

Glime noted that the second paragraph extends academic freedom to students, and for consistency they should also be included in the first paragraph. Sewell asked Dobney about the place of professional staff who lecture in classes or who do research. Dobney replied that any individual engaged in the instructional or research mission of the university would be protected under the policy. Beck suggested changing the wording to read "those involved in the teaching and research process".

Grzelak said that, because the policy was intended for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook, it should cover only those individuals to whom the handbook applies. Mroz said that the concept of academic freedom could not be extended to students, and that the lines including students should be stricken from the proposal.

Heuvers asked whether professional staff involved in their professional duties should be covered by the policy. Grzelak said that such a statement would be appropriate in the proposed staff handbook. Sewell said that the staff handbook did not yet exist, and the policy should include all university members. Moore said it was important that librarians be protected by the policy in carrying out their jobs.

Whitman said that students were included at several points in

the policy, and that they should have the right to debate with an instructor. Mroz said that students cannot get fired for arguing with an instructor, and that the critical point of academic freedom is the protection from loss of a job. Heyman said he disagreed; the policy applies principally applies to faculty, but teaching is a reciprocal process and students need protection in a teaching setting. Students should not be penalized for disagreeing with an instructor. Heuvers said that students need protection from faculty. Julien said that the inclusion of other groups does not put any limitation on faculty. Glime said that including other's rights in a faculty handbook would require faculty to recognize the rights of other groups. Heyman said that if the amendment were defeated, he would propose an amendment with more specific language.

Goodrich said she qualified as professional staff, but would never expect the type of freedom that faculty can expect in performing their classroom duties. She said that her first loyalty is to MTU, but that faculty belong to a community of scholars that extends beyond the university.

Roblee asked whether Public Safety should be permitted the right to do their job as they thought it should be done, without oversight of the institution. McKimpson asked whether the policy should address the individuals covered, or the types of activities covered by academic freedom.

Keen MOVED to send Proposal 17-94 back to the Faculty Handbook Steering Committee for further consideration. Heuvers

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4560      Minutes of Senate Meeting 217      11 May 1994

seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion of the motion.

Mullins said the proposal did need further work, because the proposal made academic freedom almost synonymous with free speech. The act of teaching differs from the act of speaking out or talking, and academic freedom applies to the way things are taught. Heuvers said that the Steering Committee should emphasize the importance of the policy to faculty specifically.

Bornhorst called for further discussion of the motion to send the proposal to committee. There was none. The motion PASSED without opposition in a voice vote.

B. Proposal 28-94 Rescission of Policy on Distribution of Grading Practices. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4550]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal. Grzelak seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Sewell said that grading practices affect students, which in turn will affect other divisions of the university. Mullins said that grading practices were not the purview of everybody on campus.

Heuvers MOVED to include the Other Course-offering Units in the voting units. Heyman seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. Sewell said that the grading practices affected counseling practices. Heuvers said that the proposal did not concern awarding of individual grades, but involved only the generation of a report on grade distributions.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to expand the voting units PASSED in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the proposal. Roblee said that the proposal called for termination of the requirement for generation and distribution of a report showing the grades awarded by different levels of classes in different departments. The

proposal was not prompted by conversion to the Banner system. The report required effort, and nobody seemed to care about the report.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

C. Proposal 30-94 Record of Course Drops. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4551]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal.

Davutyan seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Sewell said that grading practices affect students, which in turn will affect other divisions of the university. Heuvers MOVED to expand the voting unit to the full Senate. Glime seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion to expand the voting units PASSED in a voice vote.

Dufrane asked what was the premise behind the proposal. Janners said that the faculty for a long time had been concerned with the lengthy drop period. After the six-week drop deadline, a course may be dropped only with permission of the Dean of Students. The current late-drop policy is hard to enforce, and grades of I and X are available when a student cannot complete the work. The intent of the proposal is to reduce the period during which a student may drop a course with no record of enrollment. The intent is also to encourage students to think more carefully when enrolling for a course, and to provide a disincentive for frequent course dropping.

Heuvers said that the policy is consistent with policies at Michigan and Michigan State, although those institutions record W grades starting in the second or third week of the term. The policy does nothing but require a W on the transcript for drops after the third week of class.

Glime said that the proposal sent to the students asked for a W being recorded in weeks 4-8; she asked why the proposal had been modified from this period. Heuvers said that the Instructional Policy Committee had decided that the 8-week date might as well have specified the end of the term at 10 weeks; the current 6-week date was accepted as a compromise. Janners said the original proposal had called for a W being recorded for weeks 4-6, and that after week 8 no drops would be permitted. Fynewever said the only change is putting a mark on the record of a student who drops between weeks 4 through 6, which seems like punishment.

Heyman asked whether there was evidence from the other schools that the policy would solve the problem of students waiting until the end of the sixth week to drop a course. Boutilier said she hoped the policy would urge students to drop a course earlier in the term. Students frequently delay dropping a course until it affects their work in other courses. Sewell said the current drop policy needs modification. However, students will perceive the early W as punishment in their pursuit of higher grades a punishment rather than a help.

Mroz asked whether the W would be erased from the transcript if a student retakes the course. Janners said it would not be erased. Janners added that in discussions with student groups, the students had agreed that the proposed policy was correct, although it was somewhat disagreeable. USG in fact had voted to support the original proposal.

Dufrane said that USG had voted to support the original 4-8 week proposal. However, the newly elected USG had just voted to rescind that support. The new USG sees no use for the policy.

Mullins asked whether there had been some change proposed in the tuition structure to discourage enrolling for more credits. Malette said that a real concern was the closing of classes and making them unavailable to students. A student who intends to complete only four courses will schedule five with no penalty. Tuition rates are being studied to find whether frivolous

enrollments can be restricted.

Carstens said that the drop policy difficulties are a problem associated with the quarter system. Sewell said that manipulations of scheduling and dropping are an evident problem, and are self-defeating for the students. However, the approach to the problem should be broader than that in the proposal.

Roblee said that if the Senate thought that the proposed policy was onerous for students, it should be defeated. If the Senate thought that the proposal would provide a disincentive for frivolous enrollment, the proposal should pass. Heuvers said that the proposal does not change the drop date. Glime said that if the proposal aims to solve the problem of drops late in the term, then the students should be asked for solutions to the problem. The disadvantages to the students currently include scheduling problems and increased tuition.

Carstens said the proposal was an attempt to patch a poor system. Mullins said he agreed with Carstens, and that the ultimate solution rested in the tuition schedule.

Heyman said that the solution to the drop problem should be systematic, and should come from the tuition schedule. However, defeating the proposal and sending it to the students will not bring about a stronger solution. It was bizarre to think that giving Ws was an onerous policy. The six-weeks drop date is intellectually indefensible from the point of view of college-age students. It promotes micro-management of class performance. In fact, the proposal is not systematic, and is very weak.

Janners said that the current system encourages students to act against their own interests. Students need to learn to accept early negative feedback as information, away from a course. Fynewever said that academically troubled students are unsure of their performance on exams that are not handed back before the end of the sixth week. These students should not be marked on their transcripts. Roblee said that students need feedback on their performance, which requires exams and grading, which requires time at least through the sixth week. However, a W on the transcript after the fourth week is not a big deal.

Dobney said that the point of a course withdrawal system is not to allow students to manage grade-point averages, but to allow them to exit a course gracefully if they cannot understand

\*\*\*\*\*

the instructor or the material. A statement that a student did not stick out a course to the end is honest, not onerous.

Grimm said that there is too much emphasis on grades, and too little on learning. Alteration of the tuition schedule is not likely to be effective, because tuition is paid largely by parents who may not be aware of the subtleties of over-scheduling and dropping courses. Arici said that early grades could not be a complete measure of success, because F and D grades are given.

Julien MOVED to end discussion of the motion. Mroz seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

The motion to approve the proposal PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 16-12.

D. Proposal 24-94 Faculty Grievance Policy & Procedures. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4538]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal. Grzelak seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. There were no objections. Bornhorst called for discussion of the proposal.

Julien MOVED that as an editorial change the terms "week day"

and "calendar day" should be replaced by "work day" throughout the proposal. Carstens seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion of the amendment. There was none. The motion to amend PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Julien noted that the faculty review committee mentioned in the proposal had not been defined, because it was not clear whether the committee would function only for faculty grievances, or as part of other review processes. Bornhorst said that other task forces involved in revising the Handbook would also be proposing similar review committees.

Julien said a constituent was concerned about the interaction between the review committee and the university ombudsman, and about the starting of the clock for the grievance process. The response of the Task Force was that any consultation with the ombudsman would not negate the ability to start the grievance process.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

E. Proposal 26-94 Release of Grades - Right to Privacy. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4547]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal. Greuer seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Sewell said her previous arguments applied to this proposal. Heuvers MOVED to expand the voting unit to the full Senate. The motion was seconded. Bornhorst called for discussion. Heuvers said the expansion was appropriate, because the release of grades involved counselors and other staff. The motion to expand the voting units PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Grzelak asked how the grades might be posted to be consonant with the policy. Heuvers said that some instructors had assigned random numbers to students in their classes for grade posting purposes. Glime said that the prohibition against the full social security number implied that a partial number was permissible. Carstens said that "readily identifiable manner" was loosely stated. Grzelak said that the last four digits of a Social Security number can identify a student. Roblee said that several students might have the same final digits. Grzelak said that this was unlikely for students in the same class. Julien said that students can be assigned a number. Davutyan said the last four digits were no more anonymous than the whole number.

Dobney said that the University of Michigan and other Big 10 schools were moving to systems involving a Personal Identification Number (PIN) for each student, and moving away from Social Security numbers. Ouilette said that PIN numbers may be changed during an academic year, that they were used for several purposes, and that they were used to access an electronic system that must be secure. Beck said he would like to be furnished with a grade roster having some ID numbers, so that photocopying the roster would allow posting of grades. Faculty do not have time to assign random numbers.

Sewell said that the common practice of returning course work in a box in a hallway was a violation of the privacy policy. Roblee said that students were the driving force behind the posting of grades. Sewell said that students wanted the grades posted, but without the possibility of being identified as getting the lowest grade in the course. Heyman said that he returns student work in boxes, but only after distributing it to students in class. Sewell said she agreed with Heyman's practice, but that many instructors hand back all work in open boxes.

Boutilier said that there had to be some way to maintain the constitutional right to privacy. Roblee asked what had changed recently to make a problem of posting of the last five digits. Sandberg said that the posting problem could be solved. However,

there was no choice but to vote in favor of the proposal, or the Senate would be scofflaws.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to approve PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

F. Proposal 25-94 Course Grades. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4545]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal. Arici seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Heuvers MOVED to expand the voting unit to include the Other Course-Offering Units. Arici seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion to expand the voting units PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the proposal. There was no discussion. The motion to approve the proposal PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

G. Proposal 27-94 Mid-term Grade Report Policy. Bornhorst called for consideration of the proposal previously distributed to the Senate [Minutes, p.4548]. Heuvers MOVED to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded.

Bornhorst asked for objection to the recommendation of voting units. There was none. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Heyman asked whether the Senate wished to deal with the issue of High-Resolution Grades which had been brought up at the last meeting. Roblee said that the subcommittee working on the issue had determined that it should be withheld until the university moved to electronic grade reporting.

Bornhorst asked for discussion of Proposal 27-94. Keen MOVED to amend the proposal by striking all wording through the first word of the last sentence, the entire proposal to read "It is strongly recommended that instructors inform all the students in their classes about their midterm grade status by the end of the fifth week of the quarter". Jobst seconded the motion.

#### X. Adjournment

Bornhorst called for a motion to adjourn. Mroz MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Secretary of the University Senate

.