

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 220
5 Oct 1994

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Approved the minutes for meetings 218 and 219.
- (2) Learned that Bornhorst declared a vote invalid in a Senate Standing Committee because non-committee members had erroneously voted.
- (3) Discussed again a possible change from quarters to semesters but reached no conclusion on how to proceed.
- (4) Reached no conclusion on 24-94: Faculty Grievance Policy, then sent this proposal and a related proposal (5-95) back to committee.
- (5) Approved 17-94: Policy on Academic Freedom with editorial changes.
- (6) Continued discussion of 1-95: Sabbatical Leave Policy, but time ran out before a vote was possible.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from Chem Eng., AFROTC, Army ROTC, Education, IWR, and NAGrp 3; two liaison non-voting members; and a rep from Staff Council.

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

The only visitor was I. Cheney (Employee Relations).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst made several agenda adjustments: Under "8: Old Business," add 24-94: Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedure. Change remaining items to "B" and "C". Add to "9. New Business," a "D. 5-95: Recommendations for Grievance Committee." Finally, move 9D to be considered after 8A since the two items are related. Arici MOVED and Kawatra seconded to approve agenda adjustments. There was no discussion, and motion CARRIED on a voice vote. [Appendix A.] NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. MEETING 218

Beck called attention to the large number of "Appendices attached" phrases in the minutes, but none was in fact attached. Bornhorst explained that the majority of these were already in the hands of the Senate but were left off the minutes to save paper and copying costs. Appendices, however, would be attached to the minutes destined for the archives. Beck suggested a sentence in future to explain this policy.

MOVED by Heyman, second by Huang to approve minutes of Meeting 218. Motion CARRIED on voice vote.

B. MEETING 219

Leifer argued that the minutes referring to the new Sabbatical Leave proposal should reflect his suggestion to allow a single, extended sabbatical for faculty who had not previously taken them. In effect, this would be an accumulation of several sabbatical leaves. This plan, Leifer explained, would "take me out of the Provost's hair for five years." Leifer then MOVED and Hein seconded to approve the minutes of meeting 219, as amended. Motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

5. RULING BY SENATE PRESIDENT

Bornhorst read the following statement invalidating a vote for the chair of the Senate Finance Committee, a Senate Standing Committee, because the vote included several individuals who were not in fact Senate-approved members of the committee. "The Senate must operate on democratic principles and hold itself to high ethical standards. In the Minutes of Meeting 219, which we just approved, the finalized committee appointments were distributed and there were no objections from the floor. Any changes to this list must be approved by the full Senate as was done last year. Late last week the Finance Committee held an election where three persons not on this list voted in an election of the Chair. This is not acceptable under democratic procedures. I have no interest in controlling who is elected Chair, but I expect fairness. Thus, I hereby rule that the recent election of the Chair of the Finance Committee is NOT valid. Further, I now direct [Senate] VP Glime to convene a meeting of ALL members of the Senate approved Finance Committee for the purpose of electing a Chair. In the case that a tie occurs within this eight person committee, the full Senate will be asked to select the Chair by secret ballot.

"I wish to close by saying that Proposal 3-95 was drafted by the officers before this incident occurred. The officers believe the Senate must control its Standing Committees."

Leifer argued that last year anyone could be on a standing committee. Bornhorst said that anyone could be on a sub-committee, and anyone could attend a standing committee meeting, but only Senate-approved members may vote. Carstens asked if Senate Alternates could chair such committees; Bornhorst: "yes."

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

Bornhorst's comments:

A. UNIVERSITY NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD.

This group met on 9/21-22. Bornhorst led a full morning discussion on university governance. Senators Bulleit, Heyman, and Patricia Moore were in attendance as additional representatives.

B. GRADUATE COUNCIL

Met on 9/26. Graduate Students are preparing a Bill of Rights on the relationship between students and academic advisors. They have requested a Senate representative, but Bornhorst recommends they work on their own since a faculty member might dominate the discussion or intimidate merely by being present. There were no objections from the floor.

C. PRESIDENT'S CABINET

Met on 9/30 and discussed a draft proposal on discrimination and prohibited conduct; and a Long Range Strategic Plan. The President informed the cabinet that he has appointed a Presidential Committee on University Safety and Environmental Health.

Kawatra asked how many people were on the President's Cabinet. Glime said "about 30," and the cabinet meets sporadically.

D. PROVOST'S MEETING WITH SENATE OFFICERS

- Officers met with the Provost on 9/30 and discussion covered four items:
(1.) Minor name change for the Foreign Language program in the Humanities Dept.
(2.) Grievance Proposal.
(3.) Fringe benefits for summer research contracts. Matter sent to Research Policy Committee.
(4.) Strategic Planning.
(5.) University Health Care (to be discussed at a future Senate meeting).

E. FAMILY FUN DAY

This group is seeking volunteers to help with the event's organization.

F. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DRAFT PROPOSAL

Bruce Seely has sent a 20 page document on this topic. He may appear to discuss this proposal at the next Senate meeting.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS / REPORTS

A. BOARD OF CONTROL (BoC) RELATIONS COMMITTEE. Bornhorst reported that the BoC met on 9/23. Bornhorst made a presentation on behalf of the Senate, summarizing reasons for 30-94: Course Drop Policy and updating the BoC on other issues which will be brought for their approval as the Senate approves them.

The Course Drop Policy was approved by the BoC unanimously. They thanked the Senate for its input; they also appreciated student input on this topic.

B. COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS

Bornhorst reported on names sent to the President as the Senate's committee nominations.

RETENTION STUDY TASK FORCE. Bornhorst reported that Jeff Bell-Hanson and Mark Plichta had agreed to be nominees. For the TQE Committee on Classroom Scheduling Ray Halonen had agreed to be a nominee. The Senate accepted these individuals.

AD-HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHING. Dobney and Bornhorst charged this group, newly formed, to reach conclusions on three issues: Appropriate methods for evaluating teaching, Function of Center for Teaching Excellence, and Administration of Teaching Awards. [Appendix B.]

ATHLETIC COUNCIL. Bornhorst said he found no requirement that the Senate must select a member. Jobst said that Randy Freisinger has requested to be on this committee, and Jobst recommended his name be forwarded to the President. The Senate is unsure of the plans for this committee.

ACADEMIC TENURE. Jim Gale has requested a leave from the committee for one year. He will reassume his membership in the 95-96 AY if the Senate wishes. Leifer asked if an alternate was available. Heyman said de facto alternates in the past have been others running for this office, but only one person ran last year, Beth Flynn. It was suggested that Gale find his own replacement, but Leifer said we should find someone with a strong interest in this committee--someone who wished to serve; then hold an election by the tenured/tenure track faculty. Bulleit said the person should, furthermore, serve two full years. The Senate informally agreed to both suggestions. Bornhorst said the Senate must now locate people to run for this position.

C. INSTRUCTIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE--UNIVERSITY CALENDAR

Bornhorst asked Keen (Chair of committee) for a report on how to proceed on this topic, which has been debated for so many years. Keen outlined possibilities and gave a report on the history of this issue. Beginning in 1954, forty years ago, the University changed to a quarter plan with the concept that faculty would teach no MORE courses, but in ten week terms rather than 15 or 16. Since terms would be shorter, this would free faculty time for research and contemplation. Over time, however, the faculty eventually taught the same amount under the new plan.

Prior to 1960 the quarters were of variable length, approximating what we now call a "late quarter calendar." Then in 1974 the calendar changed to an early quarter plan to finish the AY by the end of May.

Keen identified two problem areas: 1. A semester, some argue, offers academic advantages with its longer time period. 2. The winter quarter is broken up and is difficult for everyone. A senator suggested turning over the problem to a TQE committee of students and faculty, but Keen said the decision will involve a value judgment.

Keen reminded the Senate of Fynewever's suggestion of a 10-5-5-10 plan, with the winter quarter similar to a summer, accelerated plan. No

student would have a grade pending after Christmas. Beck asked about conversion costs: if changes are not economically feasible, then stop deliberations now. Arici spoke against the five week terms, saying the plan would not work for graduate classes: insufficient time for projects, study, etc. Carstens said the five week plan might involve yet a fourth enrollment period, but Glime said a clear, annual schedule in the fall could cover this accelerated term.

Cross then spoke at length about the problems experienced by the University computing staff in updating software and making repairs to existing software. "We need 3-4 weeks," he argued, for such changes, "and the proposed [10-5-5-10] calendar would be even worse than we have now, which is almost impossible on my staff." Cross said his staff has been asked to work over Thanksgiving, and this is unfair. A lengthy period extending over Christmas break, however, would allow changes and updates. Cross called attention to the importance of a well functioning computer system on campus, and said the system grows more complex every year.

Brokaw speculated on the University commitment to Distance Learning and said the 10-5-5-10 plan probably would not be compatible. Glime promoted the 10-5-5-10 plan, pointing out that some departments, such as HU, could add the five separate weeks to the fall and/or spring, thus producing two fifteen week terms.

Discussion ended with no clear direction in sight.

8. OLD BUSINESS

A. 24-94: FACULTY GRIEVANCE POLICY & PROCEDURES and 5-95: REQUIREMENTS FOR GRIEVANCE COMMITTEES IN DEPARTMENT CHARTERS

Bornhorst reported that the Provost has returned proposal 24-94 with a recommendation that Departments describe in their charters a committee which would consider grievances rejected by the Chair. [Appendix C.] Senators argued that some grievances could not be handled effectively by a department committee, and Bornhorst asked for a listing of topics; all those

Page 4681

Minutes of Senate Meeting 220

5 Oct 1994

proffered were covered by other, recognized procedures. Other Senators argued that people outside the home department might be more objective. Bornhorst explained that the problem was in allowing faculty freedom to grieve major concerns, but to keep minor annoyances, such as flies on an office windowsill, at the department level. Heyman suggested an ombudsman. Greuer pointed out that current policy lacks time constraints on administrators in dealing with grievances.

Bulleit MOVED and Arici seconded to send both proposals to the Academic Policy Committee. Filer mentioned a good policy would mean fewer law suits for the University. After discussion ended, motion CARRIED on a voice vote. Bornhorst asked Heyman for a preliminary report at the next Senate meeting in two weeks.

B. 17-94: POLICY ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Bulleit MOVED and Heyman seconded to take this proposal from the floor and reconsider approving it at this time. No discussion ensued, and the motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

Whitt MOVED and Bulleit seconded an amendment to the end of the final paragraph: "In the event of a conflict between the policy on academic freedom and the tenure policy, the policy on academic freedom takes precedence. Moreover, the tenure policy shall be construed to promote academic freedom." After discussion ended, motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

Whitt then MOVED and Kawatra seconded to delete in the middle of paragraph 3, the phrase "in accordance with professional standards". After discussion ended, motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

Arici said some have worried that "distribution of knowledge" means

publishing. Jobst said it could mean any oral transmission of knowledge, such as teaching. Beck agreed.

Reed asked if the committee, when developing this proposal, considered scientific misconduct. Bulleit said no. Heyman said such proposals must cover generally, not specifically, as does the Bill of Rights. Reed countered that some areas should be explicit, such as plagiarism. Gruenberg asked whether the proposal should cover students and staff. Bornhorst said they might be covered in the forthcoming staff handbook. Discussion ended. Bornhorst asked whether amendments were editorial or substantive. Mroz argued that they were editorial so the Senate could vote tonight on the proposal. There were no objections from the floor. Motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

Bornhorst asked to amend the agenda further and introduce items under New Business so they could be voted on at the next Senate meeting. Brokaw MOVED and Carstens seconded. After no discussion, motion CARRIED on a voice vote.

9. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2-95: UNIVERSITY CLOSURE GUIDELINES

Bornhorst called attention to an aspect of the proposal: the excused absences for students as a result of a weather advisory.

B. 3-95: VOTING ON STANDING COMMITTEES

Leifer asked for clarification. Bornhorst said if this proposal passes, only Senators and Alternates may vote in the Senate standing committees.

C. 4-95: DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Bornhorst called attention to the discussion of "three year and out" plans, which will be unnecessary once the new definitions are passed.

8. C. (moved by agenda adjustment) 1-95: CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY

Bornhorst showed a table [Appendix D] obtained from the Administration listing the numbers of sabbaticals taken by department. School of Technology was not listed. Leifer noted that the table did not reveal how many quarters were taken by each person, and he requested this information.

Bornhorst suggested that the Senate vote on this proposal now and consider more dramatic changes at a later date. Leifer MOVED and Arici seconded to return the document to the Academic Policy Committee. During discussion Glime suggested accepting this document and making changes later that would encourage more sabbaticals. After discussion ended, motion FAILS on a voice vote.

Mroz MOVED and Irish seconded to support proposal 1-95. Patricia Moore asked for the Library to be included in voting units. Keen pointed out that individual units cannot be included, only groups. Roblee MOVED and Grimm seconded to allow "Academic degree granting and other course offering units" to vote on this issue. Without discussion the motion CARRIED (with dissent) on a voice vote by the Academic Degree Granting Unit representatives.

Bulleit MOVED and Glime seconded to amend the proposal and delete "must have tenure" from requirements and add after the phrase "six years" the word "consecutive." Heyman argued that the proposal needs tightening not loosening. Glime argued for some kind of leave for long term lecturers and instructors. After discussion ended, motion FAILS on a voice vote.

Mroz MOVED and Reed seconded to delete items 1, 2, 4 and 5 in the guidelines, but time, ever fleeting, had run out during discussion of this amendment.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Miner MOVED and Keen seconded to adjourn. Motion CARRIED. Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate

a