

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 232  
15 March 1995

A Special Meeting

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Passed Proposal 19-95: Ph.D. Program in Geological Engineering.
- (2) Passed Proposal 28-95: Faculty Handbook Recommendation.
- (3) Passed Proposal 26-95: Undergraduate Academic Progress.
- (4) Tabled Proposal 24-95: Academic Calendar: Homecoming.
- (5) Tabled Proposal 13-95: Faculty Grievance Policy and Procedures
- (6) Continued discussion on Proposal 22-95: Revision of Senate Bylaws.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called this Special Senate meeting to order at 5:37 pm on Wednesday, March 15, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center, after the arrival of Senator Co, who completed the necessary quorum.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were At-Large Senators Grimm, Reed, and Roblee; Unit Senators from Math, Metallurgy, School of Technology, Army and Air Force ROTC, Fine Arts, and PE.

Liaisons in attendance were Brian Whitman (Grad Student Association), Aaron Dufrane (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Bill Rose (Geological Engineering), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Tim Malette (Financial Aid), Dennis Walikainen (Tech Topics), and F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst had no agenda adjustments, and there were none proffered from the floor. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Galetto MOVED to approve the agenda; Miner seconded. President Bornhorst said that if there were no objections to the agenda, it would stand approved. There were none.

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 19-95: Ph.D. PROGRAM IN GEOLOGICAL ENGINEERING

Filer MOVED, with Arici's second, to approve Proposal 19-95 [Appendix B]. Bornhorst asked if there were any objections to the voting: Academic Degree Granting Units (ADGU) only. There were none. After a brief discussion on whether the proposal would preempt other later, similar Ph.D. programs (Rose said it would not), the Senate CARRIED the motion to approve 19-95 on a voice vote without dissent.

B. PROPOSAL 28-95: FACULTY HANDBOOK RECOMMENDATION

Bulleit MOVED, with Keen's second, to approve Proposal 28-95 [Appendix C], which would produce two handbooks, one for tenure-track faculty, and one for non-tenure track faculty. Bornhorst asked if there were any objections to the voting units: ADGU only. Bradley asked if the issue involved University resources, and if so, other voting units should participate in the vote. Dobney said the handbooks would not involve any significant

University resources. Sloan said that considering "University resources" as a means of expanding the voting units could set a dangerous precedent. Heyman MOVED to expand the voting units to everyone except Non-Academic groups. Bulleit seconded. On a voice vote without dissent the motion to expand voting units on this issue CARRIED.

Heyman said the two handbooks would contain significant overlapping, and Keen said the printing costs would be higher. Whitt said that both groups should be aware of each other's responsibilities. Discussion ended, and on a voice vote by ADGU, Other Course-Offering Units, and Research Units, the motion appeared to CARRY with dissent. The results were contested, and Bornhorst directed the Senate Secretary to call for a voice ballot: the motion CARRIED 11 to 8 with one abstention.

C. PROPOSAL 26-95: UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRESS

Keen MOVED, with Bulleit's second, to approve Proposal 26-95 [Appendix D]. Bornhorst asked for objections to ADGU as the sole voting unit; there were none. Dean of Students Janners explained how the proposal would clarify probationary rules by considering the number of credits students have taken from their major department. There was no further discussion, and on a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

D. PROPOSAL 24-95: ACADEMIC CALENDAR: HOMECOMING

Arici MOVED, with Keen's second, to approve Proposal 24-95 [Appendix E]. Bornhorst reminded the Senate that the voting units were ADGU, and asked if there were any objections. Bulleit suggested adding Other Course-Offering Units. Heyman said the issue affects non-academic units as well. Keen said that issues involving the academic calendar, according to the constitution, were reserved for ADGU.

Filer MOVED, with Heyman's second, to expand the voting units to Other Course-Offering Units, and Non-Academic Groups. The motion to expand the voting units, on a voice vote by ADGU, CARRIED without dissent.

Bornhorst said that the Undergraduate Student Government (USG) president, Jeremy Kraenzlein, had asked that the issue be tabled until the USG has had a chance to study it and develop a more comprehensive plan dealing with the calendar. Brokaw said he would rather drop K-Day and expand Martin Luther King, Jr. Day than drop the half day at Homecoming.

Keen said the half day causes problems with lab classes. He noted that MTU and Western are the only Michigan schools which dismiss for Homecoming. He also pointed out that ending the class dismissal would not impact the Hobo parade. Janners said that Homecoming has changed significantly in recent years. Alcohol no longer plays as major a role, and the Varsity Club, which organizes the festivities, is not opposed to the elimination of the half day. Dufrane said that the calendar should not be changed piecemeal, and he spoke in favor of tabling the issue.

\*\*\*\*\*

Keen, however, said the USG has had a member on the Instructional Policy Committee for the entire year, and they have had sufficient time to consider this. Others, however, said students have other responsibilities than working on the calendar.

Sloan MOVED to table Proposal 24-95 until the April 19 meeting. Whitt seconded. On a voice vote the motion CARRIED with dissent.

E. PROPOSAL 13-95: FACULTY GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Heyman MOVED to approve Proposal 13-95 [Appendix F; see Minutes, p. 4870], with Greuer's second. Bornhorst recommended the voting units: ADGU, Other Course-Offering Units (OCOU), and Other Research Units. There were no objections. Heyman MOVED to replace the text of the original proposal with a rewritten version. Keen seconded. On a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

Heyman then MOVED, with Jobst' second, for a series of amendments to

the newly-amended proposal. First, replace all references in the proposal to "Impartial Panel" with "Appeal Panel." Heyman said the second term was a more accurate expression, since a truly impartial panel would not be possible to select. Discussion ended, and on a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

Second, Heyman suggested amending Section A.4, Step Five, paragraphs 1 and 2. The amendment involves a change in numbers and phrase in Paragraph 1 from three days to seven work days, and in paragraph 2 adding the phrase "after acknowledgment of receipt" to immediately after the phrases "within five (5) work days" and "within ten (10) work days." Heyman MOVED to pass this amendment, with Glime's second. After discussion, and on a voice vote without dissent, the motion CARRIED.

Third, Heyman MOVED, with Glime's second to replace in Section A.5.1 the phrase "The faculty member who is aggrieved shall have all such costs of travel paid by the University" with "If the faculty member's grievance is upheld after the appeal process is completed (as defined above), that person's travel expenses will be reimbursed by the University." In the discussion, several spoke against the likelihood of this requirement being necessary. On a voice vote the amendment FAILED.

Brokaw MOVED to eliminate entirely the same Section A.5.1 and renumber subsequent items appropriately. Moore seconded. Brokaw said it was unlikely that individuals involved in grievances would be at any distance from the University. Whitt said there must be more than a possibility of this occurring. Discussion ended, and this motion also FAILED on a voice vote.

Keen MOVED to change A.4.2, changing "Department Chair" to "Supervisor." Leifer seconded. After minor discussion, on a voice vote, the motion CARRIED.

Heyman MOVED to replace the relevant wording in A.5.1 with "...whose grievance continues past step 3 shall have subsequent costs of travel paid by the University." Keen seconded. Dobney suggested adding other potential costs, and Heyman then amended his amendment to read "shall have all related costs of travel paid by the University." Keen seconded this motion. Discussion ended, and on a voice vote without dissent this change in the amendment CARRIED.

Bornhorst then called for a vote on the amendment itself, now with the changed wording in the last line of A.5.1. On a voice vote without dissent the motion CARRIED.

Heyman continued with amendments. He MOVED to add an A.5.8 to read "In all instances the count of days in this document shall begin the work day after the indicated event or action." Bulleit seconded. Keen asked if the "day after" means "day 1," and Heyman said yes. No further discussion, and on a voice vote without dissent, the motion to amend and add this addition to the proposal CARRIED.

Whitt MOVED to add to Step 3, a question 5: "Is there new evidence not reasonably available at prior steps?" Bulleit seconded. Discussion ended on this issue, and the motion CARRIED with dissent.

Whitt MOVED, with Bradley's second, to amend the last page of the proposal, section A.5.7. To the end add "In no case does the faculty member relinquish his/her rights to access the documents."

Horsch said that if the documents were considered part of the personnel file, then the employee could access all of them. A personnel file, she continued, is a complete record, found in many offices. The file is not merely what is at one location. Horsch said all employees have the right to access their records; the amendment is not necessary.

Whitt MOVED to table Proposal 13-95 so that it can be polished. Leifer seconded. The motion CARRIED without dissent.

Beck pointed out that the document had been in existence since May of 1994, and he asked those working on it to make changes and return it quickly to the Senate because charter committees throughout the University needed it to finish their work. Keen asked if the proposal would be fine tuned, or reworked substantially. Whitt said her changes would be mainly for clarification.

[See Minutes, p. 5270, for a copy of this proposal.] Bornhorst said he again was not seeking a motion to approve this proposal, but wished the Senate to continue discussing this issue.

Bradley asked who would pay for staff time to attend to Senate business. Horsch said that, in the past, staff have compensated for time spent on committee business by working late or coming to the office after normal duty hours. Bulleit asked how many new constituents there would be if Professional Staff joined the Senate, and Bornhorst said about 350, but only six new Senators.

Soldan said Staff Council would be sponsoring a forum on the issue. The Senate will help Staff Council with a survey to be sent to affected personnel.

#### 5. ADJOURNMENT

Huang MOVED and Miner seconded to adjourn. Motion CARRIED. Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Jack Jobst  
Secretary of the University Senate

.