

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 235
12 April 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) Passed Proposal 23-95: Conflict of Interest Policy.
- (2) Passed Proposal 27-95: Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures, with amendments.
- (3) Passed Proposal 34-95: Grievance Policy Statement.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:30 pm on Wednesday, April 12, 1995 in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Jobst called the roll. Absent were representatives from both ROTC units and NaGrp 2. Liaisons in attendance were Brian Whitman (Grad Student Association), Aaron Dufrane (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Martha Y. Janners (Dean of Students), Ellen Horsch (Human Resources), Bruce Seely (Social Sciences), Barry Pegg and Cindy Selfe (HU), Sue Beske-Diehl (Geo/Geo Engineering), Marcia Goodrich (Tech Topics), and F. Dobney (Provost and Executive Vice President).

3. AGENDA ADJUSTMENTS

President Bornhorst, to everyone's surprise, offered no changes to the agenda. [Appendix A. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the Minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

Carstens MOVED, with Miner's second, to approve the agenda. President Bornhorst said that if there were no objections to the agenda, it would stand approved. There were none.

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. PROPOSAL 23-95: CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY

[Appendix B .] Heyman MOVED, with Roblee's second, to approve Proposal 23-95. No one objected to the voting units (full Senate).

Brokaw MOVED, with Sloan's second, to delete all of #5 on page 7 up to the heading "Advantages." He argued that this segment was a duplication of other sections in the proposal. Seely responded that there were philosophical reasons for its inclusion. This section, he argued, dealt with avoiding the appearance of a conflict. Brokaw said the University is the biggest offender of this issue. Beck asked if this section dealt with a legal issue, and Seely said no.

Bulleit raised the issue of MTU employees, with their lower overhead costs, competing for projects with local firms. Carstens asked if the University had a charge for overhead, and Seely replied that it is 15%, but not always collected. Dobney suggested that a section on Unfair Business Competition may be needed. With discussion ended, the Senate voted by roll call on the motion to delete all of #5 to the word "Advantage." Twelve voted "yes," with 17 "no." The motion to delete FAILED.

Whitt MOVED to replace "personal" with "professional" on page 1 in the main paragraph. Leifer seconded. When discussion ended, on a voice vote the motion FAILED.

Several people found various typos in the lengthy document. These were corrected by a ruling from the Chair.

Keen asked for a clarification of the subsections so the document would be more navigable. Mroz asked if he must disclose to his supervisor the stocks and bonds he owns. Seely said he did if they were relevant to a grant application. Bradley asked if NSF required a coordinator, and Seely said yes, by July 1. Bradley asked why all University proposals would go to the coordinator, and Seely said the committee thought this was a more equitable method. Bradley said it seemed inefficient. Seely said a conflict of interest could also occur in private sector activities. With discussion at an end, on a voice vote, Proposal 23-95 CARRIED with dissent.

Keen said the University faculty and staff are being held to a higher standard than the Board of Control (BoC). He subsequently suggested that the Senate attach to the proposal document a proviso that the BoC either accept the proposal in its entirety or table it so that the Senate may reconsider with the BoC changes. Seely said that the BoC members must complete a lengthy document outlining their own possible conflicts of interest, but these are not public documents. Neither Seely nor anyone else expressed objections to Keen's proviso.

B. PROPOSAL 27-95: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

[Appendix C .] Keen MOVED to approve the proposal; Heyman seconded. No one objected to the voting units: Degree-granting departments.

Sue Beske-Diehl said that section 3B2 discourages collaborative efforts. Janners said students must know when collaboration is permitted, and the level of collaboration must be clearly defined. Heyman MOVED to add to the top of page 1 after #4 a new section, #5, which would state "Clearly define for students the expected level of collaboration for individual work." Glime seconded. With no further discussion, on a voice vote the amendment CARRIED without dissent.

Keen MOVED to add the word "graded" to pages 1 and 2 (sections 2B and 3B, #2). Carstens seconded. After discussion ended, on a voice vote, the motion CARRIED without dissent.

Bulleit asked about changing "should" to "shall" or "must" on page two. Keen said this would change Tech's policy to an Honors requirement, and the University, he continued, is not ready for this.

Keen discussed problems with a star athlete who cheats just before a championship game. Fynewever said that NCAA rules already prohibit treating athletes any differently than other students. She said that giving an F* (which indicates cheating) to scholarship athletes effectively removes them from school because without the ability to play sports, they would lose their scholarships and thus would be forced to drop out of school.

Reed MOVED, with Mroz' second, to delete the phrase "...remaining on their transcripts after two terms (excluding summer)" from section VI, A, #2. The amended sentence would thus read "Students with an F* ... may not serve as an officer of any recognized student organization, nor represent the university in any varsity sports, student contests, or arts performances."

Some Senators wondered if it was appropriate to single out athletes, and instead to remove a scholarship from any student receiving such a grade.

With discussion at an end, on a voice vote the amendment reading "Students with an F* may not serve..." FAILED.

Keen, with Brokaw's second, MOVED to delete on page 1 under II, B, the "and/or" and replacing with a comma. On a voice vote the amendment CARRIED.

Bornhorst said he felt the changes were editorial, and there were no objections.

With no further discussion, on a voice vote Proposal 27-95, as amended, CARRIED without dissent.

Keen MOVED for an agenda adjustment, asking the Senate to consider Proposal 34-95: Grievance Policy Statement. Mroz seconded. Keen MOVED, furthermore, that he wished it to be considered an emergency. Roblee seconded. Senate Assistant Meyers distributed ballots, and the motion to consider 34-95 as an emergency proposal CARRIED 22 to 5.

C. PROPOSAL 34-95: GRIEVANCE POLICY STATEMENT

[Appendix D .] Keen then moved to approve 34-95, with Roblee's second.

Mroz said the voting units do not include research constituents, and Bornhorst said this was consistent with the original proposal from which this was drawn.

Leifer MOVED to table, with Arici's second. On a voice vote the motion FAILED.

Leifer MOVED to adjourn, with Arici's second. On a voice vote the motion FAILED.

Keen, with Sloan's second, CALLED THE QUESTION, and on a voice vote the motion CARRIED.

On a voice vote the Senate considered proposal 34-95. The motion to approve the proposal CARRIED.

5. ADJOURNMENT

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

Submitted by Jack Jobst
Secretary of the University Senate

.