

THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL  
UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 244  
25 October 1995

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a report from Associate Dean Bowen (Sciences and Arts) on assessment
- (2) elected representatives to the Presidential Commission for Women and the Academic Integrity Committee.
- (3) approved members for the task forces on sabbatical leave and faculty development, graduate tuition, and TIAA/CREF benefits.
- (4) approved Proposal 10-94, Amendments to Final Exam Policy, with one amendment and one editorial change.
- (5) approved Proposal 5-96, Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development.
- (6) approved Proposal 33-95, Research Statement, with one editorial change.

## 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Bornhorst called the Senate meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. on Wednesday, 25 October 1995, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

Secretary Glime called roll. All unit representatives were present. Liaisons in attendance were Yadu Dar (GSC), David Henke (USG), and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

## 2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Fred Dobney (Executive Vice President and Provost), Stephen Bowen (Associate Dean, College of Sciences & Arts) and Bill Bulleit (Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching).

## 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Carstens MOVED and Diebel seconded the motion to accept the agenda as published. The agenda was APPROVED by voice vote. [**Appendix A**. NOTE: only official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

## 4. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

President Bornhorst reported that at Meeting 243 the Senate passed Proposal 7-94, Scheduling of Evening Examinations, while an open amendment was still on the floor. The open amendment was to insert the words "the following" before the word "conflicts" at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 4, to read, "Faculty scheduling evening exams must provide alternative examination times for students with the following conflicts." The President ruled that the words "the following" will be included in the final version of Proposal 7-94 sent to the Administration. There were no objections to the ruling, so the ruling stands. [**Appendix B**]

Proposal 29-95, Department of Education, and Proposal 37-95, Statement of the Value of Interdisciplinary Scholarship and Teaching, have been submitted to the Administration. [**Appendices C and D**]

President Bornhorst will try to provide a preliminary list of committee activities/work in progress next week as a handout, to be revised for submission of a better list before Christmas. Chairs should provide a list of their work in progress.

The Senate office is using the following procedure:

When a proposal is withdrawn by a committee, upon resubmission it is given a new proposal number. When a proposal is referred back to Committee by the Senate, it retains its original proposal number.

The Provost and officers met to discuss pending proposals on 24 October.

## 5. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Associate Dean Bowen (College of Sciences and Arts) presented the University Assessment Program Planning Process [**Appendix E**]. The plan was divided into three major areas. First, he addressed why we should have an assessment program. It is required for our impending accreditation review, we need to know the success of students when they are leaving the institution, and we need to find out if we are doing a good job of meeting our goals and use this information as a recruiting tool. Second, he addressed what assessment involves. It requires the definition of goals with multiple means of assessment, such as a capstone course, GRE scores, a portfolio, examination questions built into curriculum courses, or senior projects. Third, he addressed the plan for MTU, as designed by the Assessment Planning Committee that met last spring. The committee followed the 10 hallmarks suggested by NCA; assessment measures should be in three areas: disciplinary skills, breadth of understanding and skills for lifelong learning, and the acquisition of values and attitudes consistent with the traditions of scholarship. An Assessment Council, with a representative from every academic department and several other groups, provides oversight for a 3-committee structure: departmental committees for the major

discipline, values and attitudes committee, and the general education committee. These groups need to develop assessment instruments.

Senator Leifer asked who is being assessed; Bowen responded that the students as a group in a particular discipline or in the entire University. Leifer questioned success in what; Bowen responded that success should be evaluated for the goals set by the unit and that the assessment process is faculty owned. Senator Heyman pointed out that the two non-departmental committees were charged with evaluating the broader goals. Senator Arici asked if the different goals set among departments in a college might not weaken the college; Bowen responded that the goals should be different, and may even differ between different degrees within a department, but that the departmental goals should be consistent with the broad goals of the University. Senator Whitt asked if the assessment program was limited to undergraduates and Bowen responded no. Whitt asked how we would assess

5782

interdisciplinary aspects; Bowen responded that the committee had discussed that problem and decided that there were so few and such small interdisciplinary programs that we may not need to address that question yet. Provost Dobney asked if the goals for undergraduates and graduates were different; Bowen responded that they were. Arici asked who should carry this information to the faculty; Bowen responded that the departmental representatives had that responsibility. Liaison Dar (GSC) asked if all areas apply to the graduate school, since graduate school focuses on a narrow area of learning; Bowen responded that the graduate goals would be set appropriate to the discipline. President Bornhorst volunteered to be the Senate liaison to the Assessment Council. No one objected, so he will serve as the Senate liaison.

#### B. University Committee Representatives

There are three nominees for the Presidential Commission for Women: Jane Berner (Information Technology), Patty Lins (Information Technology), and Vicki Little (Advancement). There were no nominations from the floor. Soldan MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to close nominations. Jane Berner and Patty Lins WERE ELECTED by secret ballot.

There were 8 nominations for the Academic Integrity Committee for one each of three-year, two-year, and one-year positions. Nominees were Debra Bruch (Fine Arts), Jimmy Diehl (Geol. Eng. & Sci.), Bill Francis (Math. Sci.), Randy Freisinger (Humanities), Sue Martin (Social Sci.), Sheryl Sorby (Civil & Env. Eng.), John Sutherland (ME-EM), and Grace Swartz (Chemistry). There were no nominations from the floor. Walck MOVED and Soldan seconded the motion to close nominations. Jimmy Diehl WAS ELECTED by secret ballot for three years, Sue Martin for two years, and Randy Freisinger for one year. Runners up in order of votes were Bill Francis, John Sutherland, and Grace Swartz.

President Bornhorst presented the suggestions from the represented committees for the three task forces approved in Meeting 243. For the task force on sabbatical leave and faculty development, recommendations were for Christa Walck (Senate Executive Committee), Mangalam Gopal (Finance Committee), and Doug McDowell (Academic Policy Committee). For the task force on TIAA/CREF retirement health benefits, recommendations were for Les Leifer (Fringe Benefits Committee), Barry Pegg (Finance Committee), and Vicki Little (Ad Hoc Committee for Professional Staff Issues). For the task force on graduate student tuition, recommendations were for Martha Sloan (Institutional Planning Committee), Glenn Mroz (Finance Committee), and Dave Shonnard (Research Policy Committee). Arici MOVED and Thayer seconded the motion to accept the recommendations as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

## 6. OLD BUSINESS

### A. PROPOSAL 10-94, AMENDMENTS TO FINAL EXAM POLICY [Appendix F]

Keen MOVED and Arici seconded the motion to approve Proposal 10-94. The suggested voting units were academic degree-granting departments. Heyman MOVED and Arici seconded the motion to include other course offering units. The motion CARRIED on voice vote with no dissent. Senator Tyrell inquired what would happen if two courses were taken that resulted in a conflict. Senator Caspary suggested that the course conflict card be filed if there were exam conflicts. Senator Whitt asked for clarification on the last paragraph. Bornhorst ruled an editorial change to move the last sentence of the last paragraph to make a new paragraph so that it was clear it did not refer only to the three examinations per calendar day. There were no objections so the paragraph placement ruling stands. Keen clarified that if two faculty sign a course conflict card, that implies that they agree to provide an alternate exam time for that student. Whitt MOVED and Mroz seconded the motion to amend the word "will" to "need" in the paragraph on absences, to read, "Absences from final exams need not be excused when caused by a student scheduling courses with conflicting final examination times." Senator Fynewever said that the dean should decide, not the faculty member. The motion to amend PASSED by voice vote with dissent.

Senator Davis stated that prior discussion on Sunday exams had indicated that multisection courses taught by one instructor and not pre-slotted have in the past been able to schedule Sunday exams. Keen stated that the scheduling books indicated that no exams had been scheduled on Sundays for a year and a half, that the period of Friday to Sunday is too short for studying, and that no exams are scheduled Friday afternoon of exam week and that multisection courses could therefore be scheduled on Friday afternoon. Davis pointed out that an exam in business is scheduled on Sunday this term. Davis MOVED and Reed seconded the motion to amend the

statement on Sunday exams to read, "No final exams shall be scheduled on Sunday, unless the regular instruction periods are also scheduled on Sunday, except for instances where multiple sections of one course are taught by one instructor." Keen stated that the committee had discussed this and considered it unfair to the students. Fynewever stated that such an amendment only helps the instructor, not the students. Davis stated that we should decide on the basis of what the students prefer and that was probably Sunday rather than Friday. Liaison Henke (USG) stated that he thought the majority would probably prefer Sunday so they could leave sooner, but that some want more time to study. Keen clarified that under this proposal the class and instructor cannot change the exam time. Fynewever stated that students needed to recognize that school is 10 weeks of instruction plus a week of exam time. Senator Remali reported that less than half the scheduled Friday morning exams are actually given. The amendment was DEFEATED by a show of hands vote with dissent.

5783

Henke asked what if the entire class and the teacher wanted the exam on Sunday - that students have their free will. Senator Pegg responded that it is rare that the entire class really wants it. Keen pointed out that the department chair can request approval from the scheduling office to change the exam time.

The motion to approve Proposal 10-94 as amended PASSED on a voice vote with no dissent.

#### B. PROPOSAL 5-96, CENTER FOR TEACHING, LEARNING, AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT [**Appendix G**]

Carstens MOVED and Soldan seconded the motion to approve Proposal 5-96. The suggested voting units were the full Senate; there were no objections.

Senator Caspary asked why the center did not include staff development. Bulleit (Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching) clarified that the committee was charged with examining ways to improve and evaluate teaching. Provost Dobney stated that currently the Human Resources Office provides opportunities for staff development. Senator Whitt questioned why it included faculty development; Bulleit explained that it permitted greater justification for a full-time position. Vice President Walck stated that teaching improvement was part of faculty development and this expansion permitted an umbrella to include a spectrum of activities that were currently not coordinated but all related to faculty development; for example, this might include such things as creativity grants. Caspary inquired whether staff who were teaching would be able to use the Center. Bulleit stated yes, that adding faculty development did not remove teaching, and that included GTA's. Walck stated that anyone engaged in the role normally associated with faculty could use it. Glime pointed out that the title of the proposal does not use "faculty" to modify "teaching" or "learning," only "development."

Senator Arici asked how many of our benchmark institutions have a center. Bulleit replied that it is easier to say which schools do not, i.e. most do. Senator Leifer asked Bulleit to explain in one sentence why we need the center. Bulleit replied that it pulls many activities under one umbrella to have a center on campus. Walck added that there is not enough effort to promote good teaching or faculty development on campus. Senator Heyman asked if there is any release time for the persons involved in the teaching seminars for new faculty. Dobney stated that there is no release time and that one can only get the same faculty to do this kind of seminar series once or twice, that we need to institutionalize this program for the new faculty. Heyman stated that the seminar series is very helpful for new faculty and should be done every year, but that it requires a lot of effort. Bulleit stated that the center should have that responsibility. Dobney stated that we need to reform the teaching evaluation process; we say we value good teaching but we have no good way to measure it; this might be a good way to short-circuit the USG teaching evaluations. President Bornhorst stated that the Senate should lead in the teaching evaluations. Senator Keen stated that the Instructional Policy Committee has teaching evaluations at the top of its agenda as requested by President Bornhorst. Bulleit stated that the director of the center should not lead this effort, the faculty should.

Keen stated that the title applied to the center seems to be synonymous with the role of the University. Discussion indicated some dissatisfaction with the title; Keen requested that the Secretary record that APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSAL BY THE SENATE DOES NOT IMPLY APPROVAL OF THE NAME OF THE CENTER. The President so-instructed the Secretary. Leifer called for the question. There was no second. There was no further discussion. The motion to approve proposal 5-96 CARRIED by voice vote with no dissent.

#### C. PROPOSAL 33-95, RESEARCH STATEMENT [**Appendix H**]

Mroz MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to approve Proposal 33-95. The suggested voting units were academic and other research units. There were no objections so the voting units stood as suggested. Sweany suggested that the word "faulty" on page 2, line 5 under Individual Research Effort should be changed to "faculty." President Bornhorst ruled that the change was editorial and would stand as corrected. There were no objections. Senator McKimpson reported that the major changes were the addition of #5 on page 1 under requirements to clarify the conformation to other policies and the clarification of industrial and proprietary research to insure that it is in a form that is suitable for graduate student theses and consideration of promotion and tenure. The motion to approve Proposal 33-95 PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

#### D. PROPOSAL 24-95, ACADEMIC CALENDAR: HOMECOMING [**Appendix I**]

Carstens MOVED and Davis seconded the motion to approve Proposal 24-95. The suggested voting units were academic degree-granting departments. Arici MOVED and Walck seconded the motion to add other course-offering units. The motion PASSED with no dissent.

Senator Tyrell stated that the USG had consulted with the IFC and that both support the proposal offered by USG instead of this proposal; he stressed that students need a stress relief. Senator Carstens stated that the quarter system creates problems with holidays. Senator Keen stated that the counter proposal wrecks as many classes as the current status.

Leifer MOVED and Bradley seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime  
Secretary of the Senate