

The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 282

15 October 1997

Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) heard a report from Senator Evensen on the policy for student grievances (Proposal 1-98).
 - (2) heard a report from Bill Kennedy, Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development, on activities of the Calendar Issues Clarification Committee.
 - (3) approved the slate of Nancy Byers-Sprague (Institutional Analysis), Gil Lewis (Math. Sci.), and Bill Powers (Humanities) as nominees for representation of the faculty at large on the Ombudsperson Search Committee.
 - (4) elected Jim Carstens (Technology) as Senate representative to the Ombudsperson Selection Committee.
 - (5) approved the slate of Dallas Bates (Chemistry), Debra Bruch (Fine Arts), Gary Campbell (Business and Economics), and Pete Tampas (Technology) as nominees for the Committee on Academic Tenure.
 - (6) approved the slate of Bruce Pletka (Metallurgy & Materials Eng.), Bob Keen (Biol. Sci.), Bill McKilligan (Facilities Operations), Renee Greenley (Information Technology), Glenn Mroz (Forestry & Wood Prod.), and David Chesney (Chemistry), with Ellen Horsch (Human Resources) and Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office) as ex officio members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Separation.
 - (7) approved Steve Seidel (Computer Science), Dave Leddy (Chemistry), John Johnson (ME-EM), and Mark Roberts (Business and Economics) as nominees for the General Education Committee.
 - (8) approved the slate of Mohan Rao (ME-EM), Mary Ann Beckwith (Fine Arts), and Bryan Suits (Physics) to be forwarded to President Tompkins for selection to the Sabbatical Leave Committee.
-

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

President Seely called Senate Meeting 282 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 15 October 1997, in Room 101 of the ROTC Building.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senator William Shapton and representatives from Biological Sciences, Business and Economics, IMP, KRC, Academic Services-Engineering, Auxiliary Enterprises, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunities. No senator has been selected for Finance and Advancement. Liaisons in attendance were Sean Havera (USG) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Guests included Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Barry Solomon (Social Sciences), and Bill Kennedy (Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

President Seely requested that a new number 5 be inserted between 4 and 5 to hear a report from Bill Kennedy and Stephen Bowen on the activities of the Calendar Task Force; the remaining items would be moved down. He also asked that the original items 6A and 6B be reversed. Lutzke MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion to approve PASSED on voice vote with no dissent. **[Appendix A. NOTE: Only official Senate and Library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]**

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETINGS 280 AND 281

Nesbitt MOVED and McKilligan seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 280. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

For the minutes of Meeting 281, Senator Pickens requested a replacement of the first sentence of paragraph 2, column 2 on page 7135, beginning "Senator Pickens." The first sentence should be replaced by, "Senator Pickens stated that IWR is now one of two subunits; the other is forest ecology and management faculty. Thus there is no double representation within the department."

Senator Walck requested that on the same page, under "Additional corrections to minutes of Meeting 279:," *accredited* in line 5 be changed to *re-accredited*, so that it does not imply we are not accredited now.

Williams MOVED and Reed seconded the motion to approve the minutes of Meeting 281 as amended. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

5. POSTPONED; BOWEN HAD NOT YET ARRIVED.

6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT

Proposal 1-97, Policy on Threatening and Violent Behavior, has been referred to the Institutional Planning Committee; Proposal 13-97, BS in Computer Engineering, has been referred to the Finance Committee; and Proposal 1-98, on student academic grievances, has been referred to the Instructional Policy Committee.

[Appendices B-D]

Other questions will be coming to committee, including a review of policies regarding retired faculty. Several questions regarding the scientific misconduct policy will be referred to the Research Policy Committee.

NOTE that committee chairs should move on items that have been referred to them. Seely is hopeful that the Academic Policy Committee will soon have reports on their recommendations on weather advisories and on an award for faculty service.

The Curricular Policy and Finance Committees should soon have recommendations on the Computer Engineering Degree and the Curricular Policy Committee should have a recommendation on Minor Degrees.

Seely asked Senators in Non-Academic Units to please remind their constituents of the nomination process now underway for senatorial elections. Nominations close on Friday, 17 October. At least two nominees are needed from each unit. If sufficient nominees are obtained, ballots should go out on Monday, 20 October.

The Senate Executive Committee will meet with President Tompkins in the Alumni Lounge on Monday, 20 October at 9 a.m. Seely will distribute a memo regarding the nature of the dialogue.

There is a Draft Report on the MTU Self-study for NCA available on the MTU Home Page and a printed copy in the library. Comments are solicited. Senators are asked to remind their constituents to provide comments.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS

A. Instructional Policy Committee

Dean Janners convened a group to formalize the process for student grievances. Senator Evensen reported from the Instructional Policy Committee and distributed Proposal 1-98, indicating that the current procedure is too general. The proposal distributed is modeled after the procedures of the School of Business and the School of Forestry and Wood Products. It does not change any authority. **[Appendix E]**

Senator Pegg expressed concern over the statement that "the supervisor must summarize the consultation" and asked if this policy might give a supervisor the chance to "get at" an individual; he prefers that the consultant give the summary.

Evensen responded that this wording was not a change in policy but was intended to provide clarification of the original proposal in which there were unclear pronouns.

Senator Barna raised a concern on page 2 under the Appeal Process where it states "The student complainant may wish to appeal the decision of the faculty member's supervisor." There is nothing prior to indicate that the supervisor makes the decision.

Evensen responded that the committee had assumed that the supervisor response, indicated in the previous paragraph, is a decision.

Barna responded that the supervisor doesn't have the authority to change a grade.

Senator Moore stated that it is not clear what the supervisor is deciding.

Senator Reed stated that there should be a new subheading above the second paragraph under Making the grievance. Evensen suggested the heading Resolution.

Senator Pegg asked what the policy covers besides grades. Sandberg responded that it could be such cases as a faculty member saying to the class that anyone who has a beard must shave it or get out of the class.

President Seely asked Solomon (Social Sciences) if he knew of other examples. Solomon responded that it could involve permitting a student to take a make-up exam.

Vice President Soldan asked if a student is dissatisfied with something, is the supervisor obligated to continue the procedure.

Senator Santeford responded that the supervisor would be remiss not to talk to the faculty member, and that making the report would complete the procedure.

Senator Kitalong remarked that if an oral complaint is not resolved, then the student must put the complaint in writing.

Senator Reed pointed out that if there is no new evidence and the procedure is not violated, then the student can't appeal. Solomon responded that the committee intended to make it difficult to appeal; they did not want to diminish the due process rights of the faculty.

Reed expressed concern that this was too limited. Solomon responded that the faculty have a lot of discretion; the committee doesn't want to force a change in departmental policy because of a student grievance.

Seely added that these are the same grounds for faculty to appeal a tenure decision.

Liaison Havera (USG) asked if a group of students could register a grievance. Evensen responded that the policy does not preclude that.

Barna suggested that if the word "decision" under Appeal Process is changed to "response" then the policy would be consistent.

Williams asked why the policy excluded the Ombudsperson as the arbiter. Evensen responded that they did not intend for the Ombudsperson to be taken out; that was not part of the policy that they were asked to work on. Senator Santeford added that no one can be prevented from going to the Ombudsperson.

Evensen clarified that the committee is not touching the current policy regarding the involvement of the Ombudsperson.

Seely concluded the discussion by saying that a revised version of the proposal will come to the floor for approval or amendment.

5. ACTIVITIES OF TASK FORCE ON ACADEMIC CALENDAR: REPORT

Vice Provost for Instruction Bowen had not arrived, so Bill Kennedy, Director of the Center for Teaching,

Learning, and Faculty Development, summarized the recent activities of the Calendar Issues Clarification Committee, a subcommittee of the task force.

An open forum was held 7 October, with approximately 70 students attending. The vast majority of students expressed their displeasure. The CICC has held several long meetings since then to review everyone's concerns and broke the subcommittee into several groups to address various aspects.

Kennedy provided Senators with a possible calendar draft. **[Appendix F]**

At present, 60% of the schools are on semesters, 18% are on quarters, 7% are on trimesters (students go 2 out of 3 terms), and the 4-1-4 is the third largest type. The "1" is referred to as an independent activity period (IAP).

Senator Walck asked if the IAP is optional for students and Kennedy responded that it varies.

Kennedy stated that at MIT the students don't leave during that time. They look forward to it. Kennedy made it clear that his bias is in favor of the 4-1-4 (possibly as a 4-4-1).

Seely added that it provides good opportunities for undergraduate research.

Kennedy explained that some IAP courses are for credit; they vary in length. For example, students can be exposed to engineering process by designing and making prototypes; modules at MIT include mathematical modeling and the environment, astronomy field camp, French I immersion experience, and aerobic dancing, to name only a few.

Kennedy presented his view of learning that the students need to learn that they must bring something to the table and the faculty must respond to the student interests.

The calendar presented had 155 instructional days (145.5 primary instructional days) with a week-long break each semester.

Senator Barna asked why the IAP was not placed in January. Kennedy responded that many people, especially students, had expressed concern that it might kill winter carnival. Seely added that many calendars start a new term in January. Kennedy added that the May term may be important for field courses.

Senator Sandberg added that it would be important for many civil engineering courses for the same reason.

Senator Santeford stated that people in the northern Lower Peninsula want the legislature to say that schools can't start before Labor Day. There are no tourists or construction in May, but there are in August.

Kennedy stated that it may not work to have a May term. We need to redefine general education. We can individualize it. Another consideration is that we don't want to lose traditional holidays.

Kennedy then reported that President Tompkins has stated that the students have failed to make a defensible case that we should not go to semesters.

Santeford reminded the Senate that K-day had lost its original purpose of enjoying the fall colors at the end of September. He suggested we should move the holiday back to that time at the end of September.

Senator Walck asked if students and faculty who had already had 30 weeks of teaching and learning might not be too tired for the IAP course(s). She was also concerned that it might evolve into more work for faculty under the same contract as now (expected to teach 34 weeks instead of 30). She asked if a 13-week term is an option.

Seely suggested a 14-week term plus two 4-week terms. However, faculty want 145 days of instruction. The May term gives more variety of purpose. The real intention for it is to do something different. Students need to be as active as faculty in proposing courses.

Senator Sweany asked about the 2-week vacation at Christmas. Kennedy responded that the two weeks between terms is needed for faculty and administrators to get ready for the next term.

Sweany stated that it has been implied that everyone accepts this as a faculty decision, but that the students don't agree.

Kennedy acknowledged that to be absolutely true. President Tompkins says that the faculty are responsible for the decision. Encouraging students to provide feedback does not necessarily mean they have a 1:1 vote. Tompkins has interpreted the faculty vote to mean we need to do the best we can with semesters. Most other schools are changing to semesters due to legislative fiat; our change is faculty-driven. The faculty are the ones who must take the heat - they must do the work to re-design the curriculum. The President says this is the most important decision we will make in the next 25 years. The NCA report will provide an initial list of things to look at.

Seely told Senators that the black and white calendar provided needs to go to the faculty for discussion. The Board will look at the discussion draft at the next meeting. There is no decision on the formal form of the calendar yet.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS, CONTINUED

B. University Committee Elections

Ombudsperson Selection Committee. Seely stated that the Senate must vote on one Senator for the committee and there must be Senate concurrence of three nominees for faculty member at large to be elected by the faculty. The review of the Ombudsperson in one year will not be their responsibility.

Seely stated that Nancy Byers-Sprague volunteered to serve on the search committee.

Senator Lutzke pointed out that Byers-Sprague is not a faculty member. Seely responded that the Ombudsperson must be faculty but that the members of the committee must be elected by the faculty but need not be faculty.

Williams MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to accept the slate of nominees for the faculty representative. These included Nancy Byers-Sprague (Institutional Analysis), Gil Lewis (Mathematical Sciences), and Bill Powers (Humanities). The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

The slate of nominees for Senate representative to the search committee were Jim Carstens (Technology), John Jaszczak (Physics), Erik Nordberg (Library), and Ted Soldan (IT). Carstens and Soldan tied on the secret ballot vote. Carstens was ELECTED on the second secret ballot.

Pegg asked for further clarification on the composition of the committee and choice of Ombudsperson. Seely explained that one member must be elected by the faculty, one by the Senate, and one selected by the President. The Ombudsperson must be a faculty member and be the unanimous selection of the committee. Concurrence of the Senate is needed for the slate to go to the faculty. The vote will be carried out according to Senate procedures.

Committee on Academic Tenure. The current members are Barry Kunz, Dave Sikarskie, and Sheryl Sorby. Nominees were Dallas Bates (Chemistry), Debra Bruch (Humanities), Gary Campbell (Business), and Pete Tampas (Technology). Nesbitt MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to accept the slate as presented. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Ad Hoc Committee on Separation. The existing policy was driven by the layoff of 50 people. It needs a detailed procedure and policy. Two areas need to be revised/expanded: retrenchment and coverage of professional staff.

Bruce Pletka has agreed to serve on the committee - he chaired the previous committee.

Williams MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to accept the slate of nominees including Bruce Pletka (Metallurgy & Materials Eng.), Bob Keen (Biol. Sci.), Bill McKilligan (Facilities Operations), Renee Greenley

(Information Technology), Glenn Mroz (Forestry & Wood Prod.), and David Chesney (Chemistry), with Ellen Horsch (Human Resources) and Debbie Lassila (Provost's Office) as ex officio members.

Senator Suryanarayana asked if the chair of that committee must be a Senator. Seely responded no.

Senator Pegg stated that he preferred to be able to say yes or no to the committee members.

Seely responded that it is difficult to get members; only one Senator provided a nominee. Therefore, they had their chance to give input but did not exercise it. It would undermine his efforts to get committee members if the Senate placed yet another hurdle in the selection.

Senator Lutzke stated that he felt it was inappropriate to remove anyone.

Senator Reed asked if the proposal from the committee would come to the Senate. Seely responded that it would; the Senate can modify the proposal once it is on the floor.

The motion to approve the slate PASSED on voice vote with one dissent.

General Education Committee. Seely reported that this committee was the hardest for which to find nominees. Currently their major job is to approve thematic clusters. However, they will have a major role if and when there is a calendar change.

The only volunteer for the committee was Steve Seidel (Computer Science). Other nominees included Dave Leddy (Chemistry), John Johnson (Mechanical Engineering), and Mark Roberts (Business). Seely turned down one volunteer from humanities since there was already one person from fine arts and one from humanities on the committee.

Sweany MOVED and Lutzke seconded the motion to accept the slate as presented. The President will choose one from this list. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Sabbatical Leave Committee. Mohan Rao (ME-EM) volunteered to serve on the committee. Other nominees were Mary Ann Beckwith (Fine Arts), Ralph Hodek (Civil & Environmental Eng.), Jim Mihelcic (Civil & Environmental Eng.), and Bryan Suits (Physics).

Three nominees have to be forwarded to the President, so Senators needed to vote for three. All Senators present could vote.

Beckwith, Rao, and Suits were ELECTED by secret ballot.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Carstens MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime
Secretary of the University Senate