

**THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF  
MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY**

**Minutes of Meeting 283**

**5 November 1997**

**Synopsis:** The Senate

(1) heard from Bill Kennedy (Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development; CICC) an update on the proposal to change to semesters.

(2) voted to give Seely permission to appoint the outside faculty member to the SBE Dean Evaluation Committee.

(3) referred the proposal on minors back to committee to change the wording of "minor degree/degrees" to "minor/minors," changes that President Seely ruled could not be considered editorial.

(4) request Senator Pegg to bring the wording from the Faculty Handbook regarding faculty appeal of a decision regarding a student grievance (for Proposal 1-98).

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

President Seely called University Senate Meeting 283 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 5 November 1997, in Room 101 of the ROTC Building.

Secretary Glime called roll. Absent were at-large Senators Henry Santeford and Christa Walck, and representatives from Physical Education and Finance and Advancement (no Senator selected). Liaisons in attendance were Geoff Roelant (GSC) and Ted Soldan (Staff Council).

**2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Guests included Fred Dobney (Provost), Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*), Sharron Paris (Enrollment Mgmt., CICC), Renee Greenley (Information Technology), and Bill Kennedy (Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development).

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Williams MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to approve the agenda. 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 MEETING 282**

Williams MOVED and Richter seconded the motion to approve the minutes of meeting 282. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

**5. CALENDAR UPDATE**

President Seely introduced the academic calendar topic by saying that there have been several focus groups with students and members of the Calendar Issues Clarification Committee (CICC). The CICC will propose to the Calendar Task Force to change to semesters; they will not propose the form of the calendar at this time. The university community will discuss this issue and the decision on the form of the calendar will be made later.

Bill Kennedy (Director of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Faculty Development; CICC) stated that the focus groups had been very useful to set the boundary conditions. There were 49 students at the meeting with the Interfraternity Council (IFC). The students assumed that the faculty had other motivation to "dink" the students instead of the motivation to improve education.

Kennedy presented the basic calendar conditions - to have two academic terms and to preserve the total length of instruction we now have (30 weeks plus exams). He presented examples of calendars with the independent activity period (IAP), but made it clear that the IAP was not part of the proposal going to the Board of Control at this time. He also introduced the possibility of some courses being offered on a 7-week term, permitting greater diversity and flexibility.

Senator Barna asked why we needed such a long Thanksgiving break (1 week).

Kennedy responded that 48 of the 49 students at the IFC meeting wanted the long break, giving such reasons as the deer season, distance to home, and students leaving early if there is a short week.

Senator Gale raised concerns that having a one-week Thanksgiving break, followed by only three weeks of class, is disruptive.

Senator Gopal asked when grades would be due. Kennedy responded 9 January on the calendar presented. There was some discussion about the tradeoffs between giving the registrar's office a reasonable amount of time to process grades before the new term and permitting faculty to celebrate Christmas without grading exams at the same time.

Senator Snyder asked if we can prevent scheduling students for three final exams on one day, especially the first day. The final exam period should be an occasion for reflective thinking on the big picture and it will cover more material under a semester calendar, making it more difficult for students to prepare and contemplate before exams begin.

Senator Suryanarayana asked when the academic year would end and if the 4-week term would be required. Kennedy responded that it would end about 12 May; the 4-week term would be very flexible, with some courses lasting only one week. Neither students nor faculty would be required by the calendar proposal to participate in the May term, but departments might have individual requirements.

Suryanarayana asked about the cost of the 4-week term. Kennedy responded that he did not know.

Provost Dobney addressed this issue, stating that we don't know the cost yet and want the faculty to be involved in the decision. Several possibilities exist; it could be compensated like summer school, or a person could teach a course then instead of one normally taught in the regular year.

Paris (Enrollment Management) added that there are now 13 tracks in the summer; the 4-week term could be run the same way.

Senator McKilligan asked why the fall commencement was scheduled before finals. Kennedy responded that the committee considered that preferable to scheduling commencement on 23 December.

Senator Reed commented that the proposed calendar model had 36 weeks from start (end of August) to finish (second week of May), whereas the present calendar has 38. Will faculty be paid the same, or paid for two weeks less?

Dobney quipped that that would be a good idea he hadn't considered!

Kennedy stated that the committee had considered a 4-week winter term, but the students were concerned that it would kill winter carnival.

Dobney pointed out that the 4-4-1 calendar was not a "done deal."

Senator Green commented that a new bill before the state may require that school start after Labor Day. Kennedy responded that the bill only applies to K-12 education.

Senator Lutzke stated that we need to get more student input on the 4-4-1 calendar.

Snyder stated that he has found it difficult to get students to pay \$1200 for a course that takes a trip to the Bahamas during spring break. He envisions similar financial difficulties with the 4-week term.

Secretary Glime stated that the 4-4-1 need not be a university-wide program, but that any department could offer courses during that time for whatever length they found appropriate. It is better for us to concentrate on getting the best semester calendar first before being concerned about the "4-week" term.

Senator Barna agreed that the 1-month term need not be part of the calendar discussion.

Snyder stated that the 1-month term could influence the length of the winter break.

Seely stated that the students are excited about the special options available in a short term.

Suryanarayana asked why this calendar proposes a 4-week term with only a 7-week term in the summer. Why not have two 5-week terms in the summer? Kennedy responded that we can still do that, and if summer is run as it is now, that would still be possible, along with the May term or any other combination. At the University of Michigan, which is officially on a trimester system, the majority of students attend two semesters per year. At MIT there was some discussion about shortening the IAP. However, in a faculty vote, the faculty decided

to lengthen the IAP (January term) to allow some departments to offer full length courses during that time. At MIT, 36% of the students typically enroll in the IAP: 41% of freshmen, 27% of sophomores, 15% of juniors, and 17% of seniors. Approximately 25% of the faculty participate; 80% of the offerings are taught by non-faculty. Semesters there are 13.5 weeks.

Glime stated that we need to consider the impact of the reduced use of summer housing and the effect of that in cost to students per month if we shorten the summer term.

## **6. REPORT FROM SENATE PRESIDENT**

**Non-Academic Elections:** President Seely reported that most of the elections by non-academic units are completed, but some units are having trouble finding enough nominees.

**Faculty Elections:** Seely reported on the faculty election for committees:

### **A. Ombudsperson Selection Committee**

Gil Lewis 89

Bill Powers 62

Nancy Byers-Sprague 30

### **B. Academic Tenure**

Dallas Bates 68

Gary Campbell 42

Pete Tampas 30

Debra Bruch 23

**Meeting between President Tompkins and Senate Executive Committee:** Seely reported that the Senate Executive Committee met with President Tompkins on 20 October. There was a general discussion on the Senate and strategic issues. The President stated that the Senate probably spent too much time on budget issues and not enough on broad strategic planning.

This meeting was followed by a second meeting of the Executive Committee on how to proceed. The Executive Committee is exploring some ideas that matter to the campus community and which the Senate can meaningfully explore; this is still an evolving process. Seely asked how the Senate can identify the important issues and suggested some of these may be distance education and information technology.

**Communications from President Tompkins:** Seely indicated that President Tompkins had selected Steve Seidel to serve on the General Education Committee and Mohan Rao to serve on the Sabbatical Leave Committee.

**Committee Workings:** Seely reported that he will soon have a charge for the Committee working on separation. The Finance Committee is working on the proposal for a degree in Computer Engineering.

**Meeting with Provost:** Seely reported that the officers met with the Provost. There will be a statement on Academic Freedom coming from him shortly.

Provost Dobney indicated that he would like the Senate meetings to be televised again and hoped that the Senate would contact Bresnan. When contacted earlier by the Administration, Bresnan wanted the full \$60,000 they lost when MTU stopped using them to televise to the dorms, but if only the Senate meetings are being televised, perhaps they can be persuaded to do it for a reasonable charge.

Dobney reported our method of financial aid leverage is being analyzed; many faculty had expressed surprise at the percent of tuition that goes back into financial aid.

Seely warned Senators that officers and some of the committees should expect to meet with the NCA team when they are on campus 12-14 January.

**SBE Dean Evaluation Committee:** Seely stated that the SBE Dean Evaluation Committee needs an outside faculty member and requested the Senate's permission to appoint that member; the person is needed by 11 November, leaving no time to solicit nominees from the constituents. In addition to the faculty member selected by the Senate, the committee will have a student and a member of the professional staff. Seely is especially interested in getting persons with interaction with the department.

Prince MOVED and Gale seconded the motion to give Seely permission to appoint someone to the SBE evaluation committee. The motion PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Senator Suryanarayana asked for clarification on the financial issue. First we were told to consider the financial issue; now we are being told not to.

Seely said that he could not clarify that.

Senator Williams stated that the President is more than likely to be concerned about the fringe benefits committee activities.

Suryanarayana asked how the Finance Committee should proceed. Seely responded that the committee should proceed the same as before; the discussion on our role in the budget process is continuing.

## **7. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 16-97, Minor Degrees. [Appendix B. See minutes, page 6925, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Senator Nesbitt reviewed that the discussion of minors started when the Senate received two proposals for minor degrees but the University had no criteria for minors in place. Therefore, it was necessary to develop a University minor.

Senator Sandberg asked what the ABET and NCA criteria were for minors. Nesbitt responded that he has been an ABET evaluator and that it is in the purview of the department to consider criteria in their own discipline. The committee viewed that if a student is going to be here for five years, this is a way to get a minor in something else at the same time.

Seely asked if the new language addresses in a clear way how double counting works. That was the concern raised when the proposal was first introduced.

Provost Dobney stated that he was a little puzzled about the terminology "minor degree." Usually there is a minor concentration with the degree in the major.

Nesbitt responded that he doesn't know where the terminology came from. The committee tried to put together something between a major and a certificate. Calling it a degree defines it as something specific put together by the departments.

Senator Lutzke stated that he doesn't know any school with a minor "degree."

Nesbitt responded that the committee had checked and that some schools do have a degree in the minor.

Dobney responded that if we call it a degree we must put a lot more into the requirements.

Senator Snyder stated that the minor is aiming at more depth; courses can't be all 100 and 200 level.

Lutzke stated that there seems to be confusion between a minor and a dual degree.

Senator Sandberg asked how the diploma would read.

Nesbitt responded that it would read major in X with minor in Y.

Senator Pegg reminded the Senate that the department would control its own minor program.

Snyder stated that the minor would not go on the diploma, only on the transcript.

Goodrich (*Tech Topics*) stated that we don't have a major degree; we only have a degree with a major in X.

Senator Reed stated that a student could get a minor with only 192 credits if that student used free electives for the minor.

Senator Williams asked how it would be possible to give a minor in an area that did not belong to a single department, as for example polymer science.

Nesbitt responded that it has to be initiated from one of the departments involved.

Senator Chavis stated that students would get a minor with emphasis in X.

Reed asked if the intent was for the minor to be part of the degree. Nesbitt responded it was.

Seely reminded the Senate that as a result of the May Senate discussion the proposal on minors was sent back to committee for clarification. He ruled that the changes made since the proposal was introduced in May are editorial. Therefore the Senate could vote on the proposal.

Reed MOVED and Sweany seconded the motion to accept the new wording of the proposal as an amendment. The motion to amend PASSED on voice vote with no discussion. Seely ruled it to be editorial. There were no objections.

Nesbitt MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to accept Proposal 16-97.

Senator Pegg stated that he would be more comfortable to remove the word "degree" in paragraph 3. Pegg MOVED and Sandberg seconded the motion to use "minor" and "minors" to replace "minor degree/degrees."

Lutzke agreed with Pegg.

Nesbitt stated that it had been written this way because each department has the authority to define the minor.

Williams stated that a degree is a statement of professional qualification; a minor doesn't constitute that qualification.

Reed asked if the motion covers all the times the proposal uses the word degree.

Snyder asked if we confer or grant degrees.

Seely responded that we confer degrees and we grant certificates. Therefore, we grant minors.

Williams suggested that we title the proposal Minors in a Degree Program. Senator Pickens observed that page 2 reads "certificate degrees."

There was no further discussion. The motion to change minor degree/degrees to minor/minors throughout the proposal PASSED on voice vote with no dissent.

Seely ruled that the change was more than editorial. He ruled that the proposal should be go back to committee to check the wording and change the use of the word "certificate." There were no objections.

Senator Sloan suggested changing the title to "Minors in Degree Programs."

Seely responded that the committee can consider this.

## **B. Proposal 1-98, Student Academic Grievances. [Appendix C. See minutes, page 7165, for a copy of this proposal.]**

Senator Evensen summarized the changes in the proposal, which included removal of the bullets and addition of subtitles. In section c the main change is in the resolution of the grievance. In the original, the supervisor would summarize; this version changes it to supervisor and consultant. In section d the words "written response" were changed to "written decision."

Senator Snyder asked if *complainant* is a word. Evensen and others responded that it is. [Secretary's note: It is in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd ed., Deluxe.]

Senator Sloan asked why there is an appeal process for students but not for faculty in this proposal. Evensen responded that the appeal process for faculty already exists.

Sloan asked, if the supervisor overturns the faculty member, what permits the faculty member to appeal?

Sandberg responded that this proposal is intended for the student handbook, so faculty procedures are not needed here.

Senator Reed stated that it is not clear what decision the supervisor is making.

Evensen responded that it doesn't empower the supervisor to change the grade; it doesn't address that issue.

Seely stated that the appeal must be made in writing within five days and asked if that means five working days.

Sandberg MOVED and Nesbitt seconded the motion to approve Proposal 1-98.

Williams MOVED and Pegg seconded the motion to amend the proposal to state 5 *working* days.

Barna asked if the supervisor makes the decision alone.

Evensen responded that the supervisor can consult, but the supervisor must summarize.

Vice President Soldan asked how we are defining the work day.

Seely responded that it is a week day, regardless if school is in session.

Seely ruled that voting units were the academic departments. There were no objections.

The amendment to change the wording to 5 *working* days PASSED on voice vote with no opposition.

Senator Barna stated the discussion at the last meeting suggested that c and d should correspond; why change wording to decision instead of response.

Evensen asked, if no decision is made, where does the student go next?

Sandberg stated that if the faculty member refuses to permit a make-up for a legitimate reason, someone must decide.

Evensen stated that the things to be covered have to be decided on a case by case basis.

Seely added that currently there is not a clear procedure across campus. This clarifies the vague language.

Evensen stated that the policy was modeled after the ones in Business and Forestry.

Snyder stated as an example that the rules state that faculty cannot give an assignment finals week. A faculty member gave students until the end of finals week to complete a report and one student went to the dean. It required much time for faculty to resolve the problem, even though the ruling was in favor of the faculty member; the policy could resolve the way to deal with this in a more efficient manner.

Williams stated that a, b, and c should not cross sections; the next section should start with a again. These sections could use bullets instead of letters, like the section on the appeal process.

Seely asked if the Senate was comfortable with the wording "timely manner."

Senator Pegg stated that he is uncomfortable with c. Faculty should be able to respond; faculty should be able to choose who is consulted.

Seely asked Pegg to check the faculty handbook to see what avenue faculty have in which to respond.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Nesbitt MOVED and Williams seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m. with an open motion on Proposal 1-98.

Respectfully Submitted by Janice M. Glime

Secretary of the University Senate