

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

May 4, 1992 and
May 11, 1992

MINUTES

Senator not in attendance at the May 4 meeting: Alfred Wedel

Senators excused from the May 4 meeting: David Bellamy, Kenneth Biederman,
Costel Denson, Alexander Doberenz,
Robert Knecht, Frank Murray, Larry
Peterson, John Pikulski, David P.
Roselle, Carolyn Thoroughgood

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Senate adopted the Agenda with slight changes in wording as presented by President Taggart.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Senate Larry Peterson was excused from the last meeting rather than absent. The Senate approved the Minutes of April 6, 1992 with this change.

III. REMARKS BY PROVOST PIPES

Provost Pipes shared statistics about admissions and the 1992 entering class, announcing a projected class of 3100 entering students with higher SAT scores and more African-American students. He also announced

a \$300,000 scholarship pool offered to the top 10% of admitted students.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Taggart reminded Senate Committee Chairpersons that Annual Reports are due, that there will be an open hearing May 24 on the request for approval of name and location change for the Existing

Master

of Instruction in Economic Education degree which is being changed to Master of Arts in Economics for Educators in the College of Business

and

Economics. He also thanked committee chairpersons for their work this year.

V. NEW BUSINESS

Item A. Election of Senate Officers, carried on during the beginning of

the Faculty Senate meeting resulted in the election of the following Senate Officers:

President-Elect
Vice President

Bonnie K. Scott (English)
David Sperry (Life & Health)

Secretary

Sciences)
Judith Roof (English)

The Senate also elected Frank Dilley to the Committee on Committees and Nominations, and Arthur Sloane, David Haslett, and Bilian Cicin-Sain to the Committee on Rules.

Item B. A slate of persons nominated for committee positions by the Committee on Committees and Nominations was approved by the full Faculty Senate. (Copy of the Committee appointments is attached.)

Item C. Recommendation from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (M.Keefe, Chairperson), with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (K. Lomax, Chairperson), for approval of a new Honors Baccalaureate Degree in Food Science. After questions about the Honors status of 600-level courses and the grade-point requirement, the Faculty Senate approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the establishment of a new Honors Baccalaureate Degree in Food Science, effective immediately.

Item D. Recommendation from the Committee on Graduate Studies (R. Dalrymple, Chairperson), with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (K. Lomax, Chairperson), for provisional approval of the Coursework option in the Master of Mechanical Engineering Degree.

The Faculty Senate passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves provisionally, for four years, the Coursework (non-thesis) option in the Master of Mechanical Engineering, effective immediately.

Item E. Recommendation from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (M. Keefe, Chairperson), with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (K. Lomax, Chairperson), to specify that Reading Day is intended as a day set aside for studying. After establishing that the resolution would take effect in the Autumn, and after discussion about the potential loss of faculty and student flexibility, and pressures on students who would like exams when scheduled, the Faculty Senate approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the purpose of a University-wide Reading Day is to give students a day free of exams and allow them to review for upcoming finals and to complete projects, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that no exams may be given on Reading Day and that this statement be inserted in the Faculty Handbook, Section II, as paragraph 4 under II.2. "Examinations and Tests," page II-3.

Item F. Recommendations from the Committee on Academic Appeals (E. N.

Simons, Chairperson), with the concurrence of the Committee on Graduate Studies (R. Dalrymple, Chairperson), and the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (M. Keefe, Chairperson), to revise Step 3 and Step 4 of the Student Grievance Procedure. The first resolution proposed that one procedure be utilized by all Step 3 hearing committees. After a minor change in the text and passage of a motion to strike the words "whichever comes first," from the proposed rule, the Faculty Senate approved the following resolution (with changes):

RESOLUTION ONE

WHEREAS, there has not been a clearly defined, consistent procedure for different departments and colleges to use in conducting Step 3 hearings, and

WHEREAS, it has become clear that different students have received different treatments in different departments by not having any consistent procedure used for Step 3 hearings, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that one procedure be utilized by all Step 3 hearing committees to better insure that all students receive similar treatment. (The following recommendations for Step 3 Procedures would be added to Section II, paragraph 4. "Student Grievance Procedure," page II-5, of the Faculty Handbook:)

Step 3) A student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the decision reached in Step 2 may appeal to the concerned college Dean. This appeal to Step 3 must be made no more than three weeks (within a regular Fall or Spring semester) after Step 2 has been completed. The College Dean will establish a hearing panel within two weeks of receipt of an appeal or if that is too close to the end of a

regular Semester, by one month after the beginning of the next regular Semester (Fall or Spring). The college hearing panel will hear the appeal during a regular semester. Typically the panel will include three faculty members with one (only) of them coming from the involved department and the other two drawn from other departments within that college, or, where necessary from other colleges when the concerned college has few or no departmental divisions. There should be two undergraduate student members for an undergraduate appeal or two graduate student members for a graduate appeal and neither of the student members should come from the department involved. (These students may be drawn from other colleges, also.)

Where feasible, the student and professor concerned must both be present at any/all hearing/s when evidence is being presented.

The procedures utilized by colleges relating to the student grievance procedure at Step 3 should conform to the general principles of due process. To satisfy this standard, the hearing process should, at least:

- A. Fully inform the student and faculty member in writing of the procedures to be used so that they are aware of them in advance of the hearing.
- B. Make available to the student and faculty member, at least three working days prior to the hearing, all material which has been furnished to the college hearing panel that will be presented as evidence and the names of any witnesses who are scheduled to give testimony.
- C. Allow the student and faculty member to:
 - 1. Hear all testimony and examine all evidence presented on behalf of the other;
 - 2. question witnesses and/or each other about their testimony or evidence presented;
 - 3. be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice from among the members of the University community. The advisor may help prepare the case, raise questions during the hearing, and, if appropriate, help prepare an appeal to Step 4. A department Chairperson who has mediated or attempted mediation at Step 2 would not be permitted to serve as advisor to either party beyond Step 2.
 - 4. Make a summary statement at the conclusion of the hearing.

There must be a decision made at Step 3 before an appeal can be made to Step 4.

It is recommended that all hearings be tape recorded and those tape recordings be secured for no less than one year by the concerned college Dean's office.

It is recommended that a copy of the written report of the decision be filed with the appointing Dean's office at the time it is sent to the student and professor involved.

The second resolution set time limits within which Step 4 Hearings must be held. After discussion about the possibility of exceptions, what is necessary to make an appeal, and Senate approval of a motion to change the language of the rule, the Faculty Senate approved the following resolution (with changes):

RESOLUTION TWO

WHEREAS, there has been no time limits set for appeals to the final Step 4 level of academic appeals and some have arrived more than two years after the grievable incident, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that an appeal must be initiated within 30 days of the Step 3 appeal being issued. (This change to Step 4 would be added to the "Student Grievance Procedure" in the Faculty Handbook, Section II, middle of page II-5.)

Step 4) A student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the fairness or thoroughness of the procedures used in Step 3 may appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee of the University Faculty Senate. This appeal must be made to Step 4 no more than one month (within a regular Fall or Spring semester) after a Step 3 decision is issued. This Committee, on reviewing the case, may uphold the decision of the college committee without a hearing, or it may decide the appeal should be heard.

For purposes of a hearing, the Chairperson of the Academic Appeals Committee may . . .

..

Item G. Recommendation from the Committee on Student Life (R. Bennett, Chairperson), for revisions to the Academic Dishonesty Policy. The Faculty Senate discussed the wisdom of the proposed Policy's shift of responsibility for prosecution and penalty of cases of academic dishonesty to faculty members, argued whether the proposed Policy's apparently greater leniency was desirable, discussed the mechanics of the proposed procedures, debated the merits of the Proposed Policy's greater flexibility, considered whether the proposed Policy provides sufficient fairness and consistency, and after defeat of a motion to return the proposed Policy to the Committee, the Faculty Senate approved the following Resolution:

WHEREAS, the Dean of Student's Office has received complaints from faculty and students about the current academic dishonesty procedures and sanctions, and

WHEREAS, the complaints have centered on the laborious nature of the due process system and the inflexibility of the current system, and

WHEREAS, the number of academic dishonesty cases has diminished sharply from 69 two years ago to 32 last year, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the current policies and procedures concerning academic dishonesty in The Official Student Handbook 1991-1992 be amended as indicated in Attachment 6 of the Agenda.

The first meeting of the May session was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Roof
Senate Secretary

rg
Attachment