MINUTES OF SECOND SESSION OF  
MEETING NUMBER FOUR  
OF THE  
SENATE OF MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY  
1 December 1959

(Senate Minute pages: 31-36)

The meeting opened at 7:30 p.m., with President Van Pelt presiding.

The roll of members was called, showing all members present except Baker, Been, Bovard, Cox, Crawford, Dahlman, Garland, Kemp, Kerekes, Myers, Pearce, Polkinghorne, Robert, Schnelle, and Townsend.

Ballots were distributed for voting on Senate Proposal No. 2-59. In the discussion it was brought out that this Proposal was intended by the Curricular Policy Committee to apply to the undergraduate program only.

It was moved by Prof. DelliQuadri and supported by Prof. Weaver that this intent of the Curricular Policy Committee be registered with the secretary.

Prof. Bredekamp expressed the opinion that the policy should apply to both the graduate and undergraduate program.

The motion carried by a 21 - 13 vote.

Senate Proposal No. 2-59 was then voted upon by written ballot. The Proposal carried by a 36-4 vote.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Heath that Senate Proposal No. 1-59 be taken up from the table. The motion carried.

It was moved by Prof. Heath and supported by Prof. Bredekamp that Senate Proposal No. 1-59 be referred to the Curricular Policy Committee. Prof. Neilson expressed the hope that the Senate could act upon the Proposal as a committee of the whole. The motion was withdrawn.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp that a new proposal be considered in place of Senate Proposal No. 1-59. Prof. DelliQuadri rose to a point of order -- that Senate Proposal No. 1-59 was not in the Agenda. It was ruled to be in order because Senate Proposal No. 1-59 had been taken up from the table from the earlier part of the meeting. It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Belanger that Senate Proposal No. 1-59 be adopted.

In the discussion, Prof. Bredekamp suggested the following statement as a substitute for Senate Proposal No. 1-59 in order to overcome the objections to the semantics of Senate Proposal No. 1-59:

Title: Elective Credit in the Humanities

WHEREAS the Michigan College of Mining and Technology believes that certain courses are necessary for students to have a certain basic cultural background, and

WHEREAS Engineering students are to some extent limited as to the time available during their curriculum to obtains such courses, and

WHEREAS it is essential that every opportunity be presented to enable the student to obtain these courses

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The core curriculum requirements for elective credits in the Humanities and Social Studies may be elected by students from the following areas of study: Foreign Language, Literature, Music, History, Geography, Economics, Behavioral Sciences, and Fine Arts, and such other areas as may be subsequently defined as a satisfactory Humanity or Social Study. At least nine credits, not necessarily in sequence, must be completed within a single area.

It was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Prof. Hooker to amend Senate Proposal No. 1-59 as suggested by Prof. Bredekamp. Prof. Makens stated his preference for the original Proposal. Prof. Bayer said he was in favor of the amended Proposal. The motion to amend was carried.

The original motion to adopt Senate Proposal No. 1-59 as amended was carried. Senate Proposal No. 1-59 now reads as stated above.

The subject of Senate and/or committee meetings being held every third Tuesday from one o'clock to two o'clock p.m. was discussed. Prof. Longacre reminded the group that the Sault Ste. Marie members would find it very difficult to attend Senate meetings in this case. Prof. Otis supported this statement emphatically, but did point out that if Senate committee meetings were
President Van Pelt stated that it is the duty of any presiding officer to rule on the admissibility of any motion as soon as possible after it is presented. Prof. Price reminded the group that the question of admissibility as Senate business occurred last year. President Van Pelt suggested that the chairman of any Senate committee may check with the President of the College as to a ruling on the admissibility as Senate business before the subject is put on the committee agenda. Prof. Bredekamp expressed the opinion that this places too heavy a burden on the President of the College and also that any rejections of such subjects should be made in a Senate meeting so that all members of the Senate know the reason for the rejection. President Van Pelt suggested that even rejected subjects may remain on the committee agenda if it is desired to bring the matter to the Senate as a whole. Prof. Price reminded the group that all the work done on the subject of the "48-Hour Rule" was wasted time since it was ruled not Senate business after considerable study by the committee.

Prof. Gibson asked if the present Library Committee would remain as an advisory committee to the librarian after it was made a sub-committee of the Senate Instructional Policy Committee, or would all library matters be settled by the Senate. Prof. DelliQuadri asked where this item of the Agenda came from. Prof. Price pointed out that this subject arose from the statements in President Van Pelt's speech of April 8, 1959 on the Background of the Senate Constitution. Prof. Bredekamp stated, in answer to Prof. DelliQuadri's question as to why this item was on the Agenda, that the Agenda Committee was operating upon the theory that it had no right to reject a discussion proposed by a member of the Senate.

President Van Pelt asked Prof. Fryxell to give the group his opinion concerning the Library Committee. Prof. Fryxell stated that he feels that if the present Library Committee were to be made a sub-committee of the Senate Instructional Policy Committee, the procedures would become extremely complicated. He stated that many functions of the present Library Committee are operational, such as allotment of book funds, planning of a new library building, etc. He said it is his opinion it would be best if the Library Committee were left as it now is. However, possibly when the new library is constructed, a Senate committee might well set the policy for the use and control of certain parts of the library. President Van Pelt suggested that to avoid cumbersome procedures, the present Library Committee cooperate with the Senate Instructional Policy Committee on library policy matters.

Prof. Hellman referred to the minutes of the January 7, 1959 meeting, Page 3, where it was brought out that the Senate committees can consult any faculty member, group, or committee while studying proposed policies, and therefore, the Senate Instructional Policy Committee can ask the present Library Committee for any information or opinions that it may desire.

It was pointed out that Item E on the Agenda was accomplished at meeting number two, as recorded on Page 4 of the minutes for that meeting.

It was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Prof. Bredekamp that the proposal that no student should be graduated unless his English is considered acceptable, in accord with established minimum standards as set by a sub-committee of the Senate Academic Standards Committee, be referred to the Academic Standards Committee for study. The motion carried.

In consideration of Item G of the Agendas, President Van Pelt reported that he has changed the wording of the conferring of honorary degrees to say "on recommendation of the Executive Committee of the faculty" to replace "on recommendation of the faculty." He feels that it is a question of policy as to whether or not the general faculty should approve honorary degrees, but pointed out that there are great operational difficulties involved. On the other hand, he firmly believes that the academic standards of any school should be protected by the faculty. Prof. DelliQuadri asked if the Senate might not be the body to approve honorary degrees, as a voice of the faculty. President Van Pelt questioned this plan, as to whether or not it was part of academic policy as set forth in the purposes of the Senate.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Col. Schirmer that this question be referred to the Academic Standards Committee for study. It was moved by Prof. Bayer and supported by Prof. Romig that this question be postponed indefinitely. The postponement motion carried 25-12.

Prof. Neilson pointed out that item H of the Agenda is covered in Senate Proposal No. 2-60.

It was moved by Prof. DelliQuadri and supported by Prof. Bredekamp that Senate Proposal No. 1-60 be adopted.

Prof. Snelgrove was of the opinion that five variable credits are not enough and suggested that a maximum of nine be allowed. Prof. Longacre stated that the Physics Department has found their three courses of three credits each in Special Topics to be very useful. President Van Pelt felt the Proposal required some elaboration on such things as who would approve each program and how many credits could be approved for each program. He felt that these phrases should be added to insure control of these variable credits. Prof. Young pointed out that approval of such courses and credits is a function of the Curricular Policy Committee. Prof. Neilson stated he felt the amount of credit granted is an operational matter. Prof. Bredekamp pointed out the the Proposal is simply an encouragement, and is not a firm policy. Prof. Noblet pointed out that they have had courses of this type in the Forestry Department for a number of years, primarily pertaining to research, and added his support to the suggestion that the maximum credit allowed by increased to nine.

It was moved by Prof. Anderson and supported by Prof. Neilson that the Proposal be amended by removing the 1-5 credits which are in parentheses in the Proposal. The motion to amend was carried. The motion to adopt Senate Proposal No. 1-60 as amended was carried.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Van Westenberg that Senate Proposal No. 2-60 be adopted.
Prof. Heath requested clarification of the Argonne National Laboratory program for graduate students of Michigan Tech. Prof. Makens stated that a faculty member from Michigan Tech keeps in close touch with those students and is definitely in charge of the program.

Prof. Neilson distributed a new recommendation, as follows, which he said adds proficiency examinations to Senate Proposal No. 2-60:

The college recognizes that through initiative, directed study, self improvement, and/or experience, certain students may have acquired academic abilities in subject-matter field through means other than formal college course work. To recognize such proficiency it is recommended that the following policy be adopted:

1. College credit toward graduation or waiver of prerequisites may be granted for scholastic attainment through other than formal course work provided that:
   
   (a) the work is planned and is approved by the Head of the Department as part of the student's degree program, and completed under the direction of a member of the college faculty, or

   (b) the student demonstrates competence in a subject through proficiency examination.

2. Proficiency examinations may be given to those students who obtain the approval of the department concerned. Such examinations are given under the following restrictions:
   
   (a) they may be taken only by persons who are in residence or are registered in a correspondence course, or who are candidates for degrees and need no more than ten term hours to complete the requirements for their degrees;

   (b) they may not be taken to raise grades or to remove failure in courses;

   (c) they may not be taken for college credit in any subject that duplicates credit used to satisfy admission requirements.

Prof. Hooker suggested the possibility of combining the new recommendation with Senate Proposal No. 2-60. Prof. Romig questioned how the new recommendation ties in with Senate Proposal No. 2-60, because the second paragraph is in contradiction to Senate Proposal No. 2-59.

It was moved by Prof. Hooker and supported by Prof. Bredekamp that Senate Proposal No. 2-60 be referred to the Curricular Policy Committee for further study, with the idea of combining it with the new proposal. Prof. Neilson agreed that this can be done but that it would not save any wordage. The motion carried.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Work that Senate Proposal No. 3-60 be adopted.

Prof. Heath questioned what was meant by "new teachers." It was the consensus that "new teachers" referred to those with no previous teaching experience. Prof. Longacre questioned as to who should operate the program; that is, whether it should be operated by the department or be a college-wide program. Prof. Work said that the Instructional Policy Committee felt it should be college-wide. President Van Pelt informed the group that Georgia Tech adopted a similar program some years ago which has shown some very valuable results. He also said that it had been recommended by some educational societies. Prof. Heath asked if students who are hired as part-time instructors should be included. Prof. Work said the Instructional Policy Committee felt that they should be. The motion to adopt Senate Proposal No. 3-60 was carried.

Prof. Hooker stated his opinion that the Agenda Committee should do a better screening job in preparing the Agenda for Senate meetings.

President Van Pelt remarked, on the subject of Sabbatical leave, that he feels every college should work toward a budget to assist the faculty in advancing in their respective fields. However, he pointed out this is a great financial problem, but the machinery can be worked out if the financial problem can be. Therefore, he wants to give no undue encouragement to the adoption of a Sabbatical leave program, but he feels it is entirely proper for the Senate to recommend such a policy so that the School will be ready to put such a plan into effect if and when financially possible. He felt it is desirable to take some action, but reminded the group that it would take some time before it could possibly be put into effect.

Prof. Bredekamp, in answer to Prof. Hooker's remark about the Agenda Committee, stated that the Committee did not like to be arbitrary, so having no written rules as to what should or should not be included in the Agenda, it w a felt by the Committee that they had no right to exclude items presented by members of the Senate or general faculty.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp that the meeting recess until January 12, 1960. There being no support, no action was taken.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Harold Meese, Secretary