MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER FIVE
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY

3 February 1960

(Senate Minute pages: 37-44)

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

The roll of members was called, showing all members present except Anderson, Bayer, Been, Bourdo, Boyd, Bovard, Cox, Crawford, Dahlman, Heath, Longacre, Makens, Myers, Niemi, Polkinghorne, Schirmer, and Smith T.N.

Meetings of meeting number four were approved with corrections made at the December 1 session.

Members to the Committee on Committees for a two-year term which expires August 31, 1961 were elected as follows:

Representing Group II, Prof. Hellman
Representing Group III, Prof. Young
Representing Group IV, Prof. Vichich

In the discussion of Senate Proposal No. 1-59, Prof. Price suggested "humanity" is not the proper word, there being no single humanity, and the words in the proposal were changed to read "satisfactory humanities in social studies."

Prof. Fryxell suggested that the words "of the required credits" be inserted in the last sentence before the words "not necessarily in a sequence." These suggestions were approved and Senate Proposal No. 1-59, which reads as follows, was finally adopted by a vote of 35-1.

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 satisfactory Humanities or Social Studies. At least nine credits of the required credits, not necessarily in a sequence, must be completed within a single area.

In the discussion of Senate Proposal No. 1-60, Dean Kerekes wanted to add the words "not to exceed nine" after the word "credit." He felt we should not open the gates too widely in granting this variable credit. Prof. Young pointed out that all courses must be approved by the Dean, the Curricular Policy Committee, and the Executive Committee before being offered and that he felt this should be sufficient safeguard against opening the gate too widely. Dean Kerekes replied that he thought this is not good, that it entails too much red tape, and the limit should be included in the policy.

Prof. Snelgrove and Neilson pointed out that this proposal, when first brought up, had to do with summer sessions and institutes, and it was not the intention to cover all undergraduate variable credit courses. Prof. Pearce urged that this proposal be divorced from any summer session held in connection with the National Science Foundation. It curtails flexibility for special or unique opportunities and conditions for both our students and our faculty members to participate in summer institutes sponsored by the National Science Foundation. He agreed with Dean Kerekes that there should be a nine credit limit imposed on this type of course.

Prof. Bredekamp quoted, from the minutes of the December 1 meeting of the Senate, the discussion held at that meeting on Senate Proposal 1-60. Prof. Hooker expressed the opinion that policy statements should be as non-restrictive as possible. Prof. DelliQuadri rose to a point of order that discussion was proceeding without a motion being on the floor.

It was moved by Dean Kerekes and supported by Prof. Snelgrove that the words "not to exceed nine" be inserted after the word "credit." In the second line of the proposal. Pres. Van Pelt asked if this nine-credit maximum pertained to the credits a department may offer, or pertained to the credits a student may take. Prof. Pearce asked if the meaning was to be interpreted as nine undergraduate and nine graduate credits. Dean Kerekes suggested that the words "graduate and undergraduate" be left out and that each course offered be for not more than nine credits. Pres. Van Pelt asked if the word "ordinarily" in the second line of the proposal should not be left out. Dean Kerekes and Prof. Snelgrove withdrew the motion.

It was moved by Dean Kerekes and supported by Prof. Snelgrove that Proposal No. 1-60 be referred back to the Curricular Policy Committee for further study. Prof. Neilson asked if the policy intended is wrong or does the proposal need only rewording.

The motion to refer was carried.

Prof. Bredekamp asked if single courses or multiple courses should be offered. Prof. Baker suggested that the same department may offer several institutes and therefore should not be limited to one course. Prof. Neilson suggested that nine credits might restrict some departments. Pres. Van Pelt asked if it was not the purpose of this variable credit to accommodate different students taking different programs or research work under the same course name. Dean Kerekes pointed out that any course of this type listed in the catalogue can be given variable credit. He felt the faculty should determine the number of credits
given in these courses. Prof. Schnelle said it was his understanding that the College Curriculum Committee approves all
courses listed in the catalogue anyway, and suggested that the catalogue be amended to include these institute courses. Prof.
Van Pelt suggested that the College Curriculum Committee might lose control of the courses offered and credits granted if each
department decided to offer courses entitled "Special Programs in (Department)" and be allowed to assign the credits. Prof.
Schnelle wondered if the number of students should be limited or the number of professors should be limited for these courses.
He suggested the professors could use these courses for giving credit to students who carry out research projects under the
professor's supervision. Prof. Hooker suggested that this proposal is more of a resolution than a policy and therefore is the job
of the College Curriculum Committee. Prof. Robert reminded the Senate that the College Curriculum Committee has been doing
this for many years.

It was moved by Prof. Hooker and supported by Prof. Young that Senate Proposal 1-60 be reconsidered and voted on as stated.
The motion carried.

It was moved by Dean Kerekes and supported by Prof. Snelgrove that the words "not to exceed nine credits" be inserted after
the word "credit" in the second line of the proposal. The motion carried and Senate Proposal No. 1-60 now is formalized as
follows:

That departments be encouraged to institute graduate and undergraduate courses for variable credit not to exceed nine credits, in topics not ordinarily listed in the College catalogue.

There was no debate on Senate Proposal No. 3-60. It was finally adopted by a vote of 36-1.

In discussing Senate Proposal No. 2-60, Prof. Neilson stated that the combination of Senate Proposals No. 2-59, 2-60, and 6-60
was meant originally to clarify the policies, but apparently resulted in more confusion. Pres. Van Pelt stated that the wording of
Senate Proposal No. 2-60 as it stands is confusing and requested that the proposal be re-referred to the Curricular Policy
Committee for clarification of words and meaning. He suggested that the subheads are not clear and he feels that subheads 2,
3, and 4 should be combined.

If was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Prof. Romig that Senate Proposal No. 2-60 be referred to the Curricular Policy
Committee for rewording to clarify.

In the discussion of Senate Proposal No. 6-60, Pres. Van Pelt reviewed the sequence of action taken to this point. The proposal
was introduced directly to the Curricular Policy Committee by Prof. Work. (The number 6-60 was assigned this proposal when
the Secretary received word that it was to be presented.) The Curricular Policy Committee studied the proposal and
recommended the following:

Written proficiency examinations for course credit may be given to those students who have prepared
themselves by self study, tutoring, or other means, without formal registration in the course. Such examinations
must receive the approval of the department concerned and may be given only under the following restrictions:

1. They may be taken only by persons who are in residence or are registered in a correspondence or
   extension course, or who are candidates for degrees and need no more than ten hours to complete the
   requirements for their degrees.

2. They may not be taken to raise grades or to remove failure in courses.

3. They may not be taken for college credit in any subject that duplicates credit used to satisfy admission
   requirements.

Prof. Work asked which department would be the one concerned in giving approval of such examinations. Dean Kerekes
suggested that the proposal be edited to read "departments." Prof. Romig stated that he liked the idea but there are no
safeguards against overloading a particular professor with students who want to take proficiency examinations simply on the
chance that they might pass, or on the basis that the student is of the opinion that he could pass a proficiency examination. Prof.
Romig further suggested that if they fail this proficiency examination they be given a grade of F. Prof. Pearce pointed out that
Prof. Romig's suggestions were procedure rather than policy. Prof. Hooker asked for clarification of Part 1 of the proposal. Pres.
Van Pelt suggested that the proposal be edited by adding the words "are no longer in residence but" to be inserted between the
words "who" and "are" in line 3 of Part 1. Prof. Van Westenburg questioned why the student could not take these examinations
to remove a failure, as stated in Part 2. He gave as an example that this might bar an examination from former students who
have since picked up industrial experience in the subjects that they had failed. He felt these students should have a chance to
erase the failures in subjects in which they have this industrial experience. Prof. Neilson stated that the committee did not intend
this proposal to cover this type of student. Prof. Hooker asked why, if a student can take an examination without taking the
course, the same student may not take a proficiency examination to make up an F.

It was moved by Prof. DelliQuadri and supported by Dean Kerekes that Senate Proposal 6-60, with the above mentioned
changes, be adopted.
Prof. Hooker asked to have his question answered. Dean Kerekes stated that he thinks "proficiency examinations" does not apply for removing F grades. Prof. Otis asked if approval of both departments is necessary in the case of a new student who is well versed in some subject. This student must now wait until an advanced course is offered, or take a course which he has already covered, since he cannot get credit under the present regulations. Prof. Hesterberg stated that he thinks this is a matter of procedure. Prof. Hooker stated that he thought the number 2 part of the proposal should be stricken, since the matter is covered in Part 1.

Prof. Bredekamp moved to insert the words "and have not previously registered in the course" between the word "registered" and "in" in line 2 of Part 1. There being no second to the motion, no action was taken.

Prof. Pearce expressed the opinion that the Senate was laboring under a lack of word terminology here in talking about "proficiency examinations."

The motion to adopt Senate Proposal No. 6-60, as edited, carried 28-6. It reads as follows:

Written proficiency examinations for course credit may be given to those students who have prepared themselves by self study, tutoring, or other means, without formal registration in the course. Such examinations must receive the approval of the departments concerned and may be given only under the following restrictions:

1. They may be taken only by persons who are in residence or are registered in a correspondence or extension course, or who are no longer in residence but are candidates for degrees and need no more than ten hours to complete the requirements for their degrees.

2. They may not be taken to raise grades or to remove failure in courses.

3. They may not be taken for college credit in any subject that duplicates credit used to satisfy admission requirements.

In the discussion of Senate Proposal No. 3-59 concerning academic freedom, Prof. DelliQuadri felt that the school should have a statement of policy on academic freedom. Prof. Work, chairman of the Instructional Policy Committee, stated that much of the proposal was drawn from the A.A.U.P., with modifications, one of these being the statements on textbook selection.

It was moved by Prof. Work and supported by Prof. DelliQuadri that Senate Proposal No. 3-59 be adopted.

Pres. Van Pelt stated that academic freedom is of prime importance to the Board of Control and therefore any Senate approval will be presented to the Board of Control for action. He further stated that the Board will probably need a considerable amount of explanation to clarify all points of this statement and that it may require a considerable amount of time for adoption by the Board of Control.

Prof. Hooker stated that he felt such a statement was necessary as a reference for future problems, and that now is the time for such a statement and not after the problem arises. Dean Kerekes questioned: what are the established principles referred to in line 5 of the second paragraph, who established these principles, and by what authority were they established. Prof. DelliQuadri answered that many principles on academic freedom have been adopted widely by many other colleges and universities throughout the United States, particularly the larger eastern universities. Prof. Fryxell pointed out that these principles are included in the later paragraphs of the proposal. Prof. DelliQuadri gave some background on the problems of the Tenure Committee. He said that a policy statement is needed each time a tenure problem arises, therefore, he feels that such a statement is needed for support and guidance in academic freedom problems. Prof. Garland said that the language of the proposal needs to be screened and corrected where necessary.

Prof. Price moved to amend the third sentence of the sixth paragraph to read: "Any objection to their selection need be considered only if regular action to proscribe the book has been taken or is pending in a Michigan state court or in a Federal court." He also asked from whom the approval should be requested, and stated that he felt the words "litigation anywhere in the United States" is too wide an area. There followed much discussion on the point of legal action being necessary or not necessary. Entering into these discussions were Pres. Van Pelt, Professors, Price, Romig, Kemp, Weaver, and Pearce.

There being no second to the motion to amend, no action was taken.

It was moved by Prof. Pearce and supported by Prof. Hesterberg that the proposal be referred back to the committee for further study and clarification. Prof. Hooker pointed out that this will delay getting the subject before the general faculty. Prof. Pearce reminded the Senate that the committee can use any means to get ideas on this subject, and should get more thoughts from the general faculty.

The motion to refer to committee carried 19-18.

Prof. Hooker said he still desired to bring the subject before the general faculty and that at one of the first meetings of the Committee on Committees, it was recommended that hearings be held on subjects of broad interest to the general faculty. He said he felt this should be done now.

In discussing Senate Proposal No. 4-59 concerning a program for sabbatical leave, Prof. Fryxell reported that the Faculty Professional Development Committee had met seven times and spent more than fifty man hours in preparing the program for discussion at the November meeting. Thus far, no discussion had been held in a Senate meeting, and it was his hope that the
subject would be discussed at this meeting rather than postponed to the next meeting. Mr. Volin questioned if it was the intention of the committee to omit research personnel under the eligibility section. Prof. Fryxell replied that the committee was divided on this question and the majority had decided to exclude the research personnel, based primarily on the feeling that various "breaks" come to research personnel in their regular work. Prof. Robert said the committee also felt that the research groups already have a policy of leaving the school to go to industry from time to time on their regular projects. Prof. Bredekamp pointed out that in the Statement of Purposes of the Senate, the Senate was to consider academic problems and not research problems. Prof. Garland stated that the sabbatical leave is for the mutual benefit of the person and the institution. He pointed out that the person may study different levels and phases of research problems, and said that sabbatical leave should not be treated or thought of as a reward, but only as an opportunity to advance oneself and at the same time increase the potential value of the institution. Pres. Van Pelt remarked that Prof. Bredekamp's point was well taken and that possibly the administration may need to handle this problem for the research personnel. Mr. Volin stated that it appears to him that the research departments are not departments of the College. Prof. Snelgrove stated that "sabbatical" means "every seven years" but that we propose to give leave after six quarters. He felt that the words used are not proper. He also felt that the procedure for obtaining a substitute while a person is on leave should be included in the policy. Prof. Fryxell stated that the committee did not want to be bound by the tradition of sabbatical meaning every seven years.

Prof. Rakestraw, an invited consultant on sabbatical leaves, stated that he had examined the policies of many colleges on sabbatical leave and that is granted every seven years at most colleges, but there are several exceptions, some of which grant the leave on the seventh or eighth quarter.

Prof. Bredekamp stated that in Section VI, Departmental Adjustments, some clause should be inserted that will grant personnel of all departments an equal chance to be granted sabbatical leave. He pointed out that small departments in many schools suffer, since they do not have enough personnel to fill in for the absent person. He further pointed out that there are many good men in small departments, as well as in large departments, who need sabbatical leave.

It was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Prof. DelliQuadri that Senate Proposal No. 4-59 be adopted. The motion carried.

POLICY ON SABBATICAL LEAVE

I. General Policy

The policy of granting sabbatical leaves of absence is intended for the mutual benefit of the institution and the person granted such a leave. Sabbatical leaves shall be granted in recognition of significant service by faculty members for the purpose of making possible a period of creative activity free from other duties and responsibilities, during which the faculty member may further his competence in his profession. It is the policy of the institution to be liberal in interpreting various kinds of activity as appropriate to sabbatical leave; but the granting of such leave will in no case be automatic, and each request for sabbatical leave will be judged on its own merits.

II. Eligibility

Members of the faculty of Michigan College of Mining and Technology shall be eligible for sabbatical leave. The term faculty as used here shall include all members of the instructional, administrative, and library staffs with academic rank.

III. Types of Leave

A. A faculty member who has served for two years (six quarters) shall be eligible to take one quarter off with full pay.

B. A faculty member who has served for four years (12 quarters) without taking leave shall be eligible to take two quarters off with full pay.

C. A faculty member who has served for six years (18 quarters) without taking leave shall be eligible to take three quarters off with full pay.

D. The accumulation of time off for sabbatical leave, while computed at the rate of one quarter off for each six quarters of service, may be no greater than a total of three quarters at any one time.

E. The summer quarter shall not be counted in accumulating time for leave, either for three-term or four-term employees.

F. Leaves of absence without pay shall not be counted among the years of service as a basis for sabbatical leave.

G. Any individual receiving sabbatical leave must agree to return to his position for the following year, with such exceptions as the President may permit.

IV. Procedure
Any application for sabbatical leave of absence shall be made to the department head. The applicant must submit a detailed program of study, research, or other projects he proposes to carry on during his period of absence. Decision on the application shall rest jointly with the department head, the Dean of the Faculty, and the President.

V. Remuneration

Faculty members on sabbatical leave of absence shall not accept paid employment involving their teaching at any other institution of learning. They are, however, permitted to receive money from fellowships, grants for study or research, or consultation, without prejudice to the receipt of their salary from this institution.

VI. Departmental Adjustments

Care should be taken that sabbatical leaves are not granted at such times or under such circumstances that the effectiveness of the departmental program will be impaired.

It was moved by Prof. Robert and supported by Prof. Noblet that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Harold Meese, Secretary