MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER SIX
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY
2 March 1960

(Senate Minute pages: 45-52)

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

The roll of members was called, showing all members present except Been, Belanger, Bourdo, Boyd, Cox, DelliQuadri, Gibson, Heath, Hesterberg, Hicks, Hooker, Kemp, Longacre, Makens, Myers, Niemi, Noblet, Romig, Schnelle, R.L. Smith, Townsend, Van Westenburg, Vichich.

Pres. Van Pelt appointed the following to act as the Election Committee for this year:

Col. Schirmer, Chairman
Prof. Bahrman
Prof. Harry
Prof. Heath
Prof. Robert

It was moved by Prof. Snelgrove and supported by Prof. Young that Senate Proposals No. 4-59, 1-60, and 6-60 be finally adopted.

It was moved by Prof. Garland and supported by Mr. Volin to amend Senate Proposal No. 4-59 by deleting the second sentence of Part II - Eligibility. Prof. Garland expressed the opinion that the research departments were being excluded. He feels this is no more justified than administrative officers being excluded, since some of the research personnel are included on the Graduate Faculty and some do have split duties, i.e., part research and part teaching. He thinks the lack of uniformity in titles of research personnel is an administrative problem which should be smoothed out for purposes such as this.

The motion to amend Senate Proposal No. 4-59 carried.

It was moved by Dean Kerekes and supported by Prof. Fryxell to amend Senate Proposal No. 4-59 by inserting the word "General" in Part II before the word "Faculty." The motion carried.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Price to amend Senate Proposal No. 4-59 by deleting Part VI - Departmental Adjustments. Prof. Bredekamp stated that he feels strongly that faculty members in small departments, should have the same chance for sabbatical leave as faculty members in the larger departments. The motion carried.

It was pointed out by Prof. Bredekamp that unanimous consent of the members present was needed to act upon Senate Proposal No. 4-59, since it had been amended after publication to the General Faculty in the minutes of meeting number five.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Anderson that the members present give their unanimous consent to act upon Senate Proposal No. 4-59. The motion carried unanimously.

The results of written ballot voting on the motion to adopt Senate Proposals No. 4-59 (as amended), No. 1-60, and No. 6-60 were as follows:

Senate Proposal No. 4-59 was finally adopted by a vote of 29-1
Senate Proposal No. 1-60 was finally adopted by a vote of 26-3
Senate Proposal No. 6-60 was finally adopted by a vote of 27-2.

These proposals now read as follows:

Senate Proposal No. 4-59 PROGRAM FOR 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
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Members of the General Faculty of Michigan College of Mining and Technology shall be eligible for sabbatical leave.

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.

Senate Proposal No. 1-60

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.

Senate Proposal No. 6-60

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.

Prof. Sermon reported as chairman of the Academic Standards Committee by reading the minutes of a meeting of the committee at which the following recommendation was made:

RECOMMENDED SCHOLASTIC STANDARDS
A student earning less than a 1.00 average or receiving three or more failing grades in one quarter, provided the student has been enrolled for ten or more credits, shall be excluded from the following regular quarter.

A student earning an average less than 2.00 each quarter for three successive quarters, provided the student has been enrolled for ten or more credits each quarter, shall be excluded at the end of the spring quarter, or earlier at the discretion of the Committee on Scholastic Standards. The exclusion shall be for one academic year.

A student attaining a cumulative grade point deficiency greater than thirty points shall be excluded at the end of the spring quarter or earlier at the discretion of the Committee on Scholastic Standards. The exclusion shall be for one academic year.

Courses for which a student is enrolled during the summer quarter will enter into his average, but the performance therein will lead to his exclusion only by action of the Committee on Scholastic Standards.

In the discussion of this recommendation, Prof. Bredekamp asked what was meant by "thirty points" in the third paragraph. Prof. Sermon answered that this referred to grade point deficiencies. Prof. Neilson asked why the summer quarter student should be treated differently than students for the other quarters. Prof. Sermon answered that there are some students who take only one course with a large number of credits during the summer quarter, and that by receiving one poor grade, the grade point deficiency builds up so fast that it was felt to be unfair to the summer quarter student. Dean Kerekes asked why students taking less than ten credits during a quarter should be excluded from the provisions of the first paragraph. Prof. Sermon answered that these students are classified as special students and that this recommendation was intended for regularly enrolled students. He further stated that this condition could be covered by adding the phrase included in the second paragraph "or earlier at the discretion of the Committee on Scholastic Standards." Prof. Work stated that he would prefer to see a discretionary clause inserted which would take into account the judgment of a qualified committee rather than make exclusion mandatory if the student failed to meet the standards set up by this recommendation. Prof. Weaver inquired if it was intended that one academic year of exclusion was the longest period a student would be excluded. Prof. Young pointed out that a student, in order to be readmitted, must appeal to the Committee on Scholastic Standards before he is readmitted.

Prof. Neilson reported as Chairman for the Curricular Policy Committee that one meeting has been held at which a subcommittee was appointed to study and reword Senate Proposal No. 2-60. The committee also considered at this meeting the problem of students transferring from junior and community colleges to Michigan Tech. This problem is being studied further.

Prof. Work reported as Chairman for the Instructional Policy Committee that the committee is continuing its study of the statement on academic freedom and should have a proposal ready for action in the near future.

Prof. Fryxell, as Chairman, had no report for the Faculty Professional Development Committee.

Prof. Fryxell further reported, as Chairman for the Wild-Eyed Idea Committee, that this committee has held one meeting and has nine wild-eyed ideas, but is not prepared to make a formal report at this time. It will make a report soon.

Pres. Van Pelt reported that Senate Proposals No. 1-59, 2-59, and 3-60 (all finally adopted by the Senate) are being referred to the Board of Control at its meeting April 8 and 9.

It was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Col. Schirmer that Senate Proposal No. 5-60, Senate Procedural By-Laws, be referred to a committee for further study. In the discussion, Prof. Bredekamp stated that he feels the general idea of the procedures set up in this proposal will minimize the Senate acting as a "committee of the whole," will result in better wording of the proposals, and will have the advantage of everyone knowing how proposals are to be made. The motion to refer to committee carried.

Pres. Van Pelt referred Senate Proposal No. 5-60 to the Agenda Committee for further study.

It was moved by Prof. Fryxell and supported by Prof. Weaver that Senate Proposal No. 4-60 be adopted as stated. Prof. Bredekamp stated that he feels such a step is necessary, but that the information on cheating by a particular student should not be passed on to other colleges. Prof. Weaver asked what is done with the student's personnel record. Prof. Meese answered that these personnel records are kept in the Dean of Students' Office, are considered confidential, and only authorized persons see them. Prof. Work stated that the Instructional Policy is considering practices of instruction, grading, etc., and feels that this problem of cheating should be included in these considerations. Prof. Anderson stated that he feels that any record of the first offense of cheating should be destroyed upon graduation of the student.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Pearce to amend Senate Proposal No. 4-60 by adding the sentence "This confidential record of cheating by the student will be destroyed upon graduation of the student." Prof. Work asked if this meant that each personnel record of graduating students would then need to be inspected for such a record.

The motion to amend was defeated 16-15.

Dean Kerekes stated that he feels the word "automatically" in the first paragraph is wrong and that a student should have a trial or hearing before any decision is made. Prof. Neilson stated that certainly cheating is a major problem and that some students who have talked to him feel they are being discriminated against by not cheating. He feels possibly this proposal strays somewhat from policy and may be an operation problem. He further feels that the problem of cheating should tie in with an honor system which would be controlled by students rather than faculty or administrative officers. Prof. Baker asked what the procedure would be if a student was detected cheating and the incident was reported to the Dean of Students. Prof. Meese
answered that the action in each case must be decided on the evidence presented in each incident. Prof. Baker further asked if the Dean of Students is to decide whether cheating occurred or not. Prof. Meese answered that this is the intention of the proposal, but the decision would be based on evidence presented in each incident. Pres. Van Pelt pointed out that in the first sentence of the proposal it states that cheating "beyond any reasonable doubt" is required before action is taken. Prof. Hellman stated that he felt the principle of the student being innocent until proven guilty would apply. Prof. Price asked what was meant by formal examinations. Prof. Meese answered that in reconsidering the proposal he recommended the word "formal" be deleted, and that he also recommended another change in the make-up of the appeal board, in that the faculty member should be selected by the President rather than by the Senate. Prof. Pearce pointed out that there are examinations other than formal examinations. He also stated that the college does have a certain responsibility to try to prevent crime and immoral behavior on the part of its students.

It was moved by Prof. Pearce and supported by Prof. Bredekamp that Senate Proposal No. 4-60 be referred to the Instructional Policy Committee for further study. The motion carried.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Harold Meese, Secretary