MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER SEVEN
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN COLLEGE OF MINING AND TECHNOLOGY
26 May 1960

(Senate Minute pages: 53-63)

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, Bourdo, Boyd, Cox, Crawford, Dahlman, DelliQuadri, Garland, Hellman, Hesterberg, Hicks, Kerekes, Myers, Otis, Robert, R.L. Smith, Swenson, Townsend, Van Westenburg, Vichich, Volin, and Wiedenhoefer. A quorum was declared present.

It was moved by Prof. Snelgrove and supported by Prof. Young that the minutes of meeting number six be approved as distributed.

Prof. Meese reported for the Agenda Committee and presented Senate Proposal No. 5-60, Senate Procedural Bylaws.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Baker that Senate Proposal 5-60 be adopted.

It was moved by Prof. Snelgrove and supported by Prof. Bredekamp to amend Senate Proposal No. 5-60 by omitting "the condition of" from line (d), Section A-1. The motion to amend carried.

Prof. Work felt that two new pages of procedure for the Senate are unnecessary but that possibly this could be limited to about one-half page. Prof. Bredekamp replied that although it took two pages to write down the procedures, the procedures themselves are relatively simple, and the purpose was simply to have a proposal in writing before it was debated on the Senate floor.

The motion to adopt Proposal No. 5-60 as amended carried. It is as follows:

WHEREAS the Constitution of the Senate of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology specifies certain general operating procedures for its function and,

WHEREAS Section 1 and Section 2, Article VII - Procedures of said Constitution - do not differentiate between prepared statements, ideas, comments, instructions to committees, and other methods of presentation, and

WHEREAS there is a need of specific procedures to enable the Senate to operate with efficiency,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The following Procedural By-Laws of the Senate be adopted:

A. Policy Statement Procedure in the Senate

Proposed Policy considerations (Section 1, Article VII - Procedures of the Constitution of the Senate) shall follow the following procedures:

I. Form of Presentation

Consideration may be submitted under one of two conditions, defined as a formal form and as a non-formal form.

(a) The formal form shall consist of the following:

1. A Descriptive Title
2. An Introductory Statement in which the need of such a policy is given.
3. A Statement of the Resolution

(b) The non-formal form shall consist of the following:

1. A Form not defined as a formal form
2. Those statements which consist of recommendations for investigation to committees, general ideas, general comments, and any other item not a specific policy or specific procedure of the Senate.

(c) Both formal and non-formal forms shall be in writing.

(d) The Agenda Committee shall decide the form of presentation.

II. Formal Form Policy Statement Procedure

Proposed Policy Statements that are in formal form shall follow the following procedure:
1. The Statement may be delivered to the Secretary personally or at a meeting of the Senate without debate.
2. The Secretary shall number each such statement.
3. The Secretary shall submit each statement to the Agenda Committee.
4. The Agenda Committee shall place such Statement on the Agenda of the following meeting.

III. Non-Formal Form Policy Statement Procedure

Proposed Policy Statements that are in non-formal form shall follow the following procedure:

1. The Statement must be delivered to the Secretary personally or at a meeting of the Senate without debate.
2. The Secretary shall number and title each statement.
3. The Secretary shall refer the statement to the Agenda Committee.
4. The Agenda Committee shall refer the statement to the Appropriate Committee and/or other appropriate channels as outlined in Section 1, Article VII - Procedure of the Constitution of the Senate.
5. The Agenda Committee shall report to the Senate the assignment of all such statements at the following meeting of the Senate.
6. The Committee to which such statements are assigned shall report the progress of action on such statements until such time as they are formalized or recommended for no further action by the Senate.
7. Statements that are not reported out of Committee within six months of assignment may be called to the floor of the Senate by any member of the Senate.
8. Status of Statements not reported out of Committee shall be summarized by the Committee annually at the first meeting of the Senate in each academic year.

B. Debate on Policy Statements during Proceedings of the Senate Meetings.

Policy considerations which subscribe to the procedure specified in Section A above shall conform to the following debating rules:

1. Debate on the submitted proposal shall be allowed when the proposal is in formal form and presented on the Agenda of a Senate meeting.
2. Debate on proposals in final form on the Agenda shall be unlimited.
3. Debate on proposals approved by the Senate for final action of the Senate (see Section 3, Article VII - Procedure of the Constitution) shall be limited to two (2) minutes for each Senate member desiring the floor.

C. Amendments to Senate Procedural By-Laws

The Senate may amend the Procedural By-Laws by a two-thirds vote of the Senate members present.

Prof. Work reported as chairman of the Instructional Policy Committee that the committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting and formalized the wording of Senate Proposal No. 4-60 (Cheating). They also arrived at some recommendations, which will be distributed later, on improved testing procedures, but the latter was not in final form.

Prof. Neilson reported as chairman of the Curricular Policy Committee that the committee had met twice and was studying the problems of the common freshman year curriculum approach; that is, the Problems and Ideas Today courses to replace the English courses, and that each department have a System Analysis course each term.

Pres. Van Pelt reported the action taken on those Senate proposals which have previously been finally adopted and recommended: The following Senate proposals have been approved by the President as College policy:

- Senate Proposal No. 1-59 - Elective Credits in the Humanities
- Senate Proposal No. 3-60 - Teacher Training

The following Senate Proposals are under study for possible combining and modification by the President:

- Senate Proposal No. 2-59 - Transfer of Unassigned Credit
- Senate Proposal No. 1-60 - Variable Credit for Courses not Listed in College Catalogue
- Senate Proposal No. 6-60 - Proficiency Examinations
- Senate Proposal No. 2-60 - Credit for Off-Campus or Non-College Work
Senate Proposal No. 4-59, Sabbatical Leave, has been referred to the Board of Control since it is a matter of overall College policy involving expenditures of funds.

Prof. Bredekamp pointed out that the Committee on Committees should report, at the first meeting next year, appointments to the standing committees for those members of these committees whose terms expire September 1st.

Prof. Romig nominated Prof. Boyd for the office of Secretary of the Senate for a two-year term beginning September 1, 1960. It was moved by Prof. Bovard and supported by Col. Schirmer that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast in favor of Prof. Boyd. The motion carried and Prof. Boyd was declared elected.

Col. Schirmer reported as chairman of the Election Committee that the following have been elected as members of the Senate for a three-year term starting September 1, 1960:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Group II (At Large)</th>
<th>From Group IV (Departmental Representatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Boyd</td>
<td>Vernon W. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.A. Hesterberg</td>
<td>James Oswald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.R. Price</td>
<td>Lawrence Rakestraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.G. Yerg</td>
<td>Kiril Spiroff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.F. Otis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was moved by Prof. Neilson and supported by Prof. Pearce that Senate Proposal No. 2-60 be adopted.

Prof. Baker asked if this proposal was intended to give high school students, who come to Tech with good high school backgrounds, credit for courses that they do not take here. Prof. Neilson answered this is the intention if the students can pass the examination for these courses.

Prof. Bovard asked if Canadian students would be able to receive advanced credit for the 13th year which is required in many Canadian high schools. Prof. Neilson answered that they may receive credit if they can demonstrate ability to pass the examination for these courses.

Pres. Van Pelt asked if a student can be given credit for mastering the subject even though he has not taken the course here at Michigan Tech. Prof. Neilson answered that this was the intention and that this work usually was done as advanced work in high school.

Prof. Niemi pointed out that, according to the proposal, either credit can be given for a course or prerequisites for an advanced course can be waived instead.

Prof. Longacre stated that the Northern States College Conference had a rule when Tech joined the Conference that Canadian students with the 13th-year credit lost one year of college eligibility. The Conference changed this rule to be inapplicable provided no credit is granted. Probably waivers of prerequisites could be allowed, but no credit should be given which would jeopardize the Canadian students’ athletic eligibility. Prof. Neilson answered that it was not the intention of the proposal to get into the question of nationality. He also pointed out that the Canadian engineering colleges do not give any credit for the 13th year, but, in fact, require this 13th year for entrance into the colleges.

Prof. Bovard stated that if these Canadian students must pass an examination for this credit, he thought the rule would probably be satisfactory as it stands. Prof. Neilson pointed out that all students being given credit must pass the examination for that course.

Pres. Van Pelt pointed out that if the prerequisite is waived, the student must still fulfill the total number of credits required for graduation in his major department. Prof. Neilson stated that the intention was to grant credit for those courses actually skipped, otherwise the student is actually penalized on credits, or, it may be thought of as giving him an opportunity to take more advanced work. Nevertheless, it is a form of penalty for the student to be required to take the same number of credits for his degree as other students in the department, even though the advanced student was able to pass the examinations in the early courses. Pres. Van Pelt emphasized that the waiver of the prerequisite does not now excuse students from the total credits required for a degree.

Prof. Romig thought that the purpose of the proposal was to reduce the actual credit needed for graduation for those students who were able to pass these examinations. Prof. Neilson pointed out that another intention of the proposal was to encourage the better students to come to Tech and to improve the quality of incoming students.

Prof. Baker asked who decides whether the student receives credit for the course or simply a waiver of prerequisites for an advanced course. Prof. Polkinghorne asked for clarification on what is meant by “professional work.” Prof. Neilson answered that it was meant that this work be of a professional caliber before it could be considered as possible credit.

Prof. T. Smith asked if a graduate needing one or two courses for his degree would be able to get credit for these courses after working a year or so at a professional level. Prof. Neilson expressed the opinion that this would be allowed. Prof. Young gave examples of where this very credit has been granted in the past. Pres. Van Pelt said that credits for courses such as Prof. Smith mentioned should be granted with great integrity by the department and the College, and certainly the student should be able to prove that he can actually do the work in these courses. Prof. Makens asked if there should not be a limitation on the
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professional experience part of granting credit. He also asked if a man comes to Tech on the staff short of a degree but with industrial or professional experience, can this experience be substituted for credit in certain courses. Prof. Sermon stated that although there is no residence requirement in our catalogue, it has been the operational policy that the last year before receiving a degree must be spent in residence on the campus. Pres. Van Pelt stated that this is in accordance with widespread college policy throughout the country. He also pointed out that there are a number of methods of becoming educated, skillful and proficient in a profession, but a college degree is one method of proving performance of degree work and should not be compromised.

Prof. Sermon stated that the Registrar makes final recommendations and approval for courses awarded credit to the student toward graduation. He further stated that the College has been waiving prerequisites for Math. 101 so that advanced students might take Math. 102. He feels now that they should get credit for this course which they skipped.

Prof. Bredekamp expressed the opinion that these advanced students should have an explanation of the program before they start on it.

Prof. Hooker expressed the opinion that it is not possible to phrase a policy to cover all cases and that special conditions should be considered when they arise.

Prof. Schnelle asked if an unusual student who has proficiency in a foreign language might be able to get four years' credit in language. Prof. Fryxell asked who decides whether credit is given or prerequisites are waived. Prof. Sermon stated he thought the head of the department should decide. Prof. Fryxell answered Prof. Schnelle's question then, that he would not be willing to give four years' credit but would be willing to waive prerequisites. Prof. Schnelle then asked what if this was not a natural language to the student but one that he had studied to gain his proficiency in the language. Prof. Fryxell stated that the same policy would apply. Prof. Schnelle asked why credit could be given in mathematics for work done in high school but not given in language for work done in high school. Prof. Neilson asked if a student could be given credit if he studied a language in a college or university elsewhere. Prof. Fryxell stated he would be willing to give such credit as long as the work was done at the college level.

Pres. Van Pelt said he thought the granting of credits should be uniform throughout the College and that the administration should provide coordination and uniformity. Therefore he suggested that the Registrar, in conjunction with the head of the department of the course be involved, and the head of the department of the student's major field, should jointly decide what credits should be granted or prerequisites waived. This would provide uniformity of the policy throughout the College.

Prof. Pearce pointed out that the preceding discussions were more or less a difference between policy and operation. He urged that we vote on the policy and let the operation be determined by the administration. Prof. Work stated that he felt the Senate should decide whether credit should be given for these courses or simply the waiver of prerequisites granted. Prof. Bovard stated that he should have a clarification of the policy to take to the next Northern States College Conference meeting to see how it would affect the present rules.

Prof. Schnelle asked if the Curricular Policy Committee would consider dividing this proposal into two parts - one to cover the waiver of prerequisites, and the other to cover the granting of credit. Prof. Neilson answered that it was intended that this question should be decided on an individual case basis.

Prof. Longacre thinks we should not give college credit for high school work.

Prof. Belanger asked what grade would be assigned for the credit granted the students. Prof. Sermon replied that no grade is assigned, it simply reduces the total number of credits required to be taken here at Tech for the student to graduate. It also reduces the base for computing the grade point average.

Prof Niemi stated that he thought the policy should be flexible enough to allow adjustment, but not so flexible as to allow any loopholes.

The vote on the question was called for and Senate Proposal 2-60 was adopted by a vote of 23-7. It reads as follows:

WHEREAS the Senate recognizes that certain students may have acquired academic abilities in subject-matter fields by prior study or by work done at other institutions, laboratories, and research institutes,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The following broad policy be adopted as a means of recognizing such abilities:

Credit, or waiver of prerequisites, may be granted for academic or professional work provided that:

1. the work demonstrates superior achievement in a program such as the Advanced Placement Program administered by the College Entrance Examination Board, or

2. the work was approved in advance by the head of a department as part of the student's degree program, and/or the work was done under the direction of a member of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology faculty or under the supervision of the faculty or staff of a university, laboratory, research institute, or government agency carrying on a comparable professional program.
Pres. Van Pelt instructed the Curricular Policy Committee to study the feasibility of a common curriculum for engineering departments in the first year.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Work that Senate Proposal No. 4-60 (Cheating) be adopted.

Prof. Romig asked whose "reasonable doubt" was meant. Prof. Work answered that the intention was that it should be the Instructor's reasonable doubt. Prof. Hooker asked what this proposal is supposed to accomplish. He felt that it would not stop cheating, and that, after all, the student cheating is cheating only himself and this will catch up with him in the long run.

Prof. Young asked what happened to the second paragraph of the original proposal, at which point the Secretary read the report of the Instructional Policy Committee, as follows:

There is no overall college policy on handling of student cheating. Individual departments have adopted standard practices intended to minimize it and some departments have established rules for handling offenders they apprehend.

The committee has spent more than a year studying this problem. A special subcommittee held a series of meetings during this period to discover how widespread dishonest practices are in academic work, particularly in major quizzes and examinations on this campus. Representatives from student organizations such as Tau Beta Pi and the Student Council have met with the subcommittee on several occasions. As a result of these investigations the committee proposes that each member of the faculty seriously consider its report on Testing Procedures. Conscientious study of this report and application of any procedures it outlines which are applicable to a given course will do much to encourage honesty among students.

The committee's formal recommendation which follows differs from the original proposal, mainly in the deletion of provisions for machinery for appeal. It is believed that addition of this superstructure would tend to put the instructor, rather than the offender, on the defensive. The integrity of the instructor and the judgment of the Dean of Students should be taken for granted. Addition of undue red tape will encourage instructors to dodge college policy in favor of their own methods. Many instructors would not care to face the problem of documenting evidence which, however valid, may be oral or visual and thus impossible to record on the spur of the moment.

In the event a student is detected cheating beyond any reasonable doubt during any formal examination or in the preparation of any significant individual assignment such as a term paper, he is to receive a failing grade for the course, and a record of the reason for this failure is to be submitted to the Dean of Students. This record is to be for the personal use of the Dean of Students and is to be destroyed upon the student's graduation. On the second such occurrence, said student shall be expelled from Tech without the possibility of readmission.

Prof. Longacre asked if there are degrees of cheating; should crib notes, copying and stealing examinations be treated separately, with various penalties for each? Prof. Weaver stated he thinks the student is given a second chance before being expelled, which would take care of lesser degrees of cheating and not condemn the student on the first minor offense. Prof. Hooker stated that this gives the unscrupulous Instructor a method of getting rid of any student he does not like. He also stated that he thought this would challenge the students to invent new methods of cheating. Prof. Longacre stated that currently the policy in the physics department is that any student caught cheating receives a zero grade on the examination. Col. Schirmer stated that this gives the unscrupulous Instructor a method of getting rid of any student he does not like. He also stated that he thought this would challenge the students to invent new methods of cheating. Prof. Longacre stated that currently the policy in the physics department is that any student caught cheating receives a zero grade on the examination. Col. Schirmer stated that this gives the unscrupulous Instructor a method of getting rid of any student he does not like. He also stated that he thought this would challenge the students to invent new methods of cheating.

Prof. Young asked what happened to the second paragraph of the original proposal, at which point the Secretary read the report of the Instructional Policy Committee, as follows:

The student detected cheating could appeal the charge to the Dean of Students, and, if still not satisfied, to a board composed of the Dean of Students, a faculty member selected by the President and a student selected by the Student Government. The decision of this board would be final.

"The student detected cheating could appeal the charge to the Dean of Students, and, if still not satisfied, to a board composed of the Dean of Students, a faculty member selected by the President and a student selected by the Student Government. The decision of this board would be final."
The motion was supported by Prof. Kemp.

Prof. Heath asked what was meant by formal examinations. Prof. Hooker asked if we are establishing a degree of cheating and suggested that we should take the approach of convincing the students that cheating is wrong and come up with an honor system of some sort in place of such a policy as Senate Proposal No. 4-60.

Prof. Baker stated that after considerable debate in the Instructional Policy Committee on this proposal, he felt that the second paragraph is unworkable and the decision is the Dean's responsibility anyway.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Romig to recess for 15 minutes. The motion to recess was defeated.

Prof. Belanger stated that he is in favor of an honor system, but pointed out that such a system must come from the students and that it cannot be forced upon them by the administration, faculty, or anyone else. He also informed the group of some instances which indicate that the students may be more susceptible to this than we think they are.

Prof. Bayer added his thoughts that paragraph two was unworkable.

Pres. Van Pelt pointed out that as the proposal now reads, the Instructor does not need to tell the student that he is being reported. This gives a great deal of latitude and flexibility to the policy.

A vote was then taken on the motion to amend, which was defeated 20-12.

The original motion to adopt Senate Proposal No. 4-60 carried by a vote of 23-8.

Senate Proposal No. 4-60 reads as follows:

In the event a student is detected cheating beyond any reasonable doubt during any formal examination or in the preparation of any significant individual assignment such as a term paper, he is to receive a failing grade for the course, and a record of the reason for his failure is to be submitted to the Dean of Students. This record is to be used for the personal use of the Dean of Students and is to be destroyed upon the student's graduation. On the second such occurrence, said student shall be expelled from Tech without the possibility of readmission.

Pres. Van Pelt read a statement submitted by Prof. Anderson, as follows:

Resolved: That the proper Senate committee be instructed to prepare a resolution calling for the removal of the phrase "by recommendation of the faculty" from honorary degrees granted by Tech unless the name of the candidate together with sufficient pertinent information is first presented to the Faculty Senate for their explicit approval.

This is not intended to interfere with the right of the administrative officials of Tech to grant such honors. It is intended to protect faculty members who are involved by implication in the approval of the achievements, findings or philosophies of an individual without their consent.

Pres. Van Pelt ruled that this was an operational procedure and not a policy, thus it was the business of the Executive Committee rather than the Senate. Prof. Romig suggested that the phrase could be changed to "by recommendation of the Board of Control."

Prof. Hooker said that he has heard of sweeping changes in the freshman curriculum taking place on the campus, and it seems that the General Faculty, under the leadership of the Dean, is acting without consulting the Senate, but that tonight he found that the Curricular Policy Committee has this policy under consideration. He wondered why the Senate was by-passed. Prof. Neilson reported that the Curricular Policy Committee was studying the problem as a part of the general policy on curriculum for the school and that he disagrees with the instruction that the committee be instructed to study this problem.

Pres. Van Pelt stated that he felt such changes should be able to originate in any group on the campus and carried as far as possible. He also assured the Senate that the final recommendation will come to the Senate for approval, but such ideas may originate anywhere.

It was moved by Prof. Bredekamp and supported by Prof. Snelgrove that the meeting be adjourned at 9:45 p.m. The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,
Harold Meese, Secretary