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

17 May 1962

(Senate Minute pages: 126-131)

The meeting opened at 7:36 p.m., Tuesday May 17, 1962, in the Faculty Clubroom, President Van Pelt presiding.


The minutes of meeting No.12 were approved.

New Business was started, no old business existing

Committee Reports:

1. Academic Standards Committee -- no report
2. Curricular Policy Committee -- no report
3. Professional Development Committee -- no report, other than that made at last meeting when instruction was requested
4. Instructional Policy Committee -- stated report to be given later during this meeting

Report on Senate Accomplishments of 1958 - 62

1. A report in mimeographed form on all proposals made during this period was prepared by the Senate Secretary and distributed during the meeting. Dr. Van Pelt discussed this, stating that the Board of Control at its fall meeting will hear one of the proposals now in their hands, either 3-59 or 4-59. A committee presentation of this should be made to the Board at that time.

Dr. Work: Long time lapses evident in this report.
Dr. Bredekamp: Hasn't the Board discussed these?
Dr. Van Pelt: Yes.
Prof. Price: Isn't the Board's action a pocket veto? How could 3-59 go to the Board since the Senate has voted on it only once?
Dr. Van Pelt: This is the Senate's fault.
Prof. Price: This situation has been called to the Secretary's notice several times.
Dr. Van Pelt: You did the right thing by bringing it to the Senate's attention here.
Prof. Romig: What about Proposal 2-60?
Dr. Van Pelt: It and several others as shown in the Secretary's report have been referred to the Academic Standards Committee for coordination since overlapping areas are involved.

The Senate, As Recommended by the ECPD

Dr. Van Pelt stated that the ECPD had no influence in the Senate creation. Rather, that upon his arrival at Tech, finding the same set up as in the 1920's and desiring the skills and philosophy of the faculty to be used, he initiated the idea of the Senate, drawing ideas from the Faculty Association, and from the Executive Committee.

In its 1956 report, the ECPD suggested faculty participation stating that MCM&T had no faculty organization and no means of expression except as departments. This is not consistent with normal practice in American Universities. In its 1959 report statement of a new faculty policy permitting recommendations of plans by the faculty was mentioned.

Dr. Snelgrove remarked that a Senate is not required for ECPD accreditation.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that no Senate is required.

Panel Discussion of the MCM&T Senate

Panel Members: Dr. Williams, Dr. Schnelle, Dr. Bredekamp, Professor Price, Professor Hellman

Dr. Williams, as moderator, introduced the discussion pointing out that there are different kinds of Senates. Some have wide powers, meet frequently. Others meet twice yearly and have little power. What should our Senate be?
Dr. Schnelle - stated that he had made of survey of opinion by asking three questions of several faculty members from whom answers indicated their opinions.

1. What are the outstanding Senate accomplishments?
   a. Majority said none
   b. Three stated that survival was major accomplishment. Not much is to be expected since objectives are so nebulous. Some hope for the future indicated by this meeting for self-appraisal.

2. What are the chief Senate failures?
   a. Failure to impress administration or win their confidence
   b. Failure to win confidence of the faculty who look at it as a debating society
   c. Senators lack confidence in their Senate

3. What can we do to improve the Senate?
   a. If lack of confidence is the problem, build it up by:
      1. Making changes in the constitution
      2. Reorganizing, making personnel changes. College President should not be Senate President. Responsibilities conflict
      3. Recognition of policy vs. procedure as a false position
      4. Senate rules limit recommendations and actions of the faculty. Under academic policy can fall whatever the faculty defines as such.

Dr. Bredekamp discussed the responsibility and irresponsibility of the Senate. Stated that Dr. Schnelle had made lack of communication clear because:

1. Senate responsibilities clear from Board of Control
2. Senate Constitution - establishes duties of Senate on academic policy
3. Dr. Van Pelt states duties of Senate to make recommendations taking up any subject relative to academic policy
4. Constitution states (page 2) the functions of the Senate as excepting only finance and personnel. Vagueness evident
5. Constitution (page 7) states who can propose a policy. All can, and lack of proposals due to the faculty
6. The President should consider all Senate recommendations regardless of his personal feelings.

The faculty has not used the power which the Senate provides. This is due to communication failure and is responsible for the Senate failure.

Professor Price remarked as panelist that:

The Senate fails to appreciate its possibilities. Senate members are members of other organizations, such as ASEE, Faculty Association, AAUP, all of which have more power than the Senate. Minutes show ten different times when the Senate was told that something was not its business. The Senators themselves are limited in their thinking by the knowledge that only policy can be considered. Policy considered apart from procedure is meaningless.

The Senate is aided by Administration and thus has accomplished considerable, whereas other faculty organizations not so aided. Like the blue jay dropping acorns in the knothole, the Senate wants to hear the results of its efforts. Just how many of its recommendations are in use?

Professor Hellman, as a panelist, first quoted Dr. Van Pelt's statement made in accepting the Senate constitution, "First drafts of documents are usually not satisfactory... etc." Some concepts and practices of the Senate have now stabilized. Has this stifled the Senate? Has inaction become traditional? Has habit stifled the Senate? Techniques are known to reduce a stifled system. The Wild Eyed Idea Committee reduced it. Perhaps the class structure of the Senate should be eliminated, the president elected by the Senate. Perhaps a parliamentarian required to run the Senate. The constitution of the ASEE states that the 'Creation of a community of academic interest is needed.' No creation is mentioned for the Senate.

Dr. Williams called for discussion.

Dr. Work: Failure to appoint committees until late in fall term handicaps their work.

Prof. Romig: Must proposals come in? Can the Senate act without proposals?

Dr. Bredekamp: Proposals are coming in, but confusion exists due to lack of proper action which kills the proposals.

Prof. Kemp: It costs time and money to come from the Soo to attend Senate meetings. As long as the Senate only recommends, infrequent meetings are satisfactory. If some meetings are held to actually generate some proposals, then meetings should occur more often.

Dr. Williams: Is the Senate only a recommending body? What if the Senate must recommend everything to make it policy, then the Senate would be strengthened.

Dr. Bredekamp: The Senate could so act.

Dr. Williams: If the Senate must act on everything, then the Senate will become very busy.
Dr. Schnelle: There is another alternative. It is unwise for the Senate to recommend procedure. Its technical knowledge is insufficient to determine procedure. The President or his assistants can draw up procedure to finally produce a general order. Policies which are thus put into action should be reported to the Senate.

Prof. Weaver: Any policy recommended must include suggested implementation to get action on it. Attendance at Senate meetings is very bad and must be remedied.

Dr. Hesterberg: The Curricular Policy Committee was given a great job when the four-year engineering curricula was advised. Should not an ad hoc committee have been appointed?

Dr. Williams: We waited for action by a committee which didn’t know what to do.

Dr. Neison: The Senate is too big. Reorganization should be effected. All Senate members should have jobs on committees.

Dr. Work: Committee memberships should rotate to liven up the committees.

Dr. Bredekamp: Two committees having same membership is foolish.

Prof. Price: The policy as procedure squabble troubles committees too.

Prof. Bayer: The implementation of proposals is too slow.

Dr. Schnelle: The double approval required of the Senate is unnecessary. The four classes of citizenship is bad. Elections to Senate membership not representative. Perhaps all Senators should be full professors. The real size of the Senate is reduced by the low attendance at meetings.

Dr. Williams: The Senate has no way of reviewing established policy. This should be provided. New policy may be forthcoming thereby.

Prof. Romig: If the Senate proposes a policy, must the President carry it to the Board of Control? He is a member of both.

Dr. Van Pelt: There is no difference in objectives between administrators and teachers. The only difference is in their duties. Firmly believe it the right and duty of all groups to participate in Senate action. Would the Senate be better off if administration not present?

Dr. Bredekamp: This clarifies the reason that the President should have the opportunity to debate.

Dr. Van Pelt: When presenting Senate action to the Board of Control, I can disagree with the action, if necessary.

Prof. Romig: Suppose the Board asked why you disagree?

Dr. Van Pelt: The President can step out of the chairmanship or give up the chairmanship, if desired.

Prof. Niemi: If the Senate is only advisory, why trouble with details?

Dr. Snelgrove: The committees stand between the Administration and the faculty.

Prof. H. Anderson: Suggest a committee for Senate revision.

Dr. Williams: What committee?

Prof. Anderson: An ad hoc committee.

At this point the panel was thanked and excused.

Dr. Van Pelt recommended the reading of his suggestions made at the time the Senate started. Among ides for Senate effort: Recommendations for the four-year BA curriculum. Senseless unplanned curriculum expansion is bad. Presently taught 1 and 2 hour courses should be eliminated. The Curriculum Committee seems to do nothing about this. Final examinations given by some, not by others. Are they good or bad? Why? What about graduate study? Who is doing any of this job in the Senate? What about studying established policies? No Senate action on this as yet. Is Senate reorganization necessary? If a committee is to be appointed, the Committee on Committees must do it.

It was moved by Prof. H. Anderson and seconded by Dr. Neison, and unanimously approved by the Senate that the Committee on Committees appoint an ad hoc committee which shall at once be an approved committee without another vote by the Senate. The purpose of this committee is the immediate and continuing study of the Senate and devising of recommendations to improve the Senate, such study to start at once with view to presentation of recommendations to the Senate early in the Fall Term, 1962.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that one cannot separate policy from procedure. Senate should not try to do this. Senate cannot render much service if it tries to make such separation.

Dr. Schnelle asked if anything can be discussed considering the liberal definition of academic policy?
Dr. Van Pelt: No! Salary matters not discussable in the Senate.

**Other Business:**

Election Committee Report - Presented by Dr. Neilson. Stated that Professors Bahrman, Romig and Hellman were re-elected to Senate Group II. In addition, Dr. M. Berry was also elected to Group II to balance the new appointee to the administrative council, Professor Ralph Noble, now a member of Senate Group I. Report by mail from the Soo states that Professor George G. Sawezak is elected to Senate Group II, replacing Professor M.S. Dahlman.

Although not an item of Senate meeting business, report is made here of elections to Group IV by their departments:

- Robert, L.A. (CE Dept.) re-elected
- Peach, M.O. (EM Dept.)
- Hendrickson, A.A. (MY Dept.)
- Schnelle, K. (BA Dept.) re-elected
- Bredekamp, M. (ChE Dept.) re-elected
- Wyble, D.O. (Physics Dept.)

Election of Senate Secretary for 1962-64

G.W. Boyd was unanimously re-elected.

Adjourned occurred at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Secretary