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

21 May 1963

(Senate Minute pages: 146-153)

The meeting opened at 7:10 p.m., Tuesday May 21, 1963, in the Faculty Clubroom. President Van Pelt presiding.


The minutes of meeting No.15 were approved as previously distributed to all faculty members.

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business

Committee on Committees - In the absence of Dean Kerekes, the report was read by the Secretary - this report:

1. Nominated as Chairman of the Agenda Committee, Dr. M.W. Bredekamp
2. Nominated to the Constitution Revision Committee: Prof. J.A. Romig, Chairman, Prof. W. Been; Prof. L.W. Hooker, Prof. E.W. Niemi, Prof, S.R. Price, Prof. C.E. Kemp. The Senate accepted the report of these committee nominations.


The Secretary reported elections to Group IV as follows: D. Halkola, elected by H.S. Department, term ending 1966; V.W. Johnson, elected by F.R. Department, term ending 1966; W.T. Anderson, elected by E.E. Department, term ending 1966; J.P. Dobell, elected by G.E. Department, term ending 1966.

The complete election report was accepted by the Senate and these members' election approved.

Curricular Policy Committee - Prof. W. Been, Chairman, reported on Proposals 1-63, 2-63, 3-63, 4-63. He chose to consider Proposal 4-63 first. This proposal is:

Senate Proposal 4-63 Introduced by Prof. J. Romig March 7, 1963

Proposed: That the Curricular Policy Committee prepare a report on the desirability and feasibility, if the Committee finds this possible, of a program which will permit a student to take three years of Liberal Arts at another institution, two years at MCM&T, and to receive both his B.A. degree and his B.S. degree in Engineering.

Professor Bean introduced Professor DelliQuadri who discussed a study made by him for the Curriculum Committee dated September 21, 1962. A copy of this study report was presented to the Secretary following the discussion. A summary statement form of Professor DelliQuadri's remarks follows:

Professor DelliQuadri: MCM&T has been interested for over a year in this 3-2 program. Objectives of the program include:

1. To provide satisfactory humanities studies here.
2. To obtain more students for MCM&T
3. To combine Liberal Arts and Engineering curricula

About 300 schools involved but relatively few students. Purdue University stated that they have used the plan but few students were interested. Difficulty experienced in completing the Engineering curriculum in two years. Three and four years sometimes required. Students not attracted since only B.A. and B.S. finally obtained.

Students participating must be strong in mathematics, C. average in all. Agreements between participating schools is usually informal.

Tech - Physics, Mining and Civil Engineering Departments have indicated willingness to cooperate.

The Liberal Arts schools require three years with them. Then at the end of the fourth year (first at engineering school) the B.A. degree granted, at the end of the fifth year, the B.S. degree.

Professor DelliQuadri made recommendations:
1. That the 3-2 program be tried here
2. That we make continued improvement in our own H.S. offerings
3. That agreements be made with other schools to experiment with the 3-2 program, particularly with Liberal Arts schools in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

Discussion followed Professor DelliQuadri's presentation.

Dr. Bredekamp: Do your recommendations eliminate Proposal 4-63 from Senate business?

Prof. DelliQuadri: No.

Prof. Prince: What prestige effects are involved?

Prof. DelliQuadri: Association with important Liberal Arts schools.

Prof. Price: Must a student define his association with the 3-2 program when he starts his studies?

Prof. DelliQuadri: Yes.

Dr. Berry: What about arrangements with the other schools? Isn't a formal agreement required?

Prof. DelliQuadri: Yes, if we agree to accept all students that they recommend.

Dr. Neilson: Does the transferring student bring his grades here?

Prof. DelliQuadri: Yes.

Dr. Bredekamp: Will a formal proposal be prepared on this matter?

Prof. DelliQuadri: This is up to the committee chairman.

Prof. Been: The Curricular Policy Committee hadn't thought of a formal proposal on the matter. Visits made to interested schools necessary to solve the issue. The Committee will make a formal proposal.

Dr. Van Pelt: If these are recommendations then the Senate should act and the President follow up.

Prof. DelliQuadri: We can give these recommendations as a proposal.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Prof. Oswald seconded, that the proposal be rejected.

Prof. Young: Why reject this proposal?

Dr. Bredekamp - To eliminate it from further Senate business.

Dr. Van Pelt - Read Constitution Article VII - Procedure

ARTICLE VII - PROCEDURE

Sec. A. The general procedure for carrying out the functions of the Senate will be as follows:

1. Policy proposals may be originated by the Senate or a committee thereof. Any individual faculty member or group of faculty members, a department or other academic unit, or the General Faculty, may submit a policy proposal in writing to the Secretary for referral to the Agenda Committee. All proposals pertaining specifically to one academic unit shall be processed through appropriate channels in that unit before final action by the Senate.

2. The Senate shall consider such proposals and formalize a policy statement for those proposals that are approved.

3. The proposed policy statements shall be incorporated in the minutes of the Senate and except by unanimous consent of all members present at the Senate meeting shall not by finally acted upon until at least two weeks after their distribution to the General Faculty in such minutes. Upon written request of 20 members of the General Faculty, a General Faculty meeting shall be called to discuss these proposed policy statements and to inform the Senate of the thoughts of the General Faculty.

4. Voting on these formalized policy statements in the Senate shall be by written ballots.

5. Policy proposals adopted by the Senate shall be referred, with recommendations, to the President of the College for appropriate action. The President shall report the action taken to the Senate.

6. All meetings of the Senate shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order except when inconsistent with this Constitution.

Read part of Professor DelliQuadri's report as made to the Curriculum Committee.

"That we enter into agreements with certain select colleges to experiment with the three-two program."

Stated that this item the real proposal in part.
Dr. Yerg: Are we voting on the 3-2 idea or just to reject the report?

Dr. Van Pelt: If the report is rejected, further action is required by the committee. They must augment their report, include pros and cons concerning it.

Dr. Williams: Do you want action proposed?

Dr. Van Pelt: The report is only a progress report.

Dr. Bredekamp: Assuming such, and if, my second agrees, I change my motion and move to accept the report.

Prof. Been: If our committee is required to do so, we can make this proposal.

The question was called for. The motion being to accept their report, refer it back to the Curricular Policy Committee, who shall prepare the formalized proposal. Motion passed.

Prof. Been - Proposals 2-63 and 3-63 go together.

**Proposal 2-63**, Introduced by Prof. Romig, March 7, 1963

Proposed: That the Curricular Policy Committee with such findings of fact as they are able to make, devise a policy to discourage improper fragmentation of course content into more courses than are necessary.

**Proposal 3-63**, Introduced by Prof. Romig, March 7, 1963

Proposed: That the Curricular Policy Committee devise a policy to discourage improper duplication of courses.

The Curricular Policy Committee:

1. Would propose that no such things exist as herein suggested.
2. Feels that only Administration can give orders about courses.
3. Knows that the Curriculum Committee tries to avoid these things.
4. Feels that reports of fragmentation not valid due to lack of specific examples. The report not really true. Statements about fragmentation unfounded. The committee can only deplore the situation.

Dr. Snelgrove: Prof. Been himself teaches a course in fragmentation.

Dr. Van Pelt: Prof. Been's report implies that no present overlap or fragmentation of courses was investigated.

Prof. Been: No, this isn't so. Operational trouble occurs here. The Curricular Policy Committee is a policy-making group. No policing is done by the committee; it isn't their policy to do this.

Dr. Van Pelt: Evidently, the Senate feels that this should be done by someone. All departments are anxious to avoid duplication. Courses in Properties of Materials a case in point. Fragmentation is a problem. Students are better off if only 3 or 4 courses taken at one time. More courses, 5, 6 etc., very bad for the students. More 4, 5, 6 hour courses and less 2, 3 hour courses needed. The College will be better if something is done.

Prof. Been: Fragmentation understood to mean the breaking down of a course into several parts.

Dr. Van Pelt: Fragmentation of student's time is bad.

Prof. Been: Changing the time sequence of courses has been considered. Taking more math by freshmen, less other material, could help.

Dr. Van Pelt: Devising more big courses avoids duplication and fragmentation.

Prof. DeliQuadri: Can the Curricular Policy Committee fight this through?

Dr. Van Pelt: Committees can only recommend.

Prof. Been: Committee would work better if backed up.

Prof. Romig: The Senate could speak its mind if a proposal is established.

Dr. Bredekamp: The Senate makes policy, others do the real work.

Prof. Young: Brown University arranged their ME curriculum to require 4 courses per term.

Dr. Berry: All fields are covered this way by Harvard. It leads to heavy specialization, however.

Dr. Bredekamp: Moved that the report be accepted and a proposal be framed by the Curricular Policy Committee. Seconded by Prof. Price. Carried by voice vote.
Prof. Been reported on Proposal 1-63 as introduced by Dr. Bredekamp, March 7, 1963, on the subject of General Prerequisites for entrance to Sophomore, Junior and Senior year standings.

Proposed: Whereas the assignment of prerequisites to courses has been the policy of the College for a number of years, and whereas the value of such prerequisites has not been questioned, therefore:

Be it resolved that the Curricular Policy Committee consider the feasibility of setting general prerequisites for entrance to the Sophomore, Junior, and Senior year standings.

Prof. Been stated that after discussion with Dr. Bredekamp, he felt that on the base of prerequisites, a clear definition of class membership was lacking. He recommended that, as example, a student be considered a senior when all the course prerequisites established by his major department for entrance to all their Senior year fall term courses had been met.

Dr. Brown: Is this any different than the present policy?

Prof. Been: If established as policy, it would put responsibility on the students.

Dr. Yerg: If Differential Equations required, then it must be finished before identification as a Senior established.

Dr. Bredekamp: Certain courses taught in the first, second, or third year may contain material not needed until the fourth year.

Dr. Van Pelt: Course prerequisites are identified, status prerequisites are not. Going back to specifying prerequisites by number might work.

Prof. Been: This seems to be a possibility.

Dr. Bredekamp: This could lead to an enormous prerequisite list.

Dr. Van Pelt: Most prerequisites are interlocking, no long list necessary.

Dean Meese: A case is known where HS101 never taken, although the student now in graduate school.

Dr. Van Pelt: Why not establish a limiting time for taking courses?

Dr. Brown: Suppose some engineering senior wants to take Biology?

Prof. Been: As soon as any policy is written, the students try to get around it. The faculty can avoid this situation.

Dr. Van Pelt: All policies have loopholes. Any motion on Proposal 1-63?

Prof. Been: The Curricular Policy Committee will do further work on it. At a meeting of the committee, there was a proposal made to reduce by 6 hours the credit required for graduation, such reduction to be made in the Freshman year.

Dr. Williams: If this is a motion, I second it!

Dr. Van Pelt: Is this a motion to refer the idea to the Curricular Policy Committee?

Dr. Williams: I retract my proposal and will resubmit it formally.

Academic Standards Committee, Prof. T. Sermon, on Proposal 5-63, introduced by Dr. Bredekamp, March 7, 1963.

Proposed: That a committee be appointed to study the problem of standardized grading.

Prof. Sermon read the recommendations of the Academic Standards Committee as follows:

The committee, after some discussion, voted to go on record that in their opinion, instructors should as a matter of policy keep their students informed as to the caliber of work the student is doing; this is to be done by
reporting to the student grades earned on major quizzes, reports, etc., in terms of the standard letter grades of the College.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Berry seconded, acceptance of the report.

Dr. Van Pelt read the recommendation, called for vote. The motion carried.

**Constitution Revision Committee**, Prof. J. Romig, Chairman, on proposal 1-62 concerning the rewriting of, or revision of the Senate Constitution. An ad hoc committee had made certain recommendations which were accepted by the Senate Nov. 19, 1962, and which form part of the minutes of Senate meeting #14. This led to Proposal 1-62, which follows:

Acceptance of this report by the Senate orders the appointment of a committee and orders the writing by this committee of a new constitution or a revised constitution for presentation to and possible acceptance by the MCM&T Senate.

The appointment of the committee is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees.

The names of the elected committee appear earlier in these minutes. Professor DelliQuadri moved that the Constitution Revision Committee be enlarged by inclusion of one new member, the President of the Faculty Association.

Dr. Van Pelt: This Senate reports to all the faculty, the faculty is fully represented on the Senate, two former Faculty Association presidents now Senate members.

Prof. DelliQuadri: I feel that communication is bad. Believe that Faculty Association should be represented.

Prof. Romig: Senate Committees commonly invite outside help. Entire faculty may be polled on certain matters.

Dr. Van Pelt: Committees can certainly do this, which is not the same as appointing others to the committee.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Prof. Oswald seconded acceptance of those named in the Committee on Committees report. Passed.

Prof. T.N. Smith explained the virtues of a five as compared to a six-member committee.

Dr. Van Pelt: Stated that communication improper through proposed channel.

**Introduction of New Proposals and New Business by Members**

Special Resolution, Prof. J. Romig

Prof. Romig stated that his planned proposal not appropriate at this time and that he desired to cancel it.

Agenda Committee, Dr. M. Bredekamp, Chairman, reported on proposals:

**Proposal 6-63 Appointment of Faculty Affairs Committee**

Whereas many faculty problems reside in areas other than those defined for the present Senate, and Whereas such problems lower the academic effectiveness of the faculty, therefore:

Be it resolved that the Senate approve the creation of a standing committee on "Faculty Affairs." The duties of this committee shall include:

1. Faculty morale
2. Faculty structure
3. Operating conditions
4. Departmental regulations

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Brown seconded, acceptance of this proposal with view to inclusion in agenda of the next meeting. Motion passed.

**Proposal 7-63 Arrangements for Introduction and Presentation of Points of Importance at Senate Meetings**

WHEREAS the meetings of the MCM&T Senate have become inflexible in procedure and Whereas members who have statements to make have been prevented from doing so by agenda exclusivity, therefore:
BE IT RESOLVED THAT at each Senate meeting, a time for such statements be reserved, but that each statement shall be limited to a time of one minute and each member shall be limited to one statement.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Brown seconded, acceptance of this proposal with view to inclusion in agenda of the next meeting. Motion passed.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dean Meese seconded, the following:

Whereas there are at present two vacancies on the agenda committee, and Whereas the annual rotation of positions comes due in August, 1963,

Therefore, be it resolved that the appointment of additional members be made to fill these vacancies immediately. The Agenda Committee recommends the appointment of Prof. D.O. Wyble for a term expiring 8/31/66 and Prof. R.L. Papworth for a term expiring 8/31/65.

Other Proposals

Dr. Rakestraw submitted proposal tentatively numbered 8-63 as follows:

WHEREAS, the inclusion or exclusion of diverse subject matters within a single department has an effect on the academic effectiveness of the department, and WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate is charged with responsibility for making recommendations on academic affairs,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Senate examine the various departments to see if the existing separations and combinations of diverse subject matters are those best suited to the purposes of the college.

Dr. Rakestraw moved, Dr. Brown seconded, acceptance of the proposal for attention of the Agenda Committee. Motion passed.

Dr. Rakestraw mentioned courses now dropped, formerly in the Curriculum such as "History of Architecture" and other courses such as Sociology now mislocated as to department.

Dr. Snelgrove: Isn't this a division of responsibility?

Dr. Brown submitted proposal tentatively numbered 9-63 as follows:

WHEREAS, Academic department heads are now appointed for an indefinite term of service at Michigan College of Mining and Technology,

WHEREAS, At many major institutions of higher education, academic department heads or chairmen are elected or appointed for a specific time period, and these appointments are normally made in conformity with the recommendations of the department members,

AND WHEREAS, Under present conditions at MCM&T, it is difficult for a department head to relinquish his authority gracefully,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the MCM&T Senate adopt the following policy:

The chairman or head of an academic department, if not elected directly, shall be appointed after consultation with and normally in conformity with the judgment of the majority of members of the department. He shall serve for a limited term. A department head shall have the rank of full professor either by concurrent advancement or previous attainment.

Questions to be resolved in committee:

1. Shall the department head be directly elected or be appointed after consultation?
2. Shall this policy apply to present department heads?
3. Shall there be any restrictions as to reappointment?
4. Shall there be any restrictions as to age at the time of appointment?
5. What shall be the length of term of election or appointment?

Dr. Brown moved, Prof. Price seconded, acceptance of the proposal for the attention of the Agenda committee. Motion passed.

Dr. Brown mentioned that this proposal came from the AAUP National Organization.

Dr. Snelgrove mentioned an evident fallacy, since Assistant Professors eligible at some schools.
Officer's Reports:

President - Dr. Van Pelt stated that he had nothing new to report.

Secretary - Prof. Boyd thanked the Senate members for their cooperation and requested that all committees and members thereof consider their appointments as continuing until such time as replacements are actually made by the Committee on Committees.

Adjournment was announced at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Secretary