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

16 November 1963 

(Senate Minute pages: 154-163) 

The meeting opened at 7:10 p.m., Tuesday November 16, 1963, in the Faculty Clubroom. President Van Pelt presiding. 


The minutes of meeting No.16 were approved as previously distributed to all faculty members except concerning Dr. Rakestraw’s proposal 8-63, appearing on page 152 of the minutes. Dr. Snelgrove pointed out that at the time of original presentation, this motion had charged the responsibility of the President to do certain things. The proposal had been changed by the Senate at that time charging the Senate to do these things. Having done this, the last line on page 152 relative to a statement made by Dr. Snelgrove was redundant and should be struck from the minutes. This had been done. 

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business 

Committee on Committees - In the absence of Dean Kerekes, President Van Pelt read the report of this committee nominating certain of the faculty to Senate Committees. After careful consideration, the Senate voted to make a few changes in the committees and/or selection of chairmen. Later each group of the Senate individually selected one of their number for membership on the Committee on Committees. The Senate committees elected for 1963-64 are as follows: (available by request from the Senate Office). 

Constitution Revision Committee, Professor J. Romig, Chairman - Professor Romig stated that his report at this time was to be considered as a preliminary progress report. He reported the following items. 

Committee held six summer meetings, one this fall. Plans weekly meetings in winter term. Plans to announce future meetings so others can attend. Plans to: Simplify the Senate procedure. To have Senate members elected. To have membership of faculty with tenure only totaling 10% of the faculty. To eliminate departmental representatives. 

Curricular Policy Committee, Prof. Been, Chairman - Professor Been reported the results of his committee's action on proposals 1-63, 2-63, 3-63, 4-63. 

Proposal 1-63 - The determination of student rating as to class, Freshman, Sophomore, etc., is an operational matter, not a policy matter. 

Proposal 2-63 - Fragmentation of courses and 

Proposal 3-63 - Improper duplication of courses - Are both corrected wherever found or proposed by the Curriculum Committee. A policy in this matter will be redundant 

Proposal 4-63 - On the basis of little student interest here and elsewhere in obtaining a combined BA and BS degree in 5 years, the committee recommends no adoption of the plans. 

Dr. Van Pelt called for motions on the Curricular Policy Committee's recommendations. 

It was moved by Dr. Peach, seconded by Prof. Price, that proposal 1-63 be referred to the Administration. The motion passed by vote. 

It was moved by Prof. T.N. Smith and seconded by Prof. Price that Proposals 2-63 and 3-63 be dropped. The motion passed by vote. 

It was moved by Prof. H.B. Anderson, seconded and passed by vote that no further action be taken on proposal 4-63. 

Proposal 5-63 - Previously voted approved by the Senate after recommendation by the Academic Standards Committee, Professor T. Sermon, Chairman (minutes page 151) was announced for final vote. Discussion was called for.
Dr. Schnelle: stated no interim grades should be in letters since they are insufficiently discriminative.

Dr. Berry: recommended both numbers and letters be used.

Prof. W. Anderson: stated committee approves both.

Dr. Van Pelt: stated both numbers and letters are good.

Approval of the proposal will indicate that both are approved if the numbers identifiable with letter grades.

Final written vote passed proposal 5-63 that:

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.

The Agenda Committee, Dr. M. Bredekamp, Chairman, read Proposal 6-63:

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 suggested that if the proposal lacked clarity, it be referred to a committee for study.

Dr. Van Pelt called for discussion

Dean Meese: What are operating conditions?

Dr. Bredekamp: Working conditions.

Dr. Berry: What are departmental relations? Are "inter" or "intra" relations meant?

Prof. Price: The meaning must be clear.

Dr. Bredekamp: Either or both meant. Overall problems are to be considered.

Dean Meese: Should this be referred to the Committee on Committees for choice of a committee?

Dr. Van Pelt: The Constitution Revision Committee will be reporting shortly and this proposed committee may fit then. The proposal seems to defeat its own point. It seems that the present Senate Constitution must be revised to adopt this proposal. Further, it seems the time is wrong to consider it now. After the Constitution Revision Committee reports, a ruling will be made by the chair concerning the constitutionality of this proposal.

Dr. Bredekamp: The Agenda Committee believes that this proposal not eliminated by the constitution.

Dr. Van Pelt: This proposal is hereby referred to the Committee on Faculty Professional Development for study.

Dr. Peach: The Senate Constitution Revision Committee should consider it also.

Proposal 7-63 was read by Dr. Bredekamp.

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. Peach seconded the acceptance of the proposal by the Senate.
Dr. Van Pelt called for discussion of the proposal.

Prof. H.B. Anderson suggested that the time limit can be extended by the Senate if it approves.

Dr. Berry: Is this a policy or a rule?

Dr. Snelgrove: This seems like a tedious repetition of the accepted item "New Business."

Dr. Van Pelt: Seems new business to me.

Dean Meese: Is it the intention of this proposal to permit remarks which are normally not Senate business?

Dr. Van Pelt: Robert's Rules permit this freedom and they are operational in the Senate.

Dr. Work: Does this mean that each Senate member would be allowed only one minute and that possibly 35 or 40 minutes might be spent this way?

Dr. Bredekamp: Yes, this is possible.

Dr. Van Pelt: This proposal is within the province of the Senate. It is not intended to make a Hyde Park out of the Senate.

The vote was taken. The proposal passed but not unanimously and is referred to the next meeting for final vote.

Dr. L. Rakestraw read Proposal 8-63 (See page 152 minutes).

In discussing his proposal, Dr. Rakestraw pointed out that he was referring mostly to the Social Sciences such as History, Political Science and Geography, formerly otherwise, but now included as part of the English Department. This arrangement is not successful. There is no contact with Administration for the mentioned field's professors. The Dean can be approached but he is not expert in these fields. Social scientists are closely allied with other scientists. Grants for research are provided them. This is not so with English and Humanities teachers. The present arrangement is not good and is getting worse. Several new sciences are proposed to be introduced. Where will these be placed? Into what departments?

Dr. Bredekamp moved, the motion was seconded and passed by vote that this proposal be referred to the Instructional Policy Committee for study.

Dr. R. Brown read Proposal 9-63 (See page 153 minutes).

In discussing the proposal, Dr. Brown mentioned that many institutions used the proposed method for Department Head appointments. Although not a cure-all, it made for better working relations.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that this proposal implies that the departments are not consulted in the choice of their department heads. He stated that they have been since he became President. The proposal needs reworking. The present method of obtaining department heads cannot be discussed although there are strong reasons for its use.

Dr. Brown stated that he regretted if this AAUP policy of choosing department heads was not clear.

Dr. Van Pelt: The proposal needs a new form.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, the motion was seconded, that the proposal be referred to the Faculty Professional Development Committee for study.

Dr. Peach: What about rank? Shouldn't Associate or Assistant Professors be eligible?

Dr. Brown: The AAUP decided on full professors. Suggests this be added as a sixth question for study.

Dr. Snelgrove: Are department heads trying to break loose? Are there some who can't be pried loose?

Dr. Bredekamp called for vote on his motion which as passed by vote.

Introduction of New Proposals by Members: New Business

Dean Meese submitted proposal tentatively numbered 10-63 relative to adoption of a trimester academic calendar. He did not read the proposal to the Senate.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Prof. Roberts seconded, and passed by vote was to turn this proposal over to the Curricular Policy Committee for study.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that this was the kind of proposal wanted from the Senate.

Senate Proposal 10-63
It is proposed that the College adopt a trimester academic calendar consisting of three trimesters of approximately 16 weeks duration and concurrently the curricula be revised and consolidated so that all courses, except courses such as PE and ROTC, carry 5 credits and be offered every trimester (except courses such as surveying, forestry summer camp, and geological field trips which require warmer weather); a student to carry a normal load of 3 courses plus PE, ROTC, and other such extra courses.

In these years of great demand for scientists and engineers, a student could graduate under the trimester calendar in 2-2/3 years, thus serving mankind 1-1/2 years longer and earning possibly $10,000 during that time or approximately enough money to pay for his whole education during the now normal 4-year college residence.

If a student chooses, he could, of course, take the four or five years needed for him to graduate by dropping out any trimester he needed or wanted to, working (perhaps on a Co-op plan) one or more trimesters and returning to school.

From the legislature’s point of view, such a program would yield better use of physical facilities which are in such short supply, particularly in view of the predicted rapid growth in enrollment.

The program would be more expensive - mostly in the form of increased faculty salaries, since almost all the other costs continue around the calendar, anyway.

The individual faculty member might teach those segments of a course in which he was most interested with other segments being taught by another specialist in the subject matter of that segment.

The students would take only 3 major courses, and thus, be able to concentrate much more on each course.

Also, a 16-week course would reduce the pressures of having some sort of an important exam four or five times a week, which frequently happens now.

The vacation breaks, which would normally be at Christmas, near Easter in the spring, and in August, would be the best times for vacations for both the students and the faculty, thus allowing built-up pressures to be relieved before starting a new term.

It might well be easier for both students and faculty members to find work during the trimester they choose to take off - there may be less competition from other schools.

Dr. Brown stated that he wished to introduce a proposal and moved its acceptance and reference to the Faculty Professional Development Committee. The subject of the resolution was stated to be “Joint Research and Faculty Appointments.” Tentative number 11-63.

Joint Research and Faculty Appointments

WHEREAS, research in academic departments and research agencies is and will continue to be vital to the strength of Michigan Tech, and

WHEREAS, the work of research agencies should be coordinated to the highest possible degree with that of the academic departments, and

WHEREAS, the term “faculty equivalent status” confounds appointments to positions in research agencies of Michigan Tech which require academic teaching qualifications and anticipate or actually involve teaching, and

WHEREAS, the term “faculty equivalent status” at Michigan Tech discourages the optimum and continuing relationships between highly qualified research and faculty, personnel, and

WHEREAS, joint research and teaching appointments with academic rank would provide professional and academic recognition of research personnel, would provide a basis for future academic growth and professional development of research personnel, and would encourage highly qualified research personnel to remain at Michigan Tech, and

WHEREAS, a clear-cut faculty rank would strengthen research personnel in submitting proposals to various agencies, supporting research, and would strengthen academic department faculties by providing additional highly qualified personnel for teaching, thus assisting in accreditation of academic departments, and

WHEREAS, such joint appointments would strengthen the Graduate program of Michigan Tech,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Michigan Tech Chapter of the American Association of University Professors recommends that joint research and faculty appointments be clearly made and that, in all cases in which academically qualified research personnel are actually teaching or are potentially capable of teaching, academic rank be specifically designated in lieu of the term “faculty equivalent status.”
Omitted from the Senate agenda for this meeting was a proposal number 12-63. It will be placed in the next meeting.

**Proposal 12-63** Pursuant to discussions in the last Senate meeting, the following resolution is submitted:

WHEREAS, serious discussions of the problems of student attrition and academic difficulty in engineering and science have recently been held on this and other campuses, and

WHEREAS, a reduction in Freshman load seems desirable on an experimental basis to determine the effect on attrition, and,

WHEREAS, the College Catalogue of 1961-63 included SE courses which have subsequently been cancelled,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that each academic department may reduce the credits required for graduation by an amount equal to the number of credits shown for SE courses in its curriculum in the 1961-63 catalogue, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the reduction in load thus permitted be effected primarily in the Freshman year.

Senate President's remarks- None

Adjournment announced at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Secretary