MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER EIGHTEEN 
OF THE 
SENATE OF THE MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY 
24 February 1964 

(Senate Minute pages: 164-170) 

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


Absent were: Group I - Kerekes, Crawford, Howard, Bourdo, Krenitsky, Myers. II - Berry, DelliQuadri, Hooker, Sawezak, Tidwell. Group III - Spain, Young, G.A., Williams, Been, Smith, R.L. Group IV - Peach, Hall, Wyble, LaJeunesse. 

The minutes of meeting No.17 were approved as previously distributed to all faculty members. 

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business 

Constitution Revision Committee - Prof. J. Romig - on proposal 1-62 - stated that his committee has held five meetings. Further meetings will be held each Monday noon at lunch and any visitors are welcome to participate at these meetings planning the revision of the Senate Constitution. The final draft of the proposed new constitution is hoped for at the Spring Senate meeting. 

Faculty Professional Development Committee - Dr. C.E. Work - on Proposal 6-63. Appointment of a Faculty Affairs Committee. Dr. Work stated that his committee had worked entirely on the other proposal (9-63) assigned to them and had no report on this one. 

Dr. Van Pelt ruled Proposal 6-62 unconstitutional on the basis of the Senate Constitution, Article II, and the Board of Control's acceptance of same. He stated that Senate acceptance of this proposal would endanger the whole future of the Senate as at present constituted. 

Final vote of Proposal 7-63 (Minutes page 159) resulted in a count of 18 yes, 12 no, 2 abstentions votes. The Proposal was accepted and provides at all future meetings that any Senate member can discuss matters that they care to bring up. 

Instructional Policy Committee - Prof. S.R. Price, having laryngitis asked Dr. Stebbins to read the interim report on Proposal 8-63 (Minutes page 152) as follows: 

The Instructional Policy Committee has held several meetings this term, largely in order to decide upon procedures that might be followed to discharge the responsibility deputed to it by Senate Proposal 8-63, which reads 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. 

In conformity with the constitution of the Senate, the committee has begun to provide and will continue to provide means by which matters within its purview can under Proposal 8-63 be "processed within the units involved" before it will make to the Senate any recommendations in connection with these units. 

Furthermore, in connection with guidelines laid down for it years ago by memoranda from the President and the Dean, it intends to maintain liaison with interested administrative officers of the college and with any administrative committees which may be operating in the same are in which the committee is deliberating. Specifically, the Planning Committee, as you all know, is examining the problem of overall structural reorganization of the university, and their study is bound to be of interest to us. You will be pleased to know, I am sure, that we have the blessing of both Dean Kerekes asDean of the Faculty and Dr. Williams, head of the Planning Committee, to pursue our investigation without any particular regard for the conclusions at which the Planning Committee may arrive; there is by its own declaration no desire on the part of the administration to choke off any legitimate avenue of expression through which the faculty may wish to voice its views on university reorganization. Partly for this very reason, we have decided, after considerable discussion of the procedure to be followed, not to assume the existence of dissatisfaction on the campus with the studies now being conducted on reorganization of university structure, but rather to solicit requests from any of the faculty who should like us to pursue an independent inquiry into any phase of the problem. We cannot
act as a grievance committee of course, but we shall welcome any request for our services within the scope of our role as a committee of the Senate and within the apparent purpose of resolution 8-63. One such study is already underway.

Following this presentation, Dr. Van Pelt called for all possible speed in this investigation citing his coming retirement as a factor.

Subject: Senate Proposal 3-59 (on Academic Freedom) Dr. R. Brown

At its latest meeting, the Board of Control and the President of the College expressed themselves informally as favoring the adoption of a statement which would advance the cause of academic freedom on the Michigan Tech campus. They had had put before them, however, two resolutions aimed at that end, and they requested that the two faculty members present on invitation, try to draft a statement which would have the support of all interested groups on the campus. Since the Senate is certainly one of these interested groups, I am, on the express request of Dr. Van Pelt, bringing this matter to your attention at this time.

One informal meeting has already been held by the Instructional Policy Committee, of the Senate along with some of the members of the Tenure Committee; also invited were representatives of the Faculty Association and the local chapter of the AAUP. At that meeting, I attempted to explain the action of the AAUP in presenting an alternative proposal on academic freedom to the Board. Unless there is a desire on the part of the Senate to enter into all of the details relating to that matter, however, I should like simply to present the major point at issue and to describe the course of action which the members of the tenure committee suggested that we follow.

Basically, it was the hope of the local chapter of the AAUP that a statement on academic freedom would become the basis of our tenure regulations, because of the inevitability of the connection between the two. Tenure is the chief requirement of a teacher or researcher who engages in the search for truth in the classroom or laboratory. To guarantee him freedom of teaching and research is pointless if at any time he can be told that he must go elsewhere to carry on the search. Yet it was the purpose of Senate resolution 3-59 to set up a separate committee to investigate problems related to academic freedom; and the tenure committee has specifically denied having jurisdiction in this field. Had Senate resolution 3-59 been adopted by the Board, it would probably have made the consolidation of academic freedom and tenure at Tech very difficult at any time in the foreseeable future.

For this reason the representatives of the tenure committee suggested that the Senate be urged to adopt a statement which would perhaps merely enunciate the theoretical principles of academic freedom into the tenure regulations. With this end in mind, I therefore move that the Instructional Policy Committee be instructed by the Senate to reexamine resolution 3-59 and as expeditiously as possible report to the Senate for adoption a statement on academic freedom which will make feasible the consolidation of the principles of academic freedom and tenure on our campus.

Following the presentation, it was moved by Dr. Brown, seconded by Dr. Stebbins, that the recommended action be taken.

Dr. Van Pelt pointed out that the Board of Control had requested reconsideration of Proposal 3-59. This present recommendation is much more specific than the request but is not undesirable for that reason.

Dr. Brown cited the desirability of considering both the AAUP and the Senate ideas in this matter.

Dr. Van Pelt: This recommendation concerns both tenure and academic freedom.

Dr. Brown: A combination of both seems feasible.

Dr. Van Pelt: Reread the directive of the report.

Dr. Brown: Two interpretations can be made of this directive. One - a determination of feasibility. Two - a command.

Dr. Van Pelt: Work on one aspect might tie the hands of a committee working on the other.

Dr. Brown: Better if one committee only employed.

Prof. Romig: The committee did consider the two statements on academic freedom. By implication, the Senate statement was imperfect. The Senate may want a new statement prepared.

Dr. Snelgrove: Tenure is not a function of the Instructional Policy Committee.

The vote was called for and the motion passed by show of hands - yes 15, no 12.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that he hopes that the committee will accept the broader interpretation of the motion.

Faculty Professional Development Committee - Dr. C.W. Work on Proposal 9-63 Department Head Appointments. Dr. Work stated as a preliminary report that two committee meetings had been held. Two subcommittees are acting in polling the faculty and on questioning other schools on the problem. Neither poll is yet complete.

Curricular Policy Committee - Prof. H.B. Anderson on Proposal 10-63. Adoption of a Trimester System. Professor Anderson read his report as follows:

The Curricular Policy Committee met on Feb. 20, 1964 for the purpose of taking action on Senate Proposal 10-63, the trimester academic calendar. Previous to this meeting, material from the Southern Regional Education Board and the University of
Pittsburgh, both detailed studies and summaries of studies made concerning calendar revisions, was taken as a point of beginning the study of our own problem.

The committee unanimously decided to make a detailed study of the trimester calendar, but on a broader base than the specific proposal.

1. Is a year-round calendar required for Michigan Tech on the basis of enrollment pressures, if so, when?
2. Is the trimester calendar the best solution or should we consider a full four-quarter, or two semesters and a summer session as a better solution?
3. If a year-round calendar is not required for the 1967-69 calendar year, should the present 3 terms plus summer term be modified to 2 semesters and a summer session?
4. Since fragmentation, unnecessary requirements, and subject matter overlap may be a problem in some departments, how can we streamline course offerings and degree requirements so that a good basic curriculum can be accomplished more efficiently from both the student and faculty viewpoint? Efficiency is to be considered in terms of both time and money.
5. The committee will make no recommendations unless there is demonstrated improvement in the academic program, efficiency and faculty status.

A framework of broad categories was suggested as a means of making the study.

1. Considerations related to the students. Dean Harold Meese will request the student council to set up their own committee to make a study which will be a part of this report.
2. Considerations related to the faculty. C. DelliQuadri will make a study of terms of employment, opportunities for non-teaching activities and self-improvement, staff utilization and related problems.
3. Considerations related to the academic program. Prof. David Halkola will receive studies prepared by each department. Work through your own department head if you have information, ideas, or suggestions.
4. Considerations relating to income and costs. Cost analysis under the direction of Prof. Sam Tidwell.
5. Other Areas - maintenance, accreditation, self-liquidating operations, research, graduate program, calendar are under the direction of committee members or faculty appointed to work with the committee.

Other schools have studied this problem for several years before reaching conclusions. We are going to ask for specific reports for the Fall term, 1964.

Arrangements have been made to set up a reserve shelf of material for this study in the library. We already have a great deal of pertinent material.

We hope that no matter what decision is reached, the study undertaken will benefit all departments and result in the improvement of our academic program and our overall efficiency.

So far we have received wonderful help and cooperation from interested faculty. No one has turned down our request for assistance; we wish to make this study more than a catalog of preconceived opinions.

We would like to hear from any faculty member who has had experience in or knowledge of a trimester plan.

Dr. Van Pelt commended the report.

**Proposal 11-63.** Dr. R. Brown briefly outlined his proposal as in Senate minutes page 162. It was recommended that the last paragraph be changed to read as follows:

> NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, that the Senate of the Michigan Technological University 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."

Dr. Van Pelt asked if voting permissible on this now.

Prof. Boyd, Senate Secretary - answered affirmative if Senate wishes.

Prof. V.W. Johnson moved, Dr. Brown seconded, that the policy be adopted.

Prof. Romig inquired if the tenure policy of the University will apply to the people affected by this policy.

Dr. Van Pelt stated that investigation of the tenure policy must be made to determine this.

The vote was taken by voice - all voted yes for adoption of the policy. Final vote will be taken at the next meeting.

**Proposal 12-63.** minutes pg. 163. Due to the absence of Dr. Williams, Dr. Van Pelt stated the Proposal and informed the Senate that vote could be taken now or assignment could be made to committee.

Prof. Bayer moved, the motion was seconded and passed assigning the proposal to the Curricular Policy Committee.
Introduction of New Proposals New Business. Remarks

Professor A. Bovard asked what policy is established for absences acquired by students who are involved in trips for athletics, music, inspection, interviews.

Dr. Van Pelt asked Prof. T. Sermon about this.

Prof. T. Sermon stated that he had been forewarned read from the Faculty Handbook.

1. Instructors are to report two consecutive absences of any student to the Dean of Students’ office unless the absences are excused by the instructor or unless the student has authorization for the absence such as inspection trips, etc.
2. Except for final examinations, absences during examination periods are to be handled according to the instructor's discretion, or according to departmental policy.

Dr. Van Pelt: The policy is not written out. It needs defining.

Prof. Bovard: This is serious. We cannot ask students to make trips if their absences cannot be made up. Some 1% of the faculty won't excuse athletic absences.

Dr. Van Pelt: Suggest reference to the Academic Standards Committee.

Dr. Work: Careful consideration on the legitimacy and advisability of trips should be made. For example, the case of a one-week inspection trip followed by a one-week music trip occurring at the beginning of the Spring term is too much.

Prof. Romig moved, it was seconded and passed by vote that the problem be referred to the Academic Standards Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Dr. Van Pelt gave a detailed discussion of the budget for the coming fiscal year. Not being Senate business, this discussion is not recorded as part of the minutes.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Secretary