MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER NINETEEN
OF THE
SENATE OF THE MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

12 May 1964

The meeting opened at 7:05 p.m., Tuesday May 12, 1964, in the Faculty Lounge. President Van Pelt presiding.

The roll was taken. Present were:


Absent were: Group I - Kerekes, Meese, Townsend, Crawford, Howard, Bourdo, Wagner, Krenitsky, Myers. II - Berry, Hellman, Hooker, Kemp, Romig, Sawezak, Tidwell, Wiedenhoefer. Group III - Been, Smith, R.L. Group IV - Schnelle, Peach, Dobell, Hendrickson.

The minutes of meeting No.18 were approved as previously distributed to all faculty members.

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business

Constitution Revision Committee - In the absence of Prof. Romig, Prof. Price read a statement in the form of a progress report on Proposal 1-62 prepared by the Committee. This statement follows:

Proposal 1-62

Because he is out of town, I was asked to read a statement tonight for Professor Romig, chairman of the committee on Senate reorganization. Following is the first part of the statement:

"A desire for revision of the Senate Constitution arose out of the apparent ineffectiveness of the present Senate of Michigan Tech. My personal belief is that this ineffectiveness arose out of our own inability to use the instrument we had. It is true, however, that in view of the confusion of too large a body, somewhat cumbersome procedure, particularly procedure requiring delay in the final passage of policies, dissatisfaction with the present Constitution was perhaps justified. At the outset my belief was that a simple requirement that the President or Secretary keep us carefully informed at each meeting, of the action taken on every policy recommended by the Senate and of the status of various policy proposals would have been sufficient to make the Senate effective. I should like to remark, however, that reporting on policies simply by a number or even a number and a title is quite inefficient because we tend to forget from one meeting to the next (and sometimes the delay in discussing a particular policy is longer than this) just what the policy under consideration was as indicated by some particular member.

In view, however, of the mandate given to us by the Senate, it seemed incumbent upon the Committee to come up with (1) a Senate which was smaller than the present one or at least an active body which was smaller than the present one; (2) a Senate which tended to represent more clearly the voice of the faculty rather than the administration. Parenthetically, I must deplore this constant separation of the administration from the faculty, though it seems to be a reality in American academic life, but constant efforts should be made to seek ways of minimizing these differences rather than accentuating them. I would like to see, from an idealistic point of view, a university managed completely by the faculty, but I think you would find it very difficult to get anyone to administer on a permanent basis if he were not rewarded financially or in other ways in a somewhat different fashion. Administration at these prices is not necessarily the most desirable way of life."

At this point I must break off in the reading of the statement. What immediately follows in Professor Romig's statement is based upon the assumption that at its meeting yesterday, the committee would approve new constitutions, and that all three would be presented for consideration to the faculty. Unluckily or otherwise, the committee lacked a quorum - two members were out of town - and those present felt that (1) the committee should make a further effort to present a single document to the Senate for consideration, or at least narrow the choice to two documents; (2) the documents which are presented should be given more thorough scrutiny by the committee as a whole before being submitted to the Senate; and (3) preparing sufficient copies of the three documents in the time available - namely today - might at least throw the Ozalid machine and the college budget out of whack if it didn't put some of the clerical staff into high dudgeon.

Lest you should suppose, however, that the committee has been resting on its oars and shooting the breeze, I have been asked to summarize the similarities, differences, and deficiencies of the three documents to date. Then, at the suggestion of a member of the committee, if you wish, we might (assuming that you accept this report) either at the close of this meeting go into a
committee on the whole to discuss some of the points at issue; and/or we might plan for a special meeting of the Senate next fall to discuss the final report of the committee.

But to turn to the three documents being considered by the committee. They are largely in agreement in that they call for a much smaller Senate than the present one, elected by the General Faculty but including up to five administrators serving ex officio. The various drafts either provide for or make feasible more frequent regular meetings of the Senate. All provide that the Senate elect its own officers, but that administrators shall not be eligible for office in the Senate. They are in agreement to enlarge, though in differing degrees, the scope of the power and duties of the Senate and to obliterate or minimize the importance of the line now ordinarily drawn between recommendations on policy and recommendations on the implementation of policy. They provide that the Senate be consulted in the appointment of one, or more than one, of the chief administrative officers of the college. They also call for some type of reports on the budget.

Finally, since it seems unlikely that either the Administration or the Board would consider it either legal or expedient to depute final authority in these areas for a faculty body, the three documents provide that the present practice continue of making recommendations to the President or, occasionally, to the Board of Control.

One point of difference is where, as in Draft A, recommendations of the Senate shall stand unless specifically revoked or altered within a given period by the President or the Board; or whether, as in Drafts B and C, all recommendations await definite action on the part of the President (or possibly the Board) before they can be implemented.

There are also differences with respect to the relationship between the Senate and the General Faculty. Two of the documents, Form A and Form C, regard the Senate as a kind of workhorse or “advisory committee” for the General Faculty, to which the committee or the Senate would report once each term; and in Draft A, some of its recommendations are subject to Faculty revision or revocation. Form B, however, contains no provision for such a relationship between the Senate and the General Faculty.

Form B and Form C differ somewhat in the amount of detail by which the duties and powers of the Senate are defined. They treat these matters in rather general terms, and seemingly limit them somewhat more than does Form A, which, however, spells out the powers and duties in considerable detail. For example, Drafts B and C call for reports to the Senate on “plans for creation or abolition of new degrees, new departments, or new schools;” but Draft A calls for supervision of the granting of all degrees as well as for some form of faculty participation in appointments, reappointments, and promotions -- matters not mentioned in the other drafts.

I should like now to read the two final paragraphs from Professor Romig’s statement, regarding the omission from Drafts A, B, and C which could well become matters of controversy.

"It should be noted that two matters have not been sufficiently considered. One is the question of adequate representation for students. Normally we would expect this to be done by the President in his appointments to the Senate Advisory Committee, having a member of the Dean of Students' Office as one of the administrative members appointed by him. Any more radical departures - such as actually to have students in the Senate or on the Senate Advisory Committee - might well be regarded as creating mischief rather than being constructive, at least in the present state of our thinking on this subject.

Secondly, the other problem which has not been considered at all is the question of the Sault Ste. Marie Branch. It is my personal opinion that the Branch should have either its own Senate or its own Advisory Committee to the Senate. At present it is almost impossible to expect Sault members to attend meetings of the Senate committees. The amount of personal contact between the Sault Branch and the Houghton Campus staff is sufficiently limited that there is little real communication except perhaps at certain administrative levels. It is true that a separate Senate would appear to tend to further separate the two campuses, but it might, on the other hand, be giving the Sault a reasonable voice and make for a closer union, in that the Sault Branch would feel that their views are being adequately considered."

With this, I should like to solicit once more the acceptance of this interim committee report. As already suggested, a motion later in the evening to adjourn to a committee on the whole might help the committee to ascertain views of both the administration and a larger segment of the General Faculty on problems yet unresolved; and/or, in any event, a final report by the committee could easily be made the basis for a special meeting of the Senate next fall. There is clearly no shortcut to the solution of some of the problems with which we are wrestling; nor is there any expectation I suppose, that the administration and the Board of Control will accept with alacrity any document placed before them. But at least some of the members of the committee seemed to feel that their task required that they place before the faculty a document or documents which would represent the extent to which the faculty was willing to assume its responsibility for arriving at informed decisions in all areas relating to the academic enterprise on the campus: a covenant, if you will, to which it was willing to subscribe. Then the administration and the Board, supplied with this statement, could decide how far they wished to go in availing themselves of the faculty’s offer, and how far they felt that local circumstances and the times dictate that the documents be modified.

It may be true that a somewhat augmented role of the faculty increases the problems confronted by administrators. (I say nothing about its effect on the faculty). But another way of saying this is that it increases the challenge they face -- and I don't believe we have run out of men in this country who welcome challenges. Moreover, I think that it could fairly be said that the new documents being considered simply provide for the centralization of duties and powers that the faculty has been randomly shouldering at M.T.U. for a long time now. When faculty members consistently serve on administrative committees when purely administrative committees like the planning committee consult widely with the faculty before formulating their proposals and
then seek grass roots opinions and support in meetings of the general faculty before finalizing their proposals, when committees of the Senate are occasionally invited to render opinions on matters ordinarily regarded as the province of the administration, such as personnel if not budgetary problems; when in some departments hiring and promotions are decided by a jury of one’s peers; when divulging information about the budget is an annual feature of meetings of the faculty association; when the Board of Control invites faculty participation in the process of selecting a new vice president and a new president -- it is plain that few of the proposals for a new constitution of the Senate can be called radical. They instead are an official means of recognizing and channeling the support and cooperation and occasional demurrals that a faculty should expect to render to the administration in a common enterprise. And it is hard to believe that when means are found to provide a medium for cooperation and mutual deliberation which will be a first recourse for faculty and administration alike, the administration will not benefit from having a better informed and more responsible faculty.

Instructional Policy Committee - Professor Price reported on Proposal 8-63 as follows:

Resolution No. 1

WHEREAS the Instructional Policy Committee has been charged by the Faculty Senate, under resolution 8-63 to investigate the departments in the University "to see if the existing separations and combinations of diverse subject matter are those best suited to the purposes of the College;" and

WHEREAS in the comprehensive studies and hearing conducted by the Instructional Policy Committee, opportunity has been given the faculty to express its views on proposed changes in the organizational structure of the University and the Instructional Policy Committee has been informed of problems only in the Humanities and Social Studies Department; and

WHEREAS the Humanities and Social Studies Subcommittee of the Planning Committee has made recommendations, which this committee endorses, for subdividing the Department of Humanities and Social Studies in the future:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED in the light of all these studies that the Administration be urged to give careful consideration to the request of any appropriate disciplines such as those within the Humanities and Social Studies to be granted departmental status if and when the curricula and the number and scholarly standing of the staff of a particular discipline, as well as student demand therein, shall justify such status, and as soon as the Administration shall determine that personnel and budgetary problems can be solved.

Adoption of the proposal was moved by Professor Price, Dr. Snelgrove seconded. Discussion follows.

Dr. Brown: Will the breakup of any department require Senate approval?

Dr. Van Pelt: What did the Committee intend?

Prof. Price: The proposal can include the idea if wanted.

Dr. Van Pelt: The Administration has previously considered splitting departments. If suggestions are received, they would be considered. The Administration is not asleep.

Prof. Price: Sleeping is not implied.

Dr. Van Pelt: Felt that negligence was implied but glad to realize that cost and difficulty of such changes are realized by the Committee.

The vote was taken and the proposal passed by written ballot, 31 yes to 2 no. Final vote will be taken at the next meeting.

Proposal 8-63 was further reported on by Professor Price in Resolution 2.

Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS the curricula of the Sault Ste. Marie campus serving somewhat different purpose for a student body dissimilar in orientation to that at Houghton, and

WHEREAS the faculty and administration of Sault Ste. Marie have demonstrated their regard for high academic standards and a willingness to cooperate with the Houghton campus in achieving common objectives:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University administration be requested to encourage the Sault Ste. Marie branch, through appropriate investigation comparable to that being undertaken by the Long-Range Planning Committee at Houghton, to evolve proposals for the kind of departmental organization and the curricula which are best suited to meet the needs of the staff and the students at Sault Ste. Marie.

Professor Price moved, Dr. Snelgrove seconded adoption of the resolution. Discussion followed:

Professor Champion stated that the Long-Range Planning Committee is active at the Soo.
Dr. Work: What is the origin of this resolution?

Prof. Price: Some answers we received to questions directed to the Soo gave rise to it.

Dr. Garland: Is the L.R. Planning Committee for Houghton only or for the entire University?

Dr. Van Pelt: For the University although the Soo has its own committee too.

Dr. Clark: What if the Soo sets up courses different from ours?

Dr. Van Pelt: Both units operate the same although the Soo now has 4 hour language and 6 hour Political Science courses.

The vote was taken and the proposal passed by written ballot, 33 yes to 1 no. Final vote will be taken at the next Senate meeting.

Proposal 3-59, which has been brought before the Senate because of general dissatisfaction with it is reproduced here:

SENATE RESOLUTION 3-59
Passed at Meeting Number Nine
Senate of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology
February 22, 1961

The Michigan College of Mining and Technology subscribes to the principal that institutions of higher learning are conducted for the common good, and that the common good depends in part upon academic freedom, which is the free search for truth and its free exposition whether in research or in the classroom.

If at any time evidence is presented that the activities of the faculty (as a group or individually) are contrary to the best interests of the College, then the proper administrators should feel obligated to initiate counsel in private with that individual or group. In the case of unresolved conflict it is the recommendation of the Senate that the issue shall be referred to a Senate Committee on Academic Freedom.

Professor Price read the Instructional Policy Committee's proposal tentatively numbered 1-64 as follows:

Proposal 1-64

WHEREAS Senate Resolution 3-59 on academic freedom contains no provision for freedom of extramural utterance on the part of the teacher; and

WHEREAS said resolution acknowledges none of the obligations or duties of academic freedom correlative with its rights; and

WHEREAS in an educational institution tenure should rest upon the base of academic freedom as well as provide for due process; and

WHEREAS in providing for a special Senate committee to which problems in connection with academic freedom are to be appealed, Senate Resolution 3-59 assumes the disparate nature of academic freedom and tenure:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate rescind resolution 3-59 and in its stead endorse the following statement on academic freedom, as a step toward its adoption by the Administration, the Board of Control, and the Tenure Committee as basic to the tenure policy and the conduct of teaching, learning, and research at Michigan Technological University.

Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition, both of which involve academic freedom and tenure, even before the latter is technically achieved.

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom is essential to effective teaching and research. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom carries with it duties correlative with rights.

1. The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

2. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but should be careful not to introduce into his teachings controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom should be clearly stated in writing at the time of appointment.

3. The university teacher is a citizen as well as a member of a learned profession. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and a teacher, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times strive to be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.
Academic Tenure

Academic freedom can be meaningful only if bolstered by tenure as defined at Michigan Technological University. Both are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.

In accordance with those principles, it shall be the policy of the Michigan Technological University that no faculty member shall be denied the right of free expression, nor shall he be dismissed or otherwise penalized for utterance made orally or in writing, within the framework and limitations of this statement. In the event of unresolved conflicts involving the academic freedom of a faculty member, these matters shall be referred to the University Committee on Faculty Tenure for study and recommendations.

Professor Price moved adoption of the Resolution, Dr. Snelgrove seconded. Discussion followed:

Dr. Van Pelt: The entire faculty should give this matter careful consideration before its final adoption.

Prof. Sermon: Any limitations must be known at the time new faculty appointments are made.

Dr. Yerg: In Section 1. - does this mean opposition to a faculty screening committee to publications?

Prof. Price: Yes, the statement opposes such. The committee inquired of the Faculty Association, the Tenure Committee, and the AAUP before presenting the statement.

Dr. Brown: Part 2. could be controversial.

Dr. Van Pelt: Written suggestions should be brought to the next Senate meeting.

It was decided by voice vote to table the motion to adopt the resolution. Rather it shall be placed in the minutes for the consideration at the next Senate meeting.

Faculty Professional Development Committee - Dr. C.E. Work on Proposal 9-63 relative to the appointment of Department Heads.

Dr. Work stated that a questionnaire had been sent to all faculty members. The results follow: (Available by request from the Senate Office)

In summation, of the total number responding, approximately 66 percent are satisfied with the method currently used to select Department Heads. The percentage of the total faculty preferring this system may even be higher, as it is assumed that the majority of those persons who did not return the questionnaire are satisfied with the status quo.

Of those who have had experience at other colleges, 46 percent would like to see changes in our system; and of those who have worked under either a limited term or elected set-up, 73 percent would prefer such a system at Michigan Tech.

Following the first report, Dr. Work mentioned the concern of his committee about certain faculty matters as follows:

Committee believes participation in professional society activities and attendance at professional society meetings is important to professional development of faculty members. Committee is concerned about its impression that many faculty members are not doing so. Therefore, we have chosen two avenues of approach to study this matter:

1. We have solicited from the heads of the various divisions of the University, statements of travel policy in their respective divisions.
2. We are polling the academic faculty on both campuses to find who attended what professional society meetings during the 1963 calendar year and with funds from what sources: department budget, research sponsors, pockets of faculty members, etc.

Curricular Policy Committee - Professor H.B. Anderson reported on Proposal 10-63 - The Trimester System as follows:

Progress on the study of 10-63, trimester calendar proposal. It was moved that we invite Dr. Stephen Spurr, Dean, Academic Affairs, University of Michigan, to meet with the committee during his planned visit to MTU. He very kindly offered to make this meeting possible. It was pointed out at our meeting that the Long-Range Planning Committee, which is not a Committee responsible to the Faculty Senate, is making academic policy recommendations. Since two independent committees may arrive at contradictory policies, the Curricular Policy Committee wishes to have its responsibilities clarified before putting more time and effort into a calendar study which may well duplicate the work of the Planning Committee. Our Committee felt that a faculty responsible for carrying out academic policy should have a responsible voice in making and shaping that policy. We are not asking to be relieved of our responsibility, but if this is the wish of the Administration, then we will gladly turn over our considerable file of study material, now in the Library, to the Planning Committee.

Following this report, discussion took place.

Prof. Anderson: Dean Spurr’s visit will help this committee but what is the purpose of the Long-Range Planning Committee?
Dr. Williams: The L. R. Planning Committee is considering many things. The Senate should continue work on this calendar matter.

Prof. Anderson reported on Proposal 12-63 as follows:

Recommend the Adoption of Senate resolution 12-63 as printed on page 163, Senate minutes of meeting number 17, which reads.

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.

The Curricular Policy Committee feels that sufficient reasons for adoption are contained in the resolution. We respectfully suggest that 216 hours is more than a sufficient graduation requirement and that the Senate may well make the removal of the 6 hours represented by the SE courses mandatory if the degree granting department now requires more than 216 hours for graduation.

Professor Anderson moved, Professor Sermon seconded adoption of the proposal. Discussion follows.

Prof. Bayer: Has the committee considered the effects of cutting graduation requirements to 216 hours?

Dr. Stebbins: What does SE mean?

Dr. Van Pelt: Systems of Engineering description courses meant. Lack of support caused these to be dropped.

Dr. Bredekamp: Is it intended to get a unanimous vote here now so the proposal can be effective this fall?

Dr. Clark: The use of the word "may" leaves a latitude of choice.

Dr. Van Pelt: The wording goes beyond the Senate authority. The Senate can recommend matters through regular channels to the Administration.

Dr. Williams: Attrition problem is serious here. Many departments added courses to replace the six SE course credits when SE was dropped. No such additions should have been made. The Engineering departments should now decide to drop 6 credits.

Professor Bayer pointed out that these SE courses were introduced at the expense of important courses which had to be dropped.

Written ballot was taken and the resolution passed - 30 yes, 3 no. Final vote will occur at the next Senate meeting.

Professor H.B. Anderson introduced resolution tentatively numbered 2-64:

No student shall enroll in Principles of Economics until he has attained at least sophomore status, effective with the 1965-67 catalog version. In unusual individual circumstances, the Department of Business and Engineering Administration may grant exceptions.

Background: On February 26, 1964 a letter was transmitted to our committee by Dr. Van Pelt calling attention to a recommendation by Dr. Alexander and Professor Smith that Principles of Economics be considered properly a sophomore subject. A study of catalog degree schedules revealed that many departments are enrolling Freshmen in this course. In most cases this inclusion was to make up for the cancelled SE courses. No departments represented could foresee any serious scheduling difficulties arising from scheduling Principles of Economics in the sophomore year. If the Senate adopts resolution 12-63, this pressure for more Freshmen hours will be reduced by 6 hours. The resolution was written by members of the Business and Engineering Administration departments, including Prof. T. Smith, Dr. K. Alexander, and Prof. C. DelliQuadri. Dr. Van Pelt specifically referred this problem to us. It could be handled by writing the prerequisite into the catalog.

Discussion followed the reading of Resolution 2-64.

Professor H.B. Anderson: Why cannot this be written into the catalog?

Prof. DelliQuadri: Economics courses were to be sophomore courses following the SE courses' eliminated.
Prof. Anderson moved, Professor DelliQuadri seconded putting the proposal in the Senate minutes for consideration at a future meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

At this point, Dr. Van Pelt asked to be excused to attend to other business and requested Dr. Williams, with Senate approval, to conduct the meeting.

**Academic Standards Committee** - Professor T. Sermon reported on action taken by the committee on the problem of absences incurred by athletes and instructors handling of them. These proposals are collectively and tentatively numbered 3-64.

**Proposal 3-64 - Absence Policy**

The Committee assumes that final examinations are mandatory for all courses except for laboratory, field, seminar, and other courses exempted by the Dean of the Faculty. We propose that: the University shall not schedule nor shall the students participate in any official function during the scheduled final examination period.

For all classes other than the final examinations, no student shall be penalized for participating in an official college function. Participation in an official function shall be considered an excused absence. As stated in the University catalog, the student shall be allowed to make up work missed during an excused absence.

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.

All other absences are to be handled according to the instructor's discretion, consistent with departmental policy.

Catalog designated "inspection trip courses" must be scheduled so as not to preclude the students' attendance in other scheduled courses.

Discussion followed the presentation.

Prof. Bovard stated that he cannot approve this proposal.

Dr. Williams: The University of Minnesota has such a policy.

Prof. Bahrman: A clear cut policy on final examinations is needed. It is not fair to upset them.

Prof. Bovard: The recent Hockey League games were set for March 14 and 15. We would have to cancel the League playoffs under this regulation if we qualify.

Dr. Williams: This is coming up for proposal.

Prof. Sermon: The hockey team missed the fall quarter final examinations.

Prof. Price: What is an official function?

It was moved, seconded and passed by voice vote that this proposal be put in the minutes and considered at the next Senate meeting.

**Proposal 11-63** was read by Dr. Williams:

Proposal 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 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. Brown moved, Dr. Bredekamp seconded adoption of the proposal. Discussion followed:

Dr. Snelgrove: Isn't this ex-post-facto? Isn't there such a person now here?

Mr. Volin: Professors L.O. Bacon and F.L. Freyberger are such.

Dr. Williams: Is there a sharing of salary responsibility?

Dr. Stebbins: Is this to eliminate a clumsy situation?

Dr. Williams: It will make research proposals more impressive and improve morale.

Dr. Stebbins: What part of time is spent in teaching or research?

Dr. Williams: The trouble resides in our inconsistent system.

Dr. Garland: Research is recognized as academic effort.

Dr. Yerg: Research devoid of student participation is academically questionable.

Dr. Brown: "Potentially capable of teaching" means available for teaching although possibly not doing it at present.

Dr. Williams: Asked Mr. Volin if all persons now in research obtain faculty status under this proposal.

Mr. Volin: Only those desirous and capable of teaching.

Dr. Snelgrove: How would this affect persons on graduate committees?

Dr. Yerg: Those eligible would be on graduate faculty.

Dr. Bredekamp: Who appoints a person to the faculty? Does the graduate faculty override the faculty?

Dr. Yerg: No.

Dr. Williams: The graduate council endorses this.

Prof. DelliQuadri: Asked Mr. Volin if he can appoint people to the faculty.

Mr. Volin: No, the Dean of Faculty does this.

Dr. Yerg: The graduate council has no intention to override the faculty.

Dr. Hall: The Dean recommends faculty to the President. Does a research employment appoint to the faculty without the Dean's consent?

The vote was called for and by written ballot, the proposal passed 28 yes, 5 no, 1 abstain. This is a final vote adopting the policy.

Introduction of New Proposals by Members. New Business

Election Committee Report - given by Col. Seale for Col. Wagner.

The results of the Group II Senate Election on the Houghton Campus are as follows:

Prof. C.L. DelliQuadri, Business and Engineering Administration, term expiring July 31, 1967
Prof. R.O. Keeling, Physics, term expiring July 31, 1967
Prof. E.V. Niemi, Mechanical Engineering, term expiring July 31, 1967
Assoc. Prof. L.W. Hooker, Forest Products Research, term expiring July 31, 1967

Additional election was reported by the Soo of Dr. Dr. L.R. Ward to Group II replacing Prof. C.E. Kemp.

It was moved, seconded and passed that the election committee's report be accepted and those elected be received as Senate members of Group II effective September 1, 1964 to August 31, 1967.

Election of Senate Secretary resulted in the incumbent being re-elected for a third two-year term.
The Committee on Committees. Dean Frank Kerekes, Chairman, reported by presenting a tabulation of committee appointments. This report was read to the Senate by the acting chairman, Dr. Williams (Available upon request from the Senate Office).

Senate President's Report - none made because Dr. Van Pelt had departed as reported here because of other business.

Voluntary Remarks of Members:

Dr. Brown: What is happening in the matter of diverting traffic around the campus?

Dr. Williams: The Highway Department, the University Planning Committee, and the Houghton Village President are conferring. The plan is to widen Houghton Avenue to four lanes from U.S. 41 west to Thornton home, then north to College Avenue. Hearings are planned on the development.

Dr. Yerg: How does the building division view this?

Dr. Williams: No difficulty is foreseen. We can stop this action if desired.

Adjournment was called at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Secretary