MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER TWENTY-ONE
OF THE
SENATE OF THE MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

2 March 1965

(The Senate Minute pages: 202-212)

The meeting opened at 7:10 p.m., Tuesday March 2, 1965, in the Faculty Lounge. President R.L. Smith presiding.

The roll was taken. Present were:
Group I - Smith, R.L., Meese, Sermon, Howard, Wagner, Seale, Krenitsky, Noble, Williams.
Group III - Spain, Young, Clark, Work, Hesterberg, Snelgrove, Byers, Fitch, Been, Stebbins, Bovard.

Absent were:
Group I - Kerekes, Townsend, Crawford, Garland, Bourdo, Volin, Myers, Yerg.
Group II - DelliQuadri, Hooker, Keeling, Sawezak, Wiedenhoefer.
Group III - Smith, T.N., Hein, Clark, Fryxell, Smith, R.L.
Group IV - Frea, Hall, Bredekamp, McInnes.

A quorum being present the meeting proceeded.

The minutes of meeting No.20 were approved as previously distributed.

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business

Proposal 1-62 -- Senate Constitution Revision. Professor J. Romig reported that no suggestions had been received or changes made since Senate meeting #20, the minutes of which appear on pages 192, 193, 194 show the proposed constitution presented then. Prof. Romig expressed desire to resign from the committee and stated that the present Senate can be made to work. Dr. Schnelle stated that he wished to present for consideration a different version of the Senate constitution. This form is modeled from AAUP documents and copies have been distributed to the Senate this evening.

NEW PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR THE MICHIGAN TECH SENATE

PREAMBLE: In recognition of the desirability of faculty participation in university government, the Board of Control and the faculty of Michigan Technological University do hereby establish this constitution for the Faculty Senate.

ARTICLE I: NAME. The name of this organization shall be the Senate of the Michigan Technological University.

ARTICLE II: FUNCTIONS. The functions of the Senate shall be to conduct studies and to submit recommendations to the President of the University on all matters which the Senate shall deem appropriate. The Senate will prescribe regulations for its own government.

ARTICLE III: RELATIONSHIP TO THE GENERAL FACULTY. Concise minutes of meetings of the Senate shall be regularly distributed to the Faculty and shall be available to the Board of Control on request.

At least once each term, at a meeting of the General Faculty convened primarily for that purpose and presided over by the President of the University or his representative, designated members of the Senate and the Administration shall report to the General Faculty on action taken by the Senate since the time of the latest meeting of the General Faculty, and on the implementation thereof by the Administration. At these meetings, any action taken by the Senate may be challenged by any member of the Faculty and that action may be, by vote of the Faculty, amended, revoked, or referred to a committee appointed by the Chairman for study and report at the next meeting. The challenging member will always be designated chairman of any study committee so appointed.

ARTICLE IV: MEMBERSHIP. Membership in the Senate shall consist of: 1) The President of the University or his designated representative, 2) One member from each of the academic or research departments of the University, 3) Six members of the General Faculty elected at large.

Members will be elected by the departments in May of each year to take office in September of the following year. Terms for these members will be for one year, and members may serve only two terms in succession. Names of departmental members will be submitted not later than May 31 to the Secretary of the Senate by department heads.

Members at large will be elected in May for terms of three years. In the first election following adoption of this constitution, two members will be elected for one year, two for two years, and two for three years. At-large members may be re-elected once, but they will not thereafter be eligible until the lapse of three years.
All candidates for election to the Senate must have academic tenure.

**ARTICLE V: OFFICERS.** The Senate shall determine and elect its own officers. Administrative officers of the University shall not hold office in the Senate.

**ARTICLE VI: MEETINGS.** Regular meetings of the Senate shall be held tri-weekly. Special meetings may be called by the Chairman of the Senate upon due notice. All meetings shall be open to members of the General Faculty.

**ARTICLE VII: AMENDMENTS.** Amendments to the constitution may be proposed at any meeting and may be passed at any subsequent meeting after a lapse of at least one month from the first passage. Both passages will be by a simple majority.

Dr. Schnelle discussed differences in the functions, powers, membership, and responsibilities of the Senate under this proposed constitution. Also he pointed out that the Faculty Association Council had approved the items in this constitution today and preferred it to the version in minutes page 192.

Prof. Niemi asked when the Faculty Association first saw the document.

Dr. Schnelle replied that they had it in hand for five days.

Prof. Romig stated that he had presented his version with reservations.

Dr. Peach stated that the E.M. Department had considered the two forms proposed and preferred the AAUP version. Functions of a senate should not be stipulated. The number of meetings should be left up to the senate rather than specified.

Dean Meese pointed out that each version has its merits. The choice is an important decision and not enough time has been given to choose. Some definitions are needed. The Soo Branch is not mentioned. The present constitution does this explicitly.

Dean Meese moved, Prof. Romig seconded, that the constitution be referred to a committee to study and consolidate the best parts of the three versions or to study possible amending of the present constitution to meet the objectives of the proposed changes.

Dr. Schnelle objected to reference of the matter to a committee. It will take a long time. If we pass tonight on the constitution, the faculty will be involved. No arguments, no objections, have so far come from them. He suggested defeat of the motion and action on the matter tonight.

Dr. Peach: Isn't elimination of the present constitution desired? Did the committee consider amending it?

Prof. Romig: No. Instructions to committee precluded it.

Prof. Champion: The Soo desires specific mention in a constitution. Number of representatives, etc., is needed. A questionnaire at the Soo gave a strong majority to inclusion in the Houghton Senate. This is to make communication possible.

Dr. Schnelle: Responsibility for this AAUP draft is mine. Didn't intend to omit the Soo and wish to make provision in the constitution for representation of the 40 men on the Soo faculty.

Dr. Bredekamp: Urgency shouldn't determine the choice of a constitution. Consideration by a committee should be given. Amendment of the present constitution might be the best course.

Dr. Young: In opposition to Dr. Schnelle's proposal. The AAUP should not play such a major role in framing a constitution. The AAUP, a small group, may not represent the faculty. The senate should do this. Faults in the version suggested include: administration having only one representative; amendments possible with only a simple majority. Suggest voting on the motion.

Dr. Schnelle stated disturbed by limits placed on Senate powers. Pessimistic about faculty desire to actively participate in work of a Senate so limited. Powers of the Senate are circumscribed by the President and Board of Control so there can't be much change regardless of the document chosen.

Dr. Berry requested that vote be taken.

Vote was taken by count of hands and the motion was passed, 30 yes to 7 no to refer the three constitutions to a committee.

President Smith: Shall there be a new constitution?

Prof. Niemi: Personally biased by previous work; suggests new committee.

Prof. Price: Shares Prof. Niemi's feelings.

President Smith: Request Committee on Committees to appoint an ad hoc committee to handle this matter.
Proposal 9-63 - Appointment of Department Heads - Faculty Professional Development Committee. Dr. C. Work, Chairman, presented the following:

The committee sought information from two sources: all members of the Michigan Tech faculty and 50 deans of Arts and Sciences, Business and Engineering in a representative group of other colleges and universities.

The faculty survey was reported to the Senate at its meeting May 12, 1964 (see minutes pp. 179-181) and the results from the deans' survey is reported herewith. As a result of the committee's study, a change in term of appointment and procedure for renewal or replacement of department heads is recommended.

Recommendations: The committee recommends that the following policy be recommended by the Senate for adoption by the University.

Academic department heads shall be appointed by the administration for 5 year terms. Upon expiration of this term, the appointment shall be renewed or a new department head shall be selected by the administration after consultation with the faculty of the department.

Dr. Bredekamp: This statement is very specific. Why was the original resolution abandoned?

Dr. Work: The committee thinks this is better. The length of the term is chosen as best.

Dr. Brown: This proposal is practically the same as AAUP version. Direct election is satisfactory. Support from his department is necessary to any department head.

Dr. Fitch: What consideration is given during the recruitment of a department head to 9 or 12 month appointments? What will the situation be after the 5 year period?

Dr. Work: We didn't consider this since 12-month appointments are used here now. Seems that the only case where difficulty might occur might be when reappointment of a department head not doing well is concerned.

Dr. Young: Feels that his remarks about the AAUP may have been misunderstood. Hopes that Senate membership is a faculty responsibility, not AAUP or any other group. Stated that department heads can be removed at any time so why establish a five year term.

Dr. Williams: What is the competition doing? What other schools appoint for a limited period?

Dr. Hendrickson: Most others do. Renewable terms used.

President Smith: Isn't there any release from the five year term?

Dr. Work: Removal by administration is possible at any time.

Dr. Williams: Suggest that review of the department heads by their faculty be mandatory.

Dr. Work moved, Dr. Schnelle seconded approval of the proposal including appointment for five years with review then.

Prof. Halkola: Feels removal prerogative of administration.

Prof. Ward moved a restatement of the policy to be: Academic department heads shall be appointed or renewals made by the administration after consultation with the faculty of the department. Though heads shall serve at the administration's discretion, appointments will normally be for five years.

Dr. Peach seconded the adoption of the restatement.

Dr. Work: The periodic review is lost. The five year term is lost. Perhaps this is not a serious problem.

Dr. Berry: Supports Prof. Ward. A clear statement is necessary.

Prof. W.T. Anderson: Little need for this policy can be seen. Our present practice is satisfactory.

Prof. Champion: Will administration listen to this? Aren't we usurping prerogatives?

President Smith: Yes, but administration can use this policy or not as it becomes necessary.

Vote was called for and the restated form was defeated.

Vote on the committee's form of the proposal was called for and the proposal was adopted, 20 yes to 9 no. Decision was to include the word "academic" which was added to the recorded version from the committee in these minutes.

Proposal 10-63 - Trimester System, Curricular Policy Committee. Prof. H.B. Anderson read a revised statement and recommendations relevant to the proposal. These are reproduced here. Prof. Anderson moved adoption of the revised proposal.
REVISED STATEMENT OF SENATE PROPOSAL NO. 10-63 (TRIMESTER CALENDAR)

It is proposed that the University 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 band, glee club, PE and ROTC, carry 4 to 6 credits and all required undergraduate courses 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 maximum load of 16 credits consisting of not more than 4 different courses plus PE, band, glee club, and ROTC and other such extra courses.

CONCERNING: Recommendations Relevant to the Revised 10-63 Proposal

1. That MTU implement a year-round academic program in all undergraduate departments.
2. That an academic calendar consisting of three trimesters of approximately 16 week duration be adopted by MTU concurrently with the implementation of the year-round operation.
3. That curricula be revised and consolidated so that a normal load consists of not more than 16 hours per academic period (with exception of PE and ROTC). With few exceptions the normal course load should consist of not more than 4 different courses. 135 trimester hours or 180 quarter hours (with exception of PE and ROTC) should be the normal baccalaureate requirement.
4. That it is very likely that a majority of the teaching faculty will prefer a 9-month basis but that any teachers hired on a 12-month basis be placed on a department approved non-teaching assignment for 1 trimester out of 4, or 1 quarter out of 5 or the equivalent. The purpose of the non-teaching activity should be to improve the level of academic achievement and the teaching efficiency. Salary inducements should be used to encourage staff improvement rather than to promote year-round teaching without interruption. We should move toward the goal of equal pay for equal work.
5. The principal reason for adopting a year-round calendar should be that we may thereby accommodate a larger number of students without a proportionate increase in physical facilities. Eventually when year-round enrollment stability is achieved, the per capita student credit hour cost will tend to be reduced, but economy is not the principal reason for adoption. In no event can we afford to damage the quality of our teaching and our provision for encouraging higher and higher levels of academic attainment by both students and faculty in laboratory, library, and classroom.

Dr. Byers: Does number 5 include a recommendation?

Prof. Anderson: Yes and emphasizes cost not the reason for change.

Prof. Bovard: When do these trimesters begin and end? Dates are important to the athletic programs.

Prof. Anderson: Dates once established are definite. Total is 48 weeks.

Prof. Bovard: A starting time in August is bad. Ending a trimester in May eliminates golf, track, tennis. This would wreck the Spring program.

Prof. Halkola: With students on a 12-month basis, how does the trimester plan injure the PE program?

Dr. Brown: It will be difficult to use the plan in the small departments. Too few students to justify all courses to be offered each trimester.

Prof. Anderson: Year-round availability of courses will keep the students in school taking them as desired.

Prof. Bovard: What is wrong with the four quarter plan? With it we have few summer students. Why?

Dean Meese: The most important reason for the proposed change is better education. Consolidation of the courses, limiting courses to four each trimester of 15 weeks reduces overload, particularly quiz overload, now so heavy for the students. Absorption by the students would be better.

Dr. Peach: No effect on student achievement would result. The system is not relevant. The quarter system can be modified if necessary but doubtful that trimester would help.

Dr. Brown: In favor of trimester plan. Text books are written for semesters not quarters. Losses of time by starts and stops of instructional periods would be reduced. Costs will be reduced.

Prof. Hellman: Why not stay on quarters but drop to 180 credits?

Dr. Fitch: Help requested in deciding what to drop. Trying to eliminate the unnecessary now.

Dr. Berry: Agree with Prof. Been. Present reduction of Fall quarter freshmen to 15 hours made no improvement in their achievement in Chemistry.
Prof. Hellman: Believes the students overloaded.

Dean Meese: Only 10 freshmen were dismissed at Christmas time this year compared to approximately 40 dismissed similarly last year.

Dr. Schnelle: What did the committee's questionnaire to the faculty show? What was the consensus?

Prof. Anderson: There was a slight majority of the trimester plan. There was no distinct lead for the quarter plan. There is no reason to abandon the trimester plan idea.

Prof. Been: The validity of Dean Meese's drop out count seems doubtful.

Dr. Work: Not convinced of any advantage for 4 to 6 credit hour courses. Believes 3 classes per week the best.

Prof. Anderson: Hours in class and hours of credit can be adjusted.

Dr. Williams: Believes he will vote against the proposal. The quarter system can be used year around as well as another. Problem of conversion of curriculum to a trimester system just to effect a trial of the system is too great. Improvement of the quarter system should be tried first.

Dr. Schnelle: Believes curriculum improvements are constantly being made. Stated consolidation of certain B.A. courses with the mathematics department an example.

Dr. Berry: The use of a summer quarter or trimester is doubtful. Many students must work during summers for financial reasons. Trimester no solution for year around operation.

Prof. Anderson: Conferences with interviewers who come to hire our students indicate that they can be employed on a temporary basis at times other than summer.

Dr. Brown: Seconds motion to adopt the trimester plan.

Dr. Bredekamp: Called for vote on the motion.

Prof. H.B. Anderson: Doubts validity of permitting athletics to block the trimester plan.

Prof. Bovard: Statements made by me concerning the bad effects of the trimester plan on the athletic program were not intended to block the plan necessarily.

The vote was taken by hand count and the trimester proposal was defeated, 3 yes to 38 no votes.

At this point, the Senate recessed for about 15 minutes. Coffee was served, evidently through arrangements made by the President, Dr R.L. Smith. This was appreciated by all.

Proposal 1-64, Academic Freedom and Tenure - Instructional Policy Committee. Prof. Price briefly discussed the proposal (minutes pp. 177-79) pointing out that the statements therein are from the Bill of Rights and insure freedom to teach, learn, and speak. Asked why 3 negative votes were cast before?

The vote was taken by written ballot. This, the final vote, passed the proposal 39 yes to 2 no.

Proposal 3-64, Student Absence Policy - Academic Standards Committee, Prof. Sermon reviewed the proposal as printed in the minutes, p. 200.

President Smith: Are final examinations mandatory?

Prof. Sermon: No, although new senate business scheduled for this meeting will state a policy on this matter.

Dr. Bredekamp: Oppose this proposal. Objects to some courses not requiring final examinations. Objects to interference with inspection trips. These are important, and regular inspection trips must receive consideration.

Prof. Sermon: Terms ending in the middle of the week cause trouble. This won't happen in 1965.

Dr. Work: It is bad if the whole University is handicapped by two departments scheduling inspection trips.

Prof. Bahrman: Chemistry schedules their inspection trip between the winter and spring quarters.

Dr. Bredekamp: Scheduling is at fault, not the inspection trip.

Vote was taken by written ballot. The vote, final for the proposal, passed 30 yes to 7 no.

Introduction of New Proposals by Senate Members. New Business

President Smith appointed Dr. Bredekamp senate parliamentarian.
Proposal 1-65, Professional Society Meetings - Faculty Professional Development Committee. Dr. Work distributed copies of his committee’s proposal which is reproduced here.

The committee recommends that the following policy be recommended by the Senate for adoption by the University.

1. Attendance at professional society meetings is encouraged. Absence with full pay to attend such meetings will be granted unless, in the judgment of the Department Head, the absence would unduly interfere with the academic or research programs of the department.

2. Funds for faculty professional development travel shall be separated in departmental budgets from any other travel funds (i.e. funds for field trips, travel for recruiting staff, etc.)

3. Each faculty member with the rank of assistant professor or higher shall be allowed expenses for at least transportation, registration, and one scheduled banquet or luncheon for at least one professional society meeting per year. Each faculty member who is a scheduled participant shall be allowed expenses for transportation, registration, meals, and lodging.

4. Where distance and number attending justify group arrangements for transportation, faculty members are expected to take advantage of pool transportation made available by the University except where extenuating circumstances justify separate travel.

5. Meetings of educational societies such as ASEE shall be considered on the same basis as other professional society meetings.

6. Until sufficient funds are available to put these policies completely into effect, first priority shall be granted to participants, after which department heads shall be required to decide which meetings for which staff members represent best use of available funds.

Dr. Work moved, Dr. Fitch seconded acceptance of the proposal.

Dr. Bredekamp stated that since this is the first appearance on the Senate agenda, it could only be discussed or sent to committee. Any action must be postponed until the next meeting.

Dr. Schnelle: What does number 4 mean? If there is a meeting in San Francisco, would a group be expected to drive there?

Dr. Work: Not in a case like that.

Proposal 2-65, Policy on Final Examinations - Final Examination Committee. Prof. Bahrman read the proposal as follows:

A. Recommended Statement:

Final Examinations are required of all students in all courses except those recommended for exemption by the Final Examination Committee and approved by the Dean of the Faculty. These examinations are given during the regular final examination period which is the last week of the quarter.

B. Present Statement:

Certain departments require quarter-end examinations of all students in some courses. These examinations are usually given at other than regular class hours during the last week of each quarter.

Prof. Bahrman: Impossible to operate a program of scheduled final examinations under present statement. Some multiple section courses will have examinations in only part of the sections. What is the Tech policy to be? The Senate and administration must decide. Recommends 2-65A.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Prof. Hellman seconded, directing the proposal to the Instructional Policy Committee.

The Senate approved by vote.

Dr. Schnelle: This makes it a difficult thing not to give a final examination. Can't the professor decide about his final?

Prof. Bahrman: Explained the group and block system used to schedule final examinations and avoid conflicts.

Dr. Work: Policy for graduate courses should be different.

Dr. Peach: All final examinations should be in the scheduled time, the last week, examination week.

Dr. Young: "Take home" finals are a special problem too.
**Senate President’s Remarks**

Dr. Smith stated that he will report on Proposals 1-64 and 3-64, finally passed by the Senate at this meeting, next time. Also he will investigate proposals approved in the past by the Senate and report on their status.

**Voluntary Remarks of Senate Members**

Dr. Bredekamp: Senate meetings require effort. Success assured if made.

Dr. Berry: Who heads the Committee on Committees?

President Smith: Prof. Been.

Dr. Williams: Suggested more meetings at 5:00 p.m.

General disapproval registered to this by Senate.

Dr. Peach: Feels that AAUP proposals are superior to others submitted and Senate should express approval of AAUP effort by resolution.

The Senate adjourned at 10:18 p.m.

Special: The Committee on Committees reports the new Constitution Committee to be:

G. Bahrman
D. Halkola
R. Keeling
D. Pollock
L.R. Ward
G. Young

Committee to choose the chairman.

Respectfully submitted,  
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary