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

26 May 1965

(Senate Minute pages: 213-224)

The meeting opened at 7:13 p.m., Tuesday May 26, 1965, in the Faculty Lounge. President R.L. Smith presiding.


The minutes of meeting No.21 were approved as previously distributed.

Committee Reports and action on same. Old Business

Proposal 1-62 -- Senate Constitution Revision. Professor G. Bahrman, Chairman, reported that the committee had held two meetings to date. Meetings by committee members with faculty and administration members had been held. The committee plans to work during the summer and prepare a constitution to be presented at a special Senate meeting in the fall.

Dr. Smith asked if the committee members would be on campus during this summer. Prof. Bahrman stated that they would be here.

Proposal 9-63 - Appointment of Department Heads - In the absence of Dr. Work, this proposal of the Faculty Professional Development Committee was read by President Smith as follows:

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.

Discussion followed.

Prof. Ward: Would this affect the department chairmen at the Soo which does not have department heads?

President Smith: Would say it does not.

Dr. Hendrickson: Stated that it does not.

Prof. DelliQuadri: When will this proposal become effective?

President Smith: When passed by the President.

Dr. Keeling: How will this affect future department head appointments?

President Smith: This policy only points out the facts concerning department heads and their appointments.

Dr. Hendrickson: This policy is not intended to rotate department heads.

Dr. Fitch: Still indefinite about effect on recruitment and situation after the five year period.

Dr. Bredekamp: The five year period permits review of the department head's performance and intentions.

Dr. Hein: Department heads must expect this.

At this time the second and final vote was taken in writing. The proposal passed 20 yes, 9 no. This oddly is the same as the first vote.
Proposal 1-65, Professional Society Meetings Faculty Professional Development Committee. President Smith pointed out that this proposal is shown on page 210 of the minutes of which each present had a copy in hand.

Discussion took place.

Dr. Hein: How does this differ from present policy?

President Smith: It separates departmental funds to a part for this use. It provides for individuals and their travel. It means that a fund will be established by diversion from other accounts such as CSS&M (contractual services, supplies, and maintenance) for this use when available. It does not mean that the Legislature will provide any money.

Prof. DelliQuadri: High schools force travel at personal expense on their teachers. Are we going to do this? Is travel to be voluntary? What amount of money provided to each?

Dr. Hendrickson: Probably $100.

Prof. Hooker: Each man will want to travel.

Dr. Fitch: I have asked people to go on trips with no takers.

Dr. Schnelle: Matter seems confused. What is meant by available money?

President Smith: If this proposal passes, we can decide to spend money this way.

Prof. DelliQuadri: This makes more stringent the attendance at meetings. Do we mean this?

Prof. Hooker: Is each department to allocate its own funds?

President Smith: Now we specify who goes where. Under the new arrangement and with a new budget, more freedom might be possible.

Dr. Bredekamp: Am in favor of this proposal. Accreditation groups emphasize importance of travel. The proposal does not require all to travel.

Dr. Schnelle: Can't we make this more flexible? For example, can't the B.A. Department use some other department's money if they don't require it?

Dr. Fitch: CSS&M money flexible. Can be so used.

Dr. Schnelle: If this proposal passes, will flexibility be available.

Prof. DelliQuadri: Only the first statement of this proposal is pertinent to the Senate. The rest of the proposal is administrative.

Prof. Hooker: We don't want CSS&M money for travel.

President Smith: The present budget includes money for travel.

Dr. Peach: When other (more) money available, this proposal will be good.

Prof. Niemi: lack of knowledge of the $4,000 annually allotted for faculty travel by the Michigan Tech Foundation may be restricting its use. This money is administered by the Dean of the Faculty.

Dr. Schnelle: Can the use of travel money be retroactive?

Dr. Fitch: Next year I intend to push travel. Will leave money in CSS&M fund.

Dr. Snelgrove: Item #2 is supported by me.

Prof. Ward: In favor of the entire policy. At present travel by the Soo faculty is supported only to the extent of $35 per trip.

It was moved by Prof. Hooker, seconded by Prof. DelliQuadri, and passed by vote that the proposal be returned to the committee to work flexibility into and get a statement of policy as distinct from administration.
Proposal 2-65, Final Examinations - Instructional Policy Committee. Prof. Sherwood Price proposed by reading the following:

After consultation with the teaching staff, department heads designate all courses or sections of courses in which final examinations are given. These examinations are then scheduled for the final week of the term by the Final Examination Committee.

Discussion followed:

Dr. Fitch: How is this proposal different from present policy?

Prof. Price: It permits departments to rule on their final exams. Examinations are a necessary evil. No specific requirements for examinations can be defined. Other schools have tried eliminating examinations but have returned to giving them.

Prof. Bahrmann: Scheduled final examinations must be a firm commitment. Changes can be made annually. We must have a policy of definite type to permit scheduling these examinations.

Prof. Price: Some departments, lax before, will now let the examination committee know their requirements.

Dr. Schnelle: If examinations are scheduled one year in advance, why can't an instructor cancel his final examination if he chooses?

Prof. Bahrmann: Planned examination assignments prohibit taking courses having simultaneous examination periods. If a scheduled examination is called off by the instructor, the students who wanted to schedule a conflicting course but did not because of the examination conflict, have been unfairly treated.

Dr. Stebbins: The real question is: "Are final examinations important?"

Dr. Hein: This proposal implies that they are required.

Dr. Fitch: Stated case where an instructor gave his final examination the week before their scheduled time. Doubts the importance of finals to seniors.

Dr. Peach: Seniors may be taking Sophomore, Junior courses thus requiring examinations.

Prof. Price moved, Dr. Spain seconded, and the proposal passed this first vote.

Introduction of New Proposals by Senate Members. New Business

The report of the election for members of Group II of the Senate was read by Col. M. Seale, committee chairman. Newly elected to three year terms - Sept. 65 to August 68 are: Prof. G. Bahrmann; Dr. M. Bredekamp; Dr. D.W. Pollack; Dr. D.O. Wyble; Prof. J. Romig; and Prof. J. Amernick (Soo)

Col. Seale mentioned the necessity of a second primary ballot which was required in this election. The Secretary was asked how the names of eligible candidates were determined and explanation was made about the several lists of names, retirements, senate encumbency, and other factors involved.

Although not required at the meeting, the departmental representatives elected for the period 1965 to 1968 are:

| B.A. | Dr. K. Schnelle |
| Bio Sci. | Dr. K. Kraft |
| C.E. | Prof. L.A. Robert |
| CH & CM | Dr. D.H. Kenny |
| E.M. | Prof. R.L. Hennessy |
| Met. | Dr. L.A. Heldt |
| PH | Prof. P. Shandley |

Prof. Tidwell introduced Proposal 3-65, University Retirement Program.

WHEREAS, College and University retirement plans have been found to be by far the most significant form of fringe benefit to faculty members; and

WHEREAS, it has been found that a retirement plan has more long-range influence on the institution, its educational objectives, the morale of its staff members, and the ability of the institution to attract the level of talent to which it aspires than all other fringe benefits put together; and

WHEREAS, there are many variations between different retirement plans covering faculties in colleges and universities throughout the United States; and
WHEREAS, the plan currently in operation at Michigan Technological University includes a combination of
coverage under the Michigan Public School Employees Retirement Fund and Social Security; and

WHEREAS, the TIAA-CREF (Teacher Insurance and Annuity Association of America - College Equities Fund)
plan operated and managed by a non-profit life insurance company is widely used by other universities in the
State of Michigan; and

WHEREAS, it cannot be effectively determined casually whether TIAA-CREF or any other retirement plan is or
would be better for Michigan Technological University and its faculty than the present plan because of two
important reasons: (1) the complex and technical nature of each plan, and (2) the relationship of each plan to
each individual; and

WHEREAS, tax sheltered annuities apparently are legally available to members of the faculty of Michigan
Technological University as a part of possible fringe benefits related to retirement,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate cause a thorough, technical analysis of available
retirement plans including tax sheltered annuities for the purpose of recommending a plan or combination of
plans currently best suited to Michigan Technological University and its faculty.

Discussion and questions followed.

Dr. Snelgrove: Are other Michigan schools doing this?

Prof. Tidwell: Yes - three which have constitutional status are.

Prof. Hooker: What is the meaning of "tax sheltered?"

Prof. Tidwell: You can agree with Tech to withhold some amount per year of your salary toward an annuity. Tax on this
withholding can be deferred to time annuity falls due. Your income will be lower then so tax lower.

Prof. DelliQuadri: Tech will carry its own insurance now. There are advantages to be gained.

President Smith: Can anyone use tax shelter?

Prof. Tidwell: Yes, but only by definite contract between Michigan Tech and the teacher.

Dr. Hein moved, Prof. DelliQuadri seconded, and voice vote passed the admission of this proposal to Senate business.
President Smith stated that he will request the Committee on Committees to appoint a committee to handle this proposal and
that the membership of this committee will include members of the Faculty Association who cooperated in the planning and
study for this proposal.

Prof. S. Price presented the following resolution to the Senate:

Proposal 4-65 - Special Lectures Program

RESOLVED: That the Senate go on record as favoring an expanded program of special lectures on the MTU
campus.

Discussion followed.

Dr. Stebbins: What is the meaning of "special lectures"?

Prof. Price: Those not a part of formal instruction or courses. Like those given as part of the concert lecture series.

Dr. Brown: These could include people, travel accounts, etc.

The Senate voted to approve this resolution as Senate business.

A letter from Prof. R.G. Mason, president of the Michigan Tech chapter of the AAUP and addressed to the Senate secretary,
relative to a proposed constitution, was read by the secretary to the Senate. Prof. Mason pointed out that anyone can present
proposals to the Senate and that the proposal, sent through proper channels, must be considered by the Senate without
prejudice.

Prof. Bahrman pointed out that the committee at work on proposal 1-62 required Senate confirmation. This was voted
unanimously.

The President's report was given by Dr. R.L. Smith. A written copy of this report prepared later by Prof. J. Romig is reproduced
here:

Senate President's Report
I have recently received from the Secretary of the Senate by a letter of April 26, 1965, a listing of certain proposals acted on by the Senate, recommended to the President, but either not yet acted on by the President, or not implemented by appropriate administrative action.

I shall discuss all the proposals listed in the Secretary's letter of April 26. I shall use the Senate proposal number in this discussion.

Proposals 2-59, 1-60, 2-60, 6-60:

These policies have been implemented by a statement on page 40 of the 1965-1966 catalogue. If you feel this statement on transfer credit, advanced placement, and advanced credit or waivers of prerequisites does not adequately or properly implement the Senate policies, I should appreciate your comments.

Proposal 4-60, Cheating

This policy is currently being carried out, and there have been dismissals under it.

Proposal 1-61, Exam Week

This policy was accepted by the President in 1962 and no further administrative policy is needed. However, you will note that 3-64 also deals with this subject and that 2-65 now before the Senate for action also deals with final examination week.

Proposal 2-61, Minimum Level of English Usage

This policy was approved but has not been extensively used by the departments. Only one case has been reported to the Humanities Department.

Proposal 1-63, Class Standing

The Senate itself decided that this was primarily an administration problem rather than a Senate problem.

Proposal 5-63, Standardized Grading, committee to study

This I should like to refer to the Instructional Policy Committee for further study and recommendations.

Proposal 11-63, Research and Faculty Appointments

There is currently a special committee studying this problem, and I shall reserve judgment until receipt of its report.

Proposal 8-63, Departmental Organization

It appears that I have before me an earlier proposal, not the one finally adopted, and I shall have to give this further study before commenting on this policy.

Proposal 3-60, In-service Training for New Faculty Members

This has never been implemented, and I shall be receptive to any ideas you may have for implementation.

Proposal 3-64, Absence Policy

This policy I approve and accept. It should be implemented.

Proposal 1-64, Academic Freedom

This policy was in process before I became President and was finally adopted at the first meeting of the Senate at which I was chairman. The answers to some questions may aid in my thinking on this policy. (There then ensued a discussion of this policy).

Proposal 4-59, Sabbatical Leave

I am asking that the Committee on Committees appoint a committee to make a more detailed study. This committee should include someone from the Faculty Association Committee.

The Faculty Association Committee gave us the following information: Statements on policy on sabbatical leave from many of the state supported universities in Michigan and from one of the private colleges. Information from one or two of the above on the number taking sabbatical leave.

Much more detailed information is needed in terms of probable cost and actual cost to institutions now operating a program.

Voluntary Remarks of Senate Members

Dr. Peach: Wants more advanced notice of Senate meetings. Feels 10 days not enough.
Prof. DelliQuadri: Since he is retiring as a member of the Tenure Committee, he stated that the use of the non-renewal of contracts method of terminating employment being abused at MTU. Also he stated that the Soo ought to set up its own Senate.

Dr. R.L. Ward: The Soo is considering this for next year. As a member of the new Constitution Committee, he stated that he saw much merit in the present Senate constitution.

The Senate secretary thanked the Senate members for their cooperation and requested that all committee members consider their memberships continuing until such time as any new members be appointed and approved by the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary