MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER THIRTY-THREE
OF THE
SENATE OF THE MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

19 April 1967

(Senate Minute pages: 281-293)

The meeting opened at 7:12 p.m., Wednesday April 19, 1967, in the Faculty Lounge, Senate President G.E. Bahrman presiding.

The roll was taken. Present (22) were: Anderson, H.B., Berry, Brown, Kennedy, Krenitsky, Niemi, Oswald, Tidwell, Bahrman, Johnson, J.A., Johnson, V.W., Noble, Pollock, Barstow, Bovard, Boyd, Bredekamp, Halkola, Hamilton, Hennessy, Smith, R.L., Stebbins.

Absent (8) were: Lee, Boutiller, Heldt, Miller, Yerg, Bayer, Been, Keeling.

Guests present were: Crowther, Miller R.

The minutes of Meetings #31 and #32 were approved as previously distributed.

Old Business - Committee Reports

A. Election Procedure Committee, W.E. Barstow, Chairman

ELECTION PROCEDURE - MTU SENATE

Senate Election Committee

1. The Council of the Senate shall appoint annually an ad hoc committee to be charged with responsibility for conducting elections to fill vacancies in the Senate as provided by Article III, Section D, of the Senate Constitution.
2. The Committee shall be called the Senate Election Committee, hereinafter referred to as the Committee.
3. The Committee shall consist of four present senators not eligible by reason of constitutional provision for candidacy in the current year's election.

Eligibility of Electors and Candidates

1. All members of the General Faculty shall be qualified electors for the purposes of these election procedures.
2. All members of the General Faculty shall be qualified to be candidates for election as either Senator-at-Large or Senator-representative provided that they (a) meet the residence requirement of Article III Section A of the Senate Constitution and (b) are neither presently elected members of the Senate with unexpired terms of office nor ineligible for re-election to the Senate, as provided by Article II, Section B, of the Senate Constitution.

Election of Senators-At-Large

1. The Committee shall identify from Senate records the number of Senator-at-large vacancies which will occur in the current year, whether by reason of expiration of prescribed term of office or otherwise.
2. The Committee shall request each department to submit a list of all members of its staff who are eligible as of the end of the Winter Term of the current year to be candidates for election to the Senate.
3. The Committee shall compile an unofficial composite list of eligible faculty members as designated by such departmental lists.
4. The Committee shall submit by mail to all members of the General Faculty the unofficial composite list of eligible faculty members, together with appropriate directions for primary secret balloting by mail to select candidates for a final election.
5. Each such primary ballot cast may designate no more than three candidates for each Senator-at-Large vacancy to be filled.
6. The Committee shall count the primary votes cast for each eligible faculty member and certify successively as candidates for final election those persons who shall have received the highest number of votes cast, until a number of candidates shall have been certified equal to three candidates for each Senator-at-Large vacancy to be filled (or more in case of a tie vote for the last candidacy certified.)
7. Concurrent with certifying each candidacy for final election, the Committee shall confirm the assent of the faculty member to his candidacy, and shall pass over any person unwilling to be a candidate in certifying the proper number of candidates.
8. The Committee shall submit by mail to all members of the General Faculty the list of certified candidates for final election, together with appropriate directions for final secret balloting by mail to select a Senator-at-Large for each such Senate vacancy to be filled.
9. Each final election ballot cast may designate not more than one choice for each Senator-at-Large vacancy to be filled.
10. The Committee shall count the final election votes cast for each candidate and certify successively the election as Senator-at-Large of those persons who shall have received the highest number of votes cast to the number of places equaling the vacancies to be filled.

11. In the event that a tie vote prevents certification of the exact number of Senators-at-Large required to be elected, the Committee shall conduct a run-off election among only those candidates tied for election to the vacancy or vacancies still unfilled, in the same manner as was employed in the preceding putative final election.

Election of Senators - Representatives

1. The Committee shall identify from Senate records those departments for which a Senator-representative vacancy will occur in the current year, whether by reason of expiration of prescribed term of office or otherwise.
2. The Committee shall request each such department to elect by secret ballot and in accordance with Senate eligibility requirements its Senator-representative to fill the vacancy.
3. The Committee shall certify the election or re-election of each such Senator-representative pursuant to notification by the department concerned.
4. Failure of a department to designate its Senator-representative in accordance with the election schedule shall preclude the seating of that department's Senator-representative until the Winter Term following.

Election Schedule

1. Final election of Senators-at-Large shall be completed not later than two weeks prior to the second regularly scheduled Spring Term meeting of the Senate.
2. Election of Senators-representatives shall be communicated by the departments concerned to the Committee not later than the second regularly scheduled Spring Term meeting of the Senate.

Prof. Barstow briefly outlined the report which had been distributed to the Senate ten days prior to this meeting. He stated the procedure not new, being like the one used last year. The only new part is the certification of election by the Committee.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Oswald: Only two weeks allotted for departmental elections after "At Large" elections. Some departments may not have a meeting during this time.

Prof. Barstow: This the best possible in terms of time available.

Dr. Brown pointed out that Department meetings not necessary for the elections which can be conducted by memorandum.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out possible misunderstanding of eligibility, part 2b, which should establish as eligible for re-election Senators whose terms are expiring now. He stated that his name had been omitted from the list to be used in the coming election because of this.

Prof. Bahrman suggested preparation of eligibles lists by each department's secretary.

Dr. Smith suggested that the outlined procedure for departmental representatives seems to permit poor election procedure for them.

Prof. Bahrman pointed out that this report, although preliminary, would be followed by this year's election committee which, under Prof. V.W. Johnson as Chairman, is now conducting the election. The final version of the report is requested for the next Senate meeting.

B. Conflict of Interest Policy Committee, E.W. Niemi, Chairman

SUBJECT: Draft of Proposed Policy on Conflict of Interest

The attached is a draft of a proposed policy on Conflict of Interest. The document contains three parts: A) a statement of policy, B) procedural implementation of the policy, and C) an "appendix" to serve as a guide for defining potential conflict of interest situations.

There was some feeling within the committee to broaden the policy beyond merely conflict of interest and to include in it procedures for a general evaluation of faculty performance. Item 3, under Procedural Responsibility, is largely an outgrowth of this feeling, although it is a considerably watered-down version of the original idea proposed.

Also, there was expressed within the committee the suggestion to provide for a general hearing on the proposed policy, whereby any interested faculty member could discuss the policy before it is finally enacted by the Senate. Possibly the proposed draft, as it may be amended by the Senate, should be generally distributed prior to any such hearing.

Conflict of Interest Policy

Statement of Policy
External activities such as consulting, research, testing, or other professional work within the area of specialization of the individual university staff member shall, in general, be deemed advantageous to the University. However, external activities shall be prohibited which could expose the staff member to either actual or apparent conflicts of interest arising out of (a) multiple concurrent financial, recommendational, or occupational arrangements or obligations in relation to institutionally sponsored programs, or (b) excessive or disproportionate competing demands on the time, energies, or intellectual effort of the staff member.

This policy should not be interpreted in such as manner as to prevent or inhibit ad hoc professional activities of a cursory nature, unsponsored professional investigations and writings, or similar activities cognate to the primary obligation of the staff member to the University and obviously not within the intent of the policy.

It shall be both the collective responsibility of each academic department or research component, and the individual professional responsibility of each staff member to assure conformance to this policy.

Procedural Responsibility

1. The University shall take steps to assure understanding on the part of all departmental administrators and staff members, of the possible conflict of interest problems that may develop.
2. Each staff member shall inform his department chairman on a continuing basis concerning the nature and scope of all substantial external activities in which he is interested.
3. A standing committee shall be appointed in each academic department and research component to advise the respective department chairman and component directors on matters relating to staff members’ contractual obligations to the University and their adherence to accepted professional codes of ethics.
4. The University shall establish and administer uniform procedures sufficient to document compliance with this conflict of interest policy by those staff members who participate directly in research contracts between the University and any other person, organization or agency.
5. A committee composed of the Assistant to the President, the Director of Research, and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs shall serve as a review board in determining whether any staff member’s activities constitute conflict of interest when questions are referred to them either by an administrator or staff member.

Conflict Situations Defined

1. Favoring of Outside Interests. A University staff member who participates in sponsored research must avoid conflicts of interest which might arise through his having a significant interest in a private business concern, or a consulting relationship with such. Conflict of interest may arise in or from the following situations, among others:
   a. Orientation of a sponsored research project to serve the needs of a private firm (other than the sponsor) without disclosing this to the University or the sponsor.
   b. Purchase of major equipment, instruments, or materials from a private firm in which the staff member has an interest, without disclosure of such interest.
   c. Transmission of results, materials, records or other information from a sponsored research project to a private firm (other than the sponsor) in which the staff member has an interest. This refers to results, materials, records, or information not made generally available.
   d. Unauthorized divulgence of privileged information for personal gain. Privileged information here includes any information or records which are not generally available to others.
   e. Influencing negotiation of contracts between the University and a private organization in which the staff member has a consulting or other significant interest.
   f. Acceptance of gratuities or special favors from organizations with which the University may conduct business or extension of gratuities or special favors to employees of such organizations, under circumstances which might reasonably be interpreted as an attempt to influence the recipient’s conduct of their duties.
   g. Giving advice which may be of questionable objectivity because of its possible bearing on other interests.

Conflict of interest could arise, for example, when a staff member is called upon by the University or other third party for an evaluation of some technical aspect of the work of an organization in which he has a consulting or employment relationship or financial interest.

2. Distribution of Effort. Each staff member participating in sponsored research must assure that the amount of effort he devotes to his research project and other duties is in proportion to the agreed-upon division of his time (for example among research, teaching, committee assignments, outside consulting). This does not imply a precise accounting of time, because the inherent character of a faculty member's work generally precludes such detailed classification.

Prof. Niemi discussed the proposed policy after distributing copies of it to the Senate. He mentioned that the policy formulated by the Research Council had been strongly objected to at the previous Senate meeting and that his committee had taken these objections into account in carefully framing this policy. Discussion followed.

Dr. Smith asked if the new conflict of interest bill had come to the committee's attention. If desired, Prof. Romig can supply a copy of it.

Prof. Niemi stated that the committee had not seen the bill. Further, the committee had broadened their charge to include faculty performance. Item three grew from this. Suggestions from any faculty member are welcomed by his committee.

Prof. Hennessy asked if this policy when approved would comply with Federal restrictions?
Prof. Niemi stated that compliance obtained although not strongly.

Prof. Barstow stated his opinion that the proposal exceeds the AAUP version. He suggested documentation of performance and that the vehicle for documentation is available in this policy.

Prof. Halkola asked if Senate committees are open to suggestion possibly to the extent of holding Faculty meetings.

Dr. Berry stated that Senate committees have the right to hold open meetings. He requested the parliamentarian's view.

Prof. Barstow, parliamentarian, stated that in the absence of express restrictions, the Senate committees can request Faculty aid and opinions and hold open meetings.

Dr. Stebbins stated his concordance with this view. The Senate was elected for this purpose. The decisions reached at such meetings can then be considered by the Senate.

Prof. Bahrman stated that this is a preliminary report. The committee can hold meetings if desired and any suggestions, criticisms, etc., be made and taken into account before the next Senate meeting.

C. Student Grade Information Committee, H.B. Anderson, Chairman

Preliminary Recommendations for Mid-Term Grade Reporting

Charge to the Committee: "The problem here is to recommend to the Administration a policy which will alert the students as to how he is doing in class before it is too late. Should mid-term D's and F's be given? Can a program be initiated to cut attrition?"

The Committee recommends that:

1. The existing policy of keeping the student informed should be continued. This means that classes are supposed to be conducted in such a way that the student knows about where he stands on the grade scale. The method of conveying this information is up to the instructor. (In theory at least the student is already being alerted.)

2. Interested and qualified persons other than the student are to be informed of the student's performance at the end of about the 5th week by initiating the following procedure beginning in the Fall term, 1967.

   Step 1. Duplicate grade cards (in contrasting color) are to be prepared by Data Processing as soon as class rolls are complete (about the end of the 4th week). Cards are to be issued for all undergraduate students in all courses and given to the individual instructors.

   Step 2. The instructor pulls cards of all students doing U (Unsatisfactory work) work from his card deck and sends them back to Data Processing not later than Tuesday noon of the 6th week. U includes both D and F. No signature or punch operation is needed.

   Step 3. Data Processing programs their machines to prepare three lists in original and carbons as follows:

      a. A series of abbreviated section lists composed of U students only
      b. An alphabetical list by curricula
      c. A straight alphabetical list

   All lists would give name, course number and curricula information. Both lists b and c would have one entry per card so that students with more than one failure would appear as many times as there are U cards for the student.

   Step 4. Lists would be distributed as follows:

      List a - Original to instructor and carbon to department head
      List b - Original to department head and carbon composite of all department curricula list to Dean of Students
      List c - Original and one carbon to Dean of Students, and the other carbon to Athletic department

   This should be done by the end of the 6th week

   Step 5. List utilization. Departments could make full use of the lists to uncover sections with special problems, make revisions to course offerings for the following terms, take steps to provide remedial work, departmental tutoring, programmed instruction, etc. The Dean of Students could scan the lists to uncover students with known special problems, students on probation, students having more than one U, etc. Action could be initiated to bring certain students into contact with dorm proctors, counselors, instructors, advisors, etc., each being considered individually. The listed U students should know that we are genuinely concerned.

Prof. Anderson read his committee's report following which he asked the Senate opinion on two things:

1. Does this look like a good way?
2. Does the Senate want further study of attrition?

Discussion followed.

Prof. Niemi stated that this will help reduce student attrition.
Prof. Bovard asked if P.E. Department will get the list. We can help some of these students and it will help us too.

Dr. Brown stated that sometimes a call to student's advisor will help.

Prof. Hamilton asked if marginal student's family is contacted?

Dr. Berry stated that if a student is to mature, his family should not be notified.

Prof. Halkola asked if D and F grades are a true indication of unsatisfactory work?

Dr. Berry stated that a 4D student not the problem that the 3B and 1F student is.

Dr. Stebbins asked if students are now informed of their current standings and, if not, can they be?

Prof. Oswald stated that students in EE courses are informed.

Dr. Bredekamp stated that some students don't believe a D or F grade is valid and that the instructor is kidding, even up to the time that they fail to graduate.

Dr. Berry stated that some courses weight the final so heavily that students pass or fail on the basis of it alone.

By Straw vote, Prof. Anderson's two questions were given "Yes" answers.

Prof. Bahrmann announced final vote on this proposal next meeting.

---

D. General Faculty Definition Committee, M. Bredekamp, chairman

Dr. Bredekamp stated that his committee will present a formal report at the next meeting. His request for suggestions mailed to all Faculty members had elicited only 3 replies. No open meeting is needed, no original ideas submitted. Much disagreement with the report when submitted is anticipated. Within the committee there are no areas of difficulty however.

New Business

A. Academic Rank Committee - D. Stebbins, chairman, stated that no formal report is ready yet. The committee has met weekly. Gray areas such as IMR, IWW, Continuing Education, complicate the problem. People are being called in to testify. What it means to have academic rank - that is the problem! (NOTE: Kennedy replaced Halkola on this committee)

B. Religion Course Committee - D. Halkola, chairman

PRELIMINARY REPORT TO THE SENATE - April 19, 1967

Committee on Religion

In Senate meeting Number 32 (March 29, 1967) President Smith requested that Senate opinion be sought with a view to future action by the institution on the subject, "What should be the policy of the University regarding offering courses in religion?" As a result of this request, the Senate approved the appointment of a committee for that purpose and subsequently the following committee was appointed: W.T. Anderson, D.W. Pollock, S.R. Price, and D.T. Halkola, Chairman. The committee has met twice to discuss the subject, one that has admittedly created interest and concern at least in certain quarters of the faculty at Michigan Tech.

While informal interest in the general area of courses in religion might well have existed earlier, as far as the committee can ascertain, impetus for the present question of policy seems to have developed from a desire on the part of some local clergymen to have a course (or courses) initiated into the regular curriculum of the institution. One such proposal, entitled "The Bible in the 20th Century" to be instructed by a local pastor, was, in fact, introduced to the curriculum committee late last summer (1966). When questions concerning policy and procedure were raised within that committee, the proposal was referred for consideration to the Humanities and Social Studies Department. The matter was discussed at great length in a departmental meeting. While departmental members were opposed both to the format and the proposed instructor of the course, it was agreed to have a departmental committee study further the issue. In due time, the departmental committee reported to the other members of the department with the suggestion that information on institutional policy concerning "courses in religion" be sought from higher administrative levels. In that technical sense, the statement in the Senate minutes for Meeting Number 32 -- "Humanities and Social Studies Department has made recommendations concerning possible course" -- is correct. This is not to be construed, however, as necessarily granting departmental approbation. The opinion, at least of myself as a participant in the above meetings, is that the Department still reserves judgment on the desirability of such courses. Such an attitude probably reflects, as much as anything, the wish of departmental members for answers to questions that remain unresolved. Perhaps our Senate committee might answer such questions through its research into the subject.

The committee does feel and wishes to note, if only in passing, some pertinent points. In answer to any doubts as to the widespread nature of courses in or about religion presently offered in higher education in the United States, a statement from a recent article may be helpful:
Thirty years ago, 10 percent of the nation's publicly supported colleges and universities offered courses in religion as part of their established curricula. Today 90 percent do . . . What's more, one quarter of the nation's state schools have developed special departments of religion, and more universities are fast taking aim at such a goal.

Any move at Michigan Tech to institute such courses as part of the curriculum would obviously have adequate precedent insofar as our general level of education is concerned. Both the recognition of religion as a recognized discipline in education as well as the growing popularity it has among students in many institutions are points which cannot be easily challenged.

Another item is related to the question of the constitutionality of such a course (or courses). Letters received by the Office of the President of Michigan Tech from the American Civil Liberties Union and the local chapter of the AAUP have indicated just such concern. To be sure, there is a real question whether the course originally proposed would not have raised doubts on the legality of the introduction. However, as a committee, we did not pursue this matter to any particular conclusion. Much appears to depend upon such factors as to whether the course is "in religion" -- thus suggesting a sectarian approach that might proselyte - - or "about religion" -- an interpretation that could be an objective account, historical or literary in character.

While seeking additional information and still not prepared to make a final recommendation, the committee still feels, if merely to evoke discussion on the floor of the Senate this evening, that some preliminary or tentative observations should be made. First of all, it is the consensus of the committee that we are in favor of Michigan Tech looking further into the possibility of introducing courses in the area of religion into the curriculum of the institution. This might well sound rather hesitant, but it should be noted that we could very well have come in with a clear-cut recommendation that the matter be dropped forthwith. Such a stand that committee has rejected as any initial position. Secondly, should it be decided that the institution move in the direction of introducing courses "in or about religion" the committee feels strongly that these courses be taught by a properly qualified and properly employed individual who would be fully cognizant of the opportunity as well as the potential controversy that might arise.

While it would be presumptuous at this point to extend further even a tentative recommendation, we do visualize -- and feel that others should also -- what could entail. A complement of courses in such related areas as "Comparative Religion," "The History of Religion(s)," "The Bible as Literature" and other similar offerings could well become available to our students. Attendant matters of departmental administration and consequent expenditures may well not be the purview of the committee (or perhaps even of the Senate), but in helping to recommend institutional policy these matters should be recognized and appreciated.

Thus, we invite you to comment upon the subject so that the committee might get Senate reaction to an issue of some significance. In fact, so significant do we of the committee feel it to be, that we plan as part of our future consideration of the topic to make available channels of communication to the general faculty so that viewpoints from that source might also be expressed to us.

Discussion followed the reading of the report by Prof. Halkola.

Prof. Hennessy: One difference between this and other courses - academic freedom permits liberties!

Dr. Bredekamp: Same as in other courses, unsatisfactory instructors can be pulled off the course.

Prof. Hennessy: What qualifications are required of the teacher?

Prof. Halkola: Same as for other teachers.

Prof. Barstow: The AAUP took the position of objecting to the course(s) because of objections and desired clarification of:
1. Opposed to theological proselytizing
2. Desired proper process of authorizing such courses
3. Instructors used must be properly qualified.

Prof. J.A. Johnson: Religion courses are good and beneficial. Can the University provide individual clergymen opportunity to teach and counsel students of his own faith on campus?

Prof. Barstow: AAUP is not opposed to this.

Dr. Bredekamp: Every denomination is now doing this but not on campus.

Prof. J.A. Johnson: Can credit be given for these courses?

Dr. Berry: Law precludes such teaching on campus.

Prof. Halkola: Some Universities in Michigan are doing this for credit.

Dr. Brown: Some clergymen opposed to teaching "about religion."

Prof. Bahrman requested additional work on the problem to be presented at the next meeting.

C. University Organization Committee, M.Krenitsky, Chairman gave a verbal preliminary report. One meeting held so far. Having trouble defining the charge. Also awaiting other group's reports such as Earth Sciences and Forestry. Requested name
change to University Reorganization Committee.

At this point Dr. Smith stated that a massive misunderstanding existed. What he had requested was a plan for academic and research organization only. Not University organization.

It was moved by Dr. Smith, seconded by Prof. Oswald and passed by vote that the committee's name be "Academic and Research Organization."

Prof. Tidwell asked if May 15 deadline still held for work of this committee?

Dr. Smith stated that he was hopeful for it then.

Dr. Brown announced that the Faculty Association had purchased a booklet on the subject for each member of the Faculty to be distributed soon.

**D. Science Teacher Education Committee**, R. Noble Chairman.

Prof. Noble pointed out that teachers of math and science are much needed. Training of them by MTU looked on favorably by the Board of Education. MTU alumni favor it. Much preparation necessary for it and include teaching 30 hours of education courses. After reading the short report below, Prof. Noble moved, H.B. Anderson seconded acceptance of the report:

1. That the implementation of a program of instruction for the training of secondary teachers in the areas of mathematics and science be accepted as a logical development for Michigan Tech.
2. That the program at Tech place emphasis on the subject material to be taught. Existing subject matter courses should be utilized. State Department of Education requirements for educational courses must be met.
3. That a coordinator of education instruction be appointed. This person would report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and he would work in cooperation with the academic departments in developing appropriate curricula and to teach education courses as appropriate.

Discussion followed.

Prof. Hennessy asked how many credits for practice teaching?

Prof. Oswald asked if final action can be taken tonight?

Dr. Brown asked if this program would change the activities of the Continuing Education Group?

Prof. Noble stated it would not.

Prof. Halkola stated that a new department would be created and asked number of people to be involved in the Education courses.

Prof. Noble stated this is an Administrative affair. Two or 3 people at the start. Could become very large. Education courses would be new. Existing courses in Math, Physics, Chemistry utilizable.

Dr. Berry stated present curriculum for B.S. in Chemistry includes 30 hours of electives which could be in education.

Dr. Stebbins stated that if Senate approves idea that the University can set up the curriculum.

Dr. Pollock asked about degree given, B.A. or B.S.?

Prof. Noble pointed out that his committee had been asked to recommend, or not, certain action. Implementation follows.

Dr. Bredekamp emphasized that specification of the degree an important matter of policy.

Prof. Anderson suggested the possibility of B.S. in Math, Science, Chemistry, etc., with required courses in education.

Dr. Berry stated that Board of Control action must authorize a degree in Education.

Dr. Bredekamp stated that the Senate can ask this committee to frame specific programs for consideration.

Prof. Noble stated that his committee able to do this.

Dr. Stebbins stated that our graduates of this program will have B.S. degree and necessary education credits.

The question was called for and acceptance of the report was approved by vote.

**E. Amendments to Senate By-Law #6**, M. Bredekamp. In hands of Senators ten days before this meeting.
Section 6A: Emergency submission shall be considered those actions requested by the Administration of the University that require a final decision within the period between normal Senate meetings.

Section 6B: Emergency submission items must be presented in writing with a copy to each Senate member.

Section 6C: Emergency submission items approved by the Senate will be submitted to the faculty in writing, within one week.

Section 6D: The faculty shall have an opportunity of reporting to the President of the Senate, in writing, any opposition to the emergency submission action. The President shall report this opposition to the President of the University with the transmission of the Senate action, within ten days.

Dr. Bredekamp stated his belief that nothing except real emergency measures should be given immediate action by the Senate. Rarely if ever should the Senate make a final decision and pass upon a matter at one hearing.

Dr. Smith moved, Dr. Bredekamp seconded, acceptance of these proposals as amendments to the Senate By-Laws.

Prof. Barstow pointed out possible need for immediate action by others than Administration.

Dr. Bredekamp stated need for Constitutional clarification of term "Emergency."

Prof. Barstow stated that the decision as to the emergency or not of proposals presented as such under By-Law 6 can be determined at the time by the Senate.

Vote was taken: 5 Yes, 7 No, 10 abstained. The motion failed.

Prof. Oswald asked if committee reports can be sent to the Faculty ahead of the minutes to provide more time for consideration before the next Senate meeting (May 17, 1967).

Prof. Boyd replied that if the reporting committees provide 300 copies of their reports or if the duplicating stencils, masters, etc. are provided to prepare the necessary 300 copies, then this might be done. Also each Senator has his copy of each report now.

Prof. V.W. Johnson announced that his election committee will have primary ballots in the mail tomorrow. He requested some latitude in schedule to be allowed.

Prof. Bahrman suggested that as long as election completed on time, the committee can vary the schedule.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary