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

17 May 1967

(Senate Minute pages: 294-304)

The meeting opened at 7:10 p.m., Wednesday May 17, 1967, in the Library General Purpose Room, Senate President G.E. Bahrman presiding.


Absent (5) were: Lee, Barstow, Bovard, Been, Keeling.

Guests present were: Gade, Garland, Price Rakestraw

The minutes of Meetings #33 were approved as previously distributed.

Old Business - Committee Reports

A. Election Procedure.

Action on this item was postponed at the request of Prof. Barstow, committee chairman. Although not formally accepted by the Senate, the proposed procedure has been used for the election just completed and reported in these minutes.

B. Conflict of Interest Policy Committee

Prof. Niemi, committee chairman, stated that since its publication only one communication concerning it had been received and the committee recommends the policy as it now stands. Prof. Oswald moved, Dr. Stebbins seconded, adoption of the report.

A lengthy discussion concerning Procedural Responsibility, item (3) followed. As a result of this, Prof. H.B. Anderson moved, Prof. Boutilier seconded and vote passed this amended version:

3. A standing committee shall be appointed in each academic department and research component to assist the staff members in planning the endeavor and to advise the staff members and department chairman or component directors on matters relating to staff members' contractual obligations to the University.

With the change, the Senate by majority vote adopted the report. Final vote is required at a subsequent meeting.

C. Student Grade Information Committee

Dr. Berry stated that no changes had been suggested and proposed adoption of the proposal. Dr. Brown moved, Prof. Oswald seconded and the proposal was adopted by majority vote.

D. Religion Courses.

Since the last meeting of the Senate, at which time a preliminary report was made by our committee (see Minutes of Meeting No. 33), we have sought to get a more accurate feeling of faculty opinion upon the subject. Toward that end, a memorandum was sent to each member of the faculty under date of April 24, 1967, inviting communications and suggestions to be given to the committee.

A total of 8 written replies was received by the committee, and several other members of the faculty expressed themselves orally to individual members of the committee. Most of the comments were favorable to the idea of introducing courses pertaining to religion into the curriculum. No strong opposition was expressed, although some had reservations about the ability to provide suitable instruction or competent faculty. Others, while endorsing the idea in principle, raised questions about the priority such courses should have in future curriculum planning at Michigan Tech. Admittedly, the number of those in the faculty motivated sufficiently to bring a viewpoint to the attention of our committee seems small. However, the committee does feel it to be significant that apparently no segment of the faculty became sufficiently concerned about the matter to register any determined protest to the preliminary report.
Therefore, the committee, after further evaluation, retains essentially the same point of view held in the preliminary report. As long as proper regard is given to such points as constitutional propriety, which some feel is still an issue, and as long as the individual employed to teach any courses in the field is considered properly qualified, we look with favor upon the institution continuing to project the possibility of Religion in the university curriculum. The committee wishes to add for clarification that it interprets "properly qualified" to denote an individual with advanced degree(s) in the study of Religion. It has doubts whether a professional degree, such as one received upon completing basic seminary training, would be adequate.

On behalf of the committee, I make the following motion to the Senate:

The Senate does hereby recommend to the President of Michigan Technological University that:

1. the institution pursue further the possibility of introducing courses in the field of Religion, and
2. when and if such courses are inaugurated, they be instructed by an individual properly qualified through sufficient academic training.

Prof. Halkola's motion was seconded by Dr. Pollock. Discussion followed in which it was inferred that the committee seems to be following suggestions more than promoting an idea. Also, if courses in religion are to be taught then courses in anti-religion might also. Courses in theology require great scholarship for satisfactory presentation and must be conducted in an academic, not religious, framework.

The motion was adopted by majority vote. The committee was discharged with thanks by Senate President Bahrman.

E. Science Teacher Education

Prof. Noble stated that no additional recommendations were to be made and moved adoption of the proposal. The motion was seconded by Dr. Stebbins and passed by majority vote. The committee was discharged with thanks from Senate President Bahrman.

New Business

A. Election Committee (1967). V.W. Johnson, chairman, presented the following report:

SUBJECT: Election of Members at Large and Departmental Representatives to the Michigan Tech Senate

The charge of the election committee was to conduct the necessary elections to fill vacancies in the Michigan Tech Senate, which will occur at the end of the present academic year, as provided by Article III, Section D of the Senate Constitution.

From the Senate records, it was determined that the vacancies were:

a. Two members at large (expiration of term)
   b. Seven departmental or research agency representatives (expiration of term)
   c. One departmental representative (transfer of present member)

An unofficial list of the members of the general faculty who were eligible for Senate membership, according to Article III, Section A and Article III, Section B of the Senate constitution, was compiled from lists submitted by the departments, research agencies, etc. There are, or were, at the time of the election, 202 members of the general faculty eligible for elected membership in the Senate.

Nominating ballots were mailed to each of the 292 members of the general faculty requesting each to nominate not more than six candidates - three candidates for each Senator at large vacancy to be filled. A total of 185 ballots (63%) were returned, 20 of these were not counted - 18 not signed, and 2 for being late. The top six nominees were then listed on a ballot and voted on in a final election. Again, 292 ballots were sent out and this time 217 (74%) were returned. However, 8 were not counted - 7 not signed, and 1 for being late. The remaining 209 were tallied and, as a result, the following have been declared elected as members at large to the Michigan Tech Senate: Price, Sherwood., Wyble

Each of the academic departments and research agencies, in which a Senator-representative vacancy will occur by reason of expiration of prescribed term of office, or otherwise, was then requested to elect by secret ballot and in accordance with Senate eligibility requirements, its representative to fill this vacancy. The results of those elections are:

Brown, Robert T. - Biological Sciences
Bryla, Major Charles W. - Army ROTC
Kennedy, Allen D. - Institute of Mineral Research
Kenny, David H. - Chemistry and Chemical Engineering
Ortner, Gene M. - Mathematics
Oswald, James A. - Electrical Engineering
Patterson, Robert D. - Library
Sheedy, Capt. John D. - Aerospace Studies (to fill the unexpired term of Major B.V. Miller)
B. General Faculty Definition Committee, M. Bredekamp, chairman

Dr. Bredekamp presented the following prepared report:

Proposal on the Definition of Faculty
From the Senate Committee
May, 1967

Whereas the definition of "General Faculty" is often required in communications and procedures, and

Whereas there does not now exist such a definition,

The Senate of the Michigan Technological University recommends the following statements as definitive of the term "General Faculty":

Section I. The General Faculty of the University shall be considered the members of the Academic, the Administrative, and the Operational Faculties.

Section II. Interpretive Terms used within the Statement

1. "Member" of a faculty shall be a person employed by the University except those actively pursuing a degree at this University.
2. "Member" of a faculty of this University shall be assigned by the President of the University to his respective Faculty according to his qualifications.
3. "Learned Professions" shall mean these professions (or members thereof) skilled in a calling or vocation requiring advanced knowledge as evidenced by a "Bachelor" degree from a recognized College or University.
4. "Engaged in teaching" shall be interpreted to mean that the person is to teach during each academic quarter of the normal academic year that he is in residence.
5. "Appointed by the Dean of Graduate Students" shall imply appointment to the Graduate Faculty as defined by the Graduate Council. This is limited to those with advanced degrees or equivalent experience, as well as interest and experience in research or teaching on the Graduate level.
6. "Equivalent experience" shall be determined by the President of the University.

Section III. The General Faculty of the University

A. The Academic Faculty shall consist of the Undergraduate, Graduate and Research Faculties.

1. The Undergraduate Faculty shall consist of the members of the learned professions who are engaged in teaching for a degree in one of the learned professions and/or the direct supervision thereof.
2. The Graduate Faculty shall consist of members of the Academic Faculty who have been appointed by the Dean of the Graduate Studies (or equivalent position) in the University.
3. The Research Faculty shall consist of the members of the learned professions who are engaged primarily in conducting research and/or the direct supervision thereof.

B. The Administrative Faculty shall consist of members of the University engaged in the determination of the educational policies of the University. They shall be members of the learned professions or equivalent experience and appointed by the Board of Control of the University.

C. The Operational Faculty shall consist of members of the learned professions or equivalent experience who are engaged in administrating the business and other operational activities of the University.

Section IV. Membership on the Faculty

1. A faculty member may qualify for one or more of the above defined faculties.
2. All line administrative officials shall be considered members of that faculty.
   a. As example: President, Vice President, Dean, Department Head, and Instructor of the Academic Undergraduate Faculty
   b. As example: Vice President of Research (if any) would not be a member of the Academic Undergraduate Faculty
3. Administrative Officers shall be members of the Administrative Faculty whether or not they are also members of other Faculties.
   a. As example: President, Vice-President, Dean of the Academic Undergraduate Faculty, Department Head
   b. As example: Dean of Students, Registrar (if engaged in determining educational policies)
4. Members of the professional Library staff shall be considered members of the Academic Undergraduate Faculty.
5. Administrative officers whose duties do not include administration of educational policies shall be included in the Operational Faculty
   a. As example: The Controller, Treasurer, Directors
   b. As example: The Registrar (if not engaged in determining educational policy)

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Brown seconded placing the report on file with the Senate. Discussion followed and is abstracted here:

Dr. Brown: Section II 4 is contradictory.
Dr. Bredekamp: No - directing of teaching equals teaching.

Prof. Hennessy moved, Prof. Oswald seconded, deleting Section III C.

Prof. Niemi: No definition of "Faculty." Why always modified?

Prof. Oswald: Unless the amendment adopted, great care will be required in identifying faculty members.

Prof. V.W. Johnson: Large numbers of people now classed as faculty make Senate elections very cumbersome.

Prof. Halkola: Why was III C included at all in the report?

Dr. Bredekamp: It might be termed a grandfather clause.

Prof. Krenitsky: It is necessary to protect the retirement benefits of former teachers.

Prof. Niemi: See no need to perpetuate the practice.

Vote was taken to delete III C. The motion passed.

Dr. Yerg: Instructors pursuing a Doctorate are faculty members.

Dr. Brown: Are counselors in Dean of Students Office faculty members? If not, they should be, since they have close contact with students.

Dr. Yerg: The graduate program frowns on graduate students filling instructors ranks. Instructors are excluded from the graduate faculty.

Prof. Bayer moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded deletion of item II-1 and adding "and conditions of employment" to item II-2. This amendment was approved by vote.

Dr. Brown moved to reinsert item IV-5 adding to it that members of the counseling staff of the Dean of Students Office be considered faculty members. No second given.

Dr. Stebbins: No use has been made of the term "staff." Operational staff could be used.

Prof. Boutilier: If once a member of the academic faculty then that status should be retained.

Prof. Halkola moved, Dr. Yerg seconded and majority vote passed tabling the proposal until the next meeting.

C. Academic Rank Committee. Dr. Stebbins presented the following prepared report as an interim report:

The committee met with, or the chairman talked with, representatives of the following offices regarding the desirability of persons in those offices having academic rank:

   a. Division of Continuing Education
   b. Institute of Mineral Research
   c. Institute of Wood Research
   d. Ford Forestry Center
   e. University Relations
   f. Placement Office
   g. Director of Student Services including Dean of Students

These discussions pointed up the Present Situation:

1. There is no policy indicating who should have academic rank or who should make a decision as to who may have academic rank.
2. The initial appointments in the above offices were usually persons from academic departments who thereby held academic rank which they retained when they were transferred to the new position.
3. With this precedent, succeeding persons added to these offices have frequently been given academic rank.
4. In the Institute of Mineral Research, the situation regarding academic rank is not clear. Likewise, none of the other employees of IMR hold academic rank except those having joint appointments with an academic department.
5. Several persons in administration continue to hold the academic rank they held in an academic department before moving into the current administrative position.
6. In all the discussions it was apparent that academic rank was something to aspire to rather than something to despise or avoid. This is evidence that, among nearly all those associated with the University, there is a sense of prestige associated with academic rank.
7. Among the academic departments, only those holding appointments of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor have academic rank.

Philosophy
The committee recognizes that certain ancillary benefits accrue to those holding academic rank, and that such benefits might logically be extended to still others not currently holding academic rank. However, the committee feels that the additional coverage of such benefits should be the result of changes in the terms of coverage for the benefits to include others not holding academic rank, rather than extending academic rank to provide such coverage. The awarding of academic rank should be based primarily on the duties and responsibilities associated with a given position although the qualifications of the individual should be considered, too.

While it would be nice to be able to draw distinct lines enclosing the positions where academic rank is warranted and excluding those where it is not, this ideal world is not realistic. Rather, there will always be gray areas requiring individual judgments. Decisions in these cases should be made by a standing committee of the Senate.

Policy

1. Academic rank should be reserved for those who are directly involved in the major academic programs of acquisition of knowledge (research) and dissemination of knowledge (teaching) since these are the primary missions of a university. The research effort shall be of a caliber which is suitable for a thesis and which could be published in a nationally prominent specialized journal. The dissemination of knowledge shall be by teaching for credit one or more courses listed in the official University catalog or by assisting in research or instruction by offering skills acquired by professional training leading to an advanced degree beyond the baccalaureate.

2. Academic rank shall be given only in the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer. Other appointments such as teaching assistants or teaching associates or research assistants or research associates are not to be eligible for academic rank.

3. The minimum conditions of employment for awarding academic rank will be employment for at least one quarter -- this being the minimum academic term -- and at a level of at least half time.

4. Employees without tenure will have academic rank in accordance with the provisions above except that those employed for successive years shall be deemed to hold academic rank during the summer or other periods when not actually productively engaged by the University. Those employees having tenure as well as academic rank will continue to hold the academic rank even though transferred to another position not requiring academic rank.

Following the report there was some discussion:

Prof. Bayer: Is distinction made between teaching and research as compared to sponsored research?

Mr. Kennedy: There is no conflict when a professor moves to administrative job and retains his rank.

D. University Academic and Research Organization, Prof. Krenitsky discussed his report which follows:

Mark Twain once related an incident in which two men came upon the Grand Canyon and observed this magnificent spectacle in a moment of silence. Then one fell to his knees and fervently prayed to God. The other exclaimed: "Well, I'll be damned!" Now it was Mark Twain's contention that feelings of both men were the same; only in the rituals did they differ.

University administrators, faculty members, and research personnel can usually agree both as to the shortcomings and the desirable goals of administrative organization. It is in their establishment and execution that they find violent discords.

Although no single organization plan will fit all institutions, if the basic administrative functions of an institution of higher education are analyzed, an organizational structure can be projected that can serve most institutions regardless of size or complexity. These functions fall into four major areas: academic affairs -- the instructional and research programs; business affairs -- financial, plant, personnel management, etc.; student personnel services; and development and public relations. Any of the activities of colleges and universities, whether large or small, can be placed in one of the four categories.

The charge of the Committee was to recommend an administrative structure for University academic affairs, namely, the instructional and research programs.

PROPOSED ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

It has often been said that we build on the past, in the present, for the future. In other words, we must have an eye on what's ahead; that while our action is geared to the present, it must be taken with the future in mind.

The Committee believes that a line-and-staff organization has many advantages for an institution of higher education. It can be charted simply. Lines of communication and authority are clearly evident. When staff work is completed at any level, administrative decisions may be made wisely.

Chart I (Available by request from the Senate Office) is submitted as a suggested guideline for long-range planning. The Committee was unanimous in its belief that, while a common purpose underlies all higher education, Michigan Tech much seek to realize that purpose in its own way, by concentrating on those tasks it can do best. Come what may, Tech should endeavor to maintain its fundamental program and its own distinctive character, with major emphasis on engineering, mineral industries, forestry, and service to industrial management.

Chart II (Available by request from the Senate Office) is submitted as an alternate proposal to meet immediate needs for a limited, economical reorganization that would align the structure for improved communications and control, recognize the
realities of present research organization, and provide for the eventual spin-off of schools of Forestry and Business Administration. It is suggested that this structure could be a first step in a two-phased reorganization culminating in the Chart I proposal.

SOME ISSUES

Research Activities. The Committee agrees unanimously that all established research institutes should be academically oriented. This arrangement would provide a meaningful reaction and participation on the part of faculty, students, and research personnel. The programs of sponsored research should be expanded, but at the same time, every effort should be made to keep a proper balance between teaching and research.

Research Coordination. As indicated in Chart I, the office of Coordinator of Research would be a staff function concerned primarily with such activities as keeping abreast of research opportunities, preparation of proposals, coordination of related activities of the various research institutes, etc. In Chart II, the position is indicated as a line function, administering and supervising all activities of the various research institutes.

Associate Degree Program. In October of 1964, the Board of Control adopted a long-range program in engineering technology on the Houghton campus. The Committee recommends that this program be structured as a Technical Institute with a Director reporting to the Dean, School of Engineering. The Institute would operate as a separate division responsible for its own budget, staff, curriculum, entrance requirements, etc.

Division of Continuing Education. The Committee feels that this division should not be a part of the academic structure. It recommends that all courses offered for credit as part of an extension program be administered and staffed directly through the Departments concerned. Service activities connected with such courses -- registration, publicity, payment of fees, etc. -- should be handled on a liaison basis through the Division of Continuing Education.

The reorganization of the academic and research activities of the Michigan Technological University should continue to be subject to constant study and open to evolutionary change whenever change will improve their functioning. Our purpose is not to suggest a conclusion to the unfinished story of Michigan Tech, but rather to offer guidelines to meet the ever-changing conditions and problems facing us. Deviation from quality, expansion and alteration of purpose for the sake of change only should be avoided at all cost. Perhaps, the whole idea was never more neatly put than by John Gardner when he said: "The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates schoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

Respectfully submitted,

"When we enquire into any subject, the first thing we have to do is to know what books have treated of it."

(A Bibliographical list follows in the minutes which may be obtained from the Senate Office upon request).

E. Other New Business

1. Prof. Bahrman stated that since this is the last regular meeting of this Senate and since next fall the new Senate must elect officers, a nominating committee should be appointed to report at the first meeting. The Senate approved that the Senate Council appoint this committee.

2. A letter from President R.L. Smith was read requesting appointment of a committee to consider the problem of Emeritus rank. The Senate approved that the Senate Council appoint this committee.

3. Prof. Bahrman requested Senate vote on a preferred meeting room - Library or Faculty Lounge. The latter was chosen because of softer seats.

4. Dr. Brown, Biological Sciences Department, expressed dissatisfaction with the numbering of courses 200, 300 etc. He stated that the H.S. Department must have the same problem. A two level classification suggested, those for 1 and 2 year students, others for 3 and 4 years. He requested Senate consideration of the matter.

Prof. Bayer stated that the ME courses worked very well with the present numbering system.

Dr. Yerg discussed the numbers systems as it pertains to graduate students. He advised a review of the system for Fall 1967 action.

5. Dr. Stebbins asked if permanent Senate committee planned?

Prof. Bahrman stated they are possible if required.

Dr. Brown stated his belief that the Senate functions best without standing committees.

6. The Final Examination Committee requested and received discharge.

The Senate adjourned at 10:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary