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

11 October 1967

(Senate Minute pages: 305-311)

The meeting opened at 7:06 p.m., Wednesday October 11, 1967, in the Faculty Lounge, Senate President G.E. Bahrman presiding. President Bahrman announced that Dr. Bredekamp was unable to attend so item IV C to be removed from the agenda.

The roll was taken. Present (22) were: Bahrman, Boutilier, Johnson, J.A., Johnson, V.W., Noble, Pollock, Yerg, Barstow, Boyd, Halkola, Hamilton, Brown, Bryla, Kennedy, Kenny, Ortner, Oswald, Patterson, Price, Wyble, Smith, R.L., Stebbins.

Absent (8) were: Heldt, Sheedy, Bayer, Been, Bovard, Bredekamp, Hennessy, Keeling.

Guests present were: Bourdo, Dawson, Ellis, Niemi, Spahn.

Election of Officers of the Senate for 1967-68 followed. Prof. J.A. Oswald presented the report of the nominating committee consisting of the names of two Senate members for each office who had been informed of their nomination by the committee and had agreed to serve if elected. If a tie vote resulted for any office, it was agreed that a coin toss by the Secretary would decide the winner. The nominees were: For President: D.T. Halkola; R.L. Hennessy. Vice President: R. Bayer; O.D. Boutilier. Secretary: G.W. Boyd, A.D. Kennedy. These names were printed on a ballot for voting. Elected were D.T. Halkola, President; O.D. Boutilier, Vice President; G.W. Boyd, Secretary.

After the election, Prof. Halkola took the chair and complimented Prof. Bahrman on his excellent work as Senate President. He also stated that his own election was remarkable since he is not from an engineering department. Since he is a Professor of Humanities, he stated a probable need for assistance from the engineering members of the Senate when engineering terminology is employed.

The minutes of Meetings #34 were approved as previously distributed.

Old Business - Committee Reports

A. Election Procedure Committee. W.E. Barstow, Chairman, distributed a revised form of the proposal which was shown in minutes pp. 281-83; 294. This revised form provides for problems noted in the previous one concerning (1) General Faculty definition; (2) Vacation of office by Senators; (3) Departmental internal election procedures; (4) Eligibility of Senators. This revised version is presented here. Prof. Barstow proposed adoption at the next Senate meeting of this proposal.

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, herein after 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 Academic 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, (b) do not exceed the re-election limitation of Article III, Section B, of the Senate Constitution, and (c) are not present members of the Senate with continuing terms of office.

*For purposes of this procedure only, and until such time as the Senate shall have adopted an official definition, the term "General Faculty" shall be construed to include those persons within each academic or research department who shall be designated by their department as being members of the General Faculty.

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 candidacies.

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 whatever procedure it may deem appropriate but 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 to fill a scheduled vacancy 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.

Unscheduled Senator-Representative Vacancies

1. Vacancies in Senator-representative membership created by resignation or otherwise of a regularly elected incumbent, subsequent to the second Spring Term meeting of the Senate and before the Spring Term following, may be filled by appointment by the departments concerned until the next election, at which time such vacancies shall be filled for the unexpired terms by election.

2. Such temporary appointments shall be certified by the Council of the Senate pursuant to notification by the departments concerned.

B. Conflict of Interest Policy. Prof. J.A. Oswald after mentioning the history of this proposal moved its adoption. Prof. Barstow seconded and the Senate approved by majority vote the adoption.

C. Faculty Definition. Postponed to next meeting.

D. Academic Rank Committee, D.W. Stebbins, Chairman. Dr. Stebbins stated that copies of a revised version of the previous proposal will be distributed to Senate members well in advance of the next Senate meeting at which time action can be taken. Relatively little change has been made in the revised form.
E. University Academic and Research Organization, M. Krenitsky, former chairman,. Action on this old business was delayed pending the arrival of Dr. Heldt. Other business was conducted as described later in the minutes to preserve consistency. At 7:50 Prof. Barstow, also a member of the committee, acting for it, stated:

1. That this committee was a large one.
2. That the Dean's Council is involved with the same business.
3. That the charge to the committee indicated that guidance was wanted.
4. That the plans developed were for academic classroom and research organization.
5. Chart I is liberal, Chart II the economical, form suggested.
6. No unanimity in the committee but the majority opinion could be expressed by a motion.

Prof. Barstow moved, Mr. Kennedy seconded, that the Senate accept the five school approach as shown by Chart I, but not the subdivisions under each school, as the consensus.

Discussion followed. Somewhat abstracted, it was:

Prof. Noble stated his concern since his division (Continuing Education) involved. He pointed out the C. Ed. has presented degree programs since 1957 and not limited to engineering. Summer sessions are involved also. Progress is being made under the present arrangement. He recommended separate school status for C. Ed. and asked why the committee wished to change the present arrangement.

Prof. Barstow: The Committee questioned the academic standards as compared to the basic structure. The consensus was that association of research with related academic areas desirable. Actual organization is an administrative problem. This report is a broad recommendation.

Prof. Oswald stated a preference for Chart II organization.

Major Brylla: All engineering departments should be under Engineering. Recommend Chart II.

Prof. Hamilton: IWR works for industrial development. Feel that Chart II best.

Prof. Barstow: All this discussion is irrelevant to the motion.

Senate President Halkola: That is true but too closely related to ignore.

Prof. Dawson (guest) was invited to speak. He feels that Chart I would delay, Chart II, enhance, MTU action on research proposals.

Dr. Yerg: Supports Prof. Oswald's preference for Chart II. Stated that Mineral Industries are over-rated. Geophysics graduates 1 or 2. Mining fading. Geological Engineering not engineering.

Dr. Smith: The School of Engineering is not formalized. The Dean of Engineering has certain departments now. A state of flux exists here.

Dr. Pollock: Supports Chart I.

Dr. Brown: Is ROTC engineering?

Major Brylla: In most places under Arts and Science as Military Science.

Prof. Hamilton moved, Prof. Noble seconded, tabling the motion. This motion was defeated by vote.

Senate President Halkola: No formal motion made at previous meeting since no specific proposal was evident then.

Prof. Barstow: Names given the five schools are generic, not specific. Subject to change if advisable.

Prof. Niemi (guest) was asked to speak and he indicated that he doubted that the committee consensus was the five school organization supported by Prof. Barstow.

Prof. Price pointed out that if change to be made in the five school naming, no final vote can be made now.

Dr. Yerg: A sixth school is needed - the Graduate School.

The question was called for and Dr. Barstow's motion for Chart I (in part) failed. Vote: 4 yes, 22 no to accept.

Prof. Barstow stated that this organization plan is an administrative problem and no unanimity of opinion is possible. He suggested that a written discussion in the Faculty Forum be used.

Prof. Oswald moved that Chart II, as written, be considered the consensus. Prof. Hamilton seconded.

Discussion followed. Dr. Pollock feels Chart II is not good since departmental research should be under the Department Head.
Prof. Barstow moved amendment to the motion - "And also the Senate recommends Chart I and sends both charts to Administration." Dr. Brown seconded this.

Senate President Halkola ruled this amendment in contrast to the motion and therefore not an amendment but a contrary motion.

The Senate by majority vote approved this ruling.

Prof. Price stated that if Chart II is not accepted by the Senate, then the Senate is not decided. The committee is to be commended on their work, however. The report can be accepted by the Senate.

Dr. Yerg stated that the transmission of the report to Administration is the best the Senate can do. All are willing to live within the framework of Charts I or II.

The question was called for and Prof. Oswald's motion for Chart II as Senate consensus failed. Vote 5 yes, 17 no to accept.

Dr. Yerg moved, Prof. V.W. Johnson seconded, that the Senate accept the committee report and transmit it to the University President for his information without recommendation.

The Senate passed this motion by vote almost unanimously.

**New Business**

**A. Emeritus Rank Committee**, O.D. Boutilier, Chairman. Prof. Boutilier discussed the charge given the committee by President Smith and the problems involved such as time of service and age of the retiring person. He read his committee report which he had distributed to the Senate at this meeting. The report follows:

1. That retiring professors and associate professors be eligible to be appointed to emeritus rank.
2. That neither the age nor the future plans of the retiring person be a criteria for consideration for emeritus rank.
3. That emeriti faculty be invited to participate in commencement processions and similar ceremonies.

President Halkola asked if the committee moved consideration of the report by the Senate.

Prof. Boutilier moved, Dr. Stebbins seconded, that the Senate consider this report.

Prof. Barstow discussed the 10 day notice required by #5 and #6 of the By-Laws. Although stalling can be practiced through this, it is helpful to avoid snap decisions. A report can be discussed and only straw vote taken when a proposal is first submitted at a meeting.

Senate President Halkola discussed the emergency submission provision (By-Law #6). The Senate showed no feeling that this was an emergency.

Discussion followed.

Dr. Brown: Who determines Emeritus Rank?

Prof. Boutilier: Our Board of Control.

Dr. Smith: This is the policy at Tech and all qualified do receive it.

Prof. Boutilier: Read policy followed at the University of Illinois. Seems much like ours.

Dr. Smith: The question of age is important. It is possible to retire at 52 after 10 years of service.

Dr. Pollock: Can a Committee devise the emeritus policy?

Dr. Smith: Would be happy to have the committee do this.

Prof. Oswald: What can bar selection? Age and future plans are not specified.

Prof. Price: The individual's personal character and characteristics are important and should be considered.

Dr. Yerg: Suggested termination of the discussion. Stated that the committee should do additional work on the proposal.

Prof. Price: Feels that proposal satisfactory now if retirement is defined.

**B. Meeting Dates for 1967-68 Senate**

- Fall Term 1967: Wednesday, October 11 and November 8
- Winter Term 1968: Wednesday, January 24 and February 21
Spring Term 1968   Wednesday, April 10 and May 15

Time 7:00 p.m. Place to be announced on Agendas mailed 10 days prior to meeting to Senators and on weekly bulletin.

These meeting dates were accepted by the Senate

C. Other New Business

1. Standing Committees

Dr. Stebbins asked the Senate to approve two standing committees whose group consideration of problems listed is needed.

- Academic Policy Committee - for problems such as (1) number of credits required for graduation, (2) how to distribute courses in certain areas.
- Instructional Policy Committee - for problems such as (1) how much work required to earn credits. There are inconsistencies in this now, (2) examination and graduation procedures, (3) rate of material coverage in classes; amount, etc.

Dr. Stebbins stated that policy in these matters should be University policy, should be broad, and not individual to instructors or departments. He will prepare a definite proposal for submission to the Senate in advance of the the next meeting.

2. Dr. Brown moved appointment of Prof. Barstow to continue as Parliamentarian. This was done.

3. Dr. Yerg moved, Prof. Barstow seconded, that the Senate give acknowledgement to Prof. Bahrman for a job well done as last year's Senate President. The Senators stood to give this acknowledgement.

The Senate adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary