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

8 November 1967

(Senate Minute pages: 312-320)

The meeting opened at 7:04 p.m., Wednesday November 8, 1967, in the Library General Purpose Room, Senate President D. Halkola presiding.

The roll was taken. Present (25) were: Bahrman, Boutilier, Heldt, Johnson, V.W., Noble, Pollock, Yerg, Barstow, Bayer, Boyd, Bredekamp, Halkola, Hamilton, Hennessy, Keeling, Brown, Brylla, Kennedy, Kenny, Ortner, Oswald, Price, Wyble, Smith, R.L., Stebbins.

Absent (5) were: Johnson, J.A., Sheedy, Been, Bovard, Patterson.

Guests present were: Alexander, Chandler, Dawson.

The minutes of Meetings #35 were corrected as follows:

Page 306 - Election of Senators-at-Large, part 6, lines 3 and 4 to read: "---the highest number of votes cast until a number of candidates shall ---."

Page 308 - Line 10 to read "Prof. Barstow moved, Dr. Pollock seconded---"

Page 311 - Strike out part C2 - "Dr. Brown moved ---."

With these changes, the minutes were accepted.

At this point a memorandum from President R.L. Smith to Prof. D.T. Halkola was read to the Senate by the Secretary.

Conflict of Interest Policy

You might be interested to know that the day before the Senate met, I received a request from the American Council on Education that we advise John F. Morse, Director of the Commission on Federal Regulations, what action had been taken on our conflict of interest policy. I was able to send them the policy as passed by the Senate at the last meeting. Just recently I was notified that the Federal Council places Michigan Tech in Category A.

I would appreciate your notifying the Senate to this effect at the next meeting and commending them on my behalf for their action on this rather difficult problem.

R.L. Smith, President

Old Business

Because of the relationship between definition of General Faculty and items A and B of the agenda, the Senate approved that item III B should be considered first before III A.

General Faculty Definition Committee. M.W. Bredekamp, Chairman, minutes pp. 297-99, 307. Dr. Bredekamp moved, Prof. Price seconded, that the Senate untable the report. This was approved by vote.

Dr. Bredekamp pointed out that modification of the report had been made by the Senate involving Section II, item 1 which was deleted; Section II, item 2 which was modified by adding, "and conditions of employment;" Section III C deleted (minutes 299). He stated that almost all of those provided for by the report will be listed in the University catalogs. This pleases all who are listed even when not directly involved in teaching. Many fall in this category. Tenure and sabbatical leave are limited to academic faculty, however.

Dr. Bredekamp again moved to place the report on file with the Senate (minutes 299).

Discussion followed:

Dr. Brown: The Department of Biological Sciences prefers III C in.

Pres. Smith: The Board of Control extends sabbatical leave to the academic faculty only.

Prof. Oswald: What is wrong with the word "staff?"
Prof. Bayer: What is a faculty? How different from staff in the terms operational, administrative, etc.?

Prof. Hennessy: General use of word "faculty" means academic only.

Pres. Smith: The Faculty Wives Club is involved since they define Faculty too.

Senate President Halkola: The motion made to file this report with the Senate precludes its adoption now.

Prof. Oswald: The next Senate election will be involved with this definition.

Prof. Barstow: The election procedure recommendation sidesteps this issue.

Dr. Brown moved to amend the motion to include reinstatement of section III C (minutes 298). Prof. Noble seconded this.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Bayer: This includes what people?

Dr. Bredekamp: Graduates of 4 year colleges or individuals with similar experience.

Prof. Noble: Specifically in Cont. Ed., Prof. Caspary and Dr. Ellis.

Prof. V.W. Johnson: This sort of thing fouled up the last election.

The vote was taken and resulted in a tie - 10 yes, 10 no. President Halkola voted yes to break the tie. III C reinstated.

Prof. Oswald: If the main motion is passed, is the committee discharged?

Prof. Hamilton: If the main motion fails, is motion to adopt in order?

Senate Pres. Halkola ruled such motion not allowed. Rather the filed report becomes part of the record of the Senate.

Prof. Hennessy: If the motion to file passes, what then?

Dr. Bredekamp: A motion to adopt is permissible.

The vote was called for and the motion to file this report, as amended, passed. 17 yes, 4 no votes.

_Election Procedure Committee_, W. Barstow, Chairman. Minutes 281-3, 294, 305-7. Prof. Barstow briefly discussed the proposal mentioning that the revised form (minutes 305-7) tidies up the original version as suggested by the Senate. Prof. Barstow moved, Prof. V.W. Johnson seconded, the adoption of the proposal.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Oswald: The election committee is sidestepping the faculty definition problem.

Prof. Barstow: Since the Senate has filed the Bredekamp report, certainly the election committee is not the one to decide.

Dr. Stebbins: The University catalog lists the Faculty. Guidelines on whom to include will be helpful. No guidelines have been established to date. The Senate can help here.

Prof. Barstow: The procedure can be amended each time it is used as needed.

Mr. Kennedy: The committee awaits Senate action.

The vote was called for and the motion passed by vote: 21 yes, 0 no.

_Academic Rank Committee_. D.W. Stebbins, Chairman, minutes 299-301, 307. Dr. Stebbins pointed out that the issues here are difficult like those of III B. Gray areas are the Library, Dean of Students' group, Continuing Education. The report is a first attempt at solving these problems. Submitted as proposal No. 1 is stated that the Senate recommend to the administration the policy on academic rank shall be as follows:

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.

Dr. Stebbins moved, Prof. Oswald seconded, adoption of proposal No. 1.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Price: Under point 1. How much training leading to an advanced degree? One course qualifies?
Dr. Stebbins: The meaning "has led to" implied.
Prof. Barstow: A problem exists where the M.S. degree omitted on way to Ph.D. attainment.
Dr. Yerg: Universities have been criticized because they insist on advanced degrees but overlook experience, training,
capability, etc.
Prof. Oswald: How many courses must be taught to qualify?
Dr. Brown: In athletics, coaches with experience are considered as good as a youngster with a Ph.D.
Major Brylla: If an advanced degree is required to teach military science, then the contract for ROTC training is broken.
Dr. Keeling: Can't we strike out all of part 1 after professional training?
Dr. Stebbins: The committee was qualifying jobs on this campus.
Dr. Bredekamp: The job is being specified, not the man's present rank.
Mr. Kennedy: There is no intent to require an advanced degree. Skills are stipulated by the committee.
Dr. Yerg: Another committee went through this same struggle. The sentence under criticism includes the Library and Continuing
Education groups.
Prof. Price: The real problem not yet disclosed. Are students assigned teaching as part of their graduate work entitled to rank?
Dr. Yerg: No students working on M.S. are now instructors. Some students working on Ph.D. are now instructors.
Senate Pres. Halkola: Can a student working on his M.S. become an instructor?
Pres. Smith: Custom limits rating above instructor to advanced degree holders.
Dr. Yerg: Teaching Associate title given to M.S. students who are teaching.
Dr. Stebbins: Teaching one course is specified to accommodate already employed people.
Dr. Ortner: Four or five years ago several instructors were working on M.S. degrees here.
Prof. Price: Has title "Adjunct Professor" disappeared?
Dr. Stebbins: It is not used on this campus.
Dr. Heldt: Only instructors can work for a higher degree here.
The vote was called for and Proposal No. 1 was passed by vote: 20 yes, 1 no.

Emeritus Rank Committee, O.D. Boutilier, Chairman, minutes 309-310. Prof. Boutilier requested postponement which was
granted.

New Business

A. Standing Committees. D.W. Stebbins, minutes 304, 311. Dr. Stebbins discussed this proposal and problems involved such as
evening examinations, difficulties of scheduling them, student protests about them, involvement of intramural athletics with
them. Particularly bad are the two-hour variety.

Previously distributed to the Senate, Dr. Stebbins moved, Pres. Smith seconded adoption of Proposal No. 2.
It is proposed that there be appointed in the Senate a standing committee known as the Instructional Policy Committee, with the charge of recommending policy on such matters as:

a. The number of class contact hours of lecture, recitation, or laboratory expected for one hour of credit.
b. Frequency and duration of examinations during a term.
c. Guidelines for amount of material to be covered in a course in a term. It is obviously impossible to cover in four years all the material a student will need for the rest of his life; yet there is a tendency to drag students gasping through a maze of new and important developments. Some guidelines from the Senate suggesting thorough treatment of well selected fundamental topics should assist the departments and instructors in planning their courses.
d. Any other similar items

Senate President Halkola ruled that since precedent against standing committees has been set under the new Senate constitution, a discussion of committees - standing vs. ad hoc - must be made before considering this proposal.

Dr. Bredekamp moved amendment to Proposal #2. This was to delete the word "standing." Dr. Ortner seconded.

Prof. Barstow moved amendment to retitle Proposal #2. No second was made.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Hamilton: Does Dr. Stebbins object to ad hoc committees?

Dr. Stebbins: The problem is a continuing one. Although the committee need not be, it might be helpful if it were continuing too.

Dr. Brown: Will questions be directed to the committee by the Senate or by Vice President Stebbins?

Prof. Hennessy: The committee can carry all pertinent business.

Prof. Price: Some standing committees desirable. This amendment should be defeated.

Prof. Oswald: Am opposed to standing committees on the basis of work load they impose over a long period.

Prof. Bayer: If standing committees are to be used, we are back to the old Senate.

Dr. Stebbins: Am willing to withdraw the motion.

Senate Pres. Halkola: Doubt that motion can be withdrawn.

Major Brylla: Organizationally standing committees provide a place to direct problems.

Dr. Yerg: Standing committees can accomplish work outside of the Senate meetings, thus reducing the work load at these meetings, permitting more action by the Senate.

Prof. Barstow: Standing committees can be powerful. Membership of them can be rotated, however.

Prof. Price: Standing committees can request more time when they need it.

Dr. Brown: The old Senate committees failed due to overloading. Suggests a committee on committees and orderly choice of committees' memberships.

Vote on the amendment was taken. It failed: 6 Yes, 14 No votes.

Vote on the main motion was taken. It failed: 10 Yes, 10 No votes.

Dr. Ortner objects to items b and c. Competence of the faculty impugned by them.

Prof. Boutilier: The E.M. Department opposed to proposal.

Prof. Hennessy: Unless self-disciplined the faculty must expect regulation.

Dr. Keeling: Item b satisfactory but not item c.

Dr. Ortner: Giving of examinations solely the instructor's business.

Dr. Stebbins: Item b needs University wide standards to cover the case of instructor who gives no examinations. Item c - maybe it can't be done. Perhaps limiting the material but doing it well. Otherwise knowledge but no understanding can result.

Pres. Smith: Can items a, b, c be broadened, changed in terminology, to make them acceptable.

Prof. Barstow: Am disturbed. Policy committee are not rule committees. Element of rulemaking is bad.

Dr. Pollock: Senate discussion shows dislike for rules. Committee can deal with policy.

Prof. Hennessy: Stated case of overloading students by certain instructor. This robs time from other instructors.
Dr. Dawson (guest) Items b and c are serious. Individual rights and privileges are involved. Broad serious problems will face the committee appointed. Suggests a study group to rewrite the proposal to make it more acceptable.

Dr. Alexander (guest): Time is being spent on form rather than the issue.

Dr. Heldt: A Senate committee will report only to the Senate.

Dr. Ortner: Teaching is professional and shouldn't be closely regulated.

Dr. Yerg: The specifics of items a, b, c may or may not influence the committee. Desire a rewrite of the proposal before voting on it. Charge to committee very important.

Dr. Stebbins moved, Prof. Barstow seconded amended form of the proposal to read: Proposed that the Senate appoint a committee to be known as the Instructional Policy Committee.

Vote was taken and the amendment passed: 20 Yes, 0 No votes.

Dr. Yerg: Feels more thought needed.

Dr. Brown: Can't stand standing committees. Reduced teaching load will be required for committee members.

Vote was taken on the amended main motion: 20 Yes, 7 No votes.

Dr. Stebbins read a Proposal #3, which had previously been distributed to the Senate. He discussed the need for guidelines to control amount of material in the curriculum. A committee is needed.

Dr. Stebbins moved, Prof. Boutilier seconded adoption of Proposal #3.

It is proposed that there be appointed in the Senate, a standing committee to be known as the Curricular Policy Committee with the charge of recommending policy on such matters as:

- a. The total credits to be required for a baccalaureate degree.
- b. General guidelines for distribution of these credits among such general areas as:
  - 1. humanities
  - 2. biological sciences
  - 3. physical sciences
  - 4. social sciences
  - 5. mathematics
  - 6. technical specialty
- c. Any other similar matters

Prof. Barstow moved, Prof. V.W. Johnson seconded amendment to the proposal to read: Proposed that the Senate appoint a committee to be known as the Curricular Policy Committee.

Vote was taken on the amendment: 19 Yes, 1 No votes.

Vote was taken on the main motion: 15 Yes, 4 No votes.

**Academic Freedom and Administrative Rule Making Power**

Prof. Barstow moved adoption as a first reading to express Senate opinion of this proposal which had been distributed at this meeting. Dr. Yerg seconded.

It shall be the consensus of the Senate that:

1. The development and dissemination of flexible policies or guidelines in relation to the instructional process is properly a cooperative endeavor in which University Administration, Faculty Senate, and the several academic departments must all participate if academic freedom is to be preserved.
2. The unilateral prescribing of inflexible rules or directives for the control of such matters as the timing, duration, or nature of any element in the instructional process is not a proper exercise of University administrative responsibility.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Bayer: Second part of this proposal hogwash. Many things must be scheduled.

Dr. Keeling: Academic freedom requires academic responsibility.

Dr. Kenny: Tabling this proposal might provide cooling off period.
Prof. Price: Accepting this proposal puts it on the next meeting agenda.

The Senate voted to conclude discussion of this proposal for now.

Prof. Barstow moved, Prof. Hennessy seconded, that a committee be appointed to study the procedural policy of the Senate.

Dr. Stebbins: Feel that present procedure adequate.

Pres. Smith: How can this proposal be entertained? How can action concerning the Senate constitution be classed as emergency?

Vote was taken and Prof. Barstow's motion passed.

Prof. Hamilton moved to adopt the proposal of General Faculty Definition as now on file. Prof. Oswald seconded.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Oswald: Desire to unfile the proposal.

Dr. Brown: Is this proposal in conflict with Dr. Stebbins' Proposal #1?

Dr. Stebbins: Conflict exists. Who defines the five faculties? Operational faculty means what?

Prof. Bayer: Stated he is worried about part III c.

Prof. Bayer moved, Prof. Boutilier seconded, to exclude part III c.

Senate President Halkola refused to accept Prof. Bayer's motion on the grounds that Prof. Bayer had switched sides on the issue.

Dr. Brown stated that he would make Prof. Bayer's motion.

Dr. Ortner moved, Dr. Pollock seconded tabling Prof. Hamilton's motion. The Senate passed this motion by vote.

Senate President Halkola requested Senate opinion concerning a Senate Parliamentarian. Must he be a Senate member?

Dr. Barstow: Usual practice to choose parliamentarian from outside the organization. Any qualified person eligible.

By straw vote the Senate approved selection of an outsider.

Senate President Halkola requested instruction from Senate Council in the matter of investigating standing committee membership. The record does not show that the consensus was affirmative.

The Senate adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary