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

21 February 1968

(Senate Minute pages: 328-334)

The meeting opened at 7:05 p.m., Wednesday February 21, 1968, in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union, Senate President D. Halkola presiding.

The roll was taken. Present (26) were: Bahrman, Boutilier, Heldt, Johnson, V.W., Noble, Pollock, Sheedy, Yerg, Barstow, Bayer, Lucier, Boyd, Bredekamp, Halkola, Hennessy, Keeling, Brown, Kennedy, Kenny, Ortner, Oswald, Patterson, Price, Wyble, Smith, R.L., Stebbins.

Absent (4) were: Johnson, J.A., Been, Hamilton, Brylla.

Guest present: J. Romig.

The minutes of Meetings #37 were accepted.

Old Business

Emeritus Rank Committee. O.D. Boutilier, Chairman, minutes 309-310, 315, 323.

Prof. Boutilier moved, Prof. Oswald seconded adoption of the proposal (minutes 323). Discussion followed:

Dr. Bredekamp: Does this follow State law? Believe law differs.

Prof. Boutilier: Follows Faculty Handbook. Will correct if State law now different.

Prof. Bayer: Is other error present?

Dr. Smith: Minimum retirement age is now 52.

Prof. Romig (guest): Retirement possible with 10 years of service ending after age 50.

President Halkola: Should motion be deferred pending changes?

Prof. Bayer moved, Prof. Noble seconded, amending the motion to conform with the State retirement plan.

Dr. Stebbins: Are there three retirement criteria?

Dr. Smith: Perhaps the Senate should decide the criteria.

Prof. V.W. Johnson moved, Dr. Brown seconded, to strike the phrase "of the Michigan State retirement plan." (minutes 328). Prof. Bayer withdrew his amending motion.

Vote was taken; the amendment passed unanimously.

Prof. Hennessy: According to this, a man age 55 when hired, retires after 10 years and gets rank. Another, age 45 when hired, retires after 20 years of service, doesn't get rank. Why not establish some number, 20 years or other service, to obtain rank?

Prof. Oswald: Wouldn't an experienced man deserve rank even though not here so long long?

Dr. Stebbins: Can the committee explain the times established?

Prof. Boutilier: To obviate difficulties the State plan was followed.

Prof. Noble: Service with merit seems ignored. Why only the time criteria?

Dr. Brown: It is possible to set a 10 year minimum followed by selection rather than automatic granting of rank.

Prof. Boutilier: Will Dr. Brown define retirement?

Dr. Brown: Would use the Michigan State plan definition.

Prof Barstow: Why set any minimum. Service is the real criteria. Some old (when hired) but distinguished teacher might be excluded.
Prof. Price: Tenure is similar in nature. A sliding scale used there.

Prof. Hennessy: Age and seniority are not the same. The present scale is too wide in spread.

Prof. Noble: Formerly teachers might stay with one school a long time. It is not so now. Emeritus rank should depend on merit.

Dr. Yerg: What is the definition of Emeritus Rank? Seems important.

Prof. Boutilier: The original proposal (minutes 310) was changed to spell out criteria. Now the discussion seems to aim back to it.

Prof. V.W. Johnson: Emeritus Rank granted only after retirement.

Dr. Yerg: What purpose has Emeritus Rank?

Prof. V.W. Johnson: It is an honor granted to deserving eligibles.

Prof. Price: Establishing eligibility the purpose of the proposal.

Prof. V.W. Johnson: This was the committee's intent.

Vote was taken on the amended proposal. It failed: 9 yes, 10 no votes. President Halkola stated that the next meeting will consider revised parts.

**Senate Procedural Committee**, D. Yerg, Chairman. Minutes 319, 325. Dr. Yerg stated that the committee will report at the next meeting including (1) Comments on the By-Laws; (2) Procedures for conducting business; (3) Recommendations.

**Code of Ethics**, S. Price, Chairman. Minutes 326. Prof. Price moved, Dr. Yerg seconded that this code of ethics be adopted by the Senate as a statement of the responsibilities of the faculty underlying tenure; its adoption to be contingent upon the willingness of the major part of the faculty to subscribe to the code, and upon the recognition that it is the responsibility of the faculty to interpret the code and review adherence to it by the faculty.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Hennessy: Prof. Price has tied in many things. Simplification should be made to adopt code only.

Prof. Price: There are reasons for this. The Tenure Committee needs an accepted code. A statement of code of ethics is correct for any professional group and many - medicine, engineering, etc. - have them. Should the Senate adopt the code, tenure policy can require a code of ethics. Academic freedom is related to a code of ethics. This can help to avoid a situation like that at another school.

Dr. Yerg: Didn't understand Prof. Hennessy's statement. Success in getting general faculty acceptance dubious perhaps. A problem at Tech is that many seem to think their prime purpose is to train students to get jobs. This code is a reminder of other values to consider.

Prof. Price: There is no hurry about this. It can be deferred to next meeting if desired.

Prof. Oswald: Believe faculty will adopt the code but 100% adoption difficult to obtain.

Dr. Bredekamp: Code is good but the obligation is individual. The Senate cannot prescribe ethics to faculty. If passed by the faculty, alright, but the Senate can't establish a code for them. Problems will occur - how can code breaker's be punished?

Dr. Yerg: Is the motion out of order? Not distributed ten days in advance.

President Halkola: Motion in order - discussion centered on the code, not on the motion.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Stebbins seconded, tabling the motion. Vote was taken: 14 Yes, 5 No. Motion tabled.

**New Business**

**Resubmission of Resolution I by S. Price.** Minutes 324-325. Prof. Price moved, Prof. Boutilier seconded adoption of the resolution. Discussion followed.

Prof. Oswald: This is the identical motion defeated last meeting.

Dr. Bredekamp: We send a representative to another representative group. Their representative represents only himself, no us. We should send our own representative to the Governor, legislature, etc. as required.
Prof. Price: Shares Dr. Bredekamp's doubts but later information will clarify the representative situation. Meanwhile the expense difficulty can be solved by the Senate. The Senate can do anything that is legal. The faculty has voted to support the IFA so how can the Senate or the Administration ignore it? There have been misrepresentations to the State Board concerning Tech already by others. We cannot afford to stay out of the IFA.

Dr. Brown: We have a republican form of government. If we and all others send their individual representatives to Lansing, chaos results. The IFC serves for us.

Dr. Smith: The State Board does not represent Michigan Tech to the Legislature. If this plan helps represent us to the Legislature, I am all for it. The Legislature won't release budget, money, or power to the State Board. What then will a representative (IFC) do?

President Halkola: MTU has a representative to IFC now. Our problem is to have Senate sanction for him.

Dr. Heldt: We have been told that we need IFC representation. Then we are told that the IFA may become a channel to the State Board. The Senate may be opposed to this.

Prof. Barstow: The Senate hasn't been told why it should be involved.

Prof. Price: The other schools' Senates send their school representative. Our representative should have our Senate's sanction too.

Dr. Ortner: Our faculty has paid dues to IFA through our Faculty Association. The faculty members are paying for this.

Prof. Barstow: When IFC becomes important they will need us - then we can act.

Dr. Brown: We should be taking part in plans being made by IFC. If we are not satisfied with the results without Senate representation, then the Senate is without recourse.

The vote was taken by hand show: 8 Yes, 11 No. The motion failed for the second time.

Amendment to By-Laws, J. Hamilton. A change to satisfy constitutional requirements is in the form presented below. Prof. Oswald, acting for Prof. Hamilton, moved, Prof. Price seconded its adoption.

"I move that the By-Laws be amended so that any Senator that misses two consecutive meetings of the Senate without cause (fails to report in advance that he will be absent because of illness, travel, etc.) will be dropped from the Senate and he will be so notified. If he is a department-elected member, his department will be notified so that a new member may be selected prior to the next meeting of the Senate; if he is a member-at-large, a new member shall be appointed as specified in Article III D of the Constitution."

Discussion followed:

Senate Secretary Boyd: Following the last meeting, the absent Senators were called. As a result, Prof. Lucier now is here representing P.E., Capt. Sheedy representing Air Force ROTC. Only Mining did not show. Perhaps this By-Law isn't necessary. On the other hand, we have here tonight our largest attendance (26) of any meeting. Perhaps the By-Law is a good idea.

Prof. Barstow: Mining has elected a Senator. Couldn't attend tonight. The Senate seems to want to police things. Real purpose is to conduct studies and recommend. Quorum requirement (20) can be changed.

Prof. Oswald: Although difficulty of getting a quorum may be a bad delaying factor, am not in favor of changing quorum.

Dr. Brown: The idea of alternates, formerly proposed, helpful.

Dr. Pollock: Resignation and re-selection can be used.

Capt. Sheedy: If determination of the reason for the absence is the point, can't the reason match the desire?

Prof. Hennessy: Is this motion constitutional?

Senate President Halkola: Probably.

Prof. Barstow: If the motion unconstitutional, than no action can be taken.

Vote was taken: The By-Law failed, 2 Yes, 18 No votes.

Committee Appointments, Senate President Halkola. Prof. D. Boutilier took the chair to receive the Halkola report:

REPORT ON COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE
The Executive Council has convened since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate for the express purpose of making appointments to the Committees, either standing or ad hoc, that have been established as a result of Senate action. Generally, we have applied the following criteria to the composition of committees:

1. Membership upon a standing committee consist of five people, two (including the chairman) from the Senate and three from the faculty outside the Senate.

2. Membership upon ad hoc committees be limited to three, unless there be special provision for more members (note case of Elections Committee). Where it was deemed advisable the membership of an ad hoc committee include a non-Senator along with the Senators.

PERMANENT OR STANDING COMMITTEES

Instructional Policy Committee
D.W. Pollock (Sen) -- Chairman
R. L. Hennessy (Sen)
T. M. Bloom (Hum and Soc. Studies)
G.P. Krueger (Civil Engineering)
M.E. Stark (Business Administration)

Curricular Policy Committee
L.A. Heldt (Sen) - Chairman
S.R. Price (Sen)
K.O. Alexander (Business Administration)
W.T. Anderson (Electrical Engineering)
F.H. Erbisch (Biological Sciences)

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Faculty Definition -- "Documents Correction"
R. Bayer - Chairman
J.F. Hamilton
J.A. Oswald

Study on Grievance Committee
R.O. Keeling - Chairman
A.D. Kennedy (Senate)
R.G. Mason (Humanities)

Elections
C.W. Brylla - Chairman
D.H. Kenny
R.D. Patterson
D.O. Wyble

At present the Faculty Senate has besides the above committees two other ad hoc committees:

1. Emeritus Rank Committee, O.D. Boutilier, Chairman
2. Senate Procedural Committee, D.G. Yerg, Chairman

All other ad hoc committees, previously appointed, and not already discharged, are hereby considered to have completed their duties and are discharged with the appreciation of the Senate.

D.T. Halkola, President

President moved, Prof. Barstow seconded and vote approved these committees. Senate President Halkola resumed as chairman.

Approved for Emergency Submission by the Senate was the following:

Amendment of Senate Election Procedure

The primary function of the Senate is to make recommendations relating to the academic policy of the University. It, therefore, seems appropriate that the elected membership of the Senate and the faculty eligible to vote in Senate elections be restricted to the Academic Faculty of the University as defined by the General Faculty Definition Committee Proposal adopted at Senate Meeting No. 37, January 24, 1968.

THEREFORE:
It is proposed that the Senate election procedure be amended to substitute the words "Academic Faculty" for the words "General Faculty" wherever they appear.

Faculty Definition Documents Committee

Prof. Bayer moved, Dr. Bredekamp seconded adoption. Discussion followed:

Dr. Brown: Whom now eligible?

Prof. Bayer: Undergraduate, Graduate, Research and Administrative faculties.

Prof. Price: Isn't this unconstitutional? Isn't Senator Noble disenfranchised?

Prof. Bayer: No. Academic faculty makes recommendations. Others, non-academic do not.

Vote was taken: 24 Yes, 0 No. Motion passed.

Dr. Pollock: Requested that all business directed to the Instructional Policy Committee be channeled through the Senate.

President Halkola: The Senate should screen committee's business to protect them from executive demands from many sources.

Prof. Barstow: With acceptance of the committee appointment report the Instructional Policy Committee is a Senate standing committee.

Adjournment. The Senate adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary