MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER FORTY 
OF THE 
SENATE OF THE MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY 

15 May 1968 

(Senate Minute pages: 345-355)

The meeting opened at 7:06 p.m., Wednesday May 15, 1968, in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union, Senate President D. Halkola presiding.

The roll was taken. Present (26) were: Bahrman, Boutlier, Heldt, Pollock, Sheedy, Yerg, Barstow, Bayer, Greuer, Lucier, Boyd, Bredekamp, Halkola, Hamilton, Keeling, Brylla, Kennedy, Kenny, Ortner, Oswald, Patterson, Price, Wyble, Smith, R.L., Stebbins.

Absent (4) were: Johnson, J.A., Johnson, V.W., Hennessy, Erbisch.

Guests present: Kent, Romig.

The minutes of Meetings #39 were accepted as previously distributed except for a change in spelling (and meaning) on page 336, line 7, correct word being morale.

Introduced with Senate approval at this point to permit early departure because of illness in his family, Major Brylla reported on the Senate election as follow:

Elected as At-Large members for 3 years were Prof. G.E. Bahrman and O.D. Boutlier. 228 electors voted, 10 ballots were voided for lack of envelope signature, 3 for voting for too many candidates, leaving 215 valid ballots. The report and the election received Senate approval.

Elected as Departmental representatives for 3 years, except Army - 2 years, by their departments and reported by Major Brylla were the following: Caspary, G.J., Cont. Ed.; Freyberger, W.L., Metallurgy; Johnson, J.A., Ford Forestry; Johnson, V.W., Forestry; Nordeng, S.C., Geology; Polich, V.J. (2 years) Army ROTC; Sheedy, J.D., Air ROTC.

Old Business


B. Senate Procedural Committee, D. Yerg, Chairman. Minutes 319, 324, 329, 337-341. Dr Yerg stated that the proposed rules can serve to replace a parliamentarian. It is hoped that flexibility can be obtained to permit application of Roberts' Rules of Order. The second part of the report is not yet ready. Since only a progress report is involved here, no motion in order now.

C. Academic Faculty Code of Ethics, S. Price, proponent. Minutes 325-26, 329-30, 341-42. Prof. Price moved adoption (342), Dr. Kenny seconded and voice vote to accept was taken with only 1 no vote. Proposal approved.

New Business

A. Senate Election - see above.

B. President R.L. Smith - Report on Senate Administration accomplishments. President Smith read and discussed the report:

Report to Senate Concerning Senate Policy Recommendations

It has been informally reported to me that there is some uncertainty concerning administrative action or board action where necessary on Senate policies. Therefore, in order to complete the record, I have gone back to the beginning of the new Senate to determine whether there are Senate recommendations on which no action has been taken or where action has not been reported to the Senate.

Following is my action on various Senate actions on which I have no record of any written reporting by me to the Senate of my action:

a. Student Grade Information - final vote p. 294 of minutes. I don't know why this was overlooked; however, as of now, this policy is approved.
b. Organization Plan (Establishment of Colleges within the University) - p. 309 of minutes. This was transmitted with no recommendation, but administrative action was reported to the General Faculty in terms of separation into various colleges. The only change from that announcement was to keep Business Administration as a separate department not within any college.

c. Recent recommendations of the Academic Rank Committee and General Faculty Definition Committee (p. 314, 315, 323 of minutes) have not yet been acted on, but will be referred to the Board for approval in June.

To make the record complete, the following are approved Senate recommendations of which the Senate has already been notified:

a. Final Exam for Seniors - p. 271 of minutes. This recommended policy was approved by my letter to the Senate President on May 9, 1967.

b. Formal Courses in Religion - p. 294 of minutes. This recommendation was approved by my letter to the Senate President on June 7, 1967.

c. Science Teacher Education - p. 295 of minutes. This recommendation was approved by letter of June 7, 1967 to the Senate President and was also approved by the Board of Control in June of 1967.

d. Conflict of Interest Policy - p. 309 of minutes. This Senate recommendation was approved by me in a letter to the Senate President on October 30, 1967 and was approved by the Board of Control in December of the same year.

Addendum

At the last meeting, a proposal was made and passed to limit the Sabbatical Leave policy to Academic Faculty. Since this is a policy adopted by the Board, I shall take this policy to the Board for its action in June.

Also, word changes were proposed and passed to the Tenure policy. Several other aspects of that policy are presently under study and therefore I shall take no action until such study is completed.

R.L. Smith, President

The Senate accepted President Smith's report with thanks.

Professor Price suggested a graphical representation be prepared for Item C of the above report and Dr. Bredekamp was asked to draw it up although his committee on General Faculty Definition (minutes 314, 315, 323) has been discharged.

Standing Committee Reports

No reports were made at this time.

Charges to Standing Committees

The Secretary read a statement from Dr. Stebbins as follows:

**Item for Curricular Policy Committee**

There is need on the campus for a thoroughly discussed, well thought-out statement on Michigan Tech's philosophy of curricular structure. Let me elaborate.

In the very simplest terms we admit students as freshmen, expose them to four years of classes, after which we graduate them with a diploma. What contributions do we expect the four years of experience at Tech to make to the student's future personal life and to his relation with his profession and with society? These contributions can be expressed in several ways. One possibility is to measure them in increased awareness and knowledge in humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and some area of specialization. There may be better ones. Some skills in certain techniques are also desirable, especially in oral and written communications. But we need some guidelines as to the fraction of the total time at Tech that should be devoted to each of the above areas, and probably also some guidelines as to which of the four years are best for taking subjects in each area. Perhaps there are some specific courses that should be required of all students. If so, these should be listed.

In coming to a decision for recommendations, we must consider the needs of persons living in the next 10-20 years for a thorough understanding of our complex state, national, and international societies and the individual's responsibilities to them. We must recognize that speedier transportation and communications have shrunk the earth so that isolation of the United States from other countries is no longer possible. Simultaneously, isolation of one's personal life or an employment opportunity is no longer possible either. To be an informed and effective citizen requires knowledge of many disciplines, the ability to analyze complex problems critically and the ability to draw valid, logical conclusions.

To achieve this end effectively, certain guidelines in structuring curricula are needed. The Senate's Curricular Policy Committee is a logical place for such deliberations and policy recommendations. I recommend that the
Senate pass this charge on to the Curricular Policy Committee.

Such an important and complex assignment as this requires time for study and research. The task should not be taken lightly, but it would be helpful if the Senate could receive a recommendation from the committee within 9 to 18 months, with a progress report once a quarter.

D.W. Stebbins

Dr. Stebbins moved, Prof. Price seconded and the Senate by voice vote approved transmittal of this information to the Curricular Policy Committee.

The Secretary read a second statement from Dr. Stebbins as follows:

Items for the Instructional Policy Committee

There is growing concern among some of our students about instructional procedures at Tech. The University must consider these matters, and the Senate's Instructional Policy Committee is a logical place to start.

I suggest that the Senate ask the Instructional Policy Committee to consider each of the following questions and recommend policies which will assure fair standards and treatment to all students.

1. Do evening exams, with all students in a course taking the same exam at the same time, provide a significant advantage over separate exams prepared, perhaps by different instructors, taken during the regular class periods? In most regular classes, it is not possible to separate the students adequately from their neighbors; but by using larger rooms in the evenings, adequate separation can be assured.

Evening exams may interfere with other activities usually scheduled in the evening. Is this serious? Should there be a limit on the days and evening hours when exams are permitted?

Because of the limitation of available rooms, it may be impossible to schedule evening exams for every multiple section course. What guidelines in this area should be used for scheduling evening exams?

2. What policy, if any, should the University have regarding the use of the same exam year after year or in several sections of the same class which meet at different hours throughout the day or on successive days? (I have received some complaints from students about this practice.)

3. Should there be some standard for the number of proctors required in a room where an examination is being taken -- say one per 25, 50 100 or ? students?

4. Should students be permitted to bring to the examination room with them blue books or other paper on which the questions will be answered and turned in? Or should a system be devised in which the students always get from the instructor at the time of the exam the paper which he will hand in with his answers on it? (Some students have charged that in some courses students with prior knowledge of what the exam may be bring in blue books partially filled with answers to likely questions on the exam. Experience has indicated that they frequently have guessed right.)

5. Should hour exams be given during the week preceding final exams? Some schools have now deliberately set that week aside as a “quiet week” during which students can organize and review all the material they have covered during the quarter. This appears to be pedagogically sound.

6. Should final exams be required of all graduating seniors in their last quarter of residence, or only for those for whom the instructor's information, lacking a final exam grade, indicates the grade will be less than a B (or C)? (The Senate has already studied this problem and made a recommendation, but since it is so naturally in the area of concern of the Instructional Policy Committee, a statement from the Committee on the subject seems appropriate.)

7. Should final exams be given in all courses?

The above is not an exhaustive presentation of suitable topics for the Committee to consider. However, these are the kinds of things over which there appears to be growing concern among the students. These are also matters about which the faculty should be concerned and recommend policy. We would be well advised to demonstrate to the students this awareness and some action before the present rumblings develop more steam.

D.W. Stebbins

Dr. Stebbins moved, Prof. Barstow seconded and the Senate by voice vote approved transmittal of this information to the Instructional Policy Committee.

At this point, Dr. Heldt replaced Prof. Boyd as secretary to permit the latter to attend to other business.
The Emeritus Rank Committee was discharged with thanks by motion of Dr. Smith, seconded by Dr. Ortner, and Senate vote.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. G.W. Boyd, Secretary, MTU Senate
FROM: Richard G. Chandler, President, Faculty Association
DATE: May 1, 1968

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the following excerpt from the Faculty Association Council minutes of April 23, 1968.

Student Handbook Committee*: J. Issos (FAC Representative to the Committee)

"The purpose of the committee is to publish and distribute a booklet giving general information to the student concerning campus life."

The March 28th meeting was attended by numerous student body representatives, Mr. Wiener and Mr. Dalquist of the Dean of Students Office, and Mr. Chambers of University Relations.

"Conclusions were that a handbook is needed and that the contents would include student services, student government, organizations, and university regulations."

The cost of a forty-eight page booklet (4,000 copies) would be approximately $1000.

"Questions of actual size, finances, distribution date, and final contents and scope remain unanswered."

Numerous questions arose as a result of the report:

1. Should the Senate also send a representative?
2. Should FAC and the Senate send a joint representative?
3. Should the faculty member be only an observer?
4. Should the Handbook Committee report to the Senate?

Schumacher motioned that "pending Senate approval or rejection of the project, that the FAC continue to send its representative to the committee." (Seconded by LaJeunesse and passed)

The Faculty Association Council would like to know the reaction of the Senate to Mr. Issos' report. In particular we would like some response to the four questions posed by various members of the Association Council.

Mr. Issos was appointed to this committee by the Council in response to a request from the Dean of Students Office.

Discussion followed the reading of the above letter.

Prof. Barstow: Suggest the Senate President appoint a committee to consider the matter.

Dr. Stebbins: The origin and charge of the Student Handbook Committee is uncertain. To whom does the committee report?

Prof. Price: The FAC unwilling to proceed unilaterally. Senate requested to participate if desirous.

Prof. Hamilton: If the Senate does not understand we should have clarification by the Student Council.

No further discussion occurred. No action was taken.

Dr. Bredekamp requested that the Senate consider an emergency submission. He distributed copies of his resolution to the Senate.

Prof. Barstow: Emergency submission should be voted on.

Prof. Hamilton moved, Dr. Kenny seconded that the Senate accept this emergency submission. The Senate voted to accept.

Dr. Bredekamp moved, Dr. Kenny seconded acceptance of the resolution printed below:

WHEREAS the Senate of the Michigan Technological University has been created under the leadership and cooperation of the administration of this University; and

WHEREAS the Board of Control of this University has formally acknowledged that the function of the Senate is "hereby defined to be that of preparing suitable recommendations on academic policy and performance for submission to the President of the University"; and
WHEREAS, the Senate has carefully refrained from discussion or recommendation that may not deal with academic affairs -- in contrast to the opinion of the majority of the faculty as polled by the Faculty Association -- but has cooperated with the administration by not attempting to usurp administrative prerogatives; and

WHEREAS, the Senate has studied and presented reports on the following subjects during the past two years: (1) Senior Examinations; (2) Sabbatical Leave, (3) Conflict of Interest, (4) Definition of Faculty, (5) Academic Rank, (6) Student Grade Information, (7) Course in Religion, (8) Reorganization of the University, (9) Science Teacher Education, (10) Emeritus Rank, and (11) Professional Ethics: of which nine (9) of the above items were requested by the administration; and

WHEREAS now, the administrative offices of the University have prepared completely revised curricula in the Engineering fields changing credit hours required for graduation, the core curricula for Engineering, the established balance between science and engineering, and have published the same to the student body with the intention of publishing in the revised University catalog; and

WHEREAS, since the curricula of this University represent the collective thinking of the Faculty of the University for a period of over eighty years, and represent without question a major matter of academic policy, more than some requests that have been submitted by the administration to the Senate; and since the curriculum policy has a broad base in fact and philosophy; and since the decision on departmental curricula also has not universally been made by the faculty; the arbitrary changing of said policy to meet a publication deadline without submission to the careful consideration of the Senate violates the Resolution of the Board of Control: "BECAUSE this enlightened opinion should take into consideration not only the best judgment of department heads and other administrators but also the variety of opinions and outlook of all members of the Faculty";

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Senate of the Michigan Technological University recommend to the President of the University that he invoke a cease and desist order on curricula changes until the opinions of the Senate and Academic Faculty are ascertained.

Discussion followed:

Prof. Bayer: Probably error in stating that administration officers prepared the curricula. Faculty members in some departments did participate.

Prof. Barstow: The Curriculum Committee, Engineering Council and others worked on the new curricula.

Prof. Boutilier: All members of Civil Engineering considered and voted on the Civil curriculum.

Prof. Oswald: Same in E.E.

Dr. Bredekamp: Total credits required is a matter of policy. These are Senate matters. Departments did not generate the idea of reducing credit hours, for example.

Dr. Smith: Would reiterate Prof. Bayer's statement.

Dr. Stebbins: Implementation of cease and desist would probably cause problems. Other curricular changes have taken place without Senate action. This type of thing should be a matter for the Curricular Policy Committee. Did not attempt to by-pass the Senate.

Dr. Ortner: Faculty members did participate but Senate committee should participate in this type of business. This should not happen again. Curriculum committee was probably remiss in not asking for Senate action. This committee acted in an operational mode not considering the philosophy of curricular change.

Prof. Barstow: Senate should not be concerned with operational procedure.

Dr. Ortner: Dr. Bredekamp's proposal is concerned with policy.

Dr. Stebbins: The new curricula are within the guidelines of ECPD and other accrediting agencies. These are national guidelines.

Dr. Bredekamp: This business could have been submitted to the Senate a year ago.

Prof. Bahrman: No request to establish the Curricular Policy Committee was made then.

Dr. Smith: It is the intent of the administration to support the Senate.

Prof. Bayer: The new curriculum is no different in policy than the old one in M.E.

Dr. Kenny: It appears that the Academic Faculty participated but the Senate did not.

Dr. Yerg: In the future, the Senate should address itself to matters concerned with the establishment of broad policy. Faculty participation can be involved by appointing committees in particular areas or schools but this has not been subjected to University-wide consideration.
Prof. Price: The Curricular Policy Committee hopefully can accommodate.

It was moved by Prof. Barstow, seconded by Dr. Stebbins, and passed by voice vote of the Senate that the motion be voted on.

Vote was taken (voice) and the resolution was defeated.

**Standing Committee Reports**

**Committee to Study Grievance Procedure.** R.O. Keeling, Chairman. Delayed in his arrival, Dr. Keeling presented this report:

Proposal to the Senate of Michigan Technological University

An Ombudsman committee shall be formed by the Senate of Michigan Technological University

**Duties:**

The duties of the committee shall be:

a. Upon request, to informally inquire into any problem, dispute or grievance arising in conjunction with the employment of a faculty member.
b. To accept informal conciliation and effect an adjustment if possible.
c. Failing informal conciliation, to formally hear arguments and recommend solutions to the parties involved.
d. To complement and cooperate with the University Tenure Committee in those cases which eventually reach its jurisdiction.

**Procedure**

The committee shall establish its own rules and procedures but should be guided in its activities by University regulations such as those set forth in the Faculty Handbook and by the statements on academic due process of the American Association of University Professors.

**Composition**

The committee shall consist of five members chosen as follows:

a. Two members, one representing the administration, appointed by the President of the Senate
b. Three members elected from and by the general faculty.

**Terms**

The appointed members shall serve two-year staggered terms. The elected members shall serve three-year staggered terms. Details of handling appointments and elections to the committee shall be the duty of the Council of the Senate.

Ad Hoc Committee to Study Grievance Procedures: R.O. Keeling, Chairman, A.D. Kennedy, R.G. Mason

Dr. Keeling moved, Prof. Oswald seconded and the Senate passed by voice vote to consider this report at the first meeting next fall.

---

REPORT OF THE SENATE PRESIDENT TO THE FACULTY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

May 15, 1968

On the assumption that even a brief written report will be of greater value than an oral summary, I hereby respectfully submit the following in the nature of an annual report to the Senate upon the activities of the past year. I have also incorporated some observations about future areas of concern which the Senate may, if it so chooses, take up at some future date.

It is a simple truism to note that there must be a variety of conclusions concerning the effectiveness, or lack thereof, of the Senate in the past academic year. To some of you we have performed our function admirably, others see the past year as one of little accomplishment. My own feeling is that we are somewhere in between. While much more could have been done, I am not impatient with our progress. It does take time to find the particular role which the still newly-revised Senate will play within the overall structure of the university. I must note, however, that while we seek this role, our time is not unlimited. We could well lapse into an ineffectual, albeit comfortable niche where our role would be of little consequence.

Specific accomplishments are necessarily few because we are still in the stage of formulating basic policy. The minutes of our meetings provide adequate summary of these deliberations. However, may I presume to note two points upon which I feel we need to be alert.

1. It is well for us to be a deliberative body as we crystallize our thinking in our advisory role in academic policy. We must also appreciate, however, that undue deliberation can leave us handling matters "after the fact." Where the immediacy or
urgency of the moment demands rapid action, we must be prepared to provide the same, even if it means more frequent meetings. Otherwise, the Senate may well find itself bypassed in such circumstances. We cannot be both a deliberative body with the emphasis upon the adjective, and still a screen through which all administrative proposals must pass.

2. To be concerned about orderly or proper parliamentary procedure is fine. An analysis of our constitution and by-laws was both necessary and valuable. But we may also find ourselves caught in maneuvering which will tend to lessen our effectiveness as well as discourage members from participation. I do not deem this a major problem, but it does warrant mention. If the chair has been guilty of contributing toward that dilemma this past year, let this serve as an acceptance of such responsibility and apology for the same.

As to recommendations, may I state them in the form of questions? In most instances my own responses would be in the affirmative, but they are intended to provoke consideration for future action rather than spirited discussion at this meeting.

1. Is there need to communicate better with the General Faculty? Should some of our meetings be openly proclaimed as such in order to attract more observers (and even participants in discussion)?

2. What should be our relation to the Faculty Association? Should not the Senate suggest a liaison or study committee to the latter group so that it might make appropriate recommendations to bring closer contact between the two groups?

3. Does the Senate feel that the committee system as presently organized is adequate?

4. Should the Senate have some source of funds either regularly collected or allocated for its purpose? This would permit some of the clerical duties, be they the handling of election procedures or even the duplication of this report, to be assigned readily to some individual for processing? There may be other needs for which Senate budgetary funds could be used.

5. Is there any need for the Senate to establish more formal relationship to the Student Body? Are there areas in which the Senate should speak to or hear from a duly recognized representative of the student organization(s)?

One might well add the whole area of Faculty-Administration relations, but the Senate seems much more cognizant of that than the points above. We are also due to hear from the President of the University at this Senate meeting on this matter. The above five points are not exhaustive, but I dare say if we choose to tackle any one of certainly all five of them the next academic year, it will be exhausting.

In closing, I may note that it is better to wait with the assignment of committee personnel until such time as the composition of the new Senate is fully known and evaluated. Thus the Executive Council does not hereby recommend any new appointments to vacancies and the like.

I want to express my personal appreciation to the Senate for its cooperation and understanding toward myself. I pay a particular word of thanks to those of you are attending your last meeting as members of the Faculty Senate. Some of you may have given particularly large blocks of time and talent toward our objectives; all of you have rendered beyond the call of duty normally associated with faculty obligations.

To those of us who return to "do battle" in the fall of 1968, I urge continued service toward our goals and the same fine spirit of positive response to the new officials whom you choose as you have evidenced to me and it has been my pleasure to enjoy.

It has been a privilege to serve as the presiding officer for the past academic year of as dedicated and concerned a group as you have been.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,
David T. Halkola

Dr. Stebbins moved, Dr. Bredekamp seconded, and the Senate voted to accept the report of Senate President Halkola.

Adjournment was approved at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G.W. Boyd, Senate Secretary