MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 100
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

3 May 1978

(Senate Minute pages: 1438-1475)

Meeting No. 100 was called to order on Wednesday, May 3, 1978 at 7:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-four members or alternates were present. Absent were ElRite (PE), Kraft (BL), Montgomery (Stud. Council), Nobel (GE), Sachs (AL), Schulz (AROTC), Schultz (IMR), President Smith, and Snyder.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were present: Drs. P. Biesiot (BA), A. Young (HU), G. Agin (PH), G. Butler (BA), and V. Hauge (SS).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 99. It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. Pintar pointed out a correction to the meeting dates of the Board of Control: the date for October is "October 13" not "October 12." Nelson pointed out a typographical error on p. 1423, 3rd paragraph, 10th line: "interest" is misspelled.

The minutes were unanimously approved as corrected.

Subsequent to the meeting, Doane (IMR) transmitted a correction to the minutes of Meeting No. 98 (p. 1401, paragraph 4; see also Meeting No. 99, Item #III): "while FFC and IWR do report to a Dean, IMR does not."

President's Report

President P. Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report ( Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Nelson also pointed out the need to elect a nominating committee at this meeting under New Business.

Miller stated that Proposal 10-78 provided for protection of privacy by allowing a professor to not have his data included. Nelson replied that he will call this to the attention of President Smith.

Election to Chairperson of the Senate Committee on Faculty Fringe Benefits.

Nelson stated his desire to have this committee function during the summer. There were no volunteers for Chairperson of this committee. There were no objections to Pres. Nelson appointing a chairperson at a later date to serve during the summer.


- No report; Sachs absent due to illness.

Report on Meeting of the Board of Control.

Daavettila had attended in place of Sachs. He was unable to follow the proceedings because he had no copy of the agenda. He emphasized the need for the Senate Representative to have a copy of the agenda before attending the meetings.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Nelson distributed a copy of a report (Appendix B - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

V. President Stein commented that Long-Range Plan Objective I-D-3 (Appendix B, Item #2 - Available by Request from the Senate Office) was changed as a result of the faculty meeting and again changed the day of the Senate meeting.

Nelson pointed out that Dr. Yerg, Dean of the Graduate School, would meet with the Senate Curricular Policy Committee to discuss a Master of Science in Computer Science (Appendix B, Item #4 - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Dr. Young explained that "expressive writing" (Appendix B, Item 5 - Available by Request from the Senate Office) is done by an individual as a way of collecting his thoughts (this writing is not for evaluation purposes). Expressive writing is a part of the Writing Institutes being held for faculty on campus. Expressive writing serves as a means of getting students to write often. Input and cooperation from the Senate is welcomed.
B. Instructional Policy - No report. Proposal 25-78 will be submitted for consideration under New Business as an "Emergency Submission."

   The problems associated with the long drop period are being discussed by the committee.


D. Elections Committee - Givens distributed a report (Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

   It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to accept the report of the Elections Committee.

   It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried to destroy the ballots from the two elections conducted by the committee.

E. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association - See above.

F. Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and Development

   Erickson distributed copies of a report (Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Two proposals will be considered under New Business.

G. Senate Representation for Keweenaw Research Center

   Shetron distributed copies of a report (Appendix E - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Nelson pointed out a clarification on state money going to KRC (Appendix A, Item #7 - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The error resulted from a Research Division report.

Old Business - None

New Business

A. Proposal 22-78, Associate in Applied Science Degree in Mechanical Design Engineering Technology.

   It was moved and seconded that Proposal 22-78 be adopted.

   Miller asked about the distinction between the proposed program and the current MET program. Tampas pointed out that the proposed program will be oriented towards drafting; the MET program is oriented towards electrical control of mechanical devices.

   Nelson pointed out that, in the title of the program, "Engineering Technology" is needed for ECPD accreditation and "Mechanical Design" is needed to avoid competition with programs at other Michigan universities.

   Nufer expressed concern with only one HU/SS elective in the program. He pointed out that other universities require more of such electives in similar programs. Nelson pointed out that ECPD requires "at least one-fourth academic year of non-technical courses in oral and written communications and humanistic social sciences subjects exclusive of courses in physical education and ROTC." The Freshman English (HU 101-2-3), Speech (HU110), and HU/SS/BA elective total up to 15 credits; more than one-fourth of an academic year. Tampas pointed out that many community college two-year programs are pre-engineering programs; that at Michigan Tech are "terminal" or "stand alone" types of programs. A higher percentage of the credits in the proposed program are technical courses rather than HU/SS/BA courses because employees prefer this. Kauppila pointed out that the graduates of this program would be acting as "an engineer's right arm" and would have to be familiar with most of the specialty areas of the engineer. The courses specified in the program are a compromise. A student can elect more HU/SS courses; it is preferred to do this rather than force the student to take HU/SS courses.

   Proposal 22-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 17; Against - 2.

B. Proposal 23-78, Joint Committee on Relations Between the Senate and Faculty Association.

   It was moved and seconded that Proposal 23-78 be adopted.

   Erickson and Nelson explained that the proposal converts the temporary committee Roles of the Senate and the Faculty Association to a permanent committee with a new name. The committee structure will be consistent with Senate rules on standing committees.

   Proposal 23-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 18; Against - 0.

C. Proposal 24-78, Representation on the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties.
It was moved and seconded that Proposal 24-78 be adopted.

Erickson explained that the proposal spells out the selection procedures for two representatives to the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculty (AMCF) and also provides that the University pay their travel expenses for attendance at a minimum of four meetings of AMCF (estimated at $1,500 per year).

Nelson pointed out that AMCF provides information and insight on educational issues at the state level and contact with faculty at other universities and with executive budget personnel, legislators and their staffs. He also pointed out that G.R. Noble is the current Faculty Association representative to AMCF.

Daavettila stated that he has never seen any reports on meetings of AMCF. Nelson replied that the reports go to the Faculty Association and not to the Senate. This proposal will give the Senate access to the reports.

Pintar reported that the Faculty Association will continue to pay the annual AMCF dues as part of the joint agreement with the Senate. The dues are approximately $300 per year. A difficulty in the past was the travel expenses for attending the meetings; Noble was able to attend the meetings when other duties required travel to Lansing at the same time.

A question was raised on the number of institutions in AMCF. Erickson pointed out that most of the state supported colleges and universities are members. Daavettila questioned whether the information obtained will be different than what's already available. Nelson pointed out that the proposal provides for Senate input and involvement in AMCF. Pintar stated that AMCF also provides input into the budgeting process, formula funding, etc. V. Pres. Stein asked if AMCF has a staff. Pintar replied that he does not believe so; monitoring of the legislature is done by the League of Women Voters.

Proposal 24-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 15; Against - 0.


It was moved and seconded to consider Proposal 25-78 as an "emergency submission." The motion carried by the following vote: For - 18; Against - 2.

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 25-78 be adopted.

Sloan pointed out that the proposal is a modification of a previously defeated proposal. The Instructional Policy Committee had felt that the evening exam situation would have to get worse before the committee could resolve it. However, more problems were brought to the attention of the committee. The School of Business was having problems with its extended day courses and evening exams. The Humanities Department was also having problems and was considering dropping extended day courses. The committee attempted to reach a compromise: one hour is set aside for evening exams; the math courses now offered at that time could be taught earlier; the problem with athletics would be solved; regular evening exams would be scheduled through the cognizant administrative office (currently Scheduling); and other evening exams could be given but a make-up would be required for students with conflicts with extended day classes; and the policy protects the student with conflicts between exams and classes.

Butler reported that the School of Business has been trying to serve the local community by providing classes in the evening. A survey of an extended day class showed that 13 out of 44 students in the class replied that they would not be enrolled at all in college study if the extended day programs were not available at Michigan Tech. Twenty-five would not be enrolled in that class if it were not in the evening. The extended day program fits in with the role of the University.

Daavettila expressed the opposition of the Physics Department to the proposal. The time for exams (6-7pm) is too early. Physics prefers the current system.

Biesiot stated the School of Business is trying to serve the community. The extended day program does this. He suggested Saturday exams and make-up exams for students with conflicts.

Young stated that the current system puts the student in a situation where he has to choose between an exam and a class. There have been numerous conflicts between the humanities courses in the extended day program and evening exams in physics, engineering, and chemistry. Students are being forced to choose courses now.

Sloan pointed out that for this quarter the scheduling office listed the times for Chemistry and Physics exams and would not schedule students into extended day courses that conflicted with these. This minimized the problem during this quarter. The problem with athletics is also minimized since the athletes had to leave practice early for evening exams only a few times during the quarter.

Agin pointed out that during this quarter there was only one student with a conflict with any of the Physics evening exams (PH203, 204, 205, and 310) and an extended day course.

Nufer pointed out Social Science's concerns: exams that last one and a half hours; chemistry could "bump" any other exam just by its size; four hours per week is enough, especially for using Fisher 135 (Saturday exams would be a good alternative); and conflicts with evening exams prevented some students from taking some extended day courses this quarter.

It was moved and seconded to editorially amend Item #6 in the proposal to read:
6. Students required to take an evening exam shall be excused from another regularly scheduled class period in that same course.

The editorial amendment passed unanimously.

Sloan stated that current policy prohibits exams longer than one hour; the proposal will not do this but make-ups would be required for students with conflicts; scheduling can accomplish exam scheduling with the four hours per week; chemistry exams are always scheduled in advance because they need so much space.

Proposal 25-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 15; Against - 2.

The editorially amended proposal is as follows:

**PROPOSAL 25-78**

**EVENING EXAMS**

1. Senate Policies 6-69, Evening Exams, 3-70 Evening Examination Policy, and 2-74, Amendment to the Evening Examination Policy, are hereby revoked.
2. Regular evening exams by definition must be done through the cognizant administrative office to avoid conflicts and to allow effective use of University resources.
3. Priority of regular evening exams shall be given to the largest class sizes and to the lowest level courses.
4. Regular evening exams will be scheduled from 6 to 7 p.m. Monday through Thursday.
5. No classes will be scheduled from 6 to 7 p.m. Monday through Thursday.
6. Students required to take an evening exam shall be excused from another regularly scheduled class period in that same course.
7. Instructors scheduling evening examinations other than as described for regular evening examinations must provide alternate exams for students having class or exam conflicts.

In response to a question, Nelson stated that the proposal will not be implemented until approved by the President of the University.

E. Nominating Committee

Nelson stated the need for a nominating committee to come up with a slate of at least two candidates for each Senate Office: President, Vice President (also Representative to the Board of Control), and Secretary. The Committee should also come up with candidates for Chairperson of the Faculty Fringe Benefits Committee.

There were no volunteers for Chairperson or membership on the Nominating Committee. Pres. Nelson will appoint someone at a later time.

F. Senate Secretary.

Pintar made the following statement:

"As I am completing my year as Senate Secretary, I express my appreciation to Ms. Lori Joynt of the Employee Relations Office for her diligent efforts in transforming my scribblings of the minutes of the meetings into a well typed set of minutes.

I did not run for Senator-At-Large to sit behind this recording equipment serving as Secretary; therefore, I would like to announce that I will not be a candidate for Senate Secretary next year."

G. Miscellaneous

V. Pres. Stein commented on the concern expressed in the minutes of the last meeting by Sachs on the effect of the Union contract on the Academic Calendar and university holidays. Stein stated that if the Senate recommends a change in the Good Friday holiday, Mr. Gooch is willing to negotiate this with the AFSCME when the next contract renewal comes up in September, 1979. If that holiday can be moved to say, Christmas vacation, he will be very happy to follow through on that. It is not Mr. Gooch's intention that the Academic Calendar be built around the union contract.

Nufer inquired into the problem of a student having three final exams on one day - which department should give in on this? Nufer felt that the student's major department should make a change rather than a department "servicing" that student through an elective. Miller stated that under current policy a student may be required to take three exams on one day but not more than three. The student has no valid complaint if three are scheduled for one day. Nufer replied that scheduling is trying to avoid three or four exams on the same day. Social Sciences has students with three exams who want the social science instructor to allow the student to take the SS exam at some other time. Nufer felt that the student should go to his own department first. Several faculty felt that none of the exams should be changed if three exams on one day is the issue. Tampas and Nelson both replied that the student's own persuasiveness may be a factor in this.

President Nelson expressed his appreciation to the members of the Senate, to the Chairpersons of the Committees, and to the observers of various groups for the splendid work that they did during the year. He stated that he was very pleased
to serve with the Senate this year and that he felt that the Senate made much progress this year and passed many proposals which will have far-reaching, hopefully favorable, effects on the University. He thanked the Senators for their cooperation and for their efforts to attend the meetings.

As chairperson of last year's Nominating Committee, Carter thanked the offers and other candidates, especially the Senate Secretary, for agreeing to be on the ballot this year. He expressed the difficulty the committee had in filling the ballot positions for Secretary and recommended that the Senate help out the Nominating Committee in filling that position next year. Nelson commented that the Senate Secretary should not have to be an "Audio-Visual" expert. He recommended that some way be found for a non-Senator to be involved in the operation of the recording equipment and transcription of the tapes into minutes. He also stated that the position of Secretary is intended to be an "executive" position. The Secretary is responsible for maintain official Senate records and correspondence, for receiving proposals, and for receiving and issuing correspondence on proposals and on other Senate actions. Nufer, a former Senate Secretary, pointed out that the executive officer aspect of Secretary provides an opportunity for contact with the Administration and Committee Chairpersons and for insight into the operation of the Senate. He also commented on the "work" aspect of the job. He felt that it is probably the type of job that a person might take for only one year. Erickson, also a previous Senate Secretary, commented on the difficulty in meeting the fifteen day deadline for proposals and the ten days for getting out the Agenda. Nelson will make arrangements to have someone operate the recording equipment and to increase the amount of clerical support available to the Senate from the University. Nelson will try to have the position of Senate Secretary become a more truly executive position. He also pointed out that the Secretary is a member of the Senate Council, which makes all executive decisions for the Senate, formulates background statements on proposals, can instigate certain proposals that do not come from committee, and can recommend items for consideration by the committees for generation of committee proposals. He will try to eliminate the feeling that the position of Senate Secretary is a "drudge."

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Pintar
Secretary