MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 101
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

27 September 1978

(Senate Minute pages: 1476-1489)

Meeting No. 101 was called to order on Wednesday, September 27, 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-eight members or alternates were present. Absent were Adams (IWR), Heckel (MY), Shetron (FF), President Smith, and the senator from Forestry.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: Carl Bowman (Instructional Resources) was present to operate the recording equipment.

The Minutes of Meeting No. 100. It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried.

Minutes of the Emergency Meeting (May 19, 1978). (Available by Request from the Senate Office, pp. 1459-1463). It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved. The motion carried.

President's Report

President P. Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Nelson stated that he will add an item on the agenda under New Business at the request of Prof. Rakestraw (SS) concerning the presence of large numbers of Michigan Tech students on campus prior to Labor Day with little to occupy themselves, to the detriment of the neighborhood.

Nelson also stated that he will bring up an item under New Business on the possibility of establishing an ad hoc committee to look into the matter of Instructional Resources finding ways to publicize, to promote and to improve the usage of the instructional resources that are currently available or will soon be available.


Sachs commented that the attempt to make Weber's lot available for parking by part-time faculty has been unsuccessful. Vice Pres. Stein commented that there is no problem with parking in Weber's lot; the problem has to do with parking on the core campus.

V. Pres. Stein corrected two items (Item #4, p. 1465): the MTU over-all average salary increase was 9.19% not 9.5%; the 8% increase at Western was rejected and the actual number is still undetermined. The 6.9% figure for the state should be correct.

Reynolds asked if the identification of "high pressure areas" (Item #4, p. 1465) is new policy and if this refers to certain departments requiring greater salary increments. V. Pres. Stein replied that this probably was new policy; engineering as a whole, technology in the areas of civil engineering technology and mechanical design technology, and finance and accounting in the School of Business were high pressure areas. There was sufficient documentation to support this. If Michigan Tech is to remain competitive, it must respond to the marketplace. Chemical engineering was a particularly high pressure area. The deans made some of their own decisions on this even in the past; this is the first time the Vice President has done this.

Report on Meeting of the Board of Control.

Sachs commented that further investigation has shown that "Though paid sick leave is an improvement for the faculty, loss of a guarantee for personal leave is a setback." (Item #2, p. 1467). He stated that he interrogated Pres. Smith on this during the Humanities Department luncheon with the President and that Pres. Smith expressed no awareness of this change. Sachs stated his regret for Pres. Smith not being present to respond. Sachs commented that the change is serious because it is now possible for a department head to remove a tenured, female faculty member if she requests personal leave because of pregnancy. Sachs also stated that he knows of no faculty input into establishing this policy. Sachs also stated his disappointment in Pres. Smith not even being aware of this change. A number of female faculty members have expressed their concern to Sachs on this subject. Mr. Gooch has verified to Sachs that the reported change is accurate.

Sachs corrected a misspelling of "touchy" (Item #6, p. 1468). Sachs also pointed out a typographical error that should read $400,000 (Item #2, p. 1467).

Election of Nominees for the University Sabbatical Leave Committee

The names of B.M. Hamil (GE) and M.A. Goksel (IMR) were added to the list after the agenda was sent out. It was moved, seconded, and carried to close nominations.

This election and all subsequent elections were conducted by V. Snyder, C. Givens, and P. Tampas.
The remaining items on the agenda were considered while this and the other elections were being completed.

Before the results of the first ballot were revealed, it was agreed that if no one receives a majority on the first ballot then the two lowest vote-getters would be dropped from the ballot and another vote would be taken.

Ballot results available by Request from the Senate Office (P. 1478)

Givens, Nufer, and Ruotsala were declared elected and their names will be submitted to the President as Nominees for the University Sabbatical Leave Committee.

It was moved, seconded, and carried that the ballots be destroyed.

Election of Officers (pp. 1478-1479)

Paul A. Nelson was declared the winner of the election for President and will continue as Senate President (Vote tallies available by Request from the Senate Office).

Harley A. Sachs was declared the winner of the election for Vice President and will continue as Senate Vice President (Vote tallies available by Request from the Senate Office).

Martha A. Sloan was declared the winner of the election for Secretary and will assume the duties as Secretary at the next meeting. (Vote tallies available by Request from the Senate Office).

It was moved, seconded, and carried to destroy all the ballots.

Tenth Annual Report to the Faculty - No report was available for this meeting.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Nelson reported that the Department of Mathematical and Computer Science is preparing a proposal for a Master of Science in Computer Science degree program. The Curricular Policy Committee will study this in the next few weeks and may have a proposal related to this for the next meeting.

B. Instructional Policy

Sloan reported that the committee's backlog has been handled. New items now being studied are Exam Scheduling for Winter Quarter (as a result of Winter Carnival and the rule on no exams during the last week, only four days are available for exams during a three-week period) and Audit Grades (no credit is received by any department for an audit student enrolled in a course).


D. Elections Committee - The committee conducted the elections at the meeting.

E. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association

Erickson reported that Proposal 23-78 and 24-78 were approved by President Smith with the exception that the University will not pay travel expenses for attendance at meetings of the Association of Michigan Collegiate Faculties (See App. A, Item #3 - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Nelson stated that under Proposal 23-78 the Committee on Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association would become the Joint Committee on Relations Between the Senate and Faculty Association. Erickson replied that she will officially notify the Presidents of the Senate and Faculty Association that it is necessary to appoint this committee. Nelson asked Erickson to serve temporarily as chairperson of the committee; she agreed.

Sachs stated that he had asked Pres. Smith why the travel money was not approved since this meant that MTU could not really be represented in AMCF without this. According to Sachs, Pres. Smith replied that support for academic purposes will be supported. Sachs interpreted this to mean that the President does not recognize travel to AMCF as fulfilling an academic purpose. Sachs questioned the effect of this on "collegiality" at Michigan Tech. Sachs also commented that perhaps the next President will take a softer approach and we may have to wait a year on this but he hopes the President will change his mind. Sachs stressed the importance of MTU's membership in AMCF. Sachs finally expressed his hope that our representation wins the confidence of the administration and that the administration should recognize that the faculty will not "sell the University, its faculty, or its administration down the river or misrepresent the University in AMCF."

F. Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and Development

V. Pres. Stein stated that Civil Engineering and Social Sciences do not have new promotion criteria accepted.
Sachs asked if one is obliged to be promoted or cannot one stop when the level of competence is reached. He questioned the need for everyone to be "promotable" since there are a limited number of openings for dean, etc. and a university does not want to be "tenured up with full professors." Miller replied that the committee is looking for suggestions in this area - should non-promotable people not be given tenure as a way of eliminating non-promotable people or should they be promoted for the competencies that they do have even if these are not research competencies? V. Pres. Stein commented that a "cure" for this would be to make everyone a full professor if the only objective is to find a "cure." Miller replied that this is not the intent of the committee report.

G. Senate Representation for Keweenaw Research Center

No report - Shetron absent. Nelson reported that the matter is in abeyance until certain questions are resolved.

Old Business

Nelson reported that a chairperson is needed for the Committee on Fringe Benefits. Items such as sick leave for pregnancy, low tuition education for dependents of faculty, health insurance, life insurance, and others can be studied by the committee. There were no volunteers for chairperson; one will be sought by the Senate President before the next meeting.

New Business

A. Proposal 1-79, University Planning Committee.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried to consider Proposal 1-79 as an emergency submission.

It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 1-79.

Thompson asked why there would be two undergraduate students and only one graduate student on the committee when there are a number of committees on campus trying to develop the graduate program. Nelson replied that he patterned the proposed committee after Committees A, B, and C which had no graduate students and that he actually had added representation for graduate students. The reason for two undergraduates and only one graduate student is related to the enrollments of the two groups. Even by 1985, 10% or less will be graduate students.

Pintar asked about the possibility of an impasse between the President of the University and the Senate President in selecting the faculty committee members. Nelson replied that this would indicate a serious problem and the matter would have to be referred to the Senate. The procedure is similar to that for the Ombudsman Appointing Committee where three people have to agree. It should be possible for agreement on six people from the large number of nominees. Nelson did not expect an impasse. V. Pres. Stein commented that the proposal reflects a request for the Administration and Senate to work together; if they do not or cannot, the whole planning process will not work. Furthermore, if they cannot agree on a chairperson for the committee from the entire university community, there is a much bigger problem and the whole thing will not work anyway.

Hauge commented that, even though his department has not carried out an organized discussion of the proposal, he has received some negative comments on whether it is wise for the President of the Senate to be able to veto the members from the Administration selected by the President of the University. Hauge felt that the President of the University should be able to select these. Nelson replied that both the Administration and the Faculty are responsible for making this committee work and that the proposal represents a good way of balancing the "conflicting objectives." Hauge stated that the President of the University very likely has people who deal with the types of problems dealt with by the proposed committee and that he would want them on the committee. Hauge suggested that the President of the University select the administrative people and that the Senate President propose academic faculty subject to the approval of the Senate.

Hauge moved to change Proposal 1-79 section (e) from "selected jointly by the President of the University and the President of the Senate" to "selected by the President of the University." Hauge also wanted to remove the requirement of a fixed term and have the administrative members serve at the will of the President. Nelson replied that the committee will last at least until 1985 and that past experience has shown that some administrative committee appointees serve for a long time without being able to get off the committee. Furthermore, Nelson stated the need for a gradual rotation of membership without the President being able to "fire" an administrative member from the committee. Nelson also stated that the request of the Senate since 1963 to have five-year terms for Department Heads is an indication of the need for fixed terms for the administrative members of the committee.

V. Pres. Stein stated the importance of both Presidents participating in the selection of both the administrative and faculty members of the committee since each group has the responsibility for making the planning process work. It is very easy to develop an adversary relationship; this proposal allows each group to be represented and still be looking out for the good of the University. The proposal allows for an orderly turnover on the committee while properly maintaining continuity. New people bring in new ideas; the old members know why certain things have already been done. An exchange of ideas and information will occur. The committee will not be effective if an adversary relationship develops and the University will not prosper. The proposal attempts to get the President of the University and the President of the Senate to work together.

Kraft seconded the motion to amend Section (e).
Hauge questioned the wisdom of the Senate President being able to veto the appointment of a highly-ranked administrator to the committee. Nelson restated his support of the proposal as written. Carter stated that the process of selection would foster a "give and take" situation between the two Presidents and could lead to better relationships between the administration and the faculty. It was also stated that bringing up the past produces negative results at the start and continues an adversary relationship and that the proposal be accepted as it is.

Alexander commented that he is worried about the casual reference to responsibility in the discussion of the proposal. He expressed doubts about who would be responsible and accountable under the proposal; there is no clear cut responsibility. He also stated that the faculty may view the selection process as two "king makers" dividing up the list; some faculty may object to this. Nelson replied that the advantage of selecting from a list rather than direct election is the possibility of avoiding difficulties associated with providing representation for the various departments, schools, colleges, and research agencies; for junior and senior faculty; for males and females; etc. The proposal would have to be much more complex if a direct election process were established. Alexander stated that these problems will still be present even if the selection is done by the two Presidents.

The amendment to Proposal 1-79, Section (e) was defeated by the following vote: For - 6; Against - 21.

Hauge stated that the Senate should be involved in the approval of the Senate President's choices. Nelson responded that each department, division, or agency would submit the name of one academic faculty member for the list of nominees; the selection would be made from this list.

Proposal 1-79 was adopted by the following vote: For - 26; Against - 0.

Nelson restated Prof. Rakestraw's concern about the students being on campus between registration and Labor Day with little to do. Nelson interpreted this as a request for a rearrangement of the academic calendar. Nelson stated that the Senate has the sole right to initiate changes in the academic calendar. After some discussion it was moved, seconded, and carried to refer the whole question of the academic calendar to the Instructional Policy Committee for thorough study.

Nelson suggested that an ad hoc committee on Instructional Resources be formed for one year for the purpose of studying, promoting, and marketing the use of the facilities at Instructional Resources. Dr. Kuipers has requested advice in this area and Instructional Resources has requested some publicity. New technology in this area is not being used as effectively or as widely as it could be. Some technology that is currently available elsewhere is not available at Michigan Tech and could be acquired and used productively. The committee could aid in dissemination of information in this area and could initiate discussion and surveys on this subject.

It was moved, seconded and carried to establish an ad hoc Senate Instructional Resources Committee to study the potential and to promote the use of instructional resources for one year; the Senate President would appoint the chairperson and the chairperson would appoint the members.

Hauge asked about the distinction between Extended Day Classes and Continuing Education Classes. Some concern has been expressed by Social Sciences faculty that the extended day has resulted in a loss of revenue for a faculty member when there is a conflict between an extended day class and a continuing education class; teaching of continuing education classes is comparable to consulting work in engineering. Lide stated that she has been told that it is illegal for a full-time faculty member to receive extra compensation for teaching a continuing education class; this falls under the "anti double-dipping rule." She had to cancel a Swedish class even though there was a demand in the community for the class. This eliminates the possibility of supplementation of income as a substitute for consulting fees.

V. President Stein stated that there are two problems associated with Continuing Education: control of course content for courses with regular numbers and the rate of pay. Accepting such a course by the University poses a problem if the course content differs between the continuing education course and the regular academic course. Prof. Rakestraw had previously raised the issue that the University academic arm should control the salary for teaching such courses even though the work was done for Public Services in a course in which the academic arm had no control over content and yet would be held responsible for it.

Lide questioned the right of some faculty to receive pay for consulting and yet others cannot receive extra pay for teaching continuing education courses. She also stated that faculty have been encouraged to become involved in community affairs and to bring the community closer to the University. V. Pres. Stein stated the need for guidelines in this area; the salary could be negotiated with Public Services. He restated his concern over content for continuing education courses. Some faculty have felt taken advantage of because of the lower pay for teaching continuing education courses. There was additional discussion on course content and salary related to continuing education courses.

V. Pres. Stein clarified the "double dipping rule." University resources cannot be used for salary enhancement by overtime, research grants, etc. Drawing the line between justified extra compensation from a research grant and excessive compensation and neglect of one's University duties would be difficult. It would be bad practice to allow university resources to be used for salary enhancement. Serious abuses have occurred at other universities. A full-time faculty member at Michigan Tech cannot receive extra compensation for teaching a continuing education course.
Alexander commented that the faculty complained about low pay for teaching such courses and the end result under current policy is zero pay. V. Pres. Stein commented that he feels "whipsawed" from both sides on this question and would like this issue to be addressed by the Instructional Policy Committee.

Tampas asked about the policy on providing short duration technical courses upon request. Must this be done at no extra pay to the faculty member or can this be treated as consulting? V. Pres. Stein replied that there could not be extra pay if it was done through Michigan Tech. Tampas stated that some short courses will be provided to high school students using University facilities; his understanding of the policy on this is that this would have to be done as part of the faculty member's regular teaching load and there would be no extra pay. Stein replied that, if the money for providing these courses is paid to the University, there could be no extra pay for teaching such courses. The same policy applies to research contracts; the money is paid to the University and, therefore, no extra pay can be given to the faculty member involved. Stein also stated that, if a faculty member taught such a course at some industrial site on Saturday, then this could be treated as consulting and the faculty member could be paid by the company involved. Providing that such faculty members still fulfill their obligations to the University, up to one day a week can be spent in such activities. Allison asked if teaching courses of this type could be handled through released time with the department paying full salary and the faculty member spending part time teaching in continuing education. Stein stated that this is the procedure for extended day classes. Alexander asked if the administration is considering the phasing out of continuing education and, if not, it should. Stein did not know the present status of the administration's views on this.

Alexander suggested that Lide teach her Swedish course as a private arrangement with the interested people from the community.

It was moved, seconded, and carried to refer this whole matter of continuing education classes to the Instructional Policy Committee.

Pintar commented on some of the difficulties associated with preparing Senate minutes and other materials. Nelson will discuss this matter with appropriate officials in the administration and try to make things easier for the Senate Secretary.

Kraft introduced concerns associated with the disruption of multi-section courses by K-Day. It had been suggested to him that K-Day be moved to a weekend. Nelson replied that this had been discussed at a Senate meeting a year ago. Sloan stated that, as a result, K-Day was moved up one week earlier and that this eliminated the many problems associated with exams. At that same Senate meeting there was an overwhelming vote against moving K-Day to a Saturday. The Instructional Policy Committee will study this matter if it appears necessary.

The meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Pintar
Secretary