MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 103
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

13 December 1978

(Senate Minute pages: 1500-1534)

Meeting No. 103 was called to order on Wednesday, December 13, 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 Alexander (BA), Kapp (PE), Naegele (Grad. Student), and Tampas (AT).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: Faculty members Naresh, Jotwani, Karl Ottenstein, Linda Ottenstein, and Lloyd Heldt were present. Carl Bowman of Instructional Resources was present to operate the recording equipment.

The Minutes of Meeting No. 102. President Smith gave the following statement: Under New Business on page 1493, paragraph D of the minutes of meeting No. 102, October 25, 1978, the clear implication is that I reject a large number of Senate proposals. This is an inaccurate reflection of the real situation.

I would like to quote from page 1423 of the minutes of meeting No. 99, March 15, 1978:

Between April 5, 1976 and January 25, 1978, 111 proposals were introduced in the Senate. Of these 111, the Senate adopted 82. Of these 82, Administration action was required on 75. Of these 75, 60 have already been approved, 5 have not yet been acted on, 6 were approved after minor modifications in wording were made, 2 were approved after substantive changes were made, 1 was approved only in part, and 1 was disapproved outright. I think this record indicates that the Administration takes the Senate seriously.

Specifically in paragraph D of the minutes of the last meeting, I noted the following quote:

Alexander noted that in his earlier term in the Senate proposals from the Senate Curricular Policy Committee were passed unanimously several times and vetoed by the President every time. He would debate the issues with President Smith on the Senate floor and win the debate, but it would make no difference in the decisions.

Certainly a significant number of faculty could interpret this to mean that all of the Senate Curricular Policy Committee proposals to the Senate were approved unanimously and all were rejected by me during Senator Alexander's term on the committee.

I checked the Senate minutes during Senator Alexander's term on the committee from February 1968 until the Spring of 1975. During that period 22 proposals were considered. Two were bookkeeping matters which the Senate did not ask for my approval; one never emerged from the Instructional Policy Committee after having been referred there by the Senate; three were implemented under other Senate proposal numbers; one was rejected by the Senate; one I deferred action on; fifteen were approved (one with modification by me). In short, out of 22, I deferred action on only one, which could be construed as a rejection.

The minutes of the Senate should, to the extent possible, convey accurate information to the Faculty.

Tenth Annual Report to the Faculty. This report which had been distributed to the faculty was adopted by the Senate.

President's Report

President Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Attached to the President's Report were a memo from Senator Alexander reporting on the Presidential search activities of the Academic Community Committee and a 1978-79 distribution of academic salaries of full-time faculty.

Lloyd Heldt was present to discuss the report to the Senate of the University Sabbatical Leave Committee; the report is attached as Appendix B (Available by Request from the Senate Office). Heldt noted that external funds are not prerequisite to a sabbatical leave. He stated that action on a sabbatical request is usually rapid and the situation is flexible because the committee is aware that opportunities can arise rapidly. Lide commented on the desirability of full funding for a one quarter sabbatical. She stated that a one quarter sabbatical could be highly productive and that the current policy could be highly discriminatory against departments such as Humanities that have few sources of funding. Heldt indicated that there was a proposal from the Academic Council to the Senate on this matter and noted that the summer quarter can be used for creative purposes. Lide pointed out that research in Humanities ordinarily requires travel to a library and hence additional funds are usually needed especially by faculty with families. President Nelson asked Lide to discuss this with Senator R. Miller, Chairman, Senate Committee on Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and Development.


Copies were distributed of a report on the meeting of November 7 (Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office), minutes of the meeting of November 7 (Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office), and a report on the meeting of December 5 (Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Reports were written by Vice-
President Sachs; the minutes were reportedly taken by Dr. Kuipers. Sachs asked the Senate to compare the two versions of the meetings. Pintar stated that he prefers the longer reports. Carter suggested that Sachs use a tape recorder to lessen the chance of errors. Sloan noted the senators would probably prefer to consider these reports after the meeting, but that her initial reaction was that the Kuipers’ minutes merely listed some items, such as summer session, whereas the Sachs' report conveyed the flavor of the discussion. Sachs said he tries to convey the nature and character of the meeting. He noted that V.P. Stein helps point out errors that might occur in his reports.

Report on Meeting of the Board of Control.

A report of the meeting of December 7, 1978, is attached as Appendix G (Available by Request from the Senate Office). Sachs noted that he focuses on items not previously reported to the Gazette or Tech Topics and of interest to faculty.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

President Nelson presented the report of the Curricular Policy Committee, attached as Appendix H (Available by Request from the Senate Office). The report pertained to proposals 2-79, 3-79 and 4-79, listed under New Business.

B. Instructional Policy

Sloan presented the report attached as Appendix I (Available by Request from the Senate Office). The committee asks each departmental senator to hold a meeting in his or her department to discuss the calendar and to send a written report to the Instructional Policy Committee. The committee hopes to identify problems associated with the calendar to serve as a rationale for considering changes in the calendar.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Sachs presented the report of the Institutional Evaluation Committee (Appendix J - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The committee had been charged with recommending strategy for dealing with proposals which had been passed by the Senate, but not acted upon by the University President, rejected without reasons being given, amended, or approved but either not implemented or delayed indefinitely. The committee recommended five levels of action beginning with a listing in the Senate President's report of proposals that had not been approved and finally ending with a vote of censure. Sachs noted that there were judicious delays built into the recommendations and that he felt the Senate might not want to adopt them lest it lose flexibility in a future situation. President Smith objected to the first paragraph of the report as being strongly pejorative. He commented that his record of responding to proposals was outstanding.

Nelson asked for comments on the five levels of action. He first asked if anyone disagreed with Level 1, recommending that the Senate President list in his own report to the Senate proposals that have not yet been approved as is currently done. There was no objection. He then asked if there were objections to the second level of action, having the Senate President remind the President of the University before the next Senate meeting that he has not yet responded to certain proposals and that a reply is expected. Carter objected to this as nagging; President Smith concurred. President Smith further stated that he felt the recommendations were unnecessary because the events described never happened.

Sachs: These things have happened. We've had the patent policy . . . they have been important.

Smith: You've had proposals rejected very infrequently. But not that you didn't get an answer.

Sachs: We have two that are pending now that are quite important . . . How about our committee on the budget? . . .

Smith: We don't have a university budget committee.

Sachs: Who makes the budget for the university?

Smith: All the people in the university make the budget from the departments . . . I don't know what input of faculty there is in the departments . . . Mr. Eilola puts all that material together and that budget is submitted to the Executive Committee . . .

Nelson then asked President Smith about Proposal 18-78, Senate Committee on the University Budget, and Proposal 1-79, University Planning Committee. President Smith stated that "These are two that I must have missed," and promised an answer back by the next week.

D. Elections Committee

Snyder presented a copy of the Senate Election Committee, dated May 15, 1978. The committee received 245 valid and 7 invalid ballots. The results were L.R. Laub 85, P.A. Nelson 161, G.F. Reynolds 106, A.C. Vicory 73. Nelson and Reynolds were declared elected as members at large of the Michigan Tech Senate.

E. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association - No Report.
F. Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and Development - Miller reported that he needed input from Humanities on the subject of sabbatical leave. Lide will provide input.

G. Senate Representation for Keweenaw Research Center - Nelson reported for Shetron. The key problem seems to be how the Senate should be.

H. Faculty Handbook.

Pintar distributed copies of a report (Appendix K - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The committee is meeting bi-weekly to review and to revise the MTU Handbook for Academic Faculty.

I. Faculty Fringe Benefits

Reynolds distributed copies of a report attached as Appendix L - Available by Request from the Senate Office. The most urgent problem is retirement benefits under TIAA-CREF which will be adversely affected as social security taxes rise rapidly in the coming years.

I. Instructional Resources. - No Report.

Old Business - None

New Business

A. Proposal 2-79, Commitment to Develop a Master of Science Degree Program.

BACKGROUND:

Senate Proposal 7-78, General Policy for Academic Program Planning, requires Senate action prior to initiating State of Michigan procedures for requesting new degree programs. The Senate Curricular Policy Committee recommends that the following program be developed. The Faculty of the Department of Mathematical and Computer Sciences has endorsed the development of this program.

PROPOSAL:

The Senate of Michigan Technological University endorses the development of a Master of Science in Computer Science degree program. The curriculum developed under this proposal must be processed in accordance with Senate Proposal 10-70, Procedures for Developing Significant Changes in the Academic Program.

The proposal passed 25-0.

B. Proposal 3-79, Commitment to Develop of Polymer Engineering Option in the Bachelor of Science in Engineering Degree Program.

BACKGROUND:

Senate Proposal 7-78, General Policy for Academic Program Planning, requires Senate action prior to initiating State of Michigan procedures for requesting new degree programs. The Senate Curricular Policy Committee endorses, in principle, the following program provided that evidence of faculty support can be obtained.

PROPOSAL:

The Senate of Michigan Technological University endorses the entry of a Polymer Engineering option in the Bachelor of Science in Engineering Degree Program. The curriculum developed under this program must be processed in accordance with Senate Proposal 10-70, Procedures for Developing Significant Changes in the Academic Program.

Discussion ensued on the need for this proposal. As noted in the report of the Senate Curricular Policy Committee, this proposal is an endorsement for the State Board of Education. Schultz questioned the appropriateness of an undergraduate versus a graduate program. Heckel wondered whether Tech had the resources for this program. Stein commented that this proposal represents an opportunity to explore a program; it in no way indicates final endorsement by the Senate or by the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs; it is merely a preliminary look. An amendment was moved rewording the proposal to read "The Senate of Michigan Technological University endorses the entry of a Polymer Engineering option in the Bachelor of Science in Engineering Degree Program." Nelson ruled this an editorial change. The amendment passed 25-0.

The proposal passed 25-0.

C. Proposal 4-79, Commitment to Develop a Bachelor of Science in Scientific and Technical Communications Degree Program.

BACKGROUND:
Senate Proposal 7-78, General Policy for Academic Program Planning, requires Senate action prior to initiating State of Michigan procedures for requesting new degree programs. The Senate Curricular Policy Committee recommends that the following program be developed. The Faculty of the Department of Humanities has endorsed development of this program.

PROPOSAL:

The Senate of Michigan Technological University endorses the development of a Bachelor of Science in Scientific and Technical Communications degree program. The curriculum developed under this proposal must be processed in accordance with Senate Proposal 10-70, Procedures for Developing Significant Changes in the Academic Program.

Miller asked how this differed from an option. Lide pointed out that a degree is more attractive to employers.

The proposal passed 27-0.

D. Stein reported that Gooch is concerned with comments made by the Senate Instructional Policy Committee on the effect of holidays on the academic program. He would like to dialog with the committee. Nelson referred this to the Instructional Policy Committee.

E. Schultz asked the Instructional Policy Committee to look at courses involving laboratory or field work for safety considerations. Sloan stated that this was a matter of curriculum and would be more appropriately referred to the Senate Curricular Policy Committee. Nelson referred it to the Curricular Policy Committee.

F. Nelson, at a faculty member’s request, read from a memo by Dean Powers on the summer session indicating that the hours in an academic year have now risen to 1512. Prior to 1976, the academic year was considered to be 1320 hours and in 1976 this was increased to 1440. Stein is to check on the reason for this; he indicated that he thought the number came from calculating the number of hours starting one week prior to fall quarter through commencement in the spring. This was referred to the Instructional Policy Committee.

G. Snyder inquired about university policy on copyrights. Schultz noted that a computer program developed at MTU had recently been patented. Miller stated that the Faculty Association has made available standardized forms of copyright releases. Snyder said that it takes time to secure releases and wondered if the University could set up an office for this. Stein commented that faculty could do this themselves. This was referred to the Instructional Resources Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Sloan
Secretary