MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 43
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

22 January 1969

(Senate Minute pages: 383-394)

The meeting opened at 7:05 p.m., Wednesday January 22, 1969, in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union, Senate President M.W. Bredekamp presiding.

The roll was taken. 26 members were present. (Quorum 20). Members absent were Barstow (BA), Kennedy (IMR), Ortner (Math), Sachs (Hum.), Smith (Admin.)

Minutes of Meeting No. 42

The minutes of Meeting No. 42 were accepted as previously distributed.

Senate President's Report

A. Appointment: Professor D. Thayer was appointed as Senator-at-Large to replace Professor G.W. Boyd.

B. Parliamentarian: Professor P. Shandley has consented to act as Parliamentarian for the Senate.

C. History of the Senate

President Bredekamp reported the Council's recommendation that the History of the Senate be brought up to date periodically along with the Senate Procedures. He read a copy of the current procedures as taken from the By-Laws. This document is included as Appendix A (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

D. Administrative Action on Senate Proposals

Two proposals from the Senate had not been acted upon by the Administration. These were the Policy on Special Lectures and Faculty Attendance at Professional Meetings. President Bredekamp read a communication from Dr. Smith in which he stated in effect that he agreed with the recommendations, but that both were subject to budgetary limitations.

E. Inter-Faculty Association Meeting

President Bredekamp acknowledged receipt of an announcement of a meeting of the IFA which was held in November in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Old Business

A. Instructional Policy Committee. Senator R. Hennessy, chairman, reported for the committee.

1. Hennessy requested an indication from the Senate as to whether there was a serious objection to the Basic Philosophy of the Committee and the Philosophy under which they would frame their policies. There were no serious objections voiced at this time. It was clarified that the Senate had not adopted the Philosophy of the Committee as an official policy.

2. Hennessy introduced Mr. James Boyd of the Student Council and invited him to express the students’ opinions of the various academic proposals on the agenda. Mr. Boyd's first remarks were directed toward the "Pass-Fail" Policy. He suggested that the program be made available to Juniors and Seniors with a 2.25 GPA rather than 2.50, to Sophomores with a 2.75 GPA, and to Freshman with a 3.00 GPA. Mr. Boyd's next remarks were directed toward the "Curtailment of Academic Activities." He indicated that a Spring Quarter break would be a highly desirable inclusion in the academic calendar in the future.

3. Proposal 3-69 Lecture-Recitation

Hennessy moved that the Senate recommend to the President that the formal distinction between "lecture" and "recitation" be discontinued and that the term "class" be substituted. The vote was taken by a show of hands. 18-Yes, 8-No or Not voting.
Proposal 3-69 was Adopted by this action.

4. Proposal 4-69 Honors Program

The following motion was made by Hennessy: "The Instructional Policy Committee moves that an Honors Program be established within the University and that an ad hoc committee study the details of the program." The vote was taken by a show of hands. 21 - Yes, 5 - No or not voting.

The proposal was approved with changes from the original copy; therefore, it will appear on the Agenda of Meeting No. 44 for possible adoption.

5. Proposal 5-69 Curtailment of Academic Activities

Hennessy moved that the Senate adopt a philosophical position as follows:

"While we realize that certain extra-curricular activities are vital to the students' total education and that some instructors may choose to schedule examinations and other class work so as to accommodate activities such as homecoming, winter carnival, and other major events, we also recognize that both the student's and the instructor's primary commitment is to formal education and we fully respect the right of instructors to schedule examinations and class work during the regularly scheduled school year without regard to the student's extra-curricular activities, that it is the student's obligation to schedule his time accordingly. We recommend against any curtailment of classes in addition to those presently scheduled so long as the educational objective of the various curricula remain unchanged."

Senator Price suggest that the committee change the grammatical construction of this proposal. The vote on the motion was taken by a show of hands. 16 - Yes, 10 - No or not voting.

Proposal 5-69 was Adopted by this action.

6. Proposal 7-69 Final Examinations

Hennessy moved that the policy on final examinations be adopted as follows:

1. The term "final examination" is defined as an examination to be given during a special examination period at the end of the term regardless of whether it is comprehensive or incremental and no administrative regulation should attempt to govern the content of such an examination. However, if only one examination, either comprehensive or incremental, is to be given during the period covered by the last regularly scheduled week of the term and final examination week, it should be given during the final examination period.

2. After consultation with the teaching staff, department heads designate all courses or sections of courses in which final examinations are (to be) given. These examinations are then scheduled for the final week of the term by the Final Examination Committee. In general, a comprehensive final examination designed to measure the student's overall knowledge is considered to be good pedagogic policy.

3. The University shall not schedule nor shall the student participate in any official function during the scheduled final examination period. Exemption to this prohibition occurs for those events the date of which the University cannot control.

4. No regular instruction is to be continued during the final examination period except that the final examination period assigned each course can be used for instruction at the instructor's discretion.

5. Recognizing the need of the student to prepare for final examinations, no final examination will be given earlier than the regular final examination week. Special final examinations necessitated by illness, storms, hockey games, etc. will not be given at an earlier time than that scheduled for the final examination in that course.

6. The question of exemption from final examinations for seniors in their last quarter of work shall be decided by the degree granting department and the specific instructor involved in each course, the concurrence of both being necessary to support an excuse from taking a final examination.

Amendment No. 1: Freyberger moved that the motion be amended to read that no more than two examinations be scheduled in one day and that a two-hour reading period be allowed between examinations under normal schedules.

The vote on the amendment was taken by a show of hands: 16 - No, 10 - Yes or Not Voting. Amendment defeated.

Amendment No. 2: Freyberger moved that the motion be amended to read that the finals be limited to three per day.
The vote on the amendment was taken by a show of hands. 14 - Yes, 5 - No, 7 - Not Voting. Amendment carried.

The vote on Proposal 7-69 as amended was taken by a show of hands. 15 - Yes, 6 - No, 5 - Not Voting. The proposal was approved as amended so that it will appear on the agenda of Meeting No. 44 for possible adoption.

7. Proposal 6-69 Evening Examinations

Hennessy moved that the following policy be adopted:

A.

1. Evening exams should be used only in courses with large enrollment, in which all students will take the same exam, and in which it is not educationally expedient to give the exam during a regularly scheduled class period.
2. Students required to take an evening exam shall be excused from the regularly scheduled class period(s) immediately preceding or following the exam.
3. Evening exams may be given only on Wednesday or Thursday evenings. In general, to avoid undue interference with students' preparation for other courses, any two-hour evening exam should be given in one-hour segments on different evenings.
4. An instructor wishing to give an evening exam shall clear the date, time, and room to insure that conflicts are not created. The details of this process will be developed by the cognizant administrative office.

B.

That provided the resolution is amended to include the student body, the Senate endorse Art. 4 Para. B (1) and B (2), page 319 of the Senate Minutes in principle. However, with reference to Para. B (2) once policies are developed in an interaction between the faculty, student body, and University administrators, it is the responsibility of all to function in accordance with the spirit of such policies.

Amendment No. 1: Senator Lucier moved that special evening examinations should not be scheduled prior to 6:30 p.m. The vote on the amendment was taken by a show of hands. 21 - Yes, 5 - No or not voting. Amendment carried.

Amendment No. 2: Senator Oswald moved that in paragraph (A.3) change "should to "shall" and delete the words "In general." the vote on the amendment was taken by a show of hands. 20 - Yes, 6 No.

8. Proposal 8-69 Advanced Placement

Hennessy moved that the following statement regarding Advanced Placement and Accelerated Progress Toward a Baccalaureate Degree be adopted:

The Senate endorses the concept of advanced placement based on student ability.

Further, a degree being the institution's way of communicating the idea of a general level of education, it should either award credits for the courses waived in advanced placement or reduce the number of course credits required of the individual for graduation.

In those cases where credit is awarded for courses taken at MTU while the student was still in high school, the Department that presented the course will confirm the validity of the grade before it is used in computing the student's overall grade point average. It will be used, if confirmed. If only advanced placement is involved, the grade will not be used.

The detailed procedures required to implement this policy, including the basis for determination of student qualification, should be solely a departmental matter, except that no student will be forced to accept advanced placement, or to follow honors programs or other forms of accelerated education that may be adopted.

As a corollary to the above, there should be flexibility in the means by which an individual student can, at any time, present evidence of a suitable command of a subject and receive credit for it; individual study and request for examination is an example.

Amendment No. 1: Senator Price moved that the second paragraph be changed to read: ". . . advanced placement if the courses in question are those in which either skill or acquisition of actual knowledge is the sole purpose of the course or reduce the number . . . " The vote on the amendment was taken by a show of hands. 6 - Yes, 15 - No, 5 - Not voting. Amendment defeated.

The vote on Proposal 8-69 was taken by a show of hands. 19 - Yes, 1 - No, 6 - Not voting.
Proposal 8-69 was adopted by this Action.

B. Curricular Policy Committee. Senator Freyberger, chairman, reported for the Committee.

Freyberger moved adoption of the "Pass-Fail" Grading System for Undergraduate Students as follows:

I. Purpose. The purpose of the Pass-Fail grading system for undergraduates at Michigan Tech is to encourage above average students to explore areas of study outside of their major field, without the pressure of competition for a letter grade. Under no circumstances is it to serve as a means of by-passing difficult courses in the student's major field.

It is hoped that superior students will avail themselves of this opportunity to broaden their education by taking courses suggested by their own personal interests or recommended to them as being advantageous to their development

II. Opportunity. This option is available to Juniors and Seniors with a GPA of 2.5 or higher, and to Freshmen and Sophomores with a GPA of 3.0 or higher. It is available to the student only after one term of residence in the University.

III. Application. The courses available under this option are elective courses exclusive of all courses specifically named by the student's major Department as required for a degree, or otherwise excluded by the Department. Also excluded are the core requirements in the humanities and social science areas.

IV. Approval. Courses will be elected with the approval of the advisor. Generally, normal prerequisites will be required. If the student is deficient in these prerequisites, the advisor would contact the instructor in question and ask his approval for the student's registration in the course.

V. Credit Limitation. A student will be allowed to take a maximum of one course per quarter to a total of 6 courses.

VI. Time Limitation. The student would have one week after classes commence to change his registration (pass-fail versus letter grade). After that time, no change in registration (pass-fail versus letter grade) would be permitted. Normal drop privileges would still apply, however.

VII. Instructor Notice. With the distribution of the second class list for the term, the instructor would be informed of the students registered in his course under the pass-fail option.

VIII. Grading. A "Pass" grade would be given for performance equal to a letter grade of A to C. A "Fail" grade would be given for a letter grade of D or F. If a "Pass" grade is received, the course credits would count toward graduation, but neither the "Pass" nor the "Fail" grade would be counted in calculating the GPA.

IX. Trial Basis. The committee recommends that this Pass-Fail option be established on a trial basis for a specified period of time, say four years.

Amendment No. 1: Hennessy moved that the GPA be changed from 2.5 to 2.35 for Juniors and Seniors. Vote on amendment by a show of hands. 5 - Yes, 17 - No, 4 - Not Voting. Amendment defeated.

Proposal 2-69 was adopted by this action.

A motion was made by voice vote to recess the Senate for one week. 9:30 p.m.

Meeting No. 43 reconvened at 7:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 29, 1969, in the Multi-Purpose Room of the Library, with President Bredenkamp presiding.

The roll was taken. Twenty-three members were present. Members absent were: Barstow (BA), Lucier (PE), Ortner (Math), Kenny (ChE), Patterson (Library), Policy (Army), Caspary (Pub. Ser.), and Sheedy (Air Force)

The meeting continued with Old Business and Committee Reports.

C. Grievance Committee - Procedures

Senator Keeling reported that the committee had met four times since the November meeting of the Senate. He said the committee had studied a document from Central Michigan titled "Procedures for Handling Questions of Professional Concern." In general, it was found that this document did not apply in the case of Michigan Tech.

He pointed out that the original motion to form the committee contained the word reconciliation, and the committee does not intend to create a judicial body for trying cases.

The title "Ombudsman" has been used in connection with the committee, and Senator Keeling indicated that the intent of the committee now was to proceed in the direction of the true Ombudsman concept. A first draft of a proposal has been prepared for establishing an office of an Ombudsman. A second draft is in the process of being prepared and should be ready (in proposal form) at the next Senate meeting. The new proposal will be submitted under the original number 1-69. Senator Price inquired as to whether the services of the Ombudsman would be available also to the Administration as
well as the Faculty. Senator Keeling replied that they would.

D. Resolutions Committee

Senator Halkola reported for the Resolutions Committee. He indicated that the Committee visited the late Professor Boyd and delivered the Senate's Citation and gift. President Bredekamp discharged the Resolutions Committee and expressed the sincere appreciation of the Senate for the Committee's efforts.

E. Student-Faculty Senate Relations Committee

Senator Halkola reported that the committee has met to try to delineate the purpose of the committee, and they have decided to invite formal student representation. Five members representing the Student Body have been requested, but until the students are selected, no action will be taken. Any subsequent action will be reported at the next Senate meeting.

New Business

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Sick Leave

Senator Price moved the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee to study the sick leave policy.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Change of Status

Dr. Smith moved that an Ad Hoc Committee be created which would study procedures for Change of Status (Promotion) of Faculty.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

C. Senate Coordinating Committee

Senator Hamilton moved that an Ad Hoc Committee be created for determining the relationship between Colleges, Schools, Divisions, and other academic units of the University with the Senate, both at the graduate and undergraduate level.

The motion was approved by voice vote. President Bredekamp announced that this committee will work in conjunction with an administrative committee consisting of Dr. Stebbins, Dr. Yerg, and Dr. Kent.

D. Ad Hoc Committee for Development of an Honors Program

Dr. Stebbins moved that the Senate establish an Ad Hoc Committee to study the details of an honors program.

Amendment No. 1: Senator Price moved to amend the motion to allow the committee to consider both aspects of this problem: what to do with students who need special help and what to do with students who need no help whatsoever.

The amendment was approved by voice vote.

The motion as amended was approved by voice vote.

E. Other New Business

Senator Boutilier moved "that the policies that have been passed in the Faculty Senate be made available to the Editor of the Lode for publication in the student paper."

A change in the original motion was made so that the words "accepted proposals of the Senate" were substituted for the word "policies." (This was not an amendment.)

Senator Hennessy moved that the motion be amended "to the effect that the Editor of the Lode be informed merely by adding them to the distribution list for minutes of the Senate."

The amendment was approved by voice vote (3 Nay Votes).

The amended motion was approved by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.