MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 45
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

16 April 1969

(Senate Minute pages: 403--416)

Meeting No. 45 was called to order at 7:05 p.m., Wednesday April 16, 1969, in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union, with President M.W. Bredekamp presiding.

The roll was taken. 27 members were present. (Quorum 20). Members absent were Hamilton (IWR), Johnson, (Ford Forestry), Hollod (Air Force ROTC).

Minutes of Meeting No. 44

The minutes of Meeting No. 44 were accepted as previously distributed.

Senate President's Report

A. Nominating Committee Appointments

President Bredekamp announced that the following appointments had been made to the Nominating Committee (for Senate officers): G. Bahrman (Chairman), D. Halkola, M. Bredekamp.

B. Additions for Senate Committees

President Bredekamp announced the following additions to Senate Committees:

Ad Hoc Committee on Accommodations Programs: Miss Glazier
Ad Hoc Committee on Honors Program: R. Guard

Committee Reports

A. Senator Caspary moved that the agenda, as distributed for Meeting No. 45, be changed to allow the Committee on Grievance - Procedures to present their proposal (1-69) as the first item of business. This motion was approved by voice vote.

B. Grievance Committee - Procedures

Senator Keeling moved that Proposal 1-69 - "Office of the Ombudsman" be adopted by the Senate for recommendation to the Administration and Board of Control.

Office of the Ombudsman

An "Office of the Ombudsman" shall be established by the Senate of Michigan Technological University. Its purpose shall be to provide any member of the general faculty with a fair and effective means of stating a complaint to an impartial person who has investigative powers.

In carrying out the responsibilities of his office, the Ombudsman must be independent of the normal line and staff organization below the President's Office, and though ultimately responsible to, and reporting to, the President, should be accorded a fraternal status. If the holder of the office is considered merely an administrative functionary, then his most important attribute -- that of "perceived impartiality" -- is destroyed. He must be a person known to all and immediately available to listen impartially to complaints. To maintain this independence, the holder should be secure in his tenure. He may be dismissed from the office only by a two-thirds vote of the entire Senate membership. He should be a person of integrity with an understanding of the principles of simple justice, and of academic due process. Since "due process" in this context is often little more than applied wisdom, the emphasis should be on reputation rather than formal credentials.
The Office shall have no power to change any decisions; it can only investigate and persuade.

Along with the authority to investigate any complaints of any member of the general faculty, the Office shall have the authority to dismiss any complaint, with or without a hearing, subject to the responsibility of stating reasons for such dismissal to the complainant, in writing if the latter so requests.

It is vital that the holder of the Office have the power to assume jurisdiction according to his own conscience. The good sense requisite to the Office would place some limits on its jurisdiction (e.g., a holder would not "ombud" disputes among administrative officials; at this level the President normally acts as his own Ombudsman). Any member of the general faculty who thinks that he has a grievance must be allowed to present it. The Ombudsman shall attempt to conciliate the matter informally. At any point in the process, he may dismiss the complaint (a record of all dismissed complaints without identifying individuals shall be transmitted to the President semi-annually).

The Ombudsman is to be appointed by a three-man appointing committee made up as follows: one member appointed by the President of the University one member elected by the Senate from among its members; and one member elected by the general faculty (said election to be conducted by the executive committee of the Senate). The choice of the appointing committee must be unanimous. The Ombudsman shall during the initial year have his usual load reduced by one-fourth. After a period of one year (or less if requested by the Ombudsman) a similarly constituted committee shall review the work of the office, report to the President and the Senate, and recommend any needed changes.

Senator Halkola moved to table Proposal 1-69. The vote was taken by show of hands: 4 Yes, 23 No or abstain. Motion to table was defeated.

A vote was taken on the motion to adopt proposal 1-69. The vote was taken by show of hands: 24 Yes, 3 No or Abstain. Proposal 1-69 was adopted by this action.

C. Curricular Policy Committee

Senator Freyberger responded for the Curricular Policy Committee and presented a brief report on the Committee's activities. At the present time, the Committee is studying the following questions: Status of ROTC at MTU, Procedures for submission of new academic programs and Humanities - Social Science - Business Administration Electives.

1. Proposal 9-69 -- Changes in Senate Policy 1-59

   I. Senate Policy 1-59 shall be revoked and be replaced by a new policy statement as follows:

   II. Students enrolled in all curricula leading to a baccalaureate degree, except in Liberal Arts, are required to take a minimum of fifteen (15) credits of approved electives in the humanities and social sciences.

   III. Courses approved as electives for the completion of the requirements stated in paragraph II shall be listed by area in the University catalog. Departments offering these courses shall be consulted annually to bring their course listings in the catalog up to date. These listings shall be approved by mutual agreements between the departments involved and the Senate or its delegated representative.

   IV. Students shall choose electives from the approved list. At least six (6) credits shall be chosen from courses listed in the catalog as HU courses. At least six (6) other credits shall be chosen from non-HU courses on the approved list.

Senator Hennessy made a motion to amend proposal 9-69 so that Item IV shall read:

   Electives in the Humanities and Social Sciences area should be completely elective without prescribed packaging, organization, or other ordering of subject matter.

Vote on Amendment by show of hands: 7 Yes, 15 No, 5 Abstain -- Amendment defeated.

A vote was taken by show of hands on Proposal 9-69 as originally presented: 19 Yes, 5 No, 3 Abstain. Proposal 9-69 was adopted by this action.
2. **Proposal 14-69 - Undergraduate Language Credits**

Senator Freyberger moved that Proposal 14-69 be adopted as follows:

I. The requiring department shall determine the nature of its undergraduate language requirement.

II. The offering Department shall determine the number of credits carried by foreign language courses.

A vote was taken by show of hands: 24 Yes, 0 No, 3 Abstain. Proposal 14-69 was adopted by this action.

3. **Proposal 15-69 - Establishment of Undergraduate Cooperative Educational Programs**

Senator Freyberger moved the adoption of proposal 15-69 as follows:

I. The MTU Senate approves in principle the establishment of undergraduate cooperative education programs. However, it is recognized that each individual cooperative agreement must be evaluated on its own merits, both from the standpoint of academic value and from considerations of adaptability to a given curriculum.

Minimal considerations in these evaluations are:

1. The potential academic value of the cooperative program, judged in the light of the responsibility of the University to maintain an independent and critical role in society.

2. Assurance that each individual agreement between the University and a given organization provides that:
   a. The student be employed by the organization in a manner beneficial to his academic program.
   b. The University not be bound to an agreement it may be unable to fulfill, such as being required to send students to a company when none be available.
   c. No undue financial or academic burden be placed on the Department entering into the agreement, its faculty, or its students.

II. Responsibility for evaluation of each agreement lies with the faculty of the Department involved. Hence, before implementation, each cooperative agreement between the University and an organization shall be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members of that Department.

III. The results of the Departmental vote on each agreement shall be entered into the Senate agenda by the Departmental Senator for the meeting of the Senate following the Departmental vote. The results of this vote shall be entered into the Senate minutes.

IV. Prior to implementation of an agreement, the Senate may question its acceptability and may recommend that the agreement not be entered into. The Senate may also recommend termination of an existing agreement.

V. Student eligibility for enrollment in a cooperative program shall be determined by the Department involved. It is recommended that, in order to enroll in a cooperative program, a student have completed at least his freshman year and have a cumulative GPA of at least 2.20.

A discussion followed in which a clarification of Section II was requested. Freyberger stated that it is not the intent of the proposal to require the Senate to investigate each agreement with each student, but rather to record the action of the Departmental faculty as stated in section III and act in accordance with section IV if necessary.

A vote was taken by show of hands, 23 Yes, 0 No, 4 Abstain. Proposal 15-69 was adopted by this action.

D. **Instructional Policy Committee**

1. **Proposal 11-69 - Description of A Unit Credit**

Senator Hennessy moved the adoption of Proposal 11-69 which would serve to revise the Undergraduate catalog to read:

Unit of Credit (Undergraduate)

The basic unit is the quarter hour credit, or simply the credit. It is equivalent to one class period per week for one quarter.

This class period may be one hour recitation, a one hour lecture, (or a combination of the two), or a three hour laboratory. In any case, one credit is designed to require three actual hours of a student's time, on the average, per week for one quarter. One hour of class is planned to require two hours of preparation or study. A two hour laboratory period may require one hour of homework to complete the credit. A three hour period carries one credit without additional work outside the class.

A discussion followed in which several recommendations were made to the committee. These were to delete the last two sentences of the copy, to consider handling of a 4-hour laboratory, generally to allow adequate flexibility...
in the class descriptions and to rearrange the order of the sentences of the copy to allow the credit requirement to precede the "class" definition.

Senator Oswald moved that the proposal be sent back to the committee so that they might consider these suggestions. A vote by show of hands was taken: 24 Yes, 3 Abstain. Motion carried.

2. **Proposal 12-69 - Description of A Unit Credit (Graduate)**

   Senator Hennessy moved the adoption of Proposal 12-69 as follows:

   **Unit of Credit (Graduate)**

   The basic unit is the quarter hour credit, or simply the credit. It is equivalent to one class period per week for one quarter.

   This class period may be one hour recitation, a one hour lecture, (or a combination of the two), or a three hour laboratory. In any case, one credit is designed to require four actual hours of a student's time, on the average, per week for one quarter.

   Dr. Stebbins moved that proposal 12-69 be sent back to the committee for consideration of the items discussed in connection with proposal 11-69. Vote by show of hands: 22 Yes, 0 No, 4 Abstain. (NOTE: There were 26 Senators present at this point in the meeting.)

3. **Proposal 13-69 - Senate Consensus Relating to Units of Credit**

   Senator Hennessy moved the adoption of the statement of Proposal 13-69 as follows:

   1. The teaching faculty should observe the spirit of the credit hour concept expressed above in the design of course syllabi and appropriate curriculum committees should include the above premise as one of the basic considerations in approving or disapproving a course.

   2. Once the scope and objective of a course has been appropriately defined and approved, it is not within the privilege of academic freedom for an individual faculty member to make unilaterally, a significant change in either scope or objective when he teaches a course. If a difference occurs within a department as to what is or is not significant, the matter should be resolved by the faculty as a whole of that department.

   Senator Oswald moved that this proposal be referred back to the committee for reconsideration in view of changes that may be forthcoming in Proposals 11-69 and 12-69. Vote by show of hands: 22 Yes, 1 No, 3 Abstain.

4. **Cooperative Education Plan**

   The Instructional Policy Committee deferred to the Curricular Policy Committee on this issue.

5. **Variable Credit for Graduate Courses**

   The Instructional Policy Committee was asked to study a variable credit system for graduate courses. The Committee decided to issue no policy recommendation on this matter.

6. **Proposal 16-69 Procedure for Dropping a Course**

   Senator Hennessy moved the adoption of Proposal 16-69 as follows:

   The Senate does hereby recommend to the President of Michigan Technological University the adoption of the following procedures for dropping a course:

   a. N - No grade, dropped, given when a student withdraws from school after the regular drop period, passing the subject. In these cases, the Dean of Student notifies the instructor that the student has dropped from school and should receive an N grade if passing as of the date he withdrew. The student's grade card will come to the instructor at the end of the course in the normal manner. The instructor will enter the appropriate grade, N or F, thus notifying the Registrar and completing the action.

   W - no grade, dropped course.
b. Regular drop - during the first six weeks of the quarter a student desiring to drop a course secures a regular drop card from his advisor who signs the card, thus approving the request to drop the course concerned. The student delivers the drop card to the scheduling office.

c. Late Drop - After the sixth week of a quarter, a student may request a late drop only from the Dean of Students. The Dean of Students will consider only those requests which clearly involve extenuating circumstances beyond the student's control. Those late drops approved by the Dean of Students must also bear the acknowledgement of the Registrar and the comment of the student's departmental advisor and the instructor. The student will deliver the approved late drop to the Registrar's Office. The Registrar will show the course on the student's transcript as a W entered as a grade.

Senator Bayer moved to amend Proposal 16-69 so that the drop period in paragraph c be changed from 6 weeks to 4 weeks. The vote on the amendment was taken by show of hands: 5 Yes, 16 No, 4 Abstain. Amendment defeated.

(NOTE: 25 Senators present at this point in the meeting).

A vote was taken by show of hands on the original motion: 15, Yes, 6 No, 4 Abstain. Proposal 16-69 was adopted by this action.

7. **Proposal 17-69 - Mid-Term Grades**

Senator Hennessy moved the adoption of Proposal 17-69 as follows:

The Senate does hereby recommend to the President of Michigan Technological University that the policy on mid-term grades previously recommended by the Senate (pp. 286-287 of the Senate minutes) be amended as follows:

Paragraph one (1) is deleted and the following substituted:

1. All students will receive mid-term grades by post card mailed by the Registrar. A grade of S will indicate satisfactory work; a grade of U will indicate unsatisfactory work; a grade of M will indicate no grade card was received from the instructor, student should see instructor if he has any doubt.

Paragraph two (2) is amended by deleting the words "beginning in the Fall term 1967."

Step 2., Paragraph two (2) is deleted and the following substituted:

2. The instructor separates cards into two stacks. One stack will include all students doing unsatisfactory (D or F) work; the other stack consists of the remaining cards. The instructor will identify the unsatisfactory stack by marking the first two or three cards U, and will return both stacks to the Registrar.

The revised Mid-Term Grade Policy is as follows:

1. All students will receive mid-term grades by post card mailed by the Registrar. A grade of S will indicate satisfactory work; a grade of U will indicate unsatisfactory work; a grade of M will indicate no grade card was received from the instructor, student should see instructor if he has any doubt.

2. Interested and qualified persons other than the student are to be informed of the student's performance at the end of about the 5th week by initiating the following procedure.

   **Step 1.** Duplicate grade cards (in contrasting color) are to be prepared by Data Processing as soon as class rolls are complete (about the end of the 4th week). Cards are to be issued for all undergraduate students in all courses and given to the individual instructors.

   **Step 2.** The instructor separates cards into two stacks. One stack will include all students doing unsatisfactory (D or F) work; the other stack consists of the remaining cards. The instructor will identify the unsatisfactory stack by marking the first two or three cards U, and will return both stacks to the Registrar.

   **Step 3.** Data Processing programs their machines to prepare three lists in original and carbons as follows:

   a. A series of abbreviated section lists composed of U students only

   b. An alphabetical list by curricula

   c. A straight alphabetical list
All lists would give name, course number and curricula information. Both lists b and c would have one entry per card so that students with more than one failure would appear as many times as there are U cards for the student.

**Step 4.** Lists would be distributed as follows:
- List a - Original to instructor and carbon to department head
- List b - Original to department head and carbon composite of all department curricula list to Dean of Students
- List c - Original and one carbon to Dean of Students, and the other carbon to Athletic department

This should be done by the end of the 6th week

**Step 5.** List utilization. Departments could make full use of the lists to uncover sections with special problems, make revisions to course offerings for the following terms, take steps to provide remedial work, departmental tutoring, programmed instruction, etc. The Dean of Students could scan the lists to uncover students with known special problems, students on probation, students having more than one U, etc. Action could be initiated to bring certain students into contact with dorm proctors, counselors, instructors, advisors, etc., each being considered individually. The listed U students should know that we are genuinely concerned.

A vote on the proposal was taken by a show of hands: 15 Yes, 4 No, 6 Abstain. Proposal 17-69 was adopted by this action.

A motion was made to recess the meeting for one week. The motion was approved by show of hands at 9:30 p.m.

Meeting No. 45 of the Senate reconvened at 7:05 p.m., Wednesday, April 23, 1969, in the Multi-Purpose room of the Library, with President M.W. Bredekamp presiding.

The roll was taken. Twenty-four members were present (quorum 20). Members absent were: Barstow (BA), Lucier (PE), Wyble (AL), Bahrman (AL), Caspary (PS), Johnson (Ford Forestry), Smith (Admin.).

**Committee Reports (continued)**

**E. Student - Faculty - Senate Relations Committee**

Senator Halkola, Chairman of the committee, distributed a written progress report and briefly discussed several points in the report. This report is contained in Appendix A (*Available by Request from the Senate Office*).

**F. Honors Program Committee**

Senator Patterson responded for the committee and indicated that two meetings had been held.

A major decision thus far was that the academic departments should be involved in the committee's deliberations. It was announced that a request for names of interested people has been circulated to each department.

**G. Change of Status Committee**

Senator Nordeng, Chairman of the committee, reported that this committee has made progress and wished that written comments would be submitted to the committee by interested parties.

The committee's feeling at this time was that action for promotions should be generated from within the various departments. Periodic reviews of personnel could be performed by departments and a University committee.

The committee is now in the process of consulting individual departments.

**H. Accommodation Programs Committee**

Senator Price, Chairman of the committee, announced that Gretchen Glazier was now a member of this committee. He indicated that the committee had been active primarily in first learning the terminology associated with the problem of disadvantaged students. The committee has invited opinions from minority groups on campus and wishes to extend an invitation for suggestions from all concerned.

**I. Sick Leave Committee**
Senator Oswald, Chairman of the committee, indicated that the committee had met two times. Their findings thus far would indicate that the present sick leave policy has deficiencies, particularly for new people and for a group of people that have been at MTU for periods longer than 15 to 20 years. A sweeping change is being considered by the committee; however, the subject of economics must be a primary issue. It is pointed out that the task of this committee is quite expensive and a report may not be forthcoming until through the summer.

J. Senate Coordinating Committee

Senator Thayer, Chairman of the committee, read the original charge to the committee from p. 391 of the Senate minutes. He then discussed the purpose of the committee as viewed by the members. This purpose seems to be the establishment of proper and adequate channels of communication between the Senate and Administration (or Administrative Committees). Senator Boutilier suggested that Dr. Geddes might be asked to participate in this committee’s discussions.

New Business

1. Senator Sachs moved the adoption of Proposal 10-69 as follows:

The Faculty Senate of Michigan Technological University recommend to the President and the Board of Control that the Faculty be annually assessed a sum, to be fixed each year by Senate resolution, the moneys to be used for Senate expenses.

President Bredekamp read the following communication from Dr. Smith:

It is not the practice to establish budgets for advisory groups on campus. I believe it is the responsibility of the University to furnish necessary and reasonable services to take care of record keeping functions such as recording, typing, printing, collating, addressing, and distribution of minutes, storage of records, and similar matters. Currently the cost of this to the Employee Relations office and the Vice President of Academic Affairs is about $500 annually.

Any special expense, by motion of the Senate, for some other purpose would have to be considered on its merits. An annual trip by the President of the Senate to view the operations of some other university similar to ours in academic matters might well come in the category of expenses regarded as acceptable.

Senator Price moved to amend the motion by substitution of the following:

The faculty Senate shall annually solicit from faculty members such a monetary contribution as may enable the Senate to meet its budgetary expenses. All faculty members who are qualified to vote for members of the Senate shall be canvassed for this purpose by departmental representatives, who shall tender to an appropriate officer of the Senate the sums they have collected, together with an accounting of those who have contributed.

A lengthy discussion followed, regarding the basic reasons for the motion, total costs, operational procedures, and other related matters.

Senator Halkola suggested that the proponents of the motion bring forward data on procedures at other Universities and moved to postpone action on the amended motion until the next Senate meeting. A voice vote was taken and the motion to postpone carried.

2. Senator Bayer made a motion on procedural matters as follows:

"I move that all communications to the Senate be of semi-uniform format, that the memo form of heading be used to identify: To, From, and Subject, and that the date be prominently displayed at the top right corner of the first sheet. Further, that only standard 8 1/2 x 11 size paper be used for Senate communications."

This motion was adopted by voice vote.

3. Senator Halkola moved that the date of the next Senate meeting be moved from May 14 to May 21.

Vote by show of hands was taken: 10 Yes, 12 No, 2 Abstain.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

G.P. Krueger
Senate Secretary