MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 48
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

12 November 1969

(Senate Minute pages: 450-454)

Meeting No. 48 was called to order on Wednesday November 12, at 7:10 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President M.W. Bredekamp presiding.

The roster was checked by the Secretary. Twenty-three members ultimately appeared. Absent were: J.A. Johnson (Ford Forestry), G. Krueger (CE), S. Nordeng (GE), R. Smith, Administration), H. Sachs (HU), E. Vandette (SS), D. Wyble (PH) -- the last three with explanation.

Minutes of Meeting No. 47

The secretary announced the following corrections in the minutes: eliminate the title "Senator" from the names of L. Heldt and D. Thayer. Add "2-70" to identify the proposal on the Accommodations Committee on p. 438, end of line 2. The minutes were approved as corrected.

Senate President's Report

A. President Bredekamp reported on one item in addition to those presented at meeting no. 47, with respect to summer activities in which he was involved. He reported the presence on campus of investigators sent by the Legislature. Their inquiry, a very searching one, dealt with the matter of campus disorder and unrest, as part of a state-wide study of this matter.

B. The chair promised that ballots would soon be in the mail to enable the General Faculty to elect its representative to the committee charged with the selection of an Ombudsman. An agreement with the Administration has resulted in the assignment of 77 names to the list of the General Faculty who are not included among the Academic Faculty.

C. The Chair enjoined members of the Senate to stress with members of their departments the procedures by which matters are brought to the Senate. He stressed that the Senate is a democratic organization. It can change any action that it has taken and discuss any academic matter even if it has been treated heretofore only on an administrative level. Members of the academic faculty can present proposals to the Senate; can ask the Senate to investigate any matter in the area of academic policy; can address a memorandum to the Senate through its secretary; or can testify before or send suggestions to any Senate committee. Ideally, he declared, proposals should reach the floor only after soundings have been taken and a consensus has been arrived at; thus, they will ordinarily pass with little opposition.

D. The chair pointed out that the Tenure Committee has failed to make the annual report to the faculty called for in the Policy on Academic Tenure. He expressed his hope that this report would soon be forthcoming.

Committee Appointments

B. Instructional Policy: Chairman, Bahrman; G. Dawson, V. Johnson, R. Spahn, E. Vandette.
C. Student-Faculty Senate: Chairman, Boutilier; DelliQuadri, Gibson, R. Johnson, Matrosic, Natkin
D. Honors Program: Chairman, Hamilton; E. Born, Clark, Guard, Patterson
E. Change of Status: Chairman, Nordeng; Bayer, Sachs, Snyder
F. Senate Coordinating Committee: Chairman, Krueger; Bredekamp, Thayer (Kent, Stebbins, Yerg)
G. Elections Committee: Chairman, Patterson; Greuer, Hollod, Wyble
H. Accommodation Programs: Chairman, Horvath; Glazier, Nordeng
I. Sick Leave: Chairman, Keeling; Chandler, Koepel, Ortner, Romig.

Election of a Senate Representative to the Three-Member Committee to Select an Ombudsman

A. A Senate Committee consisting of Senators Sachs, Ortner, and Kennedy announced the names of the following nominees to the committee: G. Bahrman, C. DelliQuadri, F. Erbisch, W. Freyberger
B. The Election Committee distributed ballots. The vote gave no candidate a majority. Top contenders were DelliQuadri and Bahrman.

A second ballot ended in a tie. DelliQuadri then withdrew his name from consideration, and the chair declared Bahrman elected.

C. The chair described the rules set up by the Council of the Senate for the election of a committeeman by the General Faculty for the selection of an Ombudsman. No more than the top ten contenders will be submitted to the General Faculty for a second ballot, he explained, assuming that no name will win a clear majority on the first vote. In response to a question, he agreed that if the field can reasonably be narrowed to only four or five after the first vote, a winner could be declared after the second ballot, if one had merely a clear plurality rather than an outright majority.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy Committee

Senator Freyberger announced that the chief immediate concerns of the committee are the ROTC issue and the development of appropriate procedures for the submission of new degree programs. He solicited suggestions.

B. Instructional Policy Committee

Senator Bahrman, in response to a request to state in broad outline the basic functions of the committee, referred to p. 343 of the Senate minutes, where it is indicated that the committee should deal with problems of instruction and means of evaluation of a student's progress. With respect to how things are submitted to the committee, Bahrman vouchsafed the idea that any matter brought to the committee's attention by the Vice President of Academic Affairs or other appropriate members of the administration would have a high priority. Problems raised by members of the faculty might or might not call for action, depending on whether they had already been solved or were in the process of consideration by the administration.

With respect to reporting procedures, Bahrman indicated that the committee would ordinarily, as its first step, make a preliminary report to the Senate on a given matter. Then following the discussion, a formal proposal would be prepared for the Senate at a subsequent meeting.

C. The remaining committees had no reports ready.

Old Business: None

New Business

On a motion by Alexander, the following proposal (3-70) entered on the Agenda as 1-70 was placed before the house.

Proposal 3-70

The following amendment to the Evening Examination Policy adds to the first sentence and deletes the second sentence of paragraph 3:

Proposed: That the Evening Examination Policy as adopted by the Senate February 19, 1969, be amended in its paragraph 3 as follows:

As it stands:
3. Evening exams may be given only on Wednesday and Thursday evenings. To avoid undue interference with students' preparation for other courses, any two-hour evening examination shall be given in one-hour segments on different evenings.

Amend to read:
3 Evening exams may be given only on Wednesday and Thursday evenings except for the sixth week of a quarter, when they may be scheduled Monday through Thursday to handle the number of exams at midterm.
Boutilier moved to amend by restoring the second sentence of the original, in effect to renew the prohibition against two-hour examinations on one evening. Thus, the amended version would read as follows:

Proposal 3-70:
3. Evening exams may be given only on Wednesday and Thursday evenings, except for the sixth week of a quarter, when they may be scheduled Monday through Thursday to handle the number of exams at midterm. To avoid undue interference with students’ preparation for other courses, any two-hour evening examination should be given in one-hour segments on different evenings.

During a brief debate, the view was questioned that students would indeed find a two-hour examination split into two parts on successive days more convenient than a single two-hour examination. The amendment passed by a vote of 12 to 8.

In the debate on the amended motion, a question was raised: Why not apply the principle to say, the third and eighth week too? Freyberger responded: The reason for this motion originally was to prevent the wanton appropriation of student time in the evenings by overzealous instructors; extra-curricular activities are important too.

Senator Stebbins pointed out that not all the available rooms for multi-section evening examinations are being used now; but Alexander said the problem is one of conflicts in student schedules.

The vote on the measure as amended was 15 Yes, 5 No. In this amended form, it will require a final vote at the next meeting.

Senator Bayer, in response to a request from the council, presented for filing a list of the industrial concerns with which arrangements are being made in the cooperative program of the Mechanical Engineering-Engineering Mechanics Department. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the program must await the study of student responses at the close of the first three-month work schedule, he said. No credit is given; the aim is to provide financial help and work experience for students.

Question: Have you been approached by student activists who would like you to use leverage on these industries with respect to their performance in the matter of pollution?
Bayer: No . . . We have no student activists.

The Chair then adjourned the meeting upon a motion from the floor.

Sherwood Price
Secretary