MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 49
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

14 January 1970

(Senate Minute pages: 455-497)

Meeting No. 49 was called to order on Wednesday January 14, at 7:05 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President M.W. Bredekamp presiding.

The roster was checked by the Secretary. Twenty-six members and several observers were present. Absent were Alexander (BA), Caspary (AT), Vandette (SS) and Bayer with explanation.

Minutes of Meeting No. 48

Minutes of meeting No. 48 were approved with the following corrections: (1) G. Krueger should have been listed as absent "with explanation." (2) On p. 440 of the Minutes, the negative response of the Chair to the question of the suitability of writing a book as a legitimate activity for a sabbatical leave should have been qualified by the phrase "in my opinion." (See below).

Senate President's Report

A. A letter has been received from the Student Council requesting suggestions for a task force which is to re-evaluate student government on the campus.

B. Although it has not yet ruled formally on the matter, the Sabbatical Leave Committee has indicated in a letter that under certain conditions the Committee might consider writing a book an appropriate activity for a faculty member on sabbatical leave.

C. The Curriculum Committee of the College of Sciences and Arts has announced that it has proposed the creation of a major in psychology.

D. Official lists of the various faculties have been agreed upon (see Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The undergraduate Academic Faculty comprises 293 members (with 2 more whose status is still to be decided); of these, 121 are also on the graduate faculty. The Research Faculty has not yet been defined. The Administrative Educational Faculty totals 31; the Operational Faculty 77. When duplications are eliminated, there are 372 on the General Faculty (not including the Research Faculty).

E. Attention was called to the "Handbook of Graduate Study," recently distributed to the faculty. Comments should be conveyed through channels.

F. The Chair commended to the attention of other departments the accompanying statement (Appendix B -- Available by Request from the Senate Office) on how cooperative program students in Mechanical Engineering are occupied at the Ford Motor Company. The filing of all or any cooperative agreements or proposals was recommended for information purposes.

G. Referring to the report recently submitted to the Faculty by the Tenure Committee, the chair suggested that comments in writing might be channeled through the Senate Council.

H. Volunteers are requested for a committee to nominate two Tech students for participation in a group of 400 college students who will be invited to "intern" in Washington, D.C. next summer in order to study national problems and major federal programs in national and international affairs.

Committee Reports

A. Election Committee

Senator R. Patterson reported the vote on Proposal 19-69, to amend the Constitution by replacing the term "General Faculty" with the term "Academic Faculty." There were 225 "Yes" votes and 19 "No" votes.

He also announced the results of the first ballot to select a faculty representative on a committee to select an Ombudsman. Of the front running nominees, the following consented to serve if elected in a runoff election: Caspary,
Ortner, Oswald, Price, Thayer, Vandette.

B. Student-Faculty-Senate Committee

Senator O.D. Boutilier submitted the attached progress report (Appendix C -- Available by Request from the Senate Office) as an indication of "what the committee is thinking." He solicited comments before the next meeting. On a motion from the floor, the report was accepted.

Discussion of the report brought out the following questions and responses: Would not this proposal inordinately increase the workload of the Ombudsman? Is this not the province of the Dean of Student? (No: this is a last resort, when there is no other recourse. The job of an Ombudsman is to cut red tape; students need this kind of help more than anyone else.) If students are to be formally represented on the Senate, they should have a minimum of two delegates. THE CHAIR: Student representation on the Senate would call for a constitutional amendment.

C. Honors Program

At the request of the committee chairman, this report was deferred until later in the meeting.

D. Change of Status Committee

Senator S. Nordeng submitted the attached preliminary report (Appendix D -- Available by Request from the Senate Office) . He invited comment and indicated his intention to open the matter to general discussion at the next meeting, and to submit it to the decision of the Senate at the next following meeting. The report was accepted upon a motion from the floor.

E. Coordinating Committee

Senator G. Krueger announced that the recommendations of the former head of the committee (D. Thayer) are being considered by a subcommittee of the Coordinating Committee. So far, no decision has been reached, but it is hoped that a positive report will be forthcoming by the next meeting.

Old Business:

Proposal 3-70, as amended (Senate minutes #48)

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

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.

The proposal was passed without discussion by a vote of 17 Yes and 3 No.

New Business

A. Faculty Evaluation Committee

It was moved by Dr. Stebbins that an ad hoc committee on evaluations of the Faculty be established. He referred to a statement emanating from Western Michigan University (Appendix E -- Available by Request from the Senate Office) on Evaluating Teaching Proficiency as a possible basis for such procedures. The Chair directed attention to a recent issue of the "Journal of Engineering Education" which deals with the same matter.

A question from the floor: Does a vote for the committee automatically approve the concept of teacher evaluation?

The Chair: No committee can guarantee passage of its proposals.

The motion to establish an ad hoc committee on Faculty Evaluation was accepted by a vote of 21 to 0.

B. Committee on Contracts

It was moved by Senator Sachs that "an ad hoc committee of the Senate be established to study the lack of formal contracts for the teaching and research staff at Michigan Technological University, and to make recommendations for the
possible establishment of such formal contracts."

Sachs pointed out that the practice in colleges and universities throughout the country is to observe principles of due process and academic freedom, which protect the teacher but do little if anything to protect the institution. The Faculty Handbook might be viewed as a kind of contract, but personnel are not required to sign it. Contracts could include provisions such as those now subscribed to under security and patent agreements. It was brought out that there are at present no contracts with teaching or research personnel at Tech, but that they may exist at some state schools, particularly the regional universities.

By a vote of 9 Yes and 13 No, the motion was defeated.

C. **Proposal 4-70**

Proposal 4-70 called for the elimination of a reference to the selection of a Senate member from the Sault Ste. Marie branch (Article III, Section A. 4.). Since the Branch no longer exists as a division of Michigan Tech but has become autonomous, the Senate by vote of 26 to 0 authorized the Chair simply to strike the reference from the Constitution.

D. **Proposal 5-70**

On a motion by Erbisch, Proposal 5-70 was brought up for discussion and vote as an addition to Article III A. 2. of the Constitution.

An alternate member shall also be elected from and by each of the academic and research departments of the University. He shall serve with vote in the absence of the regular department representative.

Questions raised established the fact that the two-year residency requirement for Senators would apply to alternates, and that there was no provision for alternates for senators-at-large.

The proposal was passed by a vote of 21 yes and 3 no.

E. **Business from the Floor**

Under this heading some names were suggested for membership in some of the ad hoc committees created by earlier action.

F. **Deferred Business: Report of the Honors Committee**

Senator Hamilton moved the adoption of the following proposal, which had been included in the agenda for the meeting and was belatedly given the label of **Proposal 6-70**

I. In accordance with this committee's assignment to study details of an honors program for this University (Proposal 4-69, p. 396, Meeting No. 44), the accompanying background material entitled "Honors Program Report" has been prepared *(Available by Request from the Senate Office)*.

II. The Senate Honors Committee, in order to implement the honors program, recommends for adoption by the Senate the following proposal.

Proposal 6-70: To coordinate the University Honors Program:

A. A director shall be appointed

B. His function shall be:
   1. To develop a program within the framework outlined in the committee report
   2. To recruit students for the program
   3. To administer and coordinate the programs, and to develop necessary relationships with a representative council concerned with the programs
   4. To conduct an annual evaluation of the total program

Also included in the agenda was the report of the committee, which is appended hereto as Appendix F *(Available by Request from the Senate Office)*.

**DISCUSSION:**

Keeling: The Physics Department unanimously opposes the establishment of a University-wide honors program.

Stebbins: The clause "if funds are available" should qualify the motion.
Chair: This is an unwritten rider on all Senate proposals.

Hamilton: The director of the program would work with the staff to modify and improve programs and to counsel students.

Krueger: Couldn't someone be commissioned, on a part-time basis to develop the program as a basis for applying for a grant?

The Chair now recognized Ed Born, a member of the committee.

Born: In doing its research, the committee corresponded with 129 institutions, and studied programs and materials from 70. It was learned that a few programs have been discontinued; in all cases where programs failed, an internal, part-time employee was in charge of the program. Where programs succeeded, graduate and doctoral programs have been expanded and enhanced. Recruiting top students is a major objective of the program; according to knowledgeable testimony, last year Michigan Tech failed to recruit one out of twenty high school valedictorians who were approached.

A motion was made to amend the proposal by striking out the phrase "within the framework outlined in the committee report," which appears at the end of II. A. 1. of the proposal; II. A. 1. would then read, "To develop a program." A detailed program, it was held, should not be foisted upon a director if one is brought in.

Price: Throughout the report, emphasis is upon recruiting of and programs for top students. We have already called for a special program for disadvantaged students, thus, we're looking at both ends of the scale. But what are we going to do for the 98 percent of our students in between? The time has passed when we have a right to be proud of an attrition rate of 50 percent; the evidence shows today that the "selective" schools -- really the top ones -- have the lowest attrition rate for all classes of students, even the disadvantaged ones that they admit. The kind of program that we need is not that outlined in the report, with its emphasis on superior students; we need to find means, such as independent study, in every course we teach, to trap and enhance student interest regardless of the student's level. Thus, I feel that the amendment should be adopted.

Put to a vote, the amendment passed by a vote of 19 yes to 5 no.

In further discussion on the proposal itself, Keeling was challenged by DelliQuadri to explain the opposition of the Physics Department to the proposal.

Keeling: Our department has a good program for majors. We do not want another course for non-majors. The philosophy of an honors program should also be questioned: it robs the exceptional student of the chance to excel in a group, and of the interplay of competition. Moreover, I hate to teach a class from which the superior students have been arbitrarily extracted.

Freyberger: What position would the director hold? Whom would he be responsible to? Who would approve the programs? Answers drawn in part from the report now officially severed from the proposal, were that the director would work with a council including members from each department; that he would be directly responsible to the Vice President of Academic Affairs; and that decisions would be made by a council of Deans, Department heads, and teachers that had been chosen.

At this point, a motion was made to refer the proposal to the committee, particularly so that the organizational relationships of those involved in the program could be clarified. The vote to refer Proposal 6-70 passed, 14 yes and 4 no.

Senator Sachs was recognized. He called attention to the "Junior Year Abroad" programs in hopes that interest in and support for the idea might be engendered on the campus.

Senator Kennedy presented some data from a report that he said he had prepared and presented in more detail to the Faculty Association Council. He detailed some of the invidious consequences which he said result from the legislative decision to freeze funds in the Michigan Retirement System for those who recently have elected to withdraw from the system in favor of the TIAA-CREF plan. His purpose, he explained, is to generate pressure on the legislature to "unfreeze" these funds.

Adjournment followed.

S.R. Price
Secretary