Minutes of Meeting Number 54
Of the Senate of Michigan Technological University
2 December 1970

(Senate Minute pages: 578-594)

Meeting No. 54 was called to order on Wednesday December 2, 1970 at 7:02 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge of the Memorial Union by President M.W. Bredekamp.

The roster was checked by the Secretary. All thirty members or their alternates and several observers were present.

The Minutes of Meeting No. 53 were approved with the following corrections: (1) The Agenda for Meeting No. 53 should have been numbered pages 563 through 566. (2) p. 568, item D, replace the last sentence with "The President of the University invited the Student Council to form a similar committee of students but has received no reply to date."

Senate President's Report

A. A faculty listing has been prepared with a total of 333 persons listed. A listing of the General Faculty has also been prepared which shows a total of 451.

B. President Smith's response to Proposals 12-70 "Status of ROTC Programs at Michigan Tech" and 1-71 "To Establish Procedure for Course and Curricula Change" has been received. His comments appear here as Appendix A (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Ratification of New Committee Appointments

The new committee appointments as listed in the Agenda on page 575 should be changed to replace Sachs in the Elections Committee by Velics. There being no comment from the floor the appointments were approved. (See Appendix B for a complete list of current appointments - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Report on Meetings of the Academic Council

Since the Senate Council has not yet appointed a replacement for Wyble, there was no report. Any volunteer for the position of Reporter of Academic Council Meetings is urged to contact President Bredekamp.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy Committee

1. The committee has been meeting every other week. Under current discussion are a University transfer credit policy and the Physical Education, Humanities, and Social Science programs as outlined in the 1970-71 catalog.

2. Proposal 7-70 "Implementation of Approved Course and Curricular Changes in Existing Academic Programs" amended as proposed by President Smith was introduced by a motion for adoption by Krueger which was seconded. No discussion ensued and the motion was passed by a vote of 25 Yes, 0 No.

3. Proposal 10-70 "Establishing Procedures for Developing Significant Changes in the Academic Program of the University" amended as proposed by President Smith and slightly altered by the committee was introduced by a motion for approval by Krueger which was duly seconded. Following brief discussion, the amended proposal was approved by a vote of 25 Yes, 0 No.

4. In response to a question from Bayer, Krueger stated that the committee has not yet received any detailed information concerning the BSE program. It has received only a broad outline of the program.

B. Instructional Policy Committee:

The committee has concerned itself with the recommendations received in a letter from a student concerning the liberalization of the pass-fail system. Anyone having any other recommendations or suggestions on this matter are urged to contact one of the members of this committee (V. Johnson, J.A. Johnson, R.J. Spahn, D. Halkola).

C. Student-Faculty-Senate Committee: No report.
D. **Accommodations Committee:**

Two meetings have been held since Doane was appointed chairman. One was with the administration of the MTU Development Fund concerning some of the details of the Faculty Scholarship Fund for Disadvantaged Students. The faculty will soon be solicited for support for this endeavor.

E. **Sick Leave Committee:** No report.

F. **Change of Status:** No report.

G. **Community College Transfer**

Arrangements have been made to meet with members of the Registrar’s Office and Dr. C. Work.

H. **Honors**

**Proposal 6-70** “Revision of Honors” has been discussed by the committee in the light of President Smith’s comments. The committee has prepared a modified version of proposal 6-70 which will be presented to the Senate for action at Meeting No. 55. (See Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

I. **Election**

The committee has discussed the election of the ombudsman’s review committee. For a detailed report see Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

**Old Business**

No old business was brought before the Senate.

**New Business**

**Proposal 3-71** “The Disposition of Law Violators” was presented to the Senate by its author, Senator Sachs, who moved its approval. His motion was seconded. Sachs then cited an example in a nearby college where a student who had allegedly committed burglary, theft, and forgery was tried and disciplined by a faculty committee. Sachs then made further remarks in support of the proposal as follows:

> There is a lot of talk about the ills of society but not much evidence that things are being done about it. We have had student unrest across the country, unrest that has come uncomfortably close to our own campus. There has been talk about student rights - but not much about student responsibilities. There is talk about the drug problem. There is revolution. To attempt to cure student unrest by turning it toward building a park or breaking it up with a store of tear gas does not cure the illness. Both examples are useful only after trouble has begun. But things can be done beforehand.

> The role of the Senate in all this can be larger than you suspect. A single professor, or one citizen, can write letters and mend his own fences, or buy a fireproof cabinet for his manuscripts. But the Senate is a voice of authority, in spite of what appears to be a lack of power. The Senate’s collective voice can be heard far beyond the limits of this campus. That is why I have prepared the resolution before you tonight.

> It is very important not to misunderstand the intentions or the implications of this resolution. It is not, as some would have you believe, an invitation for the police to invade the campus. What it does do is recognize the university’s responsibility to the community and to its students. The day of in loco parentis is dead. The university is not a sanctuary where adolescence is to be perpetuated, but an institution that prepares young people for their place in society. One aspect of that place is the students’ responsibility to the laws of society - laws one cannot respect if they can be ignored, laws made by society the student is a part of. It is the hypocrisy of society toward its own laws that breaks down respect and makes student revolt appear to be acceptable. The resolution tonight very simply states what should be obvious -- that students are part of society and are responsible to keep order as society dictates. In loco parentis is not only dead, but the place of the parent in Michigan is taking a new turn. In one community parents may now go to jail for the acts of their children. The school administrator who conceals a crime is an accessory to it - a crime punishable in our courts.

> Do not make the false assumption that this resolution is an isolated statement taking a hard line on student misconduct. This resolution is part of a context - a plan by which the voice of the Senate can be heard on many important, related issues. To give you an example: I just persuaded the County Board of Commissioners to pass a resolution recommending that the drug law in Michigan be amended because it is not enforceable. To demand a mandatory twenty year prison sentence for giving someone a marijuana cigarette is unreasonable. That law creates a sense of injustice in the minds of our youth and it undermines our society when it is evaded in our own courts. Similar unrealistic laws and rules that should be changed are: (1) the rule about alcohol on campus and (2) the legal age for drinking in Michigan. But
the route to a credible society which young people have confidence in is to face up to our own responsibilities and our accountabilities not only to society but also to the state legislature. You may remember that the legislature is so concerned about student unrest that it will withdraw funds from those who encourage it. I believe that this resolution, along with others which I will present in the future, will build confidence in the integrity of Michigan Tech and work constructively for the improvement of our society. I urge you to support it.

Senator Krueger then asked that the chair recognize Dean Meese in order that the Senate might be informed as to the present policy. Dean Meese's remarks follow.

Presently the disciplinary function of the University is assigned to me, as Dean of Students, and carried out to the best of our ability in cooperation with local law enforcement and judicial agencies when appropriate. It is still my belief that Michigan Tech is an educational institution not a penal institution on problems within the University. If a student is arrested and charged with a violation off campus, this is processed through civil courts.

To correct the background information statement, disciplinary function has not been turned over to the housing office. A system delegating decisions and penalties to students has been set up. There is a student judiciary committee in Wadsworth and Douglas Houghton Halls. Coed Hall discipline is handled through the resident counselor. These people are trained each year by Professors Romig and Barstow and myself. We all go through the whole judiciary process with them and answer all questions on procedures, policies, and philosophies. These Hall committees are limited to everyday disturbances: noise, fights, damages, etc. in the halls. Any violation where dismissal is a possibility is referred to me for action. These cases are those dealing with drugs, drinking, fire arms, explosives, safety equipment and gambling. Action consists of investigation of reports and gathering evidence. If the investigation warrants, the violation is referred to the campus student judiciary. The campus judiciary committee consists of five students. At campus judiciary hearings a student has the chance to call his witnesses and give his account as to why and what the circumstances were. These hearings are not publicized. I feel that a student who has made a mistake will learn from his mistake. The committee tries to keep the matter in the counseling concept as much as possible, pointing out his violations, what harm has been done and suggesting constructive action on his part.

These rules that we are talking about are Board of Control rules. The only one that I know of that is a felony is drugs. The judiciary committee will decide if the man is guilty or innocent. If guilty, it reviews his past record then finds a suitable penalty. It explains this to the student and informs him of his right to appeal. The Appeal Board consists of one faculty member, one student, and myself. The Board can assign any type of penalty except suspension which can only be recommended. I alone make the final decision on that.

I interpreted this proposal to mean that all misdemeanors would be handled by local police agencies. I don't believe that is desirable, needed, nor practical. I am proud of our Michigan Tech students, only about one half of one percent get into serious trouble in a year. I think we aren't doing a bad job.

At this point, Senator Alexander berated Sachs and all who supported such action. He stated that it was unfair to turn the students over to the authorities to be disposed with in accordance with laws which we believe to be unjust.

Halkola then asked what the legal basis was for Michigan Tech's judicial system.

Romig answered that as a special purpose group, we have the right to maintain order and discipline internally in any way we desire.

Brown then cited an example where a student inadvertently broke a window. Had he (Brown) been forced to report the incident to the police the outcome could have been disastrous.

Thayer: Is forgery a felony?

Romig and Meese: Probably, yes.

Thayer: Can we legally not report a felony?

Meese: We can't protect suspected felons.

DelliQuadri: Shades of Agnew. The campus has traditionally been a sanctuary.

Halkola then stated the President of the University has a committee looking into the sort of problem to which this proposal is addressed. If view of this fact, he moved that the motion be tabled. The motion to table passed by a vote of 14 Yes, 9 No.

The meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

R.S. Horvath
Secretary