MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 78
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

6 November 1974

(Senate Minute pages: 966-977)

Meeting No. 78 was called to order on Wednesday, November 6, 1974 at 7:03 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President R.S. Horvath.

The roll was called by the Secretary, H. F. Nufer. Twenty-eight members or alternates were present. Absent were Danielson (IWR), DelliQuadri (AL), and Hennessy (AL).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 77 were corrected as follows:

Booy referred to the statement attributed to her on page 961, under "New Business and Voluntary Remarks" and stated that the phrase "Booy raised the question of examining women for pregnancy, should have read ". . . during pregnancy."

Shandley requested that the minutes be amended to show that he was present at the last meeting. He had been marked as absent.

The minutes of the above meeting were then approved as corrected.

Senate President's Report was delivered by President Doane and is included here as Appendix A (Available by Request from the Senate Office).

The President's Report was delivered by President Horvath (See Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Reports on Meetings of the Academic Council and the Board of Control were delivered by Vice President Julien, who attended both meetings as the Senate observer as follows:

A. He noted that the proceedings of the last Board of Control meeting of October 4 were published in the Lode and Daily Mining Gazette; therefore, no mention of that session would be made at this time unless any of the senators had questions. There were no queries from the floor.

B. He reported that the Academic Council discussed the following items at its October 19 meeting: Summer session for 1975, pre-employment physical exams, availability of computer terminals, future staff planning, and safety on campus. Horvath asked for clarification of what was discussed concerning "pre-employment physical exams." Julien reviewed the central question: namely, how such exams should be paid for. "Future staff planning" involved tenure, hiring, and sabbatical leaves.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Spain reported that the committee had met four times, dealing primarily with the Humanities and Social Sciences elective list, which had been worked on previously by the committee of the Engineering School. The Curricular Policy Committee is now reviewing the recommendations of that Engineering committee and hopes to have a revised, all-university Humanities and Social Sciences elective list to recommend at the next Senate meeting.

Spain also reported on having met since the last Senate meeting with President Smith, Vice President Stebbins, and J.A. Romig, regarding Proposal 6-74, Course Change Policy, (which had been rejected in its present form by President Smith). Those administrators made several recommendations relative to some changes in the wording for that policy, which, if proposed by the Senate, would meet with administrative approval.

B. Instructional Policy

Baillod reported that the committee had met once since the last Senate meeting. The new committee members appointed to replace the old ones, who had either served two or more consecutive terms, or had declined reappointment, are as follows: Baillod (CE), Beckwith (MA), E. Carlson (BL), Mikkola (MY), and Shirley (ME). That realignment in membership constitutes a completely new committee.

Baillod also related that the committee discussed a letter dated March 26, 1974, from William Phillips, then Chairman of the Inter-Residence Halls Council, to former Senate President Doane. That letter requested that the Senate consider suspension of tests and exams preferably on the three days preceding Winter Carnival, or at least on the Wednesday of Winter Carnival Week preceding the judging. This request will be reviewed by the Committee and a proposal or
recommendation may be brought before the Senate at its December 18, 1974 meeting. A general discussion on the subject of exam administration ensued. Boutilier inquired concerning the "policing" aspect to ensure that faculty members conform with stated policy on when exams are to be given. Weaver expressed his view that he felt department heads were paid more money to handle such nasty jobs as reminding their faculty members what the Senate policies are. Horvath concluded that students may approach the university ombudsman if they feel an instructor is violating the stated exam policies.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Quinones referred to page 961 of the last minutes, in which the committee was asked to report back to the Senate on the "student evaluations of the faculty" conducted last spring. He indicated that the committee had met with representatives of the Student Council, distributed copies of the published evaluations, and asked the Senate members to read the instructions on the first page. He then proceeded to explain the mechanics of that evaluation instrument. Ken Williams, of the Student Council, was introduced as one of the authors of the survey. Quinones concluded that the student effort last spring to evaluate selected faculty members was "the best thing I've seen produced locally..." There were no questions from the Senate members following Quinones' presentation.

D. Academic Calendar - Structure

Weaver reported that the committee is on the schedule set for itself, and he saw no difficulty in meeting that deadline.


F. Curricular Impact

Miller read the summary of the committee's report of November 6, 1974 dealing with evaluating curricular changes to determine the effect on other curricula and departments (see Appendix D for the entire report - Available by Request from the Senate Office). He stressed that curricular changes are to be made for the educational benefit of the students. Miller then moved that the report be accepted by the Senate, and that copies of the report be sent to all administrative personnel connected with courses and curriculum changes. Spain seconded the motion. A discussion ensued. Coffman asked about the communications involved in notifying the respective departments of any curriculum changes. Miller expressed hope that the department heads would utilize memos to announce such changes. Alexander spoke to the need of improved communications among the departments, and stressed that economics, as a discipline of the School of Business, would disappear at this university should Engineering pursue the deletion of certain economics course offerings. Horvath suggested that this committee report be placed before the Senate as a proposal. Miller expressed his own reservation that such a proposal would not be needed here, that the "mechanics" for curriculum change exist on campus. Stebbins said he was pleased that the Senate would consider the questions at hand, that he appreciates such input from the faculty. He also reminded the Senate that MTU exists for the benefit of the students, that the overall concern should be to progress as a university, not as separate departments. Mikko mentioned the pressure felt as a result of the "student credit hours" concern. Baillod explained why Engineering had decided to drop certain economics courses as required. Alexander reiterated his plea for improved communications among the departments prior to changes in requirements. Stebbins promised to contact the School of Business for any input prior to changes in economics requirements. The motion to approve the committee report carried, 25 Yes, 0 No.

G. Elections - No Report

H. Elections Procedure - No Report

I. Promotion Policy Review - No Report

J. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association

Stebler reported that the committee had met and was still evaluating the data which were collected.

Old Business - None

New Business and Voluntary Remarks

Julien moved that Proposal 1-75, "Uniform Policy for Designation of Course Offerings," be adopted by the Senate. Miller seconded the motion. A discussion ensued. Julien stated that the major thrust of the proposal was to insure that courses are properly designated and offered in the appropriate departments. Booy raised the question as to whether she should stop mentioning "chemical aspects" in her geological engineering courses, and cited "geo-chemistry" as a problem area: that is, who is to teach "geo-chemistry" at this university? Julien indicated four examples in which departments other than Chemistry were teaching "chemistry courses." Weaver spoke against a "hard and fast guideline" as to where courses should be presented. Coffman indicated that Forestry would have to fold if the proposal at hand were adopted, for such subjects as math, physics, and biology are taught, in part, in that department. Spain stated that, if Proposal 1-75 should be passed, he would submit a counter-proposal. Stebler raised the question of funding for "student credit hours." Alexander stated that it is impossible for Tech to budget on a "student credit hour" basis. Romig indicated that there are many complex
reasons why the budgeting has been conducted in its present form for the past three or four years. The motion to approve Proposal 1-75 was defeated by a vote of 1 Yes, 24 No.

Julien also explained his department's concern over the awarding of credit for "Women in Engineering," the summer program. He said that the Chemistry Department does not want people outside that department giving credit for offerings therein. William Lucier, Director of Student Services, reviewed the procedure for students receiving credits at this university. Lucier said that the "Women in Engineering" program is not listed in the University Catalog, but is a "certificate course" under the public service area. Credit for that course would have to be petitioned for. Thus, credit would only be granted if the department involved would approve such. Booy asked if this policy might be misleading to the "Women in Engineering" students, who supposedly believe that a given department would automatically approve credit for that course. Stebbins said that courses such as "Women in Engineering" are offered quite widely across the nation.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:44 p.m.

H.F. Nufer
Secretary