MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 79
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
18 December 1974

(Senate Minute pages: 978-991)

Meeting No. 79 was called to order on Wednesday, December 18, 1974 at 7:05 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President R.S. Horvath.

The roll was called by the Secretary, H. F. Nufer. Twenty-two members or alternates were present. Absent were Kapp (PE), Nelson (HU), Olson (MG), Quinones (AROTC), Shandley (PH), Shetron (FF), Stebbins (V.P.), Stebler (AT), and Juntinen (AFROTC).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 78 were approved as distributed.

The President’s Report was delivered by President Horvath with ensuing discussion from the floor, as follows:

1. Dr. Brown of the Biological Sciences Department phoned me on December 13 to inform me that he was going to be in Madison on business, and he planned on discussing the possibilities of a biological sciences co-op program with several interested business concerns in that area. I expressed the opinion to him that such a discussion would not violate University policy. I don’t know if any of you feel that it might, but he was concerned about how the Senate might feel about that. In the absence of any other opinions, I simply told him to go ahead.

2. I received a letter from David E. Cooper, Chairman of the Academic Senate at Northern Michigan University. He is attempting to gauge sentiment regarding the desirability of establishing a Michigan-wide faculty-spouse independent scholarship exchange program. I’ll read the letter for your information.

As chairman of the Academic Senate at Northern Michigan University, I have been requested to discover sentiment on the campuses of other Michigan universities regarding the desirability of establishing a faculty-spouse independent scholarship exchange program. I would like to receive your assistance in several areas.

First, does your university possess, as a faculty fringe benefit, a tuition-scholarship program for faculty spouses and legal, that is, financial, dependents? [Horvath said the answer is no.]

Second, if the answer to the above is yes, would your faculty be interested in exercising this benefit on a campus other than your own?

Third, if the answer to question two is yes, would your faculty be interested in an exchange of such scholarship awards with Northern Michigan?

So I’ll write back and mention to him that we don’t have such a fringe benefit and, therefore, the other two questions are moot. I thought you would be interested in knowing, though, that there is some activity afoot in the state along those lines. Are there any questions or comments?

At this point, the following discussion ensued: Julien asked if it might be possible for the MTU Senate to initiate something along the lines of a faculty-spouse independent scholarship exchange program as a desirable goal to pursue? Horvath responded that the Senate may recommend policy in areas of this sort, as he understands. Strictly speaking, he continued, the Senate is limited to academic affairs; but, the feelings of the faculty on fringe benefits have a bearing on academic matters. Horvath added that, if Julien or any other senator wants the Senate to look into this matter, such would be a reasonable request. Julien made a motion that the Senate at least examine the feasibility of such a scholarship program. Horvath suggested that Julien make that motion under new business.

Alexander commented that he recollected that co-op programs are restricted to the College of Engineering, and suggested that the Senate check on that matter per chance a precedent be set by which anyone can establish a co-op program. He further stressed that the Senate might want to take upon itself a change in the specific language so that there will not be the informal corporation of a co-op program as a result of informal negotiations of individuals. Horvath commented that, in discussing the co-op possibility with Dr. Brown, he pointed out to the latter that nothing of this sort could be done, of course, without approval through the ordinary channels; however, Horvath stressed to Dr. Brown that he saw no harm in Brown’s discussing the possibilities with certain people in Madison, that the Senate could not possibly restrict Dr. Brown’s actions as an individual in conversations off-campus. Alexander said that he, personally, would not want to preclude such discussions, either.
Reports on Meetings of the Academic Council and the Board of Control were delivered by Vice President Julien, who attended such meetings as the Senate observer as follows:

A. He reported that the Academic Council met twice since the last Senate meeting. He was only able to attend the second meeting, due to a change in schedule. Three items were primarily discussed at that latter session: summer school, prerequisites in courses, and the NSF Scientific Equipment proposals. On that last item, the question was raised about how to choose among proposals where there are, say nine - five from one department? Should one proposal be chosen from each department? Or, simply choose the best proposals from all submissions? No conclusions were reached other than continuing as in the past. Another item mentioned at the Academic Council was to have the Summer Faculty Research Award announcements released a couple of months earlier than usual (say, in February, instead of April) so that departmental faculty teaching schedules for the summer may be based, in part, on that.

B. He said that the Board of Control meeting, of December 6, was highlighted in the local newspapers (the Lode and Daily Mining Gazette), so he had nothing to add to that.

The following discussion ensued. Weaver asked what needed to be discussed in the Academic Council with regard to "prerequisites in courses?" Julien responded that a student, for example had taken a course, then later found that he did not have the prerequisite for it. The student then asked if he could take that course over and receive credit for the repeat. Weaver
observed that there is a Senate policy regarding this matter; however, that policy is usually ignored. Weaver also stated that, if a student passes course number two in a sequence, he cannot go back and repeat course number one to raise the latter grade.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Spain reported that the committee had held only one meeting since the last Senate session, due to the term break. That committee meeting was mostly concerned with the suggested revisions to the course change policy which were obtained from Dr. Stebbins and President Smith. The committee members were not wholly in agreement with those changes, subsequently, Spain had further discussed the changes with Dr. Stebbins. Hopefully, the committee will have a revised course change policy for the Senate at the next meeting. Spain would like to present a number of items for consideration at the January 29 Senate session.

B. Instructional Policy

Baillod reported that there had been one meeting. Senator Phillips, the student representative, was in attendance. The memo on eliminating exams during Winter Carnival Week was discussed. The committee's proposal on this will be put in the agenda for the next Senate meeting.


D. Academic Calendar - Structure

Weaver said that the committee had met the previous day and hopes to have its report for the next Senate meeting. He told the Senate that the committee will not come in with a "two sentence" solution to all the problems of calendar structuring. He indicated that the committee has received much data and feedback from many people. Several faculty members contacted expressed no interest. Some of the student body were included in the query. The committee will present to the Senate a series of recommendations. Weaver stressed that most university members probably will be unhappy with the committee's package; thus, the Senate members will have to help by talking to their fellow department members about the proposals. The hope would be to avoid having another committee "plow the same ground" two years hence.

E. Audio-Visual Instructional Material:

Danielson said that the committee had no report due primarily to difficulties of getting the three members together for a meeting. He hopes to have a report at a future Senate session.

F. Curricular Impact

President Horvath dismissed the Curricular Impact Committee, and its honorable chairperson, Miller, with all due thanks from the Senate.

G. Elections - No Report

H. Elections Procedure - No Report

I. Promotion Policy Review

Hennessy reviewed where the Senate stands with regard to the development of detailed criteria for promotion. At present, he said that the next step is for the departments to look at the "generalized" criteria -- which read "like you have to be everything to all men." -- and tailor such to the needs of the particular department. Spain indicated that Biological Sciences has already studied the promotion criteria, revised such according to the department's needs, and approved it within the department. Horvath observed that the Administration would still have final approval on any promotions, and that the Promotion Policy Review Committee's function is to serve as a "watchdog" in seeing that the procedures are followed.

J. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association

Horvath reported on behalf of Stebler who was unable to attend this evening. The committee is chaired by Keith Baldwin of the Faculty Association. The faculty is presently being polled on the topic of the "expected roles of the two organizations." The results of that poll will have a large part in what the committee's final report for the Senate will be.

Old Business - None

New Business and Voluntary Remarks
Julien referred to the letter in the President's report and asked if there is any way in which the Senate could fully examine the faculty-spouse scholarship program: first, how widespread such is in Michigan, and second, the advisability of having Michigan Tech involved in that program. Julien then made a motion to form an ad hoc committee to look into the feasibility of having, as a faculty fringe benefit, a tuition scholarship program for faculty spouses and dependents at MTU. The motion carried 15 Yes, 1 No.

President Smith reported on a visit he and other state university presidents had with Governor Milliken on December 17, with regard to budget matters. Such Michigan schools will have to cut 1.5% out of their current year's operating budgets. Each of those universities was also asked by the Governor to submit its budget for next year based on 96% of this year's budget. The Governor promised to put an "economic package" on top of that, which package may include inflation and salary increases although neither the Governor nor his staff defined such possibilities. The state university presidents in attendance at that meeting took a "united front" regarding higher education, as follows: first, that education is different than perhaps some of the other state departments. Today, education is exactly that area in which you should not cut back. It is better to have people in higher education than on welfare; it is better for the state to have people prepared to take jobs. Second, that inflation has hit higher education worse than most state agencies. In the past, as the state universities were given their budgets, no one took into account all the different things that university administrators have had to do which they had not done previously: OSHO, contract negotiations, minimum wage law, equal pay, affirmative action, Title 9, and the Buckley Amendment, in addition to a proliferation of the kinds of data which must be sent to Lansing. As an aside, President Smith said that MTU's budget book this year was 3 1/2 inches thick. Third, that, instead of going through the peculiar exercise of reducing next year's budget (to 96% of this year's), as a base, and then building on top of that, say 8% (which would only be a real 4% increase), it would be better for the state simply to give each university a budget and say that a 4% increase, or whatever, was given. A reduction exercise should be an internal matter for the school. President Smith said that Governor Milliken listened with interest to the above suggestions by university presidents. What will result from that meeting remains to be seen. Hennessy asked it the proposed 4% decrease for next year would be for "operations" or for "operations plus capital outlay." President Smith responded that only "operations" was involved in the cut. As for "capital outlay" those buildings already under construction will be completed. Alexander commented that he supposed one reason for the Governor's motivation in proposing a 4% cutback for next year is to "condition" the heads of state agencies to the idea that next year is going to be a tight year, and to get them thinking about how they are going to cut back. President Smith said that the university heads had asked that same question, and were given the same answer: that the Governor wants them to be better managers, that things are going to get tougher. Coffman asked for clarification on the 1.5% reduction from the current year's budget. President Smith said that such was from the total budget for the present (1974-75) year, and not simply from the remainder of the year. Horvath then asked if the planned 4% reduction next year would be from the original budget total for the present year. President Smith said yes.

Nufer observed that the Senate meeting attendance on this date (only 22 present) might have been greater had it not been the last Wednesday before Christmas, when there was a Christmas concert at Houghton High School. Possibly, as a precedent, the Senate could try in the future to avoid scheduling Senate meetings in the last week prior to the Christmas recess.

Horvath wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

H.F. Nufer
Secretary