MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 80
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOCAL UNIVERSITY
29 January 1975

(Senate Minute pages: 992-1019)

Meeting No. 80 was called to order on Wednesday, January 29, 1975 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-seven members or alternates were present. Absent were Danielson (IWR), Gibson (ME), Smith (Pres.), and Stebbins (V.P.)

The Minutes of Meeting No. 79 were approved after the following clarification by Stebler concerning the Roles of the Senate & Faculty Association Committee report (see Item J on page 983):

Stebler reports that a committee of the Faculty Association, chaired by Keith Baldwin, is presently preparing a questionnaire to poll the faculty on the "role of the Faculty Association." The results of this poll will have a large part in what the Senate [Roles of the Senate & Faculty Association] Committee's final report on the respective roles of the two organizations will be.

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

1. Vice President Julien has consented to be chairman of the Dependents Scholarship Committee.

2. I received a communication yesterday from Dr. D.G. Yerg, Dean of the Graduate School. His letter concerning off-campus instruction follows:

   The attached report [see Appendix A - Available by request from the Senate Office] to these minutes for the four proposals contained in that report] will be presented for adoption and distribution by the Michigan Council of Graduate Deans on April 5, 1975. The four specific proposals are an outgrowth of the report and also will be considered at the same time. Any comments or suggestions you might have will be welcomed.

   Stimulated by the work of the Michigan Council of Graduate Deans (MCGD) and by concerns raised through the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States on November 7, 1974, the Graduate Council of Michigan Tech authorized a committee on off-campus instruction and research for graduate credit. This committee will prepare a brief statement of guidelines and requirements for recognition of graduate credits based on off-campus activities.

   You will be informed of the work of the committee and will have an opportunity to comment on committee recommendations before they are presented to the Graduate Council late in the spring.

At this point, Horvath read the four proposals. The concern seems to be primarily with diploma-mill type situations which are cropping up. Apparently, Nova University jobs out courses to a proprietor group which has complete control of course content, professors, and enrollments. While the university has no control over such, yet the university is granting credit for it. Are there any questions or comments from the Senate?

The following discussion ensued: Booy stated that she felt each department should have a copy of the above report, for it sounded as if the stated four proposals might be unduly restrictive. She also said that, before evaluations are made, the matter should be looked into further by the Senate. DelliQuadri asked if Dean Yerg's letter was a "communications item," or would the Senate have a voice in it? Horvath replied that the letter was simply a "communications item" but that the Senate could voice its opinion. Julien inquired whether the Yerg letter would go through the Graduate Council. Horvath answered yes, and said one of the items Dr. Yerg mentioned in the letter was that there is a committee on off-campus instruction and research for graduate credit which is authorized by the Graduate Council of Michigan Tech. This latter committee will prepare a brief statement of guidelines and requirements for the recommendations of graduate credit based on off-campus activities. Horvath also noted that the Senate will be informed of that Committee’s work and have an opportunity to comment on the resultant recommendations.

DelliQuadri asked if the Senate's jurisdictional lines are clear enough that major policies at Tech are made in the Senate, or may the Graduate Council go in a direction without the aid of the Senate? Horvath replied that any group on campus can go the way it chooses without input from the Senate. DelliQuadri then stated that it seems as if the Senate's policy was already made with regard to a "university without walls." Somewhere, he added, there is a proposal in which credit is extended to those not on campus. Now, such has extended to graduate areas. Is this a result of Senate policy, or a separate one? Horvath replied no, the Senate passed a resolution supporting the concept of such, but felt details should go through normal channels. What MCGD is doing, Horvath said, is attempting to restrict this concept of a "university without walls," at least as such applies to certain types of graduate programs.
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 once, on January 14, 1975, at which time three items were primarily discussed:

1. It has been revealed that personnel files on campus are incomplete and vary from department to department. Some universities are running into trouble with regard to the termination of faculty members when it is discovered that files are incomplete or inaccurate. Other aspects of this problem include the need to maintain a "proof of degree" in the faculty member's file; records of conferences between the department head and the faculty member should be kept, especially for purposes of tenure; and there is the question of where such files should be maintained: namely, in a central file on campus, or in each individual department?

2. John Gooch, Director of Employee Relations, has in his office an IBM typewriter for a "word processing" service. That machine will aid in the process of speeding up the printing of letters and reports. This service is available to all departments.

3. Four Polish professors will be on campus in February. There is interest in developing research exchange programs for senior faculty members and graduate students between Michigan Tech and the Warsaw Technological University in Poland. [Horvath interjected here that Dr. Stebbins had sent a memo to all departments, asking for all persons interested in these programs to contact the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.]

B. He said that no Board of Control meetings were held during this period.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Spain reported that he was re-presenting the Course Change Policy, Proposal 2-75 which is a revision of Proposal 6-74, adopted by the Senate on March 20, 1974, but subsequently rejected by President Smith. Spain recounted a subsequent meeting he had with President Smith, Vice President Stebbins, and J.A. Romig in which those administrators recommended areas in the policy which needed revision to allow for more control. Those revisions are represented in Proposal 2-75 by underlined statements. Spain then made a motion that Proposal 2-75 be adopted. Weaver seconded the motion.

DelliQuadri asked if the underlined portions in the above proposal are those which were "modified." Spain said that those were discussed by the committee and approved, although not unanimously, and represent some changes. Baillod noted that, in the types of changes covered in Proposal 2-75, there is a loophole or an exclusion, that is, it is fairly clear that course additions and deletions are covered, and that changes in degree programs fall under Senate Policy 10-70; however, that earlier policy (Senate Proposal 10-70) only covers "significant changes." Thus, Baillod asked about "minor changes" such as additions or deletions of a required course in a curriculum. Spain responded that the University Curriculum Review Committee covers such. Baillod further asked about the "mechanics": would the department say that it has a provisional change in its curriculum, and would such a change remain until argued against by someone? Spain said that he would personally like to see changes in curriculum, as well as newly proposed curriculum, be the responsibility of an entirely new committee of the Senate. After a lengthy discussion involving "significant" vis-a-vis "minor changes" in old and new programs, it was moved by Baillod, and seconded by Spain, that the phrase, "which fall under Senate Policy 10-70" be deleted from the last sentence in paragraph II of Proposal 2-75 on page 987. Thus, that last sentence would read simply: "Also excluded are changes in degree programs."

Julien asked if the new policy in Proposal 2-75 governs individual course additions, deletions, and changes? Miller submitted that this policy is not needed, for each department has a "catch all" course number for which it can teach anything the faculty wants. Thus, when a new course has proven itself, the department simply submits a regular proposal for a new course and such will be approved within a reasonable time. Spain responded that the procedure outlined by Miller is an "easy out" and that students suffer from such approaches. The above amendment to the proposal was passed by a vote of 22 Yes, 1 No.

Stebler then offered an editorial amendment to paragraph IV of Proposal 2-75 on page 988, substituting the words "School of Technology" for two-year programs in Applied Technology." Carr seconded the motion. This amendment was approved by a vote of 23 Yes, 0 No.

Boutilier raised the question of possible departmental expense necessitated by the requirements in paragraph III-C. Spain replied that such course descriptions would not have to be multi-page efforts answering dozens of questions; rather that such should include only enough information to announce to other departments that a particular course is coming, and do they have any objections? Thus, on one page such items would be included as: the course title, catalog description, credits, and the topic outline an instructor would anticipate using. Approximately only 250 copies would need to be made.
DelliQuadri moved the previous question. Stebler seconded. The motion on adopting Proposal 1-75, with two editorial amendments as noted above, passed by a vote of 16 yes, 3 No.

B. Instructional Policy

Baillod reported that one meeting had been held. He endorsed Proposal 3-75 and said that such would be submitted as new business with regard to hourly exams during Winter Carnival break.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Wettack stated that the committee would report at the next meeting, on March 19.

D. Academic Calendar - Structure

Weaver commented briefly on the committee report which was distributed prior to tonight's meeting (Appendix B - Available by request from the Senate Office). He stated that the report was not a formal proposal but simply reasons for calendar structure. He cited the primary objectives followed by the committee members and indicated that the committee attempted to keep "personal opinion" out of its findings as much as possible. DelliQuadri made a motion that the Senate receive the report. Hennessy seconded.

DelliQuadri questioned the wording of the last paragraph on the third page of the report and said that the statement seemed biased, as half of the state's higher educational institutions use semesters, and half, quarters. Weaver stated that the committee was misinformed on that matter and would have changed the wording had the correct percentages been known at the time.

Carr voiced the opinion that the present early quarters at MTU were better than the Forest Tech staff, allowing students to be out in the fields during deer season. Civil Tech's, on the other hand, prefer late quarters, as surveying classes are offered in the spring quarter when the ground is still very wet. Julien suggested that, at some time, there should be a poll taken of all faculty and students as to their feelings concerning semesters vis-a-vis quarters.

The question of funding the distribution of the committee report was discussed. Horvath indicated that the Senate would pay the cost involved. Spain suggested asking the Lode as the student newspaper, to publish the report. Jolyn Welsh, the Lode reporter present, indicated when asked that perhaps the Lode would consider publishing the committee report in three installments. Weaver suggested photo reduction if such were done in that newspaper. Phillips said that the Student Council might consider polling the students on their sentiments with regard to semesters or quarters, in reply to Julien's comment, above.

DelliQuadri suggested that the committee report become part of the Minutes. Booy said that she liked the semesters, but would prefer anything to get rid of the break in the winter quarter at Christmas. She also noted that those faculty members who work nine months, instead of 12, are greatly affected by the late quarters.

A vote was taken on the motion to receive the report. The motion passed with a 24 Yes, 0 No vote.

E. Audio-Visual Instructional Material - No Report

F. Dependents Scholarship

Julien said that this new committee was still investigating the matter of dependents scholarship possibilities.

G. Elections Committee

Doane reported that she had received a mailing list for faculty members and solicited additions or deletions from each department, as she is presently compiling the roster for the spring election of the senators at large.

H. Elections Procedure

DelliQuadri said that there were no matters to report at this time.

I. Promotion Policy Review

Hennessy commented on having written appraisals if an organization employed more than 15 personnel. He had talked with a labor relations representative regarding the relevance of such appraisals at a university. Hennessy learned that Office of Economic Opportunity (OEC) guidelines indicate that any employer who employs more than 15 people must have written appraisals on them unless he has an Affirmative Action program. If the employer does not have such written appraisals, then he must hire or promote someone on quota basis and justify his actions accordingly. As to whether such applies to a university, the labor relations man said to Hennessy that there is a great debate going on at the present time, but his guess would be yes, that if any member of a faculty protested over not being promoted, or for being fired, and no written appraisals were available, the university administration would be held accountable. Hennessy then indicated that it is important personnel files are maintained accurately, reflecting, among other things, interviews between department heads and faculty members.

J. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association
Stebler reported that this committee had not met since the last Senate session; however, the committee's work is still ongoing, presently attempting to obtain written information -- such as copies of constitutions and by-laws of the Senate and Parent-Faculty Association, if there are such -- from all state higher educational institutions. The committee members are also gathering a historical background on the present MTU Senate: namely, its founding and purposes. Stebler then reviewed the Faculty Association's preamble.

**Old Business** - None

**New Business**

A. Since Proposal 2-75, Course Change Policy, had already been discussed, nothing further was added at this point.

B. Concerning Proposal 3-75, Phillips moved that it be adopted. Booy seconded. Weaver said that such a proposal would reduce the winter term by two days. Phillips replied that regular classes would be held with daily assignments and quizzes being allowed. Only hourly exams would be suspended during that time. Nufer stated it would be ludicrous to give mid-term exams on such days of Winter Carnival Week, due to the tremendous physical strain placed on students involved in the activities; and he questioned how motivated the students are to participate in those activities in the first place. Alexander asked if Proposal 3-75 would become a standing policy for future carnivals. Weaver responded that it no doubt would, although it would be difficult to say at this time, not knowing how President Smith feels about the proposal. Proposal 3-75 was then passed by a vote of 23 Yes, 1 No.

C. Hennessy proposed the establishment of an ad hoc committee to study Policy on Faculty Release for Budgetary Reasons (see Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office). He made a motion for such a committee. Stebler seconded. Alexander expressed his view that such a committee would break precedent and suggested that the Senate table this motion pending the arrival of budget restraints. He formally moved to table. That motion was seconded by Stanulus and passed by a vote of 11 Yes, 10 No.

D. Julien asked if any course of action were needed to set up the Academic Calendar, and Horvath replied that the Senate Executive Council would meet and decide on a course of action for the Senate's consideration.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

H.F. Nufer
Secretary