MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 81
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

19 March 1975

(Senate Minute pages: 1020-1030)

Meeting No. 81 was called to order on Wednesday, March 19, 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-six members or alternates were present. Absent were Olson (MG), Shetron (FF), Stebbins (VP), Weaver (AL), and Juntunen (AFROTC).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 80 were approved after the following corrections:

1. Booy said that the last sentence in the final paragraph of Item D should read: "She also noted that the 1975-76 school year requires one more week on the campus from faculty members on nine-month contracts.

2. Boutilier commented that the last line of Item D should read "out of the fields" instead of "out in the fields."

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

1. The Senate Executive Council has agreed to asked the Academic Calendar-Structure Committee to poll the faculty as to which calendar they would prefer. We hope that committee can complete the polling in time for our next Senate meeting.

2. Bill Lucier called me to ask what the Senate Executive Council will do about the "Weaver Report" (The Report of the Academic Calendar-Structure Committee accepted by the Senate at Meeting No. 80 on January 29). He also informed me that, in order to meet the printer's deadline, any calendar changes planned for 1976-77 must be finalized by the end of March. I told him that there was no chance the faculty could recommend, and the Administration approve, a major change that soon. Therefore, any change we may propose could not possibly take effect before the 1977-78 school year.

3. Senator Doane, chairman of the Elections Committee, has informed me that two committee members -- George Bahrman and Mildred Townsend -- have declared themselves ineligible for election as senators-at-large, to avoid any question of conflict of interest. She suggests, and I concur, that, in the future, the Elections Committee should consist only of ineligible senators for such at-large elections.

[At this point, DelliQuadri asked for clarification on senators elected two terms in a row succeeding themselves. Horvath responded that senators who have served two consecutive terms cannot succeed themselves for a third term. Horvath added that, in the future, it would be well to ensure that all members on the Elections Committee are senators either in the beginning of their initial three-year term or those completing their second term, so that there would be no chance that they would be nominated.]

4. Senator Doane also asked what the status of the Mining Engineering Department is: whether it is part of the Metallurgical Engineering Department, or is separate and thus entitled to its own senator. My interpretation of the Senate Constitution, and the departmental structure as outlined in the new (1975-76) Catalog, is that Mining Engineering is a separate department which happens to have as its head the same individual who is the head of the Metallurgical Engineering Department and so, as such, is entitled to its own departmental senator. If there are any questions from the floor on this matter, or if anyone wants to challenge this decision, we can discuss it at this time. There are three members in the Mining Engineering Department; it has a structure of its own and offers its own courses.

5. I have received several mailings from Professor George Love concerning the Association of Michigan College Faculties (AMCF). The most recent includes the following resolution:

   Be it resolved that the Academic Senate endorses changes in the State Retirement Law which would:

   a. Give TIAA-CREF members the opportunity to return to MPSER [which I assume, means the Michigan Public School Employees Retirement System]; and

   b. Remove the ceiling, but not the floor, on institutional contributions on behalf of TIAA-CREF members.

The above resolution was recently approved at Central Michigan University, and is the essence of legislation which will be introduced in Lansing soon. The AMCF is urging that we be aware of this and, if we are in support of this sort of thing, to notify our representatives in Lansing. In addition, the AMCF is urging that the academic bodies at member schools adopt such a resolution. I have no strong feelings for this one way or another. Are there any questions or comments from the Senate?
The following discussion ensued: Miller said that we may be faced with the same problem of Senate representation with regard to Applied Technology, now that the latter is a school (School of Technology). President Smith responded that this matter deserves investigation, and that it may be necessary to designate Nursing as a separate department for purposes of such representation.

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. Julien was unable to attend the first meeting due to a schedule conflict. Several points were discussed at the second meeting on March 18 as follows:

1. On personnel records, and the keeping of such, nothing was decided except that, in the future, it appears we are going to be required to have a centralized form of record keeping for all faculty members. Some departments already have aspects of this procedure in effect; however, the Academic Council would like to see a uniform record system established which would state various things about the faculty members. There are many questions of significance concerning this, including the confidentiality, the utilization of these records, who should maintain them, and where they should be kept. I feel that it would probably be of interest for the Senate to look into this matter, especially if we are to have any contributions to make in the maintenance of such records.

2. Doug Rappley brought up the question of Student Placement questionnaires. It seems as though the students are not very good about returning those questionnaires, so Placement cannot tell where all the students have gone for employment after graduation.

3. Travel restrictions were mentioned. If money is available, there have been no particular restrictions, at least to the knowledge of the Academic Council.

4. There was some discussion about redefining the "faculty assistant:" that is, the job description for graduate research/teaching associates, and the relationships between these people and those who might be hired temporarily, say, on a quarter-basis, to teach certain courses.

The following discussion ensued: President Smith commented that Julien's point about records was well taken and that the Senate should look at this first; then, if the Senate feels the need, form a committee and meet with MTU's legal counsel, Bob Vercruysee, the next time the latter is on campus (expected in April). President Smith said that Joe Romig could set up such a meeting for the Senate President with Vercruysee. What the Administration is attempting to fulfill are some legal requirements as a result of recent policies, and to get control over records to the extent that improper things are not in records. President Smith emphasized that most faculty members would benefit from such greater control. President Smith also suggested that uniformity as to the content of records is important; there should be an agreement as to what is in records; thus, it would be well for the Senate to have its President, Horvath, meet with Vercruysee and then report back to the Senate. Horvath asked if the Administration's effort was two-fold with regard to record keeping: to centralize records and location, and to make the records uniform in content? President Smith said the effort was more than that: to ensure that no improper entries are in the records. Delliquadri asked what the school's policy would be with regard to faculty members having access to their own records on file centrally. Romig indicated that the Administration had not reached that point as yet. President Smith envisioned no problem over faculty access to records; however, he reiterated the need for centralized control of records.

B. Julien said that the meeting of the Board was reported in the local newspapers; however, he would mention two specific topics of interest from that meeting:

1. On faculty re-employments: a comment was made by one of the board members that it would be nice to learn how faculty members performed after they were promoted, especially in light of the "glowing reports" used by the department heads and deans to justify such promotions initially.

2. Two of the board members, Harwood and McGlynn, indicated that about 10 years ago the board had determined to upgrade the physical plant at MTU. Now that such up-grading was proving successful, perhaps it is time to sit down and make a similar plan for the mechanism of the overall curriculum within the university. This latter plan would be aimed at keeping MTU in the forefront, predicting which kinds of needs, directions, and trends the departments should consider in providing an education for our students. [Julien saw this comment as a possible indication of the attitude which the board may take in the near future.]

At this point, Horvath stated that the College of Engineering currently is involved in a long-range plan involving the study of various problems, including some of the above. President Smith said that he had responded in that Board of Control meeting, stressing that MTU had made a very comprehensive study in which all departments developed their respective long-range plans. Those plans are on file in the departments, are updated annually, and the department heads meet periodically to review those plans with the Administration. President Smith also acknowledged that Harwood is an international authority on long-range planning. Bovy questioned whether the above discussion was meant to imply that Tech had done so well in the 10-year plan for buildings that a new gymnasium might be in the pipeline, especially as more and more of the incoming students express their interest in such a new facility. President Smith said that there is no money available for a gym at present, with no immediate hope; however, the physical education facility is next in line.
Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Spain said that there would be no report at this time.

B. Instructional Policy - No Report.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Quinones distributed a handout entitled "Results of Teacher Evaluation Survey" (see Appendix A to these minutes for a revised copy of that survey -- Available by Request from the Senate Office). He indicated that this survey represented information received from 16 department heads on the use of written evaluations of teachers by students. Fourteen of the 16 departments surveyed in January by the committee have, or will have, a written policy with regard to some sort of a teacher evaluation program, and 13 of those departments used such evaluations when considering matters of tenure, reappointment, promotion, or improving instruction. Quinones said that Nursing was omitted from the survey. This survey was conducted to inform the Senate on existing teacher evaluation programs, university-wide, and to serve as a possible basis for the committee to develop a proposal in the future. Horvath noted that, in addition to Nursing being omitted, the entire School of Technology was missing from the survey. Stebler said that, if he might speak for the School of Technology, the answers in the survey would be "yes, yes, yes" under the three columns (see Appendix A). DelliQuadri suggested that the School of Business should also be added to the survey. Nufer recommended that, as two of the schools were omitted in the January survey, the survey should be reaccomplished and resubmitted for entry into the minutes. Alexander raised the question of utilizing teacher evaluations for the purposes of promotion or tenure (see column 3 in Appendix A), and felt that such should not be published in the present form. A discussion ensued on the voluntary nature of the application of column 3. Horvath said that a Senate committee several years ago recommended, and the Senate approved, the use of teacher evaluations on a strictly voluntary basis for such matters as promotion or tenure. Coffman said that such an approach was voluntary in Mechanical Engineering and Engineering Mechanics. DelliQuadri reminded the Senate that a policy had been adopted some years ago to place the use of teacher evaluations on a voluntary basis.

D. Academic Calendar - Structure - No Report.

E. Audio-Visual Instructional Material

Danielson referred to Proposal 4-75, Amendments to the Faculty Patent Policy. He reviewed the history of the Patent Policy Subcommittee, including the latter's report to the Senate (page 927 in the Minutes). Briefly, Danielson said that the subcommittee over the past year had studied the patent policies as found at several universities throughout the nation, and surveyed MTU faculty members, through the departmental representatives to the Senate. That committee also discussed the present patent policy at Tech with Tom Evans, the Director of Research. The subcommittee found the following items in need of clarification and, in some cases, modification, with regard to the present patent policy:

1. The waiting period which the inventor must go through once he has submitted the disclosure to the university's Director of Research: there is an unwritten regulation which specifies a 90-day period of waiting; therefore, the inventor has to experience a long, formal proceeding to obtain action on his disclosure.

2. The present policy makes no distinction between purely research faculty and other faculty members on the Tech campus.

3. The overall procedures involved in the present patent policy are generally complicated.

4. The right and opportunity of the inventor to participate in the negotiations concerning the developments for which he is responsible need clarification.

Danielson then contrasted the present patent policy at MTU with those recommendations of the committee. Horvath asked if there was a motion to adopt Proposal 4-75, Amendments to the Faculty Patent Policy. Danielson so moved; Julien seconded. A discussion ensued relative to various parts of the proposal. DelliQuadri asked if there had been any collective bargaining between the subcommittee and the Administration in an effort to compromise on the differences noted in the present patent policy vis-a-vis Proposal 4-75? Professor Harley Sachs responded that he had sent a preliminary minority report of that subcommittee last year to the Director of Research and to the Secretary of the Board of Control; however, no responses had been received from either of those officials. DelliQuadri asked if there had been a majority report? Sachs responded that the minority report was actually a letter from him to the above administrators, summarizing the findings of that subcommittee. DelliQuadri further inquired if the minority report differed from Proposal 4-75 above? Sachs replied that the only difference was in the specific wording of the amendments. Romig said that he did not understand Sachs' letter was a minority report, and he apologized for overlooking the matter. Alexander asked about transferable rights under the old or the new patent policies? DelliQuadri recommended that the Senate and the Administration work jointly on the patent policy rather than the former assuming an adversary position. Danielson said it seemed proper that the committee had submitted the present proposal (4-75) and that further contacts could be made between the committee and the Administration. Mikkola pointed out that the wording regarding patent
rights could have an effect on future work in related areas. DelliQuadri proposed to amend the motion so that a committee of three, chosen from the Audio-Visual Instructional Material Committee, should meet with three counterparts in the Administration to hammer out differences in the approaches to the question of patent policies at MTU. Hennessy seconded that motion. The vote carried 25 Yes, 0 No. A vote then was taken on the motion to approve Proposal 4-75. The vote was 24 Yes, 0 No.

F. Dependents Scholarship

Julien indicated that he had contacted David Cooper to see what the latter's responses had been from other universities. Cooper heard from Central Michigan University, the University of Michigan, Lake Superior College, Wayne State, Oakland, and Northern Michigan. None of the above schools has a dependents scholarship program. Some have a rebate program, wherein the tuition may be waived by an adviser. Julien also conducted a survey at MTU to determine how many students would attend Tech as dependents of faculty. The total is approximately 115, of which 88 are presently attending classes at Tech. It would cost approximately $600 annually for each dependent student (or, a total of about $53,000 yearly). Opinions vary on the wisdom of such a program, Julien reported. Faculty members without children appeared opposed to such a scholarship program for dependents at MTU; those faculty with children were in favor. Julien's own opinion was simply to submit this as a report and not carry the subject any further. Gibson recalled that this subject was discussed some years ago by the Faculty Association Council; there, the matter seemed to die. Horvath said that this present committee will be kept active to see if there is any further interest by any of the faculty as a result of this report on the numbers and costs involved being published in these minutes.

G. Elections Committee - No Report.

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 would be no report until after the next election.

I. Promotion Policy Review

Hennessy said that there was nothing new to report at this time.

J. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association

Stebler reported that the committee had not met since the last Senate meeting. He then proceeded to update the work of the committee. This committee is essentially a data-gathering body, receiving information from all of the state universities and colleges in Michigan. He also indicated that he understood the Faculty Association this week is distributing its questionnaire to the faculty as a whole. The purpose of that questionnaire is to find out from the faculty what the latter feels the Faculty Association should be doing. When the results of the local survey are compiled with the data from other schools, the committee should then be able to submit a definitive report to the Senate on what the general feelings are with regard to the local organizations. Stebler expressed the hope that the faculty would take the survey seriously and complete the survey questionnaire.

Old Business - None

New Business

A. Alexander said that he was under a mandate of his faculty (the School of Business). On February 28, 1975 the faculty of the School of Business received the following memo, which Alexander said he had been requested to read to the Senate at this time: [A memo from Dean Biesoit to his School of Business Faculty was read by Alexander at this point, the directive indicating that "It is necessary to have better records on absences from campus; . . . (therefore) all personnel, academic and staff, (must) submit an absence request form before leaving on any trip, whether on university business, personal business, or vacation."

Alexander continued that the School of Business faculty voted unanimously to bring this question of the need for such absence forms before the Senate. President Smith asked to comment on this matter. He said that there is a breakdown in communication, that the absence report forms were only intended to be used by those officials reporting directly to the President. Apparently, this word was not passed down through the Academic Council after the mistake was discovered. Several Senate members said at this point that no corrections had been made at the departmental level.

B. Nufer said that the Department of Social Sciences asked him to raise the question of evaluations of administrators, possibly setting up a committee to study this. The consensus of the departmental members favored the evaluation of administrators, specifically to be worked out at a later date. This does not have to be done immediately; this is simply something which the Senate might want to consider. Such an evaluation might serve as an aid to the administrators. Alexander said that this is supposed to be a primary mandate of the Institutional Evaluation Committee. Quinones responded that the Institutional Evaluation Committee is still involved with the student evaluation of teachers and will look into the evaluation of administrators in the future.
The meeting was adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

H.F. Nufer
Secretary