MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 85
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

10 December 1975

(Senate Minute pages: 1078-1096)

Meeting No. 85 was called to order on Wednesday, December 10, 1975 at 7:05 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President L.M. Julien.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-six members or alternates were present. Absent were ElRite, R.E. (PE), Stebler, R.C. (AL), Thompson, V.D. (AROTC).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitor was in attendance: Zak, R. (Lode Reporter).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 84 were approved after the following additions and corrections.

Nufer said that the following clarification should be made concerning submission of the memo "Rights of Non-Smokers" (see page 1067. He said that the person who submitted the memo will not be identified unless the Senate should request to know who it is.

Page 1065, first full paragraph. The Council talked about the increasing problem of a large number of tenured spots on the faculty. The underlined word should have been "Council", not "Board."

Page 1063. Heldt said that the report summarized the sabbatical leave program to date. Insert the word "program."

The President's Report

1. Long-Range Planning Steering Committee Report. The Steering Committee, consisting of President Smith, Vice President Stebbins, Mr. Russell Hoyer, member of the Board of Control, and Senate President Julien met and talked about the first objective of the Steering Committee which is to obtain members for various other committees. The Self-Evaluation Committee has already met, and evaluated certain parameters of the University. There are five other committees which have various charges:

Committee A: The primary goal of this committee is to try to predict what is going to happen in the future.

Committee B: is to evaluate realistically what can be done about these goals and needs under our present or existing conditions.

Committee C will be basically concerned with how these programs can be implemented and the guidelines which should be used.

Committee D will set the order of priorities of the overall plan.

Committee E will see the implementation of these plans.

Each Senate representative is to present to President Julien the name of one person selected from within their department and one person from outside their department for both Committee A and Committee B. These names will be given to the Steering Committee; and used to select faculty members to be representatives on these planning committees.

At the end of this part of President Julien's report there were numerous questions. Julien was asked if students would be included on the Committees. He said, "Yes." How many would be on Committee A and B, and what would be the composition? Committee A will have seven to nine members and Committee B may consist of the same people or different people. The Committees will probably consist of two faculty members, one or two students, one or two from outside the University community, and a Board of Control member. He was asked whether Committees C, D, E would be made up later, and whether the faculty would have representatives on them. Julien said, "Yes." What time span would be planned? He said that a ten-year span was thought to be reasonable. He was asked if the Committees would work on all functions of the University such as research or would the work be aimed at the academic sector. Julien said that it would be pretty well inclusive. President Smith added that while it would be pretty well inclusive, the primary objective focuses on the academic. He also added that at the next Senate meeting if the Senate wanted that he might talk about Long-Range Planning.

2. Annual Faculty Research Award Selection Process. After reading the minutes from the last Senate meeting, Tom Evans, Chairman, Research Council, found that there was a lack of knowledge about the selection process for the annual faculty research award. The report he sent to President Julien is included in the minutes (See Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Mr. Evans has included a list of the faculty research award recipients.
3. Committee on Professional Standards and Development. President Julien has set up an ad hoc committee on Professional Standards and Development which Senator Kauppila has agreed to head. The Committee is to set up criteria for analyzing professional development and from these criteria develop guidelines for implementation.

Julien said that the faculty have turned in reports listing papers presented, meetings attended, research papers and that he thinks the information is readily available and asked the cooperation of those collecting the information in assisting Kauppila in setting up these criteria. Hennessy pointed out that before going into a person's file, one would have to have that person's permission. Julien said that maybe a questionnaire could be sent to each individual. He recommended that the ad hoc committee should proceed in whatever direction it can. He also asked for volunteers for the committee. Nelson asked whether there is a relationship between this new committee and criteria for promotion and tenure. Julien responded that this was not the intent of the new Committee.

4. The Budget. Faculty Teaching Loads. President Julien asked President Smith to comment on the University's position regarding increased faculty teaching loads because of the increased number of students.

President Smith said that Michigan Tech is to have a $175,000 budget cut in addition to the $250,000 budget cut at the beginning of the year. The faculty has absorbed a higher teaching load this year. Despite the budget cuts, Tech will maintain the integrity of the academic program. He said that the University is in a terrible spot. If it does not take the students, the source of income is lost, but if the students are accepted, Tech has to have the faculty to teach them.

Weaver said that he heard that the number of students at Tech went up about 10% and that he thought that the number of the faculty had gone down. President Smith responded that the net number on the faculty had not gone down. The University and the Board of Control had a very difficult choice. The salary increases could have been kept lower this year and more faculty added. The decision was to give larger increases.

President Smith indicated that the 10% increase came from returning students that the University could not turn down. Weaver said that there has been considerable speculation that the 10% increase was obtained by lowering admission standards. In the report given was strictly about the rooms, and had nothing to do with enrollment problems. The Board asked for a report about residence halls because it is deeply concerned about overcrowding experienced in the dormitories.

President Julien noted that there is another problem related to the discussion about enrollment. He said that there is some concern among the various faculty about too large a number of students being reinstated after they have been dropped from the rolls due to bad grades. There are regulations stating that they are to stay out two quarters after they have been dropped, but he thinks that perhaps the situation should be examined thoroughly to see if these regulations are being followed.

5. Faculty Salary Information. President Julien asked President Smith to state the position of the administration regarding information on salaries. Julien read the following from Proposal 4-74:

The administration shall provide the necessary information to the Secretary of the Senate to permit the inclusion of salary schedules in the Annual Report to the Faculty. The Secretary shall include a list of salaries for each faculty member by rank and department and for each administrative officer by title. No names shall be included in the listing.

Julien said that the Senate has had a partial response to this proposal from the administration.

President Smith responded that a private citizen has asked for the same information but some faculty members and staff members have indicated to the administration that they would start suit against the University if it released that information, under the rights of privacy. He said that he would rather have the court decide whether or not such salary information is to be released. The Board of Control's viewpoint is that even if there is one person who has an objection to their salary being released, they will abide by the right of privacy by the individual until they are directed otherwise by the courts. He asked how the faculty feels about the issue.

Boutilier said that is is rumored strongly that this private citizen does have a complete list of everyone's salaries. Smith responded that some of the data this person has seems accurate and other data does not seem accurate.

Miller said that he was disappointed by the administration's response to Proposal 4-74 and that salary information ought to be published just the way the Senate asked for it.

President Smith responded to Miller by saying that if all of the information under Proposal 4-74 had been given as the Senate requested, that there would have been persons critical of the University for doing this and not able to understand why people were curious about their salaries. He said the University is caught in the middle. Many faculty and staff do not want their salary information published.

Booy said that since the tax payer's money is involved that she feels that the tax payer has a right to know who is getting what. She added that she is not ashamed of what she makes, but that the University should be ashamed that it is paying her so little.

Weaver said that he does not understand the type of thought that says that because he works for the state he must therefore
disclose private information, such as salary information.

Julien said that depending on the outcome of the case pending against the University, that he thinks that there is enough faculty interest to warrant expanding Proposal 4-74 in such a way that privacy could be maintained and yet more information disseminated.

Miller wondered why the administration has not yet given the Senate information on 1975-76 Faculty Salaries (see page 1058 of the Senate minutes). Julien noted that Salary Schedules to be included in the Senate Annual Report are issued later and later each year by the administration.

Report on the Meeting of the Academic Council was delivered by Vice President P. Nelson. (See Appendix B of these minutes -- Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Report on the Meeting of the Board of Control was delivered by Vice President P. Nelson. (See Appendix C of these minutes -- Available by Request from the Senate Office). At the conclusion of the report, Nelson said that copies of the minutes from the meetings of the Board of Control are located in the Library's Reserve Room, that he had looked at them, and that they seemed to be complete.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy - Chairman Nelson read a statement of purpose and scope which the Committee approved.

The purpose of the Senate Curricular Policy Committee is to develop policy recommendations for Senate consideration on matters related to modifications of the curriculum. The scope of the Committee includes the following general issues:

1. Review of proposals for new degree programs.
2. Review of HU-SS list of electives.
3. Review of development of policies on general curriculum guidelines, the course change mechanism and other matters having significant impact on the curriculum.

The Curricular Policy Committee is currently studying two related issues. According to the minutes of past meetings, the Vice President has asked this committee many times to study the issue of general curriculum guidelines. The Committee has resolved to take a closer look at this matter and to make some kind of a recommendation, either in the form of a proposal or a recommendation that nothing be done in this area.

The Committee is looking at the need for policy on oral and written communications and expects to have a report on that topic at a future meeting.

Nelson handed out copies of a preliminary report on a survey, taken last spring by Dr. Spain for the Committee, of each department, to gather information on the need for general curriculum guidelines. The report only includes numerical information from the survey. (See Appendix D of these minutes Available by Request from the Senate Office).

B. Instructional Policy

The Committee consists of C.R. Baillod, Chairman, E. Carlson, J.P. Beckwith, D.E. Mikkola and L.K. Shirley. Chairman Baillod gave the report; since the last Senate meeting the Committee met once. It discussed the suggestion made at the last Senate meeting relative to a revision in the grading policy. Attention was focused primarily on the possibility, desirability, the advantages and disadvantages of revising the Michigan Tech grading system to allow for a more specific grade such as A-, B+, B-, etc. It was felt that over a period of several terms an apparent injustice inflicted on the student who gets the "highest B or highest C" would be rectified, since he or she may subsequently earn the "lowest B or lowest A." However, the Committee had no data to substantiate this feeling. It was also felt that the availability of the A-, B+ grades would generally make it easier for the faculty to issue grades. On November 11, the Committee Chairman met with William Lucier, Director of Student Services, to discuss the mechanical and administrative problems related to implementing a change in the grading policy.

It would take three to four man-months of effort to modify the data processing system to handle the plus/minus type grades. In addition, the data processing people felt that it would be inadvisable to proceed with this change until after the new registration system is completely implemented on the computer, that is, sometime after the fall of 1976. Mr. Lucier also informed the Committee that all other state supported colleges in Michigan, except for a few graduate schools, use the straight A, B, C, D, E, F grading system and that the Michigan Association of Collegiate Registration Officials was striving for uniformity in grading. He also expressed some concern about the relative difference persons such as employers might have interpreting the more complicated grading system. The Committee also gave some thought to the old numerical system in effect here many years ago.

Before making any recommendations relative to a change in the grading policy, the Committee decided that it would be appropriate to make a deeper study of the whole grading system. To begin with, information will be requested from the registrar concerning grade point averages over the period 1965-1975, first overall by class, by course number, and by
department and classes within the department. It is suspected that grades have been and are continuing to rise at Michigan Tech.

The Committee briefly discussed and expressed some concern over enforcement of various instructional policies, particularly repeating of more than the allowable number of courses by marginal students, and the final exam policy. Apparently, some faculty are still giving final exams during the tenth week.

Finally, the topic of goals for the Committee was addressed. Chairman Baillo set up particular goals for this year as well as general charges for the Committee. The goals of the Committee for 1975-76 are to continue with the program or reviewing instructional policy with particular emphasis on the degree to which existing policies are followed and the study of the grading system at Michigan Tech, including dissemination of information on trends and grade point averages to the faculty. Statements of the general charge and reason for existence of the Instructional Policy Committee are contained in previous Senate minutes of October 11, 1967 (page 311); November 8, 1967 (page 316-318), April 10, 1968 (page 343); May 15, 1968 (page 348). Based on these minutes, areas of responsibility of the Instructional Policy Committee are interpreted to be:

1. Problems of instruction such as class size, teaching aides, amount of work required for credits, scheduling of classes.
2. Evaluation of students. Scheduling of exams, number of exams, grading schemes.
3. Any similar areas.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Senator Quinones could not attend the meeting so President Julien read the following report, submitted by Quinones, dated October 22, 1975:

The President of the Student Council, Phyllis Dorman, Dr. Joan Kuipers, and Senator Quinones met October 22 to discuss the objectives and priorities of the Institutional Evaluation Committee. Since past efforts have been exclusively dedicated to teacher evaluation studies and awareness of this aspect of institutional evaluation has reached a high point on this campus, Committee efforts will now be focused on methods of evaluating administrators.

Faculty representation on this Committee is being requested through the deans of colleges and schools as well as the Student Council office. Within three weeks a meeting will be called. Prior to this meeting information concerning this Committee's function will be distributed to orient all members.


E. Elections Committee - No Report.

F. Promotion Policy Review

Senator Hennessy, Chairman, gave the report. The Committee was formed as the result of a motion which reads as follows (page 794 of minutes):

"Halkola moved the appointment of a Promotional Policy Review Committee to inquire into the implementation of the new Promotional Policy all the way down the line to see what progress is being made in the appointment of committees, formulation of Procedures, etc. The motion passed." (The policy referred to was "Promotion Policy and Procedures" approved by the Board of Control, August 25, 1972, found on page 787-789 of the Senate minutes).

Crowther was appointed Chairman of the Committee; during ensuing months he refined the above charge (page 866 of minutes) by pointing out the Committee had two jobs:

a. To determine if the policy approved by the Board of Control was being followed, and to recommend changes if deemed appropriate.

b. To act as liaison with the Vice President for Academic Affairs in generating the specific criteria for promotion.

With regard to (b) above, "I believe that the Committee has done what it could. It submitted its report to the Senate which the Senate accepted (page 866 of minutes) without specifically approving or disapproving it. It would seem, however, that the action constituted tacit approval. At least if I were the Vice President for Academic Affairs, I would view it that way," Chairman Hennessy said.

However, (a) above, poses another problem. The actual implementation of the Promotion Policy and Procedures has been going on since 1972, and is still continuing. The principal items remaining are:

a. Under Article III of the Promotion Policy and Procedures: Return to Department of their modified criteria, approved or disapproved. Evaluations by the Senate of complaints, if any, from the Departments when their criteria are returned.

b. Under Article IV, an improvement in the dissemination of the information within Colleges and Schools of the mechanics for evaluating and processing recommendations.

c. Article V poses another sort of problem. This article calls for a number of things, including annual interviews between Department head and faculty member, establishment of promotion committees in Departments, the
forwarding of recommendations by Deans, and notification of results and areas needing improvement for those turned down. The Committee is studying what, if anything, to do in this area.

G. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association - No Report.

H. Smoking

Booy gave an interim report. There is a "very complete" statement from the Board of Control regarding smoking: "Smoking is not permitted in areas where such action is prohibited by the administration." Apparently, in 1974, Academic Deans and Department Heads were given information on how this has been effectively implemented. The effect seems to be that you cannot smoke in elevators because it is illegal, you do not smoke in classrooms. In general, there are some buildings where there seems to be no prohibition of smoking in corridors, and the effect seems to be that at the ends of corridors and stairwells there are smoking urns. Within the hallways and the classrooms themselves smoking is not permissible. In peoples' private offices there does not seem to be a prohibition and the general effect would seem to be cooperation and good manners.

After a brief discussion of Booy's report it was agreed not to discharge the Committee and to hear the non-smoking member's report at the next Senate meeting. Nufer said that the Senate might want to consider different guidelines and that more than a review of regulations would be in order. Julien agreed that the Committee can be charged with setting specific guidelines and bringing them to a meeting for approval.

At the conclusion of the committee reports, President Julien thanked all of the committee chairmen who have stated the goals of their committees. Based on information in the committee reports, faculty members should now know to what committee to direct problems.

Old Business - None

New Business

President Smith introduced a resolution he drafted in which regret was expressed over Senator Timm's untimely death:

Whereas Professor R.F. Timm was a member of this Academic Senate of Michigan Technological University, and  
Whereas Professor Timm has served effectively and with distinction as a Professor in the Department of Mechanical Engineering - Engineering Mechanics, and  
Whereas he showed great promise for many future years of productive service and of contributions to knowledge, now therefore

Be it resolved that the Senate of Michigan Technological University expresses profound regret over his untimely death at an early age and extends its sympathy to his family in their loss of a husband and father.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. The Secretary was asked to send a copy of the resolution to Mrs. Timm.

Senator Boutilier said that she had been told that there were ambiguities in the Senate final exam policy, but that she did not see them. It states very clearly that no final exams will be given the final week of regularly scheduled classes. She made a motion to charge the Instructional Policy Committee to ask the departments to state any ambiguities which are present in the policy. The motion was seconded, and there was a lengthy discussion.

Julien said that if an instructor gives a quiz in the last week of the quarter he must, in addition to that, give a final exam.

Weaver said that there are people who say there are ambiguities, but those are the people who have decided that in no way are they going to follow University policy and so they are looking for ambiguities when there are none. Weaver said that if, in fact, it is going to be the wish of the major part of the college faculty to not follow University final exam policy then there should be no University final exam policy.

One Senator said that the policy is fairly clear except in the case of an optional final exam.

Boutilier said that she knows of cases where all of the students in a class have voted to have their final exam in the last week of regularly scheduled classes.

Weaver said that he objects to the fact that some students miss his class the last week because they are taking a final exam in another professor's class. He added that he would be willing to vote the censure of the Senate against faculty members who give the final exams during the last week of the quarter and subsequently take students out of his class. Julien said that the student Lode could list the faculty members violating final exam policy and being censured by the Faculty Senate.

Nelson asked if graduate courses are included in the policy. The feeling in the Senate was that final exams in graduate courses cannot be held during the last week of classes.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the motion was voted upon and passed to have the Instructional Policy Committee ask departments to state any ambiguities that are present in the final exam policy.
The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Emily. Erickson
Secretary