MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 87
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

17 March 1976

(Senate Minute pages: 1114-1142)

Meeting No. 87 was called to order on Wednesday, March 17, 1976 at 7:05 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President L.M. Julien.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-three members or alternates were present. Absent were ElRite, R.E. (PE), Horvath, R.S. (EE), Juntunen, J.L. (AFROTC), Shetron, S.G. (FFC), Stebbins, D.W. (VP), Stebler, R.C. (AL), Thompson, V.D. (AROTC).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitor was in attendance: Riley, C. (Memorial Union Board).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 86 were approved after the following change: Page 1100, first paragraph. Change Professor Jewell to Professor Juola.

The President's Report

1. Selection of Members of the Michigan Tech Board of Control. A letter was sent to the Governor's office asking the office to provide information indicating how an individual is selected to be on the Board of Control of Michigan Technological University, and whether a Michigan Tech faculty member can serve on the Michigan Technological University Board of Control (see page 1103).

2. Representation of Department of Nursing on the Senate. According to the Constitution of the Senate, Article III, A4, and Amendment III, A4, "For election to the Senate, a two-year residency shall be required except for ROTC personnel and the student member." President Julien reported that the Department of Nursing has a problem; the department has only one permanent staff member who has been here for two years and who would be eligible for Senate membership. The department could elect that one person Senator but would like to have more than that choice, and has asked the Senate if anything can be done. There is a choice of letting the Department of Nursing vote for that one person or of providing a constitutional amendment which could allow them to elect someone else.

One Senator said that the Senate will be faced by this problem whenever a new department emerges, and suggested that the Constitution be changed to read, "Except when a new department is formed."

President Julien said that this issue can be discussed under New Business later in the meeting.

3. Selection of Faculty Members for Search and Screening Committee to aid in the appointment of a successor to Dr. D.W. Stebbins. President Julien asked Senator Doane, chairman of the Elections Committee, to give this part of the President's Report.

The faculty was solicited for volunteers who would like to be selected for the Search and Screening Committee, their names were sent to the Senate Elections Committee, each Senator voted by ballot, and the top four vote-getters were nominated for the Search and Screening Committee. Doane reported that the top four vote-getters were: William E. Barstow, Lloyd A. Heldt, Ralph S. Horvath, and James D. Spain. These four names were submitted to the Steering Committee for Long-Range Planning who selected the following three faculty members to be on the Search and Screening Committee: William E. Barstow, Business and Engineering Administration; Lloyd A. Heldt, Department of Metallurgical Engineering; and James D. Spain, Department of Biological Sciences.

The faculty was to have had two members selected to be on the Search and Screening Committee, but there have been three selected.

4. Committee A (Committee to be involved with University Long-Range Planning). Paul A. Nelson has resigned from Committee A.

Richard C. Born has also resigned from Committee A because he is planning to take a sabbatical next year. President Smith phoned Senate President Julien saying that Dick Brown would probably be going on sabbatical next year and asking if it would be all right if Theodore A. Grzelak took Dick Born's place and President Julien said that it would be all right. President Julien thought that Ted Grzelak was selected by Dick Born as his replacement, but found out later that he was not. Ted has already attended one meeting of Committee A. Later, on second thought, President Julien said that he thought it would be better to take the name of a replacement from the list of names submitted by the Senate to the Steering Committee for Long Range Planning. He recommended that a request be made to the Steering Committee to choose the name of another faculty member from the list submitted by the Senate to serve on Committee A. A motion was made, seconded, voted upon and passed unanimously to request the Steering Committee to choose another Faculty member from that list submitted by the Senate to serve on Committee A.

5. Humanities-Social Sciences Electives. The College of Engineering has a committee for approved Humanities and Social Sciences electives. However, the Senate Curricular Policy Committee makes up the HU-SS electives list. The Dean of
Engineering has asked President Julien if there is any way that he can circumvent the Senate Curricular Policy Committee HU-SS elective list. President Julien said that he could not, and that the Senate Curricular Policy is pretty well spelled out. He also told the Dean that the reason for having a Curricular Policy Committee was to eliminate special interest groups from changing things without the knowledge of other groups, and affecting other departments.

6. Michigan Higher Education Funding Trends 1966-1976. President Julien received from the President of the Michigan Tech chapter of the AAUP a report on Michigan Higher Education Funding Trends. As President Julien understands, it is a model that is used by the joint Senate legislative committee in Lansing. Julien wondered whether a committee should be formed to examine the report, or whether it should be included as an appendix to the minutes. He said that he would bring it up for discussion under New Business.

Reports on The Meeting of the Academic Council were delivered by Vice President P. Nelson. (See Appendix A of these minutes -- Available by Request from the Senate Office).

At the conclusion of the report there was a brief discussion concerning the length of service required in order to be eligible for a sabbatical leave. According to the February 24, 1976, Report on the Meeting of the Academic Council, "anyone with seven years of service should be eligible." However, Senator Nufer pointed out that according to the Faculty Handbook any academic faculty member with six years of service is eligible for sabbatical leave. Vice President Nelson said that "seven" is what he happened to hear at the meeting or there might have been a simple recording error on his transcription of the report of the meeting.

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

At the conclusion of his report, Vice President Nelson commented that he was very impressed by the fact that the Board of Control seems to be extremely interested in academic quality. He noted this when the topic of scholarships was discussed, the Board seemed to be very interested in trying to use whatever means available to attract and recruit better students based on scholarship.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Senator P. Nelson, chairman, gave the report. The Committee is in the process of completing a study of free electives in baccalaureate curricula. The Committee has been given a sample of degree schedules for the 1974-75 academic year graduates, and has constructed tables showing departmental patterns of free electives actually taken by persons in each degree program. When completed, this study will suggest the presence or absence of the need for a policy on free electives.

The HU-SS list will not appear in the new catalog. This was determined at the Academic Council meeting on February 24, 1976. There has been widespread misunderstanding among Deans and Department Heads on just what the current process is for updating the HU-SS list. On February 26, the Committee chairman met with Dr. Stebbins and presented him with a copy of Senate Policy 9-69, Humanistic Social Courses, which was passed by the Senate on April 16, 1969, and approved by President Smith on April 21, 1971. Dr. Stebbins agreed that Senate Policy 9-69, in fact, is still the University policy on the HU-SS list of approved electives. This policy appears on pages 405-406 of the Senate Minutes. This policy, in essence, provides that the HU-SS listings shall be approved by mutual agreements between the departments involved and the Senate or its delegated representatives. On April 8, 1970, the Senate adopted a resolution which empowered the Senate Curricular Policy Committee to act for the Senate in judging HU-SS approved courses. One factor contributing to the misunderstanding on this was an item appearing on page six of the addendum to the 1975-76 catalog. The item in the addendum stated in part that HU-SS electives may be selected from a list approved by the faculty of the college or school in which the student is a major. This statement in the catalog addendum is in error, and Dr. Stebbins agrees with that. Although the Senate Curricular Policy Committee is in the process of developing a proposal which would permit each college or school to develop its own HU-SS list subject to certain guidelines and review, the Committee is taking the position that the old policy is in force until such time as the new proposal is adopted by the Senate and approved by the President. Accordingly, the Committee expects to be able to fulfill its function on this matter in the immediate future.

Nelson said that "As chairman of the Senate Curricular Policy Committee I want to express my extreme regret that the administration chose to bypass the Senate Curricular Policy Committee on implementing a new course change proposal dated March 1, 1976, and which was put into effect March 16th. The new policy which was sent in memorandum form to academic Deans and Department Heads states that it is in agreement with the Senate Curricular Impact Committee report of November 6, 1974. Perhaps it is. The key issue is that the Senate Curricular Impact Report which appears on pages 974-977 of the Senate minutes was accepted by the Senate on November 6, 1974, simply as a report. It was never placed before the Senate as a proposal, and hence it cannot be formally construed to be Senate policy. Moreover, anything which is so clearly related to the curriculum as a new course change proposal should be looked at by the Senate. It is my sincere hope that the administration will refer this March 1, 1976 course change document to the Senate for consideration."
B. Instructional Policy

Senator Baillod, Chairman, gave the report. The Committee is currently considering and will submit to the Secretary of the Senate two proposals prior to the next Senate meeting.
There are three topics currently under consideration. First of all, with regard to the grading system, the Committee has temporarily tabled the suggestion that the grading system be revised. The majority of the committee felt that it would go with the present ABCD system, at least, for the time being. There is some chance that the Student Council will conduct a student poll on this during the next quarter or next year, and then, at that time, the Committee will consider it.

The proposal that the Committee will submit has to do with distribution of grade point trend information. Essentially the proposal will request that the administration send to all academic faculty a summary of grade point averages each quarter by department and by course number level.

The current thought of the Committee is that final exam policy will be tightened up a bit, and will tend to obligate faculty to give exams during the regularly scheduled time. Also, the proposal would prohibit any hour exam during the last week of the quarter, and the last week of instruction.

The third item that the Committee is considering has to do with the mid-term grading policy. The Committee has not really gotten into this too deeply yet, but there is some sentiment for relaxing the mid-term grading policy, or at least maybe not requiring mid-term grades to be given in three hundred and four hundred level courses.

There was a lengthy discussion at the conclusion of the report. Brown said that he gives oral examinations instead of written finals in some of his courses. Students can sign up for any particular time they want during the final exam week to take an oral examination. He said that he would hate to be tied and not be able to do this. Baillod said that it is a good point, and the Committee will consider it. He said that the final exam for Brown's course would be "by arrangement." Brown said that he just did not want to be tied down to giving a written examination at a specific time during final exam week.

Baillod said that the intent of this policy will be to stop all exams in the last week of instruction and to strongly encourage, if not force, final exams to be given the regularly scheduled time during examination week.

Booy said that perhaps an exemption should be made for laboratory finals. Baillod responded that there would be.

Nelson said that if it is the Committee's intention to have this policy applied to graduate courses as well as undergraduate, please spell out graduate and undergraduate so that there is absolutely no room for misinterpretation. Baillod said that the Committee has not really talked about that yet, but probably will.

Julien asked whether there has been any discussion as to maybe setting up a uniform number of days of instruction each quarter. Baillod said that the Committee had not talked about that. Weaver said that his Committee got into the issue a year ago. The only way there can be precisely uniform number of days in each quarter is to start and stop in the middle of weeks and to start and stop final exams for example, in the middle of weeks. He said that as long as there are days like Scramble Day, K-Day, Winter Carnival, and Good Friday, there are going to be partial weeks. Every time previously that final exam week started and stopped in the middle of the week, it has been a disaster, he said.

Boutilier made some comments about finals given in laboratory courses.

Baillod said that the policy will specify a laboratory practical exam will be given as opposed to a written exam.

Weaver suggested that the Senate might want to find a mechanism by which the suggestions are actually going to prevent somebody from giving a final at whatever time they wish to give the final. He pointed out that there have been times when instructors have given final exams the last week of classes and nobody in the administration has done anything about this, and he was wondering what was the sense of having a final exam policy.

Julien told about something that occurred over the Winter Carnival recess. A group of students complained to the administration about teachers who were giving exams after the scheduled time. Julien has heard about this from various faculty members. The administration talked to the faculty members about giving tests during these times. The response to the student's wishes was quite rapid, and it was quite significant in a couple of cases.

Baillod said that frequent violation of final exam policy shall be taken into account in evaluation of performance by colleagues and administrators.

Julien said that he thought that the threat of publication of information about violations in the student paper is as good as any threat.

Weaver said that perhaps the Student Senator can get word to the Lode that when they do the teacher evaluations, they might also serve as a collection point for data on violations of the final exam policy, and see that it gets published.

Phillips responded that the Student Council is now beginning to reorganize their faculty evaluation.

C. **Institutional Evaluation** - No Report.

D. **Audio-Visual Instructional Material**

The Committee's **Proposal 4-75, Amendments to the Faculty Patent Policy** has been rejected by the University, and the Senate has taken no further action. It was agreed that President Julien should discharge the Committee.
E. Elections Committee

Senator Doane, chairman of the committee, gave the report. The Elections Committee handled the election in which the names of four faculty members nominated to serve on the Search and Screening Committee were submitted to the Long-Range Committee (see President's Report).

Doane had sent out petitions which interested faculty members are to return to the Elections Committee if they wish to run for the position of Member-at-Large of the Senate. Three Members-at-Large will be elected; there are two regular vacancies and one unexpired term. Six faculty members have turned in petitions to have their names placed on the ballot.

Nominations for the Distinguished Teacher Award will also be solicited at the time of election of Members-at-Large.

F. Promotional Policy Review

Chairman Hennessy gave the report. He said that President Smith recently sent a letter to all departments saying that he does not have the Promotional Policies from all of the departments yet. He will not approve any departmental promotional policy until after he receives promotional policies from all of the departments and after the "full package" of policies has been reviewed by his legal advice. Hennessy asked Mr. Romig to explain what has caused President Smith to take this action.

Mr. Romig said that there are a number of regulations that have to do with equal pay and that the University is in a position where there have been claims made or potential lawsuits threatened where people are asserting that departmental standards should not be followed but that there should be a college-wide or University-wide standard. The University is still taking the position that the departmental standards can be followed and should be. But the University recognizes that there are legal problems involved with this in the light of new governmental regulations and new governmental agencies. Before the University approves a whole group of separate department criteria, the University thinks that it should have a careful look at them to see if there are any legal liabilities which will be raised. He said that the delay is not deliberate; it is caused by external regulations which now affect the University.

Hennessy said that a new factor has been added to the problem of Promotional Policy Review and that that Committee has not had a chance to meet and consider whether to do anything or to wait for what, he guessed, would be a lengthy period of time. He said that in the interim it would appear that the University would operate under the present broad policy which is University wide and not tailored to any particular department.

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

H. Smoking

R.W. Kauppila, committee member, gave the report. Kauppila discussed the answers to a questionnaire on "Smoking and the Right to Breathe Clean Air" which he distributed in the department of Mechanical Engineering-Engineering Mechanics. In the written introduction to the questionnaire he said, "Smoking and the right to breathe clean air is a problem that has been presented to the MTU Senate for study. Guidelines that the University might follow are sought. Although legislation pertaining to smoking is being passed in Lansing, a sample of staff opinion is solicited that might serve as a guide for a broader University questionnaire." The questions he asked included:

1. Do you smoke tobacco regularly?
2. If not, did you ever smoke?
3. Do you object to inhaling the smoke of others?
4. Do you feel that a person has the right to (ask for, demand) clean air (free from tobacco smoke) in your own home, other's home, own office, conference room at MTU, public meeting places such as restaurants, public transportation, riding in state car?
5. Should designated smoking areas be established?
6. Any additional comments?

Kauppila also passed out copies of the same questionnaire to each Senator asking that they answer the questions and return them to him. It is possible that the Committee might come up with a general questionnaire and circulate it among the entire University. Booy, the other committee member, suggested a few other questions that should be placed on such a questionnaire.

In response to the questionnaire, Kauppila distributed in his department, it seems that an overwhelming majority of the ME-EM department really feel that they have a right to clean air. If there is a University-wide poll or faculty-wide poll and the results are the same, Kauppila thinks that it would be in order for the Smoking Committee to suggest some guidelines.

I. Professional Standards and Development

President Julien said that R. Kauppila cannot continue to serve as chairman of the Committee, but would like to continue as a member of the Committee. Thus, the Senate is looking for a volunteer to be chairman of the Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to set criteria and guidelines for professional development (see pages 1046, 1079).
Kauppila stated that there are certain individual departments on campus which show excellent professional development and other departments which seem to be lacking in this respect, where, for some reason people are not developing professionally and are not making their contribution. He added that the reason he was interested in a Committee of this sort was that he found that in the industrial environment exactly the same kind of a system existed, but after a study was made some rather surprising answers were brought to light as to why some showed an excellent development record and others such a poor record. He sees the intention of the Committee being to make a study and probably provide guidelines to encourage or help faculty develop professionally.

Old Business - None

New Business

1. Proposal 1-76: Abolishment of K-Day

Senator Horvath submitted the proposal. In view of the size of the student body and the many incidents of drunkenness as well as the increasing number of automobile accidents associated with recent K-Day celebrations, the Faculty Senate recommends that the traditional K-Day celebration be abolished. Phillips moved that the proposal be adopted, Sachs seconded the motion, and discussion followed.

Phillips said that he had letters from Dean Meese and the Memorial Union Board expressing their recommendation to abolish K-Day. Phillips read the letter from the Memorial Union Board K-Day Committee. "After observing K-Day for the last several years and discussing the issue thoroughly, the K-Day Committee has reached the following conclusions: that the growth of Michigan Tech has caused K-Day to outlive its usefulness as a device to bring faculty and students together, and that the large numbers of students attending the event are more than Fort Wilkins or any other local facility can handle. The Board has in fact been contacted by officials of the park for just this reason. For these reasons we feel the event cannot feasibly be continued under its current status. However, rather than eliminate the quarter century old tradition altogether, we would like to recommend as an alternative that the resources, both financial and human, of the Memorial Union Board would provide sums of money for and help in the organization of these smaller gatherings. Allocations to each department would depend on the number of students enrolled in that department. Several departments have been contacted, and have offered their full cooperation. It is our hope that reduced numbers of participants at any given event, and an increase in faculty representation would tend to restrain many of the problems which have become associated with K-Day in the past."

Next, Phillips discussed Dean Meese's memo to President Smith recommending that K-Day be abolished. The Dean's letter goes briefly into the history and some of the problems. K-Day was established in the 1950's by President Dillman who thought it would be a wonderful thing for the new students to have the opportunity to meet all the faculty. That was the essential theme of K-Day, and the Dean contends that the original purpose of K-Day has disappeared, and recommends that for this reason it should be terminated. Other reasons for termination of K-Day: there were five car accidents, at least three of which could have been fatal, and fifteen students were treated in the hospital for injuries. The Department of Natural Resources, through their District Parks Supervisor, wrote a letter stating the problems which occurred at Fort Wilkins this past K-Day, and that 4,000 people at one time is simply beyond the capacity of the park. He received several complaints from the law enforcement units, including the State Police and Keweenaw County Sheriff's Department, about the unusual number of accidents tying up all units so that none were left to carry on normal enforcement which was needed because of many traffic violations. And a minor consideration would be energy used. And then Dean Meese went on to say that he realizes that the faculty and staff will be upset about not having a half day holiday but he's placing the lion's share of the blame on the faculty and staff for not participating. This past K-Day approximately 4,000 students were in attendance, less than 20 faculty and staff employees were in attendance.

Booy said that she feels the phrasing of this proposal implies that the students are a bunch of lushes, which may or may not be true, but she doesn't think this is a very nice thing to say. She went on to say that she has never heard from the University that the faculty is welcome, much less encouraged to attend. She said that she thinks that the amount of energy expended by students once a year taking a look at the countryside, rather than a book, is well spent in terms of mental health and social growth. Perhaps if earlier groups had gone to K-Days there would have been fewer problems with the allegedly overly scientifically oriented non-ecological engineers.

Nufer said that when he came to the University in 1970 that it was made perfectly clear that faculty were encouraged to go. Nufer asked if the students don't go to Fort Wilkins, where are they going to go?

Booy said that if the State Park could not handle students in such large numbers, then there should be a provision for a Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior K-Day, and that it is not up to the Senate to call the kids of a bunch of drunks.

Sachs said that he never saw such a sloppy bunch of drunks as he did at this past K-Day.

Brown said that he has had classes of students in the past who have asked to go on field trips, rather than attend K-Day. At the conclusion of the trips, they briefly attended K-Day and had supper. Driving back, the kids said that they think K-Day should be abolished; everyone in the car was absolutely terrified by the drunken Michigan Tech students.

Miss Riley, chairman of the Memorial Union Board, gave her views. The Memorial Union Board has the responsibility for putting on K-Day and there are more problems associated with K-Day than one can realize. One is the drunkenness of
the students. The original meaning of K-Day is gone, with 20 faculty and 4,000 students attending. Fort Wilkins has sent the Board a letter saying they may have to close the gates to Tech in 1977. Another big problem encountered is that three extra people have to be hired for the day after to clean up the mess that is left by the students and faculty. She said that the Memorial Union Board does not want the responsibility of K-Day anymore. Dean Meese has done the same thing in supporting the Board.

Weaver asked what does K-Day have to do with Academic Affairs? Nelson said it involves release time. Miller said that it is one holiday that the students have at Tech that nobody can plan on because it is never known whether it is going to be Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday and it can disrupt more classes than any other holiday in the school calendar. He suggested and editorial change in the proposal -- that everything prior to the comma be deleted, and recommended that the Senate pass Proposal 1-76 as amended: "The Faculty Senate recommends that the traditional K-Day celebration be abolished."

Julien said that he would prefer to see K-Day moved to a weekend with support to go towards individual departmental K-Days on weekends. His department has inaugurated a fall and spring party for their students, and about 80% of the faculty do attend.

Julien asked Miss Riley if the Memorial Union Board is planning on supporting departmental parties. She responded that the Memorial Union Board is trying to get support from the Senate for the recommendation regarding abolishment of K-Day. She said the MUB has not set any definite plans. Quite a few plans have been discussed; there has been some discussion as to the feasibility of departmental parties, with some funding from the Student Council to the departments -- preferably for any weekend during the month of October when the department wanted it.

One Senator said that he was against the Senate’s recommendation of the abolishment of K-Day without making any suggestions that something be continued in its place.

Nufer recommended that the Senate ought to express support of what the Memorial Union Board wants to do to change the traditional approach to K-Day.

Julien asked for a vote on Proposal 1-76. The proposal was passed, 17 - 4, as amended. The Faculty Senate recommends that the traditional K-Day celebration be abolished.

2. Senate to Support Memorial Union Board.

Boutilier made a motion that the Senate go on record as supporting the recommendation of the Memorial Union Board in finding alternative K-Day type celebrations within the departments on weekends in October. Davaetilla seconded the motion, it was voted upon, and passed unanimously.

3. Proposal 2-76, Winter Carnival Break

Senate Policy as outlined in Proposal 3-76 precludes any meaningful enforcement of attendance at classes held on Thursday morning of Winter Carnival Week; statue judging takes place on Thursday morning, and students are often absent recovering from the final stint of snow statue construction. Therefore, the Faculty Senate recommends that the Winter Carnival Week recess start at 9:30 p.m. on Wednesday of Winter Carnival Week and extend through the weekend.

The proposal was made, seconded, and discussion followed.

Weaver referred to Proposal 3-75 on page 998. The issue of whether 3-75 applied to one Winter Carnival, or was a policy for all Winter Carnivals was discussed. It was agreed that the proposal applied to all Winter Carnivals.

Hennessy said that he finds that cutting off classes at noon is a very inconsistent, non-rational thing, especially if one has two sections in the same subject, one in the morning, and one in the afternoon.

Nufer said that he would favor dismissing classes Thursday morning of Winter Carnival.

Weaver was against passing Proposal 2-76. He said that the majority of students show up for class that Thursday -- that he is interested in teaching the majority. If the minority wished to take the day off, they can.

Baillod suggested canceling classes Good Friday morning instead of canceling classes Thursday morning of Winter Carnival. Weaver asked what does a half day in the Winter Quarter have to do with a half day in the Spring Quarter? Booy said that she was against the classes being cancelled the morning of Good Friday, and questioned the constitutionality of canceling classes Good Friday afternoon as a matter of public university policy.

Julien asked the Senators to vote on the proposal, and it passed 16-2.

4. Department of Nursing Representation on the Senate

Senator Carr made the motion to start the procedure of amending the Senate Constitution Article III, A4 and Amendment II, A4 to read as follows: For election to the Senate, a two-year residency shall be required except for ROTC personnel, the student member and newly created departments having less than three faculty members meeting the minimum qualifications. The motion was seconded.
One Senator said that the words "newly created" should be deleted from the motion because there are departments on campus with less than three members eligible for the Senate, no matter how long they have existed.

Julien asked for a vote on amending Article III, A4 to read: and departments having less than three faculty members meeting the minimum qualifications. It carried by more than 2/3 majority, and he said that it will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. If, at that time, it passes by more than a 2/3 majority, it will go to the academic faculty for approval, and then to the Board of Control for approval.


Sachs suggested that the report given President Julien by Hunzeker be included as an appendix to the minutes. Due to the length of the report, the Senate Council made the decision that each officer would keep a copy of the report on file. Any faculty member wishing to have a copy of the report can address a request to the Council.

6. Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Julien said that the University administration has asked the Senate to nominate faculty members to serve on Committees for Long-Range Planning and the committee to select a new Vice President of Academic Affairs. He suggested that perhaps the Senate ought to be more involved in the actual selection process than just submitting names, as it does now. For example, if there were five candidates for an administrative position, which would the faculty Senate recommend highly to fill the position? The Senate would act as an advisor in selecting persons to fill administrative positions and as an approving body after they have been selected. He recommended that the Senate evaluate persons in administrative positions, starting at the level of dean and going up to the level of president.

During a brief discussion it was suggested that the Institutional Evaluation Committee might be an appropriate place to discuss these ideas. The chairman of the Committee will not be back next year and a replacement will be needed.

Sachs said that the Senate would be studying vita and letters of recommendation which he thinks are not very meaningful; he said that what really counts is the way that person functions on a job.

Weaver said that what Julien has suggested is done at other schools, and that it would certainly be good if the Senate were involved.

Julien said that he would like to see the Senate develop a proposal, either through the Institutional Evaluation Committee, or through other means, and asked the Senate to come up with suggestions at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

E. Erickson
Secretary