MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 88
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

5 May 1976

(Senate Minute pages: 1143-1175)

Meeting No. 88 was called to order on Wednesday, May 5, 1976 at 7:02 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President L.M. Julien.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-five members or alternates were present. Absent were Doane, V.L. (MMR), Juntunen J.L. (AFROTC), Olson, C.K. (MG), Snyder, V.W. (AL), Stebler, R.C. (AL). J. Romig attended in place of President R.L. Smith who did not attend this meeting. M. Sloan (EE) in place of R. Horvath who did not attend.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were in attendance: Brown, R. (BL), Carter, J. (CE). (Both are newly elected Senators-at-Large).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 87 were approved after the following change: Page 1117, last paragraph, 4th sentence. Change "Hennessy asked" to "a Senator asked."

Page 1125, second paragraph, 2nd sentence. Change "release time" to "released time."

President's Report

1. Governor Milliken responded as follows to a Senate request for information on appointments to the Board of Control: "as vacancies arise, interested persons may submit their names for consideration to fill the vacancies. The Executive Office reviews self-initiated requests and gathers information on other prospective appointees . . ." and ". . . faculty members are not eligible for appointment to the Board of Control, based upon rulings of the Attorney General."

2. President R.L. Smith has approved Proposal 2-76, Winter Carnival Break. The Winter Carnival Week recess will start at 9:30 p.m. on Wednesday of Winter Carnival Week and extend through the weekend.

President Smith has deferred action on Senate Proposal 1-76, Abolishment of K-Day. President Julien has received a note from Senator Doane pointing out that K-Day is a half-day holiday in the union contract at Tech and that this should be considered before K-Day can be abolished.

3. Gordon P. Krueger, Department of Civil Engineering, has been appointed to Committee A as a representative of the Faculty Senate.

4. It has been brought to President Julien's attention that some MTU faculty members have been unjustly labeled "unfit to teach" by some local citizens at a recent public meeting where the faculty members voiced their opinions on public issues. Only the faculty member has legal recourse in such cases, but "these attacks are a concern to all faculty members and we must support their right to voice these opinions in an atmosphere free from unjust abuse."

5. President Smith has conveyed to President Julien an invitation to the officers of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Association to join the Board of Control for a noon luncheon at the fall meeting, Friday, October 15, of the Board of Control. In addition, all of the members of the Faculty Senate are invited to a coffee hour with the Board of Control in the Faculty Lounge from 10 to 11 a.m. of the same day.

6. Lloyd Heldt, Chairman of the Search and Screening Committee has sent President Julien a progress report on the Search and Screening Committee for a Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Committee members are students Nick Banda and Cynthia Manninen. The faculty members are William E. Barstow, Lloyd A. Heldt, Michael V. Krenitsky, James D. Spain, and George K. Wadlin. President Julien quoted Dr. Heldt: "Our committee has requested nomination of external candidates from all Michigan Tech personnel, approximately seventy university presidents, and several persons in university, governmental, and professional society organizations. Advertising has been placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education. We have identified several strong nominees and have contacted them to determine their interest and to gain more information about their experience and qualification."

At the conclusion of the President's report there were a few comments on the fact that some faculty members have participated in events off-campus and have been verbally attacked. One Senator pointed out that laws governing libel would apply in such cases. Another Senator mentioned the possibility of writing letters to the editor of the local newspaper. It was also pointed out that faculty as private citizens have the right to say what they think as individuals. President Julien said that the faculty can give its moral support to persons who say what they believe as individual private citizens.

Reports on Two Meetings of the Academic Council were delivered by Vice President P. Nelson. (Available by Request from the Senate Office (pages 1144-1145))
The Report on the Meeting of the Board of Control was delivered by Vice President P. Nelson (Available by Request from the Senate Office (pages 1145-1146))

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Senator P. Nelson, chairman, gave the report. This year the Committee resolved to study the need for general curriculum guidelines. The project was divided into various tasks.

Free electives. The Committee sought to determine whether there was a need for Senate policy on free electives. Essentially it found that students in every degree program had the opportunity to take several free elective courses, that many elective courses taken by students in each degree program were outside of their departments, and that most students did not have to enroll for many more credits than required for graduation in order to take their free elective courses. The Committee concluded that there was no pressing need for a policy on free electives. Nelson passed out copies of the Committee’s report on free electives (See AppendixA: Available by Request from the Senate Office).

HU-SS electives. Nelson asked to defer discussion of HU-SS electives until Senate Proposal 7-76 is discussed under New Business.

Oral and written communications. The Committee is still investigating this matter. Many universities have implemented new policies in this area during the year and the Committee is trying to assess the nature and effectiveness of these adventures. The Committee expects to have a report on oral and written communications sometime next fall. The Committee has also investigated the need for a policy to clarify the students’ rights to graduate under the degree requirements in force during the year in which he or she matriculated. The Committee decided in February that the most effective method of dealing with this involved problem would be to specify an appeal process by which a student might seek remedies to hardships caused by changing degree requirements. The Committee has not as yet completed its work on this.

Course change policy. Senator Spain, speaking for the Committee, made some remarks on course change policy. He raised the question of what has happened to the Course Change policy that was approved in March 1974. Proposal 6-74 was passed by the Senate and subsequently submitted to the President. Spain said that this was apparently discussed within the Administration and turned down. Subsequently, it was passed back to the Senate and reviewed by the Senate. In further discussions with the Administration it was discovered that a few changes in wording would be satisfactory. This was passed as policy 2-75 by a margin of 16 Yes, and 3 No. Spain said that it was his understanding that this was then approved by the President but has not been implemented. He believes that it was the Senate’s intention that this policy become the policy for course change at Michigan Tech -- not just an alternate policy or one that one might use if one happens to know about it. This raises a concern about what the role of the Senate is -- whether it has any role to play in the University or not. This policy was twice passed by the Senate after three years of study in committee, two presentations to the Senate, and at least four discussions before the Senate. This policy approved by the Senate has not, as far as can be determined, been implemented by the Administration. Spain said that he cannot understand what the Senate’s relationship is with the Administration.

Miller said that he sits on the University Course Change Committee, and that evidently the old method is working. He asked whether the Senate wants the Administration to send copies of this to all Department Heads.

Vice President Stebbins said that, according to his recollection, all departments were advised of this policy and told what they had to do. He said that it was also his recollection that he saw nothing in the Senate Policy which said that the other method was abolished and superseded by the new one, and that apparently departments still choose to do it the other way. They are free to do it the way the Senate proposed if they want to. They have instructions but nobody so far has chosen to do it that way.

Spain said that he believes when a new policy is passed that it automatically cancels out the old policy.

Weaver said that his department knows about the new policy, and discussed using it and decided to use the previous one so some departments do know about the new policy.

Vice President Stebbins said that he thinks all departments know about it.

Julien said that the reason for the change in the Course Change Policy was that the old procedure was not working three or four years ago. The Administration is, in fact, ignoring the new Course Change Policy by sending out new guidelines to use the old method. The new Course Change Policy has been given no more than lip service as to being implemented. The new Course Change Policy has succeeded in getting the old procedure working. However, it has been completely ignored as a policy. Julien said that he does not think there has been a single course implemented in the new way. It is up to the Senate to decide if it wants to stress more that it should be used. Does the Senate or does the Senate not insist more upon Senate policy being listened to and carried out?

Spain said he was astounded when he saw the new policy come out this spring indicating the new procedures for course changes when, in fact, it was the antithesis of the policy passed by the Senate. The objective of the new Senate Course Change Policy was for rapid course change to keep pace with changes in various fields. It placed the major responsibility...
for review of course work on the departments, where the people know what the course is about, know what the requirements are in terms of cost, and know what the space requirements are. The responsibility should be within the department. Department Heads are paid to do this job and Deans are paid to make sure that Department Heads do the job. Why then have a Committee that probably will not have people with the expertise capable of evaluating the course, not able to make judgments about money, not able to make judgments about space, when there are questions about space, money, and staff to teach the course. These are questions that the department can answer, and these are the questions that should be asked within the department, and the department should be held responsible. The policy this spring was a 180 degree turn from what was proposed by the Senate. He said that it is inconceivable that this should go on.

Vice President Stebbins objected to the Senate saying the new Course Change Policy has not been implemented. He said that the policy is in effect, and ready to use, and the departments have been advised. He asked whether he is supposed to go to departments and whop them over the head, and say you ought to do it this way? There has to be a Committee because there is an appeal process.

Spain said that the Senate expected Vice President Stebbins' office to put together the implementation.

Vice President Stebbins told Spain that every department has a copy of the policy right now, and that the new Course Change Policy is not nearly as simple to implement as the Senate thought it was. He added that he thinks it will be found that the New Course Change Policy is going to be slower and more cumbersome than the old one but the New Course Change Policy will be tried.

Baillod suggested that the Curricular Policy Committee be charged with coming up with a recommendation at the next Senate meeting as to whether or not to have this new Course Change Policy exclusive of the old one or eliminate the old one. Tech is operating now under two policies -- the traditional Course Change Policy and the new Course Change Policy.

Spain said that the new Course Change Policy was going to replace the old Course Change Policy and that new Senate policy always replaces the old. Baillod responded that that is not quite clear. Julien said that it is not clear because it has not been implemented clearly. Baillod replied that there was a lot of confusion in his department over exactly what the Course Change Policy was now in light of this new policy, and the old policy. Spain said that he cannot believe that when the Senate passes a new policy that one can either follow the old policy or the new policy. Baillod responded that technically perhaps this could happen. In Proposal 3-76, Final Exam Policy, the old policy is repealed in one of the first clauses. Romig noted that the legislature has a lot of trouble and, they have recently introduced repealer in their statutes. One does not necessarily wipe out an old statute or rule because another one has been passed.

Brown gave an example of one Senate policy that was passed by the Senate, approved by the President, and carried out for awhile, and then dropped. A Department Head was appointed for a period of five years, and came up for reappointment with the agreement of the Administration and the faculty of the department. He could be reappointed or not. But in recent years, this has been completely dropped and seemingly forgotten. It is not in the Faculty Handbook.

Spain said that when the Senate is reorganized next year, it should think about whether it is going to spend endless hours in Committee coming up with proposals which are going to be discussed with more peoples' time spent in the Senate which come to naught in the end.

Julien said that this can be brought up at the fall meeting.

B. Instructional Policy

Senator Baillod, Chairman, gave the report. The Committee met several times since the last report, and finalized three Proposals which will be submitted during the New Business portion of the meeting.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Chairman Quinones did not attend the meeting, but submitted a brief written report to President Julien in which he made some suggestions regarding the Committee:

1. Quinones suggested selecting a replacement as Committee Chairman since this is his last year at Tech.
2. The Senate should restrict the term of Chairman of the Committee to a one-year period to provide a steady flow of new ideas and directions.
3. Senators should be encouraged to act as a focal point within their respective departments for the collection, discussion and distribution of information to the Chairman of the Evaluation Committee. In this way a constant give-and-take exchange of information dealing with evaluations can be made available through the efforts of the Committee to all concerned.

At the conclusion of the report, President Julien said that Senator Sachs has agreed to become the new Chairman of the Institutional Evaluation Committee.

D. Elections Committee

Chairman Doane did not attend the meeting but sent the following report to President Julien:
1. Professor George Bahrman has asked to be replaced; therefore, I suggest he be released. He has spent many years on the Committee and I have appreciated his help.

2. Dr. Virgil Snyder has agreed to replace him, so the committee now consists of Mildred Townsend, Virgil Snyder, and Virginia Doane.

3. The Senate-at-Large Election was conducted. Ballots were mailed March 31, 1976. Results were mailed to representatives in a memo dated April 22, 1976.

**RESULTS: SENATOR-AT-LARGE ELECTION**

The Election Committee received 6 nominating petitions to fill two 3-year and one 2-year Senator-At-Large vacancies. In the election 231 envelopes were received. Two hundred, twenty one were signed, therefore certified but 2 were empty so that only 219 ballots were received and counted. Ten unsigned invalid envelopes were not opened.

Results of the election were: Robert Brown 99 votes; John L. Carter, 100 votes; Vincent W. Hauge, 62 votes; Harley L. Sachs, 122 votes; Robert C. Stinson, 67 votes; and Peter M. Tampas, 89 votes.

The results were checked and hereby certified as being correct. The following are declared to be winners of the Senator-at-Large election: Harley L. Sachs (122 votes) - 3-year term 1976-1979; John L. Carter, (100 votes) - 3-year term, 1976-1979; Robert Brown (99 votes) - 2-year unexpired term 1975-1978.

4. The solicitations for Faculty Nomination for the Distinguished Teacher Award were mailed with the Election Ballots as per Senate action. Nominations were forwarded to Larry Chambers.

5. Notices with "how to" instructions for elections have been sent to the eight departments which presently have senators whose term of office expire on August 31, 1976.

**E. Promotional Policy Review**

Senator Hennessy, Committee Chairman, distributed copies of a written report which he prepared. (See Appendix B - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Hennessy suggested that it be accepted as a report, but that the Proposals be put on the agenda for the first Senate meeting in the fall. He also said that he thinks the subject of the report is of considerable interest to the faculty. In Part I the following resolution is proposed: "The Senate does reaffirm the principle expressed in the present Promotion Policy and Procedures that criteria for promotion should vary from department to department . . . " Second, the Committee would like to see a profile of the people promoted, and a profile of people recommended but not promoted. Therefore, in Part II the following Resolution is proposed: "The Senate requests the President to have prepared, annually, a report for the Senate . . . summarizing the contributions of those faculty considered for promotion, both favorably and unfavorably . . ." It is difficult to anticipate what that information will reveal.

Brown pointed out that Consulting Activity (last page of report) is not necessarily considered an attribute; it is not necessarily something that is good. Hennessy responded that the label good or bad is not meant to be put on any of these. Hennessy referred to the chart explaining that numbers one, two, three, four, and five have to do with teaching. Numbers six, seven, eight, nine have to do with professional activity. The last three items have to do with services -- University Services and Public Services. Those are the three activities which appear in the handbook for faculty: to teach, do research, and perform public services.

Julien said that the report will be accepted but action on it will be deferred until next fall.

**F. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association** - No Report.

**G. Smoking**

Senator Kauppila, committee member, gave the report. He discussed the questionnaire sent to staff members to find what their opinions were regarding "Smoking and the Right to Breathe Clean Air." It was felt at the last Senate meeting that the entire University should be surveyed. There were a total of 554 replies, a much larger number of replies than Kauppila expected. He discussed the highlights (See Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Almost everybody had something to say. Some of the comments were humorous; some of them not so humorous; some of them were very conscientious; some of them carry a banner. Kauppila said that he thinks the results of this survey are very clear, and asked to have the results included with the minutes. He said that the two members of the Committee present two rather diverse opinions and Kauppila said he would not comment on Committee differences since the other Committee member was not present at this meeting.

Julien commented that he received a call from the other member of the Committee objecting to the format of the questionnaire. She thought that the questions were prejudiced toward non-smokers.

Hennessy asked Kauppila about his use of the verb "demand" in the questionnaire. Kauppila responded that he used "demand" and "ask for" in order to allow a person to provide either a passive answer or a strong answer. In some cases people wanted a strong answer, and the word "demand" seemed to be a word that represented strength; and "ask for" was the passive answer.

**H. Professional Standards and Development** - Ross Miller has agreed to chair the Committee.
Old Business

1. Department of Nursing Representation on the Senate.

Proposal 8-76, Constitutional Amendment to Provide Senate Representation for Newly Created Departments. Amendment V to the Constitution (See Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office). President Julien asked for discussion regarding the amendment of Senate Constitution Article III, A4, changing the two-year residency requirement for departments having less than three faculty members meeting the minimum qualifications for Senate membership. At the last Senate meeting the amendment carried by a 2/3 majority and if passed by a 2/3 majority at this meeting, it will go before the academic faculty for approval, and then to the Board of Control for approval.

Baillod said that this proposed amendment seems to make second class faculty out of those faculty with less than two years residency in the larger departments. He thinks that either the two-year residency requirement is a valid requirement or it is not. If the residency requirement is going to be eliminated for the smaller departments then it should also be eliminated for all departments. Either it serves some purpose or it does not.

Nufer said that the purpose of amending the Constitution is to benefit those departments which are new, such as the Department of Nursing. Julien said that if the amendment does not pass, then the Department of Nursing can only be represented by the one person in that department who is eligible for election. Baillod said that if it is important to have senior people on the Senate, then the residency should hold for all departments. Nuferaid some departments would be unrepresented if the Constitution is not amended and a two-year residency is required of all departments. Weaver said that he looked at the amendment from the point of view that it is less bad to have an unqualified person as a Senator than to have a department totally unrepresented.

Julien called for a vote on the amendment. The vote was 17 for and 2 against, and it carried by more than a 2/3 majority of those present. Next, the amendment will be presented to the Academic Faculty for approval.

New Business

1. Proposal 3-76: Final Exam Policy

Senator Baillod introduced the Proposal and moved that it be adopted. Weaver seconded the Proposal. Baillod briefly discussed it and President Julien opened up the floor to discussion.

Miller said that 3-76 does not provide for laboratory practical exams. Baillod said that a laboratory performance exam can be given in the tenth week as long as a written final is given during the Final Examination Period. Miller said that he did not see this written into 3-76. Baillod replied that if a Final Exam is given in the Final Examination Period that any kind of exam can be given in the last week, including laboratory exams. However, if a department eliminates a written final under III.D.1., then no written exam can be given during the two weeks preceding the Final Examination Period.

One Senator asked how the policy is to be applied to take-home exams. Take home exams terminate during Final Exam Week, but they often have to start sometime in the tenth week. Baillod said that according to 3-76 that course would have to be scheduled for Final Examination by the Director of Scheduling during the Final Examination Period unless it could qualify for one of the exceptions, and that take home finals would be turned in during Final Examination Week.

Weaver pointed out that if 3-76 is passed that there will still be the same percentage of unprofessional, unethical faculty who will not follow the policy while the rest try to follow the rules, and that the policy will not get the people it is aimed at.

A number of Senators asked how self-paced courses would be handled under 3-76. For example, Program Dynamics sometimes ends in the seventh or eighth week, or goes a few weeks into the next quarter. Baillod said that would be viewed as an accelerated course, and the Final would be given the last class period. It was pointed out to Baillod that this is not clear in the Proposal. Hennessy pointed out that a special paragraph on programmed instruction is needed. Baillod said that III.L could be changed to read "special provisions applicable to accelerated or individualized instruction courses, or programmed courses." Programmed courses which the student completes in the middle of the term, Baillod said, could be taken care of under III.L.1. by changing the wording to read: "The time period devoted to instruction and examination may be shorter or longer than eleven weeks."

Boutilier related that the Mathematics Department wants to keep the old Final Exam Policy, which they feel is very clear except for those few who frequently want to violate it, but to add the very last sentence from 3-76 to the old policy: "Deliberate and frequent violations shall be taken into account in evaluation of performance by colleagues and administrators." The Mathematics Department also wanted this added to the old policy: "and the Faculty Senate shall publicly censure frequent violations." The Mathematics Department commented on III.L. "Special provisions applicable to accelerated courses," and said there is no reason that any course cannot be said to be accelerated. Baillod said that a definition of "accelerated course" is needed.

Hennessy objected to "throwing" graduate and undergraduate courses together in 3-76. In the graduate courses he teaches, the students write four term papers and Hennessy said that he is satisfied that he explores what the students know in the subject better with the four term papers than he would with a final. Baillod said that he could get an exception to the policy. Hennessy questioned having to justify on a graduate level that he is not going to give a final.
Julien quoted 3-76, "The intent of this policy is to require that Final Examinations be given to all students in all courses," saying that he feels that this is an insult to faculty members who feel they can evaluate a student without giving final examinations. He said that the Proposal is aimed at eliminating injustices caused by a few faculty because their Department Heads do not tell them they cannot violate the policy. He said that he would rather see a Senate Final Exam Policy which states that it is good procedure to give a final exam, and that Final Exams should not be given during the last week of classes. Baillod replied that this is present policy and that he thought from previous Senate meetings that there was sentiment for tightening that policy up. When the Committee got the letters back from the Department Heads, there were many different interpretations of Final Exam Policy, and many said they did not understand what "we felt was very clear in the existing policy."

Weaver said that the head of ME-EM has stated very firmly that he understands what the Final Exam Policy is and that those in ME-EM are not to violate it. He added that his feeling is that 3-76 is too restrictive a policy, and that if the Deans and Department Heads would do their job there would not be this difficulty.

Sloan raised three questions on behalf of Electrical Engineering. (1) III.C. "Students in their last quarter of work . . . may be exempted from a Final Examination." She pointed out that a lot of bookkeeping would be involved in courses having a large percentage of graduating seniors, and asked that III.C.1. be revised. (2) III.J. She questioned the fact that a special final examination shall not be given at an earlier time. Nufer pointed out that Social Sciences felt that III.J. and K. are too restrictive. For example, under III.J. what would happen if a special exam was to take the place of one scheduled from 7:30 to 9:30 p.m. Friday of the exam week? Would the special final be given on Saturday? There is no provision in the proposal to cover this situation, and Social Sciences feels that there ought to be a provision in 3-76 for those exams scheduled for the last day. (3) III.K. No student shall be required to take more than three Final Examinations per day. EE agrees with provisions of III.K. but have traditionally found there are cases in which students are scheduled for three final exams but not one of the three instructors will give; EE feels that a way of resolving this conflict should be included in 3-76.

Phillips said that if everything is spelled out for every possible exception the Senate ends up with a lengthy Proposal; and that there will be loopholes in this Proposal or any Proposal on Final Exam Policy. He suggested a Final Exam Proposal saying there shall be no final examinations given before the eleventh week, rather than trying to spell everything out, as in 3-76.

P. Nelson relayed the joint viewpoint of Professors Alexander and DelliQuadri addressed to the Senate: "You are cracking the whip at a few delinquent faculty members but on many other issues you are acquiescing to many delinquent administrators."

Weaver pointed out a phrase from Proposal 10-72: "No regular exams shall be given the last two days of class in the term." This Proposal did not pass, but many people in the University think that it has been passed. The idea was not to have any hour exams the last two days in order to allow students to prepare for finals. He suggested that it could be incorporated into Senate Final Exam Policy. Baillod said that according to the feedback received from the various departments there was a lot of sentiment against putting restrictions on examinations during the tenth week. Weaver asked Baillod if he had consulted any students and said that many students find it difficult to take hour exams on Friday of the tenth week, and then start finals the next Monday.

Baillod said that the real problem is having Final Exams given the last class period of the tenth week. If a Final Exam policy is passed which strongly requires that final examinations be given during Final Exam Week, then the problem of exams during the tenth week will disappear.

Julien said that the real question is whether 3-76 will eliminate the problem. Baillod replied that 3-76 is written as explicitly detailed as possible to eliminate the excuse that giving a final exam in the last day of class is not in violation of Senate policy.

Weaver asked the administrative representative whether there is anything that anyone in the Administration can do to someone who completely disregards Senate Final Exam Policy.

Vice President Stebbins responded that he has been concerned about this policy for some time and that he gets reports from students about it. For example, he had a report from one student recently that three finals were moved up from Final Exam Week to the preceding week. He said that he does not think that there is much he can do about it personally. One year, he said, he played "detective." He sent a secretary around campus to check on the rooms in which exams were scheduled by the Final Exam Committee to see how many were really not being held. It turned out that approximately 90 to 92 percent were being held as scheduled. There were a few that apparently were not held. It gets very difficult to get convincing proof that a certain exam was not held as scheduled.

Vice President Stebbins added some comments about Proposal 3-76. He said that he is bothered by the wording suggested for the Proposal because he thinks it is better for the University or community of scholars to have as few regulations as possible and to try to instill the faculty and administrators alike with the desire to do what they think is right, and have them do that more or less voluntarily without having to be forced to. He also said that he wondered if Department Heads could be held responsible in cases where an exam is being moved ahead, and is not being given during the Final Exam Week.

Spain asked Dr. Stebbins if he has called any professors saying that they should not be violating exam policy. Dr. Stebbins responded that he must first get firm facts on who does this. Students who complain are reluctant to specify
names of faculty who violate policy. Dr. Stebbins concluded by saying that in the past the Lode listed a few professors who supposedly were violating exam policy and that he thought that to do this might be effective.

Spain suggested that the Dean of Students or the Vice President of Academic Affairs ask each Department head to make a list at the end of each term with every course that is taught by that department and a requirement that somebody make some statement about that course — that there is going to be a final exam, or an excuse as to why there is not going to be an exam. He feels that this would be implementation of existing policy.

Weaver quoted W. Dix of Scheduling as saying that he gets a list of courses in which finals are given, assigns rooms, but finds that if he checks the rooms he finds a sizeable fraction that in fact do not use those rooms at that time. He cannot get the departments to honestly say that they are not going to give a final. Later, the department, Weaver said, can say, "We gave all our exams."

At the conclusion of this rather lengthy discussion of Proposal 3-76, President Julien asked for a vote. The Proposal was defeated by a vote of 1 Yes, 16 No.

2. Proposal 4-76, Policy on Distribution of Information on Grading Practices to Academic Faculty.

Senator Baillod introduced the Proposal and moved that it be adopted. He said that support for this Proposal on the Instructional Policy Committee was not unanimous. The purpose of the Proposal is to keep the faculty informed about grading trends. Presently grade distributions and averages for sections are compiled and transmitted to Department Heads; some faculty see this information, others do not. A majority of the committee think that the type of information asked for would be very useful and easily understood by academic faculty in a one sheet format, without looking through pages and pages of statistics. The Committee has had discussions about this with the Administration, registrar, and Mr. Dix, and they have indicated that there would be no technical problem in putting out a summary like this. Weaver seconded the Proposal. President Julien opened the floor to discussion.

Sachs pointed out the possibility of getting a false statistical figure in the Humanities Department for 100 level courses because such a large number of students take English composition, and he said he thought that student grades are better in the non-composition 100-level courses. He feared that the proposed summary of grades would make it appear that students are performing better in 100-level English courses than they really are.

Baillod responded that the statistics in the table would be weighted by student credit hours, and the large student credit hour total generated in the freshman English courses would be appropriately reflected in that number, and that larger section grade point averages as computed would be weighted by student credit hours generated. The larger courses will receive their full weight in proportion to their student credit hours. Thus, if a department gives out a thousand credit hours of C and ten student credit hours of A, the average will be very close to C, and B's will be very insignificant.

Brown and Nufer both pointed out the fact that grade point averages have gone up at Tech because of the increased period of time which students have to drop courses. Brown added that he does not object to the long drop period. Nufer said that because of the longer drop period that "you finish with the better finishers. You finish with the A's and B's and C's but the others have dropped out."

Julien said that grading information would be useful so that grade trends could be recognized.

Miller said that he would rather see class size taken into consideration in such a summary of grades than class level; or that perhaps both class level and size could be considered in the summary.

One Senator questioned whether the Senate wanted to create more work in the Administration. He also said that if the tabular summary is disseminated each quarter that the only way to see trends would be to same the summaries. He said that it would be more meaningful to have the grade summary on a periodic basis. He pointed out that elaborate, detailed computer printouts are apparently available now.

Julien asked for a vote on Proposal 4-76. The Proposal was passed by a vote of 9 Yes, 8 No.

3. Proposal 5-76, Amendment to Mid-Term Grade Policy.

Senator Baillod introduced the Proposal and moved that it be adopted. He said that the present Mid-Term Grade Policy as stated in Senate Policy 17-69 provides that mid-term grades be assigned to all undergraduate students. Under the Amendment grades would not be issued for juniors and seniors, and no mid-term grades would be issued in courses 300 and above. If a sophomore took a 300 level course, he would not get a mid-term grade in that course. Weaver seconded the motion to adopt the Proposal and Julien opened up the floor for discussion.

P. Nelson asked whether there would be another kind of notice mailed to juniors and seniors during approximately the sixth week of the quarter which would tell them what courses the University says they are enrolled in (Presently, the mid-term grade serves as this notice).

Spain pointed out that in the past the mid-term grade card has surfaced certain students who thought they had dropped but who were still on the roll.

Baillod said that he had talked with the registrar about this and that juniors and seniors would still be notified as to what courses the University says they are enrolled in.
There were some comments about whether graduate students receive mid-term grade cards. Baillod said that graduate students do not receive mid-term grade cards; however, seniors enrolled in graduate courses do get such cards. It was pointed out that presently a computer sees that mid-term grade cards are not sent for graduate students. If 5-76 were passed, a computer would eliminate grade cards for juniors and seniors, and those enrolled in courses numbered 300 and above.

Julien asked for a vote on Proposal 5-76. The Proposal was passed by a vote of 17-0.

4. Proposal 6-76, To Change Dates of the 1977 Notre Dame Hockey Series

Senator ElRite introduced the Proposal and moved that it be adopted. The Athletic Department is asking for a deviation from the Senate's final examination policy passed on February 19, 1969 in order to give students an opportunity to view the final 1976-77 hockey series. Final exams are scheduled from February 21-25, 1977. Athletic events are not supposed to be scheduled during final examination week. The series would be on Thursday and Friday rather than Friday and Saturday; thus, the Saturday game would be moved back to Thursday. If a larger number of students could attend the series, there would be more enthusiasm and the Athletic Department thinks that this would affect the playing of Tech's hockey team. The League has scheduled the games for Thursday and Friday, but Tech has contacted Notre Dame and they would be willing to play the series on Thursday and Friday. Weaver seconded the motion to adopt Proposal 6-76, and Julien opened up the floor for discussion.

Weaver asked if this Proposal is passed, and if the game interferes with a student's final exam, is the Athletic Department asking that the student be exempted from the exam and given a late exam? How would the Proposal affect faculty -- would they be expected to give late exams? ElRite responded that the Athletic Department was only asking for the privilege of scheduling games on Thursday and Friday; if there is an exam scheduled, that exam goes on as scheduled. If the Proposal passes, the students with that time free would have the opportunity to go to the game.

Miller said that only two examination periods, from 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. Thursday and Friday evenings would be affected. Boutillier said that if the game begins at 9:00 p.m., students having evening exams would possibly miss only a small part of the game.

One Senator wondered if changing the schedule for this game would set a precedent. ElRite said that he did not think so since Tech has been playing hockey for many years and that this is the first time this situation has come up.

ElRite was asked if other games are scheduled during vacation time this year and he replied to his knowledge there are not.

Weaver said that he approves of passing Proposal 6-76 since specific dates are specified. He said that he does not want to see a precedent set, but that that the Athletic Department does not appear to be asking that a precedent be set.

Sachs asked ElRite if the gate receipts would be affected by having the game moved to Thursday. ElRite said that he was not sure because he is not involved in the financial aspects of the Athletic Department. Primarily, the Athletic Department wants students to have the opportunity to see the game; Notre Dame has a good hockey team; the series should be a good one and it might be a crucial one for Tech.

Julien asked for a vote on Proposal 6-76 and it was passed by a vote of 18-0.

5. Proposal 7-76, Policy on Humanistic Courses

Senator P. Nelson introduced the Proposal and moved that it be adopted. Under present Senate policy there is a single HU-SS list for the entire University. Proposal 7-76 would allow the faculty of each college or school to develop and maintain their own HU-SS list. Nelson said that support for the Proposal is not unanimous. Phillips seconded the Proposal and President Julien opened the floor to discussion.

Spain spoke out against passing Proposal 7-76 saying that it should not be up to each college or school to make their own HU-SS list. During the past, with the single HU-SS list, the Engineering School has had a committee which reviewed the courses on the list, using criteria which were set forth by the Engineers Council on Professional Development. Using ECPD criteria, courses on the HU-SS list cannot be technical skill courses. The criteria being applied by the Engineering School were rigorous. Therefore, it was felt that since the Engineering School seemed to be the limiting factor because of ECPD requirements, it was logical that they should first review the list, and then if there were any disagreements, these could be ironed out through negotiation with the Curricular Policy Committee. Spain said that his personal feeling was that there should continue to be a single list for the University. He concluded by saying, "What's good for engineering is good for Michigan Tech."

P. Nelson responded that a large number of petitions are processed to substitute courses which are not on the HU-SS list and that many try to bypass the list by the rather liberal use of petitions. Another point he made was that the ECPD "frowns" upon the skill type courses such as drama and ballet and does not allow them on the HU-SS list. However, such courses might be "perfectly legitimate courses" for individuals in the School of Forestry, School of Business, or the College of Sciences and Arts.

Hennessy asked Nelson whether it would be possible to have a single list, marking with an asterisk those courses not permitted for engineers. Nelson responded that it would be possible but cumbersome.
Weaver said that he hated to see the unnecessarily restricted rules of ECPD doing harm to the rest of the curricula on campus, and that his personal opinion was that ECPD disallows courses ridiculously. He hates to see some of the rest of the faculty not allowing their students to take "some of those perfectly good courses."

Spain questioned whether the list is unnecessarily restricted. He said that having the ECPD as an outside group exerting a little pressure on the University is a good thing. There is a limit to what will be on the list, and "it will not ultimately become everything that is taught at Michigan Tech."

Julien said that passing this Proposal "opens up the door for Deans to institute almost anything they want." P. Nelson responded that there is something deliberate in the language of the Proposal to prevent that from happening: "From a list approved by the faculty of the college or school in which the student is a major." Thus, Nelson said, if a Dean wants to do something, he somehow has to get all of his faculty to go along with it. Julien replied that a Dean could choose faculty who agree with what he says, and they could give him the list he wants.

Boutilier said that she thinks ECPD restrictions put on the Engineering School restrict those in mathematics and physics from what they might want students to take, and that the restrictions result in the petitions which have been complained about. Vice President Stebbins asked if all the petitions were necessarily approved and Boutilier replied that she did not know.

Kauppila commented that the number of petitions would suggest that there is something wrong with the list.

Hennessy said that transfer students often use petitions to get courses they have taken accepted, but which are not on the Tech HU-SS list.

Julien asked for a vote on Proposal 7-76. The Proposal passed by a vote of 10 yes, and 8 No.

6. Joseph A. Romig and Dean Stebbins given acclamation of appreciation for their contributions to the Senate.

Senator Sachs commented that he believed that this is the last Senate meeting that will be attended by Dean Stebbins and Joseph Romig. He said, "While we haven't always agreed in our debate, I've enjoyed their company very much, and I've learned a lot from them, and I wish them God's speed." He moved that the Senate express its appreciation for their attendance and input at Senate meetings, and that the expression of appreciation be put on the record. Senator Spain seconded the motion. President Julien asked for a voice vote on the motion and it passed unanimously.

Vice President Stebbins responded to the acclamation of appreciation saying that it has been interesting watching the Senate develop. "I think it is a better Senate now than it was ten years ago. And we have had our differences, it's true. I guess Ford has his differences with Congress so I don't think that's unusual. I just hope that things go better in the future than they have in the past. Good luck to all of you."

Mr. Romig responded to the acclamation of appreciation, "I would like to comment that I appreciated the blessings of God but I didn't know whether I wanted a speedy removal."

7. Senate Annual Report

Senator Hennessy suggested to President Julien that for the Annual Report the Senate President ask the Committee Chairmen to report to him those areas where they think he should report to the University President. Julien liked the idea and made the official request to the Committee Chairmen to present him a short report of the questions that need to be brought to the attention of the President.

Julien also said that he intends to place in the Annual Report a compilation of all the Senate Proposals that have been passed and approved by the President. Spain said that it would be interesting to review every one of the Proposals, as to what has happened to them, to find out what their status is, to what extent the University adheres to them, and whether they are being implemented.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

E. Erickson
Secretary