MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 90
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

20 October 1976

(Senate Minute pages: 1194-1223)

Meeting No. 90 was called to order on Wednesday, October 20, 1976 at 7:05 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-five members or alternates were present. Absent were Allison, J.C. (CH), Brown, R.T. (AL), Davis, L.L. (MA), Shetron, S.G. (FFC), Snyder, V.W. (AL).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitor attended: Zaburunov, S. (Lode reporter).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 89 were approved after the following changes, corrections and additions: Page 1178, fifth paragraph, 4th sentence. At the request of Senator M. Sloan change "Ruth" to "Ruth Miller."

Page 1180, second paragraph. At the request of M. Sloan, the secretary has changed the wording of this paragraph to read as follows:

"Senator M. Sloan said that she does not think that the Senate has to go to President Smith and ask for permission to evaluate parts of the institution. Sloan suggested the type of evaluation in which one looks upwards, "as opposed to finding out how the University evaluates us looking downwards." Sloan also said that the Committee can evaluate the excellence of Michigan Tech and its academic mission." (NOTE: The new words are underlined).

Page 1186, sixth paragraph, last sentence. At the suggestion of R. Horvath (EE) who phoned the secretary, and also of Senator M. Sloan who talked to the Secretary, change the sentence to read:

"In further discussion it was mentioned that according to the Faculty Handbook a newly appointed assistant professor must be granted tenure after five years and a newly appointed associate professor must be granted tenure within three years." (NOTE: The new words are underlined).

President's Report

President P. Nelson delivered the President's report (See Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). At the conclusion of his report, President Nelson asked Vice President Sachs to give the report which he had prepared for his department on the Harrington Seminar and which is included in the minutes (See Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Nelson asked if there were comments on the President's report. Hauge referred to 9-63. He said that after the last Senate meeting he looked through the Senate minutes up through October 1, 1970, and said that he could not find any reference indicating that President Smith had not approved 9-63. President Smith responded to Hauge's remark, saying that Proposal 9-63 was not approved, and "that should be formally introduced into the minutes now."

Reports on Meeting of the Academic Council. There were reports on two meetings of the Academic Council. President P. Nelson attended the first meeting and delivered the report (See Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office) Vice President Sachs attended the second meeting and delivered the report. (See Appendix E - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Vice President Romig said that there was one correction of Sachs' report. There will be only one Career Workshop for women per institution. He said that Sachs reported on the Council meeting accurately, but Romig said he found that information out today.

Reports on Meeting of the Board of Control Vice President Sachs delivered a report on the meeting of the Board of Control (See Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office)

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

President Nelson, chairman, gave the report. This year the members of the Curricular Policy Committee are Dr. Eugene Huang from Civil Engineering, Dr. Virgil Snyder from ME-EM, Dr. Michael Coffman from Forestry, Dr. Charles Nelson from Humanities, Dr. Paul Nelson from the School of Business, and John Strump, the student member.

The Committee held a meeting on the proposed industrial forestry option. Comments which had been received from academic deans and department heads were discussed. Enough questions had been raised on the proposal to warrant further discussions with the Forestry Department and others before the proposal can be brought to the Senate Floor, for a vote under Senate Policy 10-70. The Committee hopes to have the industrial forestry option proposal before the Senate at its next meeting.

B. Instructional Policy - No Report.

C. Institutional Evaluation
Vice President Sachs, chairman of the committee, gave the report, and commented on some of the Committee’s progress. The President of the Senate has charged the Committee to develop a means of evaluating the institution but not to conduct those evaluations. Sachs listed three areas of concern to the committee.

1. One suggestion for the committee to pursue is a revision of the job description for the Vice President of Academic Affairs, which would call upon the Vice President to inspire a climate of faculty productivity.
2. Should the Board of Control, like some top level industrial board of directors, retain a consulting agency to perform an external management effectiveness audit? This could suggest that Michigan Tech has areas that need examination. It would indicate to the Board of Control that the Senate recognizes problems and this would supplement the accreditation reports which presently are filtered through the President before reaching the Board of Control.
3. The chairman is asking for the Student Council to make some recommendations on how student evaluations can be put into departmental procedures for raises, promotions and retention. Sachs’ concern is that there will be no evaluations at any time or place which are anonymous. If someone has a complaint against somebody, that person should be prepared to defend the complaint or make it to the face of the person against whom he is complaining. This is not a place for anonymous denunciations.

The Committee is presently made up or was made up of Professors Hennessy, Rakestraw, Prowant, C. Nelson; Jeff Boyce, Joan Kuipers, Doug Stuart, and Sue Haut, a student; and Sachs, the chairman. Professor Rakestraw withdrew from the Committee, saying that he did not want to be on a Committee that had students and administrators on it because he felt he did not want to be outvoted by an administrator. Sachs’ view is that this is an open Committee, and that anybody who wants to put their ideas and thoughts into it is welcome to do that. "We do not conduct closed sessions and the more cross the line communication that we conduct, the better the chances are that our work will be fruitful, so I welcome the input of administrators and students on this Committee. What we propose to the Senate eventually will be up to the Senate to approve of or disapprove, but the administrators on our Committee, I hope, will give us more credibility in evaluating administrators and also give us better access to the information for present evaluations.

At the conclusion of the report, President Smith asked Sachs about the filtering process on accreditation reports mentioned in the Committee report, and if this is just an assumption by Sachs. Sachs replied, "I think that is just an assumption and reflects the kind of suspicion that I alluded to at the Harrington Seminar and which I hope we will be able to dispel entirely." President Smith responded that Tech's major accreditation report, which is ECPD (Engineers' Council for Professional Development), is specifically disallowed by ECPD for public dissemination. The University cannot disseminate the details of the report; this would be in violation of ECPD policy. Sachs replied, "But there is nothing to prevent you from disseminating the report to the Board of Control." President Smith answered, "The Board can have it anytime they want to; I think they have in the past, but that is why I was confused, I just was not aware that they ever did not get it." Sachs answered, "I don't know what they got."

Booy asked President Smith about ECPD accreditation reports, asking how she can find out what the accreditation of her department was based on. President Smith replied that the ECPD reports go to the department head. Booy said that she doesn't "really know what it is that they (ECPD) are getting after." President Smith responded, "I think what you should do is raise it in your departmental faculty meetings. I think it is a perfectly legitimate question to raise at your departmental faculty meeting. What are the specific criticisms? I personally see no reason why those criticisms cannot be aired if everyone in the faculty say they will not disclose this publicly. And I think if that was said by all faculty members in the department, there's no reason why they shouldn't have the full scope of the criticism." Booy said, "I don't know what they (ECPD) look at in a particular department. I don't know who influences them and I wonder how many people in engineering education really do know. What is it that we're working for?" President Smith replied that this is completely public information and it should be available to Booy in her department. There is a booklet ECPD puts out annually and it gives all the criteria. The booklet should be available in her department and in the library, and he said that he would send her a reference on it.

D. Elections Committee

Senator Evensen gave the report. He reported that the Academic Faculty had ratified Proposal 8-76, Constitutional Amendment to Provide Senate Representation for Newly Created Departments (Amendment V to the Constitution). The vote was 145 in favor of the Proposal and 20 opposed. He said that one ballot came to the Elections Committee with the comment written on it, stating that nobody's really defined "newly created." The Elections Committee Report, dated October 18, 1976 was signed by Virginia Doane, Mildred Townsend, Virgil Snyder.

President P. Nelson said that clearly more than two-thirds of the Academic Faculty who voted approved the amendment and that it shall become effective upon approval by the Board of Control, and that the Council will submit Proposal 8-76 to the President to submit to the Board of Control for their consideration.

E. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association - No Report. President P. Nelson is looking for a person who is willing to be chairman of this Committee.

F. Smoking Committee

Senator Hauge, Committee member, distributed copies of two Senate Proposals on smoking which he and three others prepared. (See Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). He said that Kauppila participated in the discussion on smoking at the last meeting and that President P. Nelson suggested that Hauge might participate in preparing a proposal since the matter had originally been raised by the Social Sciences Department. Four people met;
they were R. Kauppila, K. Kraft, L. Rakestraw and V. Hauge. The proposal that they have come up with is essentially in
two parts; one directed at the Senate itself, in terms of its own behavior, and one directed to the Senate as they would
address the President of the University. The proposal relating to the Senate is that smokers shall be segregated to one
area of the faculty lounge during meetings of the Senate, that area to be downwind of the nonsmokers.

The portion of the Senate proposals directed to the President of the University basically breaks down into two parts, one
being Recommendations for the restriction of smoking to designated areas/sections of the environment and the other,
Recommendations for the prohibition of smoking in certain environments. There are two recommendations concerning
implementation of these proposals.

The Committee thought that the faculty and others might be interested so they offered a recommendation directed to the
campus groups such as students, and the faculty in their roles as members of the Faculty Association and at
departmental meetings.

"The Senate Smoking Committee recommends that other campus groups may wish to pursue the general
sense of Proposals 4-77 and 5-77 by designating smoking and nonsmoking areas or by prohibiting
smoking entirely from certain places or functions.

For example, at present on a given floor of the ME-EM building, both alcoves (1) lack adequate ventilation
and (2) are designated as smoking areas. The Student Government may wish to request the President to
have (1) the ventilation problem rectified, and (2) one alcove reserved for nonsmokers.

For another example, the Faculty Association may wish to designate smoking and non-smoking areas at
its meetings and functions.

For yet another example, University departments may wish to prohibit smoking at meetings of their
members.

Finally, The Senate recommends that this policy statement be given general distribution to all
organizations within the University community."

He noted three results of the Smoking Questionnaire which Kauppila had distributed in May. (1) By a vote of 375 to 163,
375 respondents objected to inhaling the smoke of others. (2) Sixty-four of the 554 replying to the questionnaire objected
to the smoking of others on the basis of health, for reasons such as allergies. (3) Three hundred sixty-six who responded
thought that designated smoking areas should be established. These kinds of findings directed the thinking of the four
who wrote the proposals. Hauge said that if the Senate did not act favorably on the first proposal directed at the Senate
itself, it should not consider the other, because obviously, it would not be appropriate for the Senate to recommend to
others what it would not recommend for itself.

President P. Nelson said that the proposals would be published with the agenda and considered at the next meeting, and
asked for discussion.

One Senator asked whether there were any smokers in the group of people who wrote the proposals. Hauge responded
that he believed not.

Booy made some comments on the proposals. First, she said it should be called the Nonsmoking Committee. She
commented on the Recommendations for the prohibition of smoking in an environment. (1) The recommendation that
smoking be prohibited in the Finnish Room. She suggested that this might require further thought because recruiters
frequently lunch in the Finnish Room with the faculty in order to discuss students who are seeking jobs. She said, "I'm not
sure that would be the most hospitable thing to knock a cigarette effectively out of a possible job donor's hand. (2) The
recommendation that smoking be prohibited in University cars if nonsmokers are present. She said that quite a few
nonsmokers do not care if they ride with smokers, depending on the density of smoke, the amount of ventilation, and the
legality or illegality of the material being smoked. (3) The recommendation of separate sleeping facilities on University
trips for smokers and nonsmokers should nonsmokers request. She said that quite a few

Sachs spoke out against adoption of the smoking proposals saying, "People, I discover, are pretty decent; you cannot
legislate morality; there's nothing in here that says how you're going to enforce this . . . if people are polity they will be
to one another, and the smoker will desist if it's making somebody uncomfortable or ill."

Hauge responded by pointing out his surprise at the large number of people who find it uncomfortable to go out of the
stands between periods at hockey games because of the suffocating smoke in the halls, and he has been surprised with
the concern that people expressed in this regard. Secondly, he brought up the subject of obscenities at Tech movies, and
the fact that it has not been enough to ask spectators "to cease and desist; something more has been necessary and it
has not been forthcoming . . . in that case they poisoned the air in another respect. In this case we're talking about
smoking, but I think the analogy still stands."

Baillod said that his impression is that there is existing Board of Control policy on the smoking question. Booy had
investigated this matter and responded to Baillod's comment. She referred to the minutes of the December 10, 1971
meeting of the Board of Control. She read, "The President also recommends that the 1948 regulation concerning
smoking on campus be updated and revised with the following, and the quote is, “Smoking is not permitted in areas where such action is prohibited by the administration;” it was moved, seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote that the Board approve and adopt the above two recommendations.”


Old Business - None

New Business

1. To Change the Winter Quarter 1976-77 Academic Calendar.

Senator Haut suggested a deviation from the Winter Quarter Academic Calendar for this year, suggesting the cancellation of classes on January 3, 1977 (This is Senate Proposal 5-77). President P. Nelson said that this proposal would be voted upon at the next Senate meeting, and asked for discussion.

One Senator asked why Haut was suggesting that classes be resumed January 4th rather than January 3rd. Haut responded that New Year's Day is a holiday and the weekend of January 1-2 can be considered a holiday weekend, and under the present calendar the weekend would be broken up by people traveling in order to return to classes on Monday, but if classes were resumed on Tuesday it would not be necessary to travel on the holiday weekend. Changing the calendar would also be convenient for those who have to be driven up by their parents; if the calendar is changed, they will not have to be driven up on New Year's Day. Under the present calendar many parents will be driving their children to Houghton Saturday, January 1; some parents will then be driving back home Sunday, January 2.

One Senator said that normally classes have resumed on Tuesday in order to get away from holiday weekend traffic for safety reasons, and wondered why classes are being resumed on the Monday after the Christmas - New Year recess.

A number of comments were made on the length of an academic quarter. Miller said that the length of academic quarters is not counted in numbers of weeks; what is counted is the number of instructional days during the quarter.

Mr. Romig said that there are approximately 51 1/2 days in an academic quarter. He said that the Senate should ask Bill Lucier to talk about the length of academic quarters some time. Mr. Lucier has worked very hard to try to keep the quarters almost identical in length. One problem is that the change in length of the Thanksgiving break has made the Christmas break somewhat shorter than it has sometimes been. Mr. Romig emphasized that he was not taking a position on Haut's proposal, but that there has been an effort to keep the number of days almost even in each quarter.

Pres. P. Nelson said that he would try to ask for comments from Mr. Lucier and members of his staff. He will also ask Art Weaver to give his comments because his committee was responsible for recommendations on the current calendar.

2. Academic Calendar

Haut raised another item of new business, asking if there is a committee for scheduling. President P. Nelson responded, saying that the Committee on the Academic Calendar was an ad hoc committee which was dismissed over a year ago, and that there is not a currently meeting committee that deals with the academic calendar. If it is a matter of substantial concern, it could be referred to an existing committee or a new committee could be established.

Haut pointed out two reasons why she feels the need for a committee to study the calendar. (1) There will be no Labor Day weekend break for students. (2) The Christmas holidays will be shortened. She said that she thinks that the New Year's weekend for two years following this one will again be broken by traveling. She said that she knows that is very difficult to get something changed once it is in the catalog, but that she thinks in future years it should be emphasized that there are traditions that belong to these holidays that should not be taken away from the students or faculty.

Baillod suggested that this be referred to the Instructional Policy Committee since the Committee is already involved in some aspects of scheduling, instead of creating a new ad hoc committee. As a result of this suggestion, President P. Nelson referred this to the Instructional Policy Committee.

Booy asked that whoever checks into the calendar count up how many Mondays the students have off in the winter quarter. She expressed particular interest in how having Monday off would affect laboratory sections, and said that there is difficulty created when there is a day off in courses with big lab sections. She did say that she has no objection to Monday off, but that it is a problem that should be looked into; for example, it would be a problem if there were a quarter in which classes were scheduled ten Wednesdays, but only two Mondays.

3. Faculty Association Salary Survey.

Referring to the Faculty Association Salary Survey, which was discussed at the September 15 Senate meeting, Hauge asked whether there was a breakdown of information available indicating how the administration responded to questions on the salary survey and how the faculty responded to questions on the salary survey. President P. Nelson responded, referring to the copy of the tabulation of the salary survey information questionnaire which he brought to the meeting.
According to the tabulation, the Faculty Association does not have a breakdown indicating whether individual persons responding to the salary survey were administrators or faculty members. Sachs added that the Faculty Association, "decided not to code the questionnaires so that that kind of separation could be made. They felt that to code the questionnaires would have been a dishonest way to deal with the issue and the honest way to deal with it would have been to put in a question, ‘Are you an administrator or faculty member?’ and they decided not to do that. So you cannot get that information out of the survey."

4. **Sheets on Daily Class Changes.**

Hauge asked that it be suggested to the Registrar's Office, through the Senate, that the sheets on daily class changes, given out during the first week of a term, be sent out on a biweekly or weekly basis instead. He gave three reasons for the suggestion. (1) This flood of paper serves no useful purpose; in fact, it gets in the way. He does not know of any teachers who modify their class books daily. (2) It is a horrible waste of paper. (3) Daily sorting of these handouts involves a great waste of time. On the average, it takes the secretary at least one half an hour to sort out and distribute these sheets each day. If the individual teacher takes them seriously, he will spend at least ten minutes per day per class correcting previous information.

President P. Nelson said that he would discuss the matter with Mr. Lucier. He said that if no one in Hauge's department really wants the daily ones, there is no reason why the department cannot have the department secretary simply not pass them out and wait until the second list comes along.

The meeting was voted to adjourn at 8:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Erickson
Secretary