MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 94
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

4 May 1977

(Senate Minute pages: 1295-1310)

Meeting No. 94 was called to order on Wednesday, May 4, 1977 at 8:10 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-four members or alternates were present. Absent were Brown, R.T. (AL), Davis, L.L. (AROTC), ElRite, R.E. (PE), Evensen, H.A. (ME-EM), Givens, C.R. (Math), Schultz, C.W. (IMR), Sherman, F.V. (AFROTC), Smith, R.L. (Pres.)

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitor attended: Thompson, C. (Graduate Student Council).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 93 were approved as distributed.

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 the report, Nelson said that he had asked Lloyd A. Heldt, Chairman of the Sabbatical Leave Committee to give the annual report of the Sabbatical Leave Committee to the Senate. Heldt could not attend so he gave Nelson a written report which Nelson read to the Senate (See Appendix B - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Meeting of the Academic Council. - Vice President Sachs delivered a report on the meeting of the Academic Council. (See Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

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

At the conclusion of the report a Senator asked about item No. 6 (MTU has won the battle over the McNaughton estate). Sachs explained the details of the estate. There was a $300,000 bequest to a hospital as first choice. The hospital had to use the money within a certain time, and if it didn't, Michigan Tech had to apply for the money within a certain time. Michigan Tech applied for the money, the hospital held on to it far beyond the expiration time, the other people in the family that might have a chance at it protested and then they said that Michigan Tech didn't have any right to it either because the time had elapsed, but it was settled out of court finally and Michigan Tech will get the $300,000.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy - P. Nelson, chairman, gave the report.

The primary activity of the Curricular Policy Committee this academic year was to develop a recommendation on the Industrial Forestry option and present it to the Senate this past fall. The Senate approved the motion and it is currently being deliberated on by the administration. No other items were referred to the Curricular Policy Committee by the administration during the year so there has not been much activity by the Curricular Policy Committee during the Winter or Spring quarters.

B. Instructional Policy - Senator Baillod chairman gave the report (See Appendix E - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Sachs requested that perhaps a copy of the report rating publishers should go to those publishers who cause an extra long wait, "so that they might get the message."

Baillod said, "I'm sure that is part of the idea. The bookstore seems to feel that they have very little leverage in dealing with publishers since the publishers realize that the bookstore does not choose the textbook or publisher, and it was felt that the people who could best put leverage on the publishing houses to improve their performance would be the individual faculty in dealing with the representatives." Miller asked Baillod if he had any indication of what is excellent, good, bad, long, or extra long in terms of time the bookstore waits for texts. Baillod said he did not. However, he said that Mr. Murphy in the bookstore said that some publishers could put textbooks on an airplane and ship them here in a matter of 3 or 4 days if additional textbooks were needed for a course.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Senator Sachs, chairman, gave the report (See Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Proposal 14-77 will be discussed during the New Business portion of the meeting.

D. Elections Committee - Senator Snyder, chairman, gave the report (See Appendix G - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

E. Roles of the Senate and Faculty Association - No Report.
Old Business

Proposal 9-77, Amendment to Mid-Term Grade Policy. It was moved and seconded that Proposal 9-77 be adopted. President Nelson asked for a vote on Proposal 9-77 and it was defeated.

New Business


It was moved and seconded that Proposal 14-77 be adopted. President Nelson asked for discussion.

One Senator said that he thinks it should be made clear that what the Proposal says is that, in principle, do you want institutional evaluation? There is nothing in the Proposal about what the system will be or what it will cover. It is just that, in principle, do you want Institutional Evaluation?

Another Senator said that the question is, if this were to be voted in, what is the next step?

President Nelson said that if this Proposal is adopted, it is transmitted to the President of the University. "How they would implement that is left to them. In other words, the idea is the old issue of policy versus procedure. This proposal advocates a policy that there should be an evaluation of department heads and deans with faculty input. The procedure by which the administration would implement it if the Senate approved the Proposal would be of their own design."

Daavettila commented, "I would say that they must be doing it already. The only new thing in the Proposal would be the statement 'soliciting faculty input.' I suspect that they do it anyway."

P. Nelson said, "Yes, the whole idea of this is faculty input."

Vice President Stein was against passage of Proposal 14-77. Stein said, "Obviously we do evaluations of deans and department heads and try to ask if they are doing their job. I can tell you that I don't know if there is a formal procedure which is a particularly useful device for evaluation. In fact, I've had questions, talking with department heads, about how effective it is in dealing with faculty. Most of the reading I have done on the subject, and what I found from personal experience, is that you work with people much more effectively on a day to day basis. If you have difficulty, you deal with the problem at the time and I think the faculty looking at their department head should work with him at the time of the difficulty and sort of focus on the thing. If you get a formal kind of a confrontational procedure, the kind of atmosphere that I feel a University should have is broken down at that time. And the department head's job, I think, is the most difficult one on the campus. He's under pressure from both directions, trying to perform well, represent his faculty well. In doing his job, he is trying to represent the administration well to the faculty. It is a difficult job. Put him into a formal review procedure where there is basically going to be a confrontation -- at a particular point, the evaluation that is done is very damaging. I have had some experience with it on this campus. We are all concerned about developing better performance from the administration and faculty and student; we all want to get better. The question is, how can we best create that atmosphere? I guess I feel an interaction on an informal basis, a less structured kind of situation, is the way people work together best, develop together best. So I do have some concern about this. Obviously we do make mistakes with our department heads, but sometimes the entire department gets into an evaluation, and it turns out to be a very difficult situation, but we have to do it at times. So I guess I would like to see an informal sort of thing allowed to remain; I think it's an effective way. We can work together better to make it more effective that it is right now. Also, I think it's time for the faculty member to take responsibility to help the department head develop in those areas that are weak. I appreciated very much the help that I got. I felt that developing that kind of atmosphere you could get the job done."

P. Nelson raised the question, "Perhaps some of the negative effects that may have resulted from some type of a departmental evaluation of an administrator might have had to do with the exact procedure used rather than the notion that there was faculty input to the evaluation process. So it is possible that maybe some different format of this thing could eliminate some of the dangers."

One Senator responded to Vice President Stein's remarks. "I see absolutely nothing wrong with putting the department head smack on the spot. He puts his faculty on the spot all the time. Faculty are put on the spot by students."

Another responded to Vice President's Stein's remarks. He said he did not object to somebody's having to answer to people whom he controls. He said he did not understand the reluctance to require this individual to answer to those who are essentially his peers. He said, "If he doesn't feel they are, then we certainly do have an adversary situation develop. This one on one informal procedure in the past 10 years, in my observation, has not worked well until a crisis has developed. An evaluation procedure, if it is designed correctly, will identify areas that need attention before they become a crisis, with people winding up in court snarling at each other."

President Nelson asked for a vote on Proposal 14-77. The Proposal was approved: 13 were in favor, 8 were opposed.
Hauge asked for a roll call vote on 14-77. He said that he had had his hand up to request a roll call vote before Nelson asked for a vote, but had not been recognized. Nelson asked for a vote of those senators in favor of a roll call vote. The motion was defeated.

2. Senate Nominating Committee.

Those senators interested in serving on the Senate Nominating Committee to select nominees for officers of the Senate for next year were asked to see President Nelson after the meeting.


President Nelson was asked if 1976-1977 salary data is available yet. Nelson said that a salary report has been requested from the administration, but not received yet. He said that when the report is received, it will be attached to the Annual Report of the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Erickson
Secretary