MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 96
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
19 October 1977

(Senate Minute pages: 1331-1348)

Meeting No. 96 was called to order on Wednesday, October 19, 1977 at 7:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-eight members or alternates were present. Absent were Carter (AL), Evensen (ME-EM), Heckel (MY), Kraft (BL), Schultz (IMR).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were present: Dr. John Lowther (Computer Science), Dr. Zane Motteler (Head, Mathematics), and Grace Maxfield (Lode).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 95 and the Ninth Annual Report to the Faculty. Two corrections were made to the Minutes of Meeting No. 95. Flom, Alternate (NU), was present in place of Brugge (NU). The word "thanks" was misspelled under Item #12, p. 1315. The minutes were approved as corrected.

President Nelson commented on the number needed for a quorum (20) in the By-Laws, pp. 5-6, Ninth Annual Report to the Faculty. His discussion with the people involved in the formation of the Senate indicated that the intent was to require two-thirds of the members for a quorum. Thus, the current number should be twenty-two (22) for a quorum. It was moved and seconded to accept the Ninth Annual Report with the typographical correction of "(20)" to "(22)" in items #7A and #8 of the By-Laws.

It was suggested that the By-Laws should be officially changed to read two-thirds without the numerical value. Nelson suggested that keeping the numerical value conveniently indicates the actual number needed for a quorum.

The motion was adopted unanimously and thus the Ninth Annual Report was accepted as corrected.

President's Report

President P. Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). A revised version of Item #3 was transmitted to the secretary on November 6, 1977.

Brown asked for clarification of the University Judicial System (Item #12) as to whether a student can select either the Dean of Students or the University Judiciary Committee but not both. Nelson commented that it had to be one or the other. Also, the actual hearing committee for any case is selected from the members of the University Judiciary Committee. Copies of the actual statements from the Student Handbook on this matter will be sent to the faculty.

Nominations will be sought for the Ombudsman Selection Committee and for the University Judiciary Committee.

Nufer asked for a report on the recommendations of the Summer Session Review Committee (Item #9). Nelson replied that recommendations will be circulated by Dr. Kuipers to the faculty either by individual copies or by copies for each department.


Sachs emphasized the portion on Course Evaluation (Item #1). Brown commented that the name now is Course Evaluation and not Faculty Evaluation. He also recommended that, if evaluation is done, it should be done during some quarter other than winter quarter. The last few evaluations have always been during winter quarter. Sachs agreed.

Montgomery reported that the Student Council is not supporting any Teacher or Course Evaluation at this time. There will be no evaluation this winter quarter.

Nelson commented on the quotation used by the students allegedly made by him (Nelson). He reported that they asked me if the Senate could help them make the faculty participate. My response to that was that the Senate is a parliamentary organization. The President of the Senate does not impose his will on the Senate and make them vote one way or another. Instead, the Senate votes whatever way the majority of the members see fit. Moreover, the Senate is not in the habit of imposing its will upon the faculty. Rather, it’s supposed to be a method of trying to coalesce and represent the faculty so that it does not and is not expected to pass proposals that the majority of the faculty are against! I guess I can see how that might have been interpreted by them that the Senate is an ineffective way for them to achieve their objective. I have no recollection whatsoever of the statement that appears in the Report on the Academic Council Meeting.

Sachs commented that the Course Evaluation Instrument (CEI) is reported in various ways, depending on the audience, to play to that audience’s sympathies. He thinks that the student report to the academic council would not find any favor if the same report were given to the Senate.

Report on Meeting of the Board of Control. - Both Sachs and Daavettila were unable to attend the last meeting and so no report was made.
Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Nelson reported that the Student Council has named Ellen Heidi Howlett to the committee as its representative.

The Committee had received proposals from the Humanities Department for the establishment of a Certificate of Achievement in Communications to be awarded to students who complete twenty-one credits of certain courses with a certain minimum grade-point average. The Committee will study this proposal and report to the Senate in the future. The Committee is also looking into curriculum guidelines in the area of communications skills.

Three proposals will be presented under New Business.

B. Instructional Policy - M. Sloan distributed a report (Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Sloan conducted a straw vote on K-Day.

Sachs commented prior to the vote, that bad weather could eliminate K-Day if it were held on a Saturday. Sloan replied that three possible Saturdays could be designated. R. Miller commented that conflicts with football games could result. He also commented that a certain date, say a Wednesday or a Saturday, could be designated as K-Day and that the event be held on that date regardless of the weather. Sloan mentioned that the major problems with K-Day are now associated with the unpredictability of the date. C. Thompson commented that the use of Saturday for K-Day could cause tremendous traffic problems in the local communities and on the road to McLain.

The results of the straw vote were: Abolish K-Day: 4; Hold K-Day on a Saturday: 5; Keep K-Day as is: 16.

A question was raised on when the change in procedure on audit grades took place. Sloan replied that this could not be determined but that the history of the audit grade had been explored. It was also stated that the change in procedure on audit grades took place without any official action by the faculty nor any official notification of the faculty.


D. Elections Committee - No Report.

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


Old Business - E. Erickson reported that copies of the Senate Handbook for new Senators and supplements to the Handbook for all Senators will be out in the near future.

New Business

1. Proposal 1-78 Change the Name of the Department of Mathematics to the Department of Mathematical and Computer Sciences.

It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 1-78. There was no discussion. Proposal 1-78 was unanimously adopted by a vote of 25-0.


It was moved and seconded that Proposal 2-78 be adopted. A typographical correction was made to the Business Administration Core. The second course should be BA122, Principles of Accounting II.

Proposal 2-78 was unanimously adopted by a vote of 23-0.

3. Proposal 3-78, Applications Programming Option

It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 3-78. There was no discussion. Proposal 3-78 was unanimously adopted by a vote of 23-0.

4. Sabbatical Leave

Nelson stated that not only the sabbatical leave process but also the criteria for sabbatical leaves should be studied. The only formal criteria at present are "professional development." In the early days of the Sabbatical Leave Committee the main problem was getting enough proposals. Currently, there are sufficient enough proposals but there are now complications such as allowing a person wanting to teach at another university for a year with MTU continuing the fringe benefits program and the other university paying whatever salary can be negotiated. MTU does participate in some exchange programs but others should be studied by the Promotional Policy and Professional Standards and...
Development Committee. It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to refer the matter to this committee. Nelson will issue a written charge to the committee in the future.

5. Miscellaneous

R. Brown inquired about the status of vending machines, pinball machines, etc.; Who has the contract, how much money is made, etc.? President Smith suggested that Ed. Koepel be contacted. C. Thompson mentioned that vending machines for the Chem-Met building were procured through Jack Porritt, Manager of the Memorial Union Building.

F. Stormer stated that a great number of faculty are concerned with that their role in the development of university policy. He proposed that either this problem be studied by a newly formed committee or by the Institutional Evaluation Committee. Sachs stated that the Institutional Evaluation Committee would try to study the matter. He requested as much input as possible. He also stated that "The committees I've served on that have tried to take part in policy making, such as patents and evaluation of administrators, have run into negative stone walls. I haven't seen very much that would indicate good possible results, but I'm willing to try."

It was moved, seconded, and adopted to refer the matter of an investigation into University Governance to the Institutional Evaluation Committee.

H. Nufer (SS) expressed his department's chagrin at not being visited by any members of the North Central Accreditation Team. President Smith stated that the North Central evaluation was requested because of the Ph.D. programs and not a general evaluation. We have preliminary accreditation of some of these programs. Vice President Stein stated that the North Central team decides who they will see and how the visit would be conducted.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anton J. Pintar
Secretary