MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 97
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

7 December 1977

(Senate Minute pages: 1349-1380)

Meeting No. 97 was called to order on Wednesday, December 7, 1977 at 7:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-seven members or alternates were present. Absent were Adams (IWR), Brown (AL), Carter (AL), ElRite (PE), Schultz (AROTC), and Thompson (Grad. Student Council).

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were present: Dr. G.Q. Dawson (Chemistry), Dr. G.F. Reynolds (Chemistry), Colleen Kobe (Lode), and Winsand (Lode).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 96. Typographical corrections were made to the Minutes of Meeting No. 96:
"allegedly" and "faculty" (p. 1332), "faculty" (Item II, 2nd paragraph, p. 1337), "University" (Item 12, p. 1337), "and MTU" should read "at MTU" in Item V, p. 1332 to give a direct quote: He reported, "They asked me if . . . Meeting."

The minutes were approved as corrected.

President's Report

President P. Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Sachs and Nufer both felt that the vote for Senate elections should be printed in the minutes (Item 3).


Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

P. Nelson reported that two proposals would be discussed under New Business. The committee reviewed a proposal from Humanities to establish a Certificate of Achievement Program in Communications; the proposal was referred back to Humanities for modification.

B. Instructional Policy - M. Sloan distributed a report (Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

C. Institutional Evaluation

H. Sachs distributed copies of a report for information only. (Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The committee wants feedback from the faculty on faculty participation in University Governance.

D. Elections Committee - No Report.

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


Old Business

An election was held to elect one senator to the University Ombudsman Appointing Committee. V. Snyder, Chairman of the Elections Committee, conducted the election. Two candidates had already been announced; Givens (Math) and ElRite (PE). There were no nominations from the floor. Mr. Townsend assisted Snyder in conducting the election. The results of the election were: C. Givens: 15; R. ElRite: 12.

Givens was declared the winner and will be the Senate representative to the University Ombudsman Appointing Committee. It was moved, seconded, nd unanimously approved to destroy the ballots.

A question was raised on when the Senate Handbook would be available. The supplements and new copies of the handbook should be ready in one week.

Nufer raised the question on the Summer Session Review Committee. (See Appendix A, Item 13 - Available by Request from the Senate Office). He felt that recommendations had been made to the Vice President; Dr. Kuiper's memo implied that none had been made. Vice President Stein commented that it was his impression that the Committee does not appear to be at a consensus on the total package on the summer session. Some committee members have recommended certain specific points but many items are inter-related. He needs a complete set of recommendations.
after faculty input has been received by the Committee. M. Sloan felt that the Committee had made recommendations to
the Vice President of Academic Affairs. H. Sachs stated his concern that there is no formal procedure for faculty feedback
to the Summer Session Review Committee.

New Business

1. Proposal 4-78 to Change the Winter Quarter, 1977-78 Academic Calendar.

   It was moved and seconded that Proposal 4-78 be adopted. Sloan commented that the proposal was initially
   recommended by Vice President W. Lucier. Pintar commented that it is standard procedure for the Federal Government
to celebrate a holiday on a Monday if it falls on a Sunday and that this should have been known before the present
academic calendar was drawn up. He recommended that the Senate defeat the proposal and leave it to the
administrators to take any action on changing the calendar. Sloan responded that the administration was unaware of
January 2 being a Federal holiday until the first week in November. Also it was not until November that it was determined
that the New Year's Day bowl games would be played on Monday, January 2. Sachs asked if the academic calendar is
dependent on when the bowl games are played. He also commented that a quick calculation shows that one day of the
operating budget of the University is approximately $76,000 versus the approximately $4,500 saved if certain personnel
do not have to work on January 2. He questioned the reasoning behind the proposal. He also stated that a faculty
attempt to change the calendar for Christmas, 1976-77 was opposed because laboratory specimens in some biology labs
would be lost. He asked if this was a possibility this year. Coffman questioned the tailoring of the academic calendar
around bowl games and Federal holidays; he mentioned that there are numerous Federal holidays that have no effect on
the calendar. He also stated that it is not in the educational process to keep changing the calendar for extra-curricular
activities when education is the primary goal of the University, and that this change would create many problems for
laboratory courses which meet only one day out of the week. Some Forestry laboratories are already two or three weeks
out of sequence and this change would further antagonize the problem. It was also pointed out that this change would
undo the action by the Senate to equalize the number of Tuesdays, Wednesdays, etc. in the quarter. Dawson asked if the
University is under contract to provide a certain number of classes to the students once they have paid their fees.
President Smith said that he doubts this is the case. Nufer questioned the publication of the Instructional Policy
Committee's recommendation of this proposal in the Lode prior to the Senate meeting. Sloan replied that this was done
to alert the faculty to the fact that a change in the calendar was possible so that faculty could take this into account when
preparing their syllabi.

   Proposal 4-78 was defeated by the following vote: 7 in favor, 15 against.

   In response to a question, Nelson stated that the defeat of this proposal shows the opposition of the Senate to changing
the calendar and that the administration might still decide to cancel classes on January 2 but that if this were done, it
would be without faculty support.

2. Proposal 5-78, Promotion Policy.

   It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 5-78. R. Miller reported that this proposal is a revised version of a
previous proposal that had been tabled as a result of his opposition. He stated that he supports the present version of the
proposal. He mentioned that the faculty still do not know precisely what is expected of them for promotion and would like
some means of comparing those recommended for promotion and those recommended for promotion and not promoted
within each college and school. In order to clarify the proposal, he stated that the form would not have to be filled out by a
particular college or school until at least three faculty were promoted and at least three faculty were not promoted to a
particular rank in a three year period. If less than three faculty were involved in any category the form would not be
completed at the request of these faculty. Sachs inquired into the exception given to Nursing. Miller replied that Nursing
has promotion criteria that are much different than those of the rest of the School of Technology. Sachs stated that the
section on research discriminates against the musicians, the artists, the creative writers, authors, and others in
Humanities and elsewhere on campus and that there is no provision for creative activity appropriate to one's field of
professional endeavor.

   Sachs moved to amend the section on research to include: "Appropriate creative or artistic activities." The motion to
amend was seconded. P. Brugge questioned adding this to the research section and suggested a new section such as
"Scholarly Activities." Sachs replied that these activities are normally included under research. Miller stated that it was the
feeling of his committee that such activities would be included in the "Other Professional Involvement" category. Nelson
pointed out that R. Brown had expressed concern that the "Teaching and Instruction" category did not include credit for
external funding and that a number of faculty do receive funds for development of new programs or new laboratories. The
amendment was adopted unanimously by voice vote.

   Vice President Stein stated that the word "considered" should be changed to "recommended" since Senate policy holds
that all faculty other than full professors are considered for promotion every year and that the proposal should apply only
to those recommended for promotion by their department committee or department head.

   It was pointed out that R. Brown would like to see a "Continuing Education" category added. It was also suggested that a
distinction be made in the "Administrative" category between being on a committee and chairing a committee.
Brugge questioned the separation of Nursing from the other parts of the School of Technology since their criteria are not significantly different and Nursing would probably not have enough faculty being recommended for promotion in three years to qualify for publishing of the form. She was in favor of amending the proposal to remove the exception of Nursing from the School of Technology.

Nelson suggested that the proposal be referred back to the committee for further work. It was moved, seconded, and carried by voice vote to refer Proposal 5-78 back to committee.

3. Proposal 6-78, Audit Grades.

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 6-78 be adopted.

Sloan stated that her committee was concerned that audit grades were essentially being given by the Registrar rather than by the faculty and that the faculty had no input after mid-term whether the student had satisfactorily audited the course. The audit grade appears on the transcript and can be used by a student as a bargaining point in attaining employment. The committee also felt that if a student can retake a course for credit if it was failed then the student should be able to retake a course for credit if it was audited.

In response to the question, Sloan stated that the instructor can decide if an audit student takes exams. Dawson mentioned that she has turned in F's for students who were not coming to class and that she called the registrar and requested that a grade of V not be given. The registrar did comply with her request. Sloan replied that this was an informal method and that she was unable to achieve this even with memos to the Registrar. Miller commented that the rule prohibiting more than three repeats of a course is not being enforced and thus there is little reason for a student to audit a course. He opposed part two of the proposal, especially for required courses. Vice President Stein stated that the College of Engineering is enforcing the prohibition of more than three repeats. Miller replied that the Dean of Students office is not enforcing the policy. Nelson stated that it is his impression that the present computer system can not check on the number of repeats but that he was told that within a year or two the computer will make it possible to enforce rules such as this. Sachs stated that the policy of receiving credit in a course by taking an examination could be used by a student after he audited a course.

Synder stated his approval of the proposal since the main objective of an educator is to evaluate what a student has gained in a course regardless of how he has gained it, if by audit or by repeating it five times.

Proposal 6-78 was adopted by the following vote: 20 in Favor; 3 Against.


It was moved and seconded that Proposal 7-78 be adopted.

Nelson commented that the state has changed its approach on the AP-1 Academic Program Planning Questionnaire. Previously, the form was used as a shopping list for new programs. Presently, the Administration or the Board of Control must clearly state its intent to offer or plan to offer a new program. The proposal is necessary to make it easier to respond to this change in procedure.

Sachs expressed his concern that the Senate does not see the AP-1 form until one month after submission; he would want the Senate to see the form before it is submitted. Nelson replied that the Senate is involved at two stages of program planning: once when the AP-1 form is submitted and a second time under Proposal 10-70 when the state approves a new program. The first stage is usually involved with a general idea; the second stage deals with the specific details of the program.

Proposal 7-78 was adopted by the following vote: 18 in favor, 0 against.

5. Proposal 8-78, Bachelor of Science in Land Surveying.

The Department of Forestry requested an Emergency Submission of Proposal 8-78 for consideration at the meeting. Nelson stated that the Curricular Policy Committee reviewed the proposal on November 16 and made some suggestions for changes. Forestry made the changes and resubmitted the proposal to the committee. The revised proposal was received too late for inclusion in the meeting's agenda.

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 7-78 be brought to the floor as an Emergency Submission in accordance with Senate By-Laws. Snyder objected to things being hastily pushed through the Senate. Miller replied that the proposal was originally scheduled for regular submission in plenty of time but that it was then held up because it was felt that the proposal would have to be brought down to the State Board of Education. It was then decided that it would not be handled through the State Board of Education but by that time it was too late to be included in the agenda. President Smith commented that the administration is completely unaware of the proposal and it is not trying to push the proposal. A question was raised on the urgency of the proposal being acted on at this meeting. Miller replied that the curriculum was developed at the request of the State Board of Registration. About 60 students in the two-year land surveying option
in Forestry cannot be registered in Michigan because of a recent Attorney General's opinion. The four-year land surveying option is being proposed one year earlier than originally intended. Sachs voiced his support of the consideration of the proposal at this meeting as a service to the students.

The motion to bring Proposal 8-78 to the Senate floor as an Emergency Submission was adopted by the following vote: 18 in favor; 2 against.

In response to a question, it was stated that a meeting was held with the State Board of Registration on the proposed surveying program. It was also noted that the proposal will not affect the 60 students currently enrolled in land surveying. The proposed curriculum is in no way modeled after the Ferris program. A question was raised on the Board of Registration's reaction to the Applied Engineering Technology Program. Miller replied that the original attempt at developing the program included engineering or professional level courses in Statics, Dynamics, etc. A five-year program producing an engineer with land surveying capabilities would have resulted. The State Board did not want this but rather wanted a professional land surveyor. This program would be a higher quality than the Ferris program. Nelson stated that R. Brown's concern that no biology courses were included.

In response to a question on a need for a college degree for a land surveyor, Miller replied that the State Legislature requires this in order to avoid costly mistakes in surveying. An additional four years of professional experience will still be required of the graduates of this program before being eligible to take the exam for registration.

Pintar raised the point that this program would in essence establish a four-year technology degree program at Michigan Tech. Miller replied that professional land surveyors are registered by the State of Michigan, all technologies are not.

In response to another question, Miller stated that many land surveyors received registration by grandfather's clauses and many costly mistakes have resulted. Highly qualified surveyors are now needed to avoid legal problems.

Sachs inquired into the role of surveyors in environmental impact statements and the need for report writing. Miller replied that composition (HU 101, 102, and 103) are the required writing courses mainly because they are required of all Freshmen at Michigan Tech.

Snyder inquired into the urgency of adopting the proposal. Miller replied that the urgency centers around the need for continuity in the surveying program. It was pointed out by Sachs that it may take three or more years for approval of the program at the state level. Nelson stated that Dr. Hesterber has consulted with other department heads and deans and received their comments on the proposal.

Proposal 8-78 was adopted by the following vote: 14 in favor; 4 against.

6. Extended Day Courses

Daavetilla stated that a member of his department felt that the evening exam should have priority over an evening course. Nelson pointed out that a committee report accepted by the Senate recommends that a scheduled evening class should have priority.

Sloan stated that giving priority to an evening exam could create hardships for the instructor of a conflicting evening class unless the exam were scheduled a quarter in advance. Possibly a certain hour of a day could be set aside for exams. It was also pointed out that the extended day classes may have shifted classes from three and four o'clock in the afternoon to the evening. The matter of conflicts between evening exams and extended day courses was referred to the Instructional Policy Committee by a unanimous vote.

7. Senate Representative for Keweenaw Research Center.

Shetron was appointed chairman of an ad hoc committee to study the matter.

8. Tribute to Major Myron Johnson.

It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to convey the sympathy of the Senate to the family of the deceased Major Myron Johnson; Head of the Department of Air Force ROTC, Professor of Aerospace Studies, and Alternate Senator from Air Force ROTC.


Sachs commented on the new copyright law. He has requested that Dr. Kuipers keep faculty informed on changes in the law. Dr. Kuipers will be attending a workshop and will submit a report to the faculty. A publication by the American Association of Publishers on this matter was recommended.
10. Mid-Term Grades.

Nufer commented that a faculty member in his department was concerned about the mid-term grade policy. Twice, a senior did not realize that he was enrolled in a 100 level course and received an F. Nufer recommended a compromise on the mid-term grade policy; all students enrolled in 100 and 200 level courses receive a mid-term grade.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Pintar
Secretary