MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 98
OF THE
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

25 January 1978

Meeting No. 98 was called to order on Wednesday, January 25, 1978 at 7:00 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President P.A. Nelson.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-nine members or alternates were present. Absent were Daavettila (PH), Montgomery (Stud. Council), Olson (MG), and President Smith.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were present: Colleen Kobe (Lode) and Dr. L. Heldt (MY).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 97. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote. Typographical errors are: "Hesterberg" (last paragraph, p. 1355), "Kent" (page 1362), and "Kuipers" (page 1363).

President's Report

President P. Nelson distributed copies of the President's Report (Appendix A - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Vice President Stein reported that the Bachelor of Science in Land Surveying had been supported on January 24, 1978 by the Academic Officers of Michigan Colleges and Universities.

Election Committee

Pres. Nelson asked if there were any objections to moving up the Report of the Elections Committee since Senator Synder had to leave early. There being none, the report was considered at this time (Appendix B - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The results of the election of a faculty member to the University Ombudsman Appointing Committee showed Dr. David Halkola to be the winner. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously carried to accept the election results. It was then moved, seconded, and unanimously carried to destroy the ballots.

Report on Meeting of the Academic Council. - No report since Sachs missed the meeting of the Academic Council.

Report on Meeting of the Board of Control.

Sachs distributed copies of a report on the December 9, 1977 meeting (Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office). The next meeting will be in Detroit on February 16, 1978.

Nufer spoke on behalf of the Social Sciences Department in objection to V. Pres. Stein's comments on the quality of the Social Sciences instruction. Sachs mentioned that a comment was left out of the report that states that the productivity of the College of Sciences and Arts was quite high and perhaps higher than justified. Sachs was unsure of its meaning. The productivity of Science and Arts personnel was over 1,000 SCH/yr compared to that of Engineering which is about 700. The College of Engineering receives a multiplier so that engineering credits appear to be worth more. V. Pres. Stein commented that the State Formula uses the multiplier and this is not his formula. He also stated that the formula results from a give and take by the fourteen universities with Dr. Murphy's participation. The comments are improperly attributed to him (V. Pres. Stein); they simply reflect the State Formula Funding model. A different formula is used for different disciplines, and for lower division, upper division, M.S., and Ph.D. level programs. Sachs replied that he attributed the statements to V. Pres. Stein as the presenter of the information. Sachs asked if the faculty could see the same presentation Stein said that he would be happy to do it. Sachs also commented that Social Sciences and Humanities feel that their credits are worth plenty since they work so hard to derive them. Stein expressed his agreement and mentioned that MTU has input into the Funding Model and would like to have all of its programs considered especially difficult. All of the universities get together and compromise with each other and with the State Fiscal Agencies in arriving at the numbers in the formula. Sachs modified his report to read: "the state formula considers . . . "(Item #4, Appendix C - Available by Request from the Senate Office). Nufer then withdrew his objections.

Miller asked if the numbers "745" and "1064" SCH are before or after the multiplier is applied. Stein replied that these are the raw student credit hours.

Lide questioned whether engineering courses are "harder to teach." "Harder to teach than what?" Stein replied that the state is looking at the student credit hours production that they would like to see from certain courses and is judging the difficulty in producing a certain number of credit hours in certain activities. More technology and larger section sizes are expected in some disciplines and not in others. For example, engineering, music, and languages are given a low number of students per section; it is more difficult for a professor in these areas to produce a large number of credit hours. Compromises are made on these numbers.
Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

Nelson distributed copies of a report (See Appendix D - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

In reference to the proposed new Mining Engineering curriculum (Item 2, Appendix D) Miller commented that the Curricular Impact Committee, which he chaired, made a report to the Senate three to four years ago. The report was not made into policy. He also asked if the University Committee on surveying was contacted with regards to the Mine Surveying course. Nelson replied that Dr. Work, Acting Head of the Mining Engineering Department, had reported that in the previous two years Dr. Wellborn had investigated this and it was determined that the necessary equipment did not exist on campus. The equipment would cost in excess of $100,000. V. Pres. Stein commented that three-dimensional surveying is involved and equipment is needed for studying tunnel construction, etc. Miller stated that things have changed in the last two years and the Surveying Committee should be contacted to see if the course could be offered at Michigan Tech. Nelson will inform the University Course Change Committee of this.

Brown commented that the new Mining Engineering curriculum will bring about a more specialized degree. He felt that this is the wrong direction to go if a broader education is desired. Nelson replied that the committee felt that this represented no major change in focus or orientation of the Mining Engineering program. The number of mining engineering credits will increase from 17% to 25% and most of this is due to replacing courses taught by Civil Engineering with mining engineering courses. Change by change, there is not substantial change in orientation. No new disciplines were added. Prior to 1966, underground surveying was taught but then the equipment became outdated; thus, the mining department taught its own surveying courses until 1966 then Civil Engineering took over. V. Pres. Stein commented that mining engineering has the lowest percentage of courses required in its own department of any discipline on campus. The average is 33%.

A question was raised on the additional cost to the student for the trip to Canada for the mining engineering student to take the mine surveying course (Item #2, Appendix D). Nelson replied that it was assumed that the students would pool together for transportation. The tuition cost for the course would not be substantial. No definite cost figures were available. The committee felt that there would not be any major financial burden.

B. Instructional Policy - Nelson distributed a report from Senator M. Sloan who was unable to attend (Appendix E - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

C. Institutional Evaluation

Sachs reported that the committee still wants feedback from departments on its last report on governance. Only Metallurgy and Business have replied as departments. He has two comments from his own department. He has asked the university to publish figures on the MTU faculty's administrative load - the percentage of faculty time spent on committee work. V. Pres. Stein will provide numbers (not by individual faculty) obtained from the Faculty Service Reports. Carter commented that the Service Report is not accurate. He found no way to list his committee work without exceeding 100%. Sachs replied that in his department the committee work is reported and they are instructed that teaching loads should not exceed 85%; he felt that his teaching load is 100% and everything else is an overload. Carter again commented that the use of the Service Report data will not give the true information on the effort spent on committees.

V. Pres. Stein will provide the data for a "first pass" on the subject.

Nufer commented that maybe the faculty have not responded to Sachs' request for input because they are bombarded with information on governance right now and have reached the saturation point. Sachs replied that he wants the faculty to be made aware of the amount of administrative work they already do and then maybe they will think twice before asking for more.

D. Elections Committee - See President's Report above.

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


G. Senate Representation for Keweenaw Research Center - Shetron distributed copies of his report (Appendix F - Available by Request from the Senate Office).

Old Business - None

New Business

A. Proposal 9-78 Audit Grades.

It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 9-78.
Nelson pointed out that this is a revision of Proposal 6-78. The following changes were made: Rather than deleting an audited course from a student's transcript for unsatisfactory audit, a letter grade of "U" would be recorded (considerable effort would have been required on the part of the Registrar's Office to delete an audited course) and approval of a student's major department would be required to take a course for credit after it has been audited (Forestry objected that a large number of students would audit difficult courses before taking them for credit; a staffing and space problem could be created).

In response to a question, Nelson pointed out that an unsatisfactory audit ("U") would be based on what was negotiated between the student and the instructor at the start of the course.

Nufer brought up the fact that the "spirit of an audit" is to let a student see what is in a particular field without taking the course for credit. Nelson replied that the student can negotiate this with the instructor and in most cases an instructor would be pleased to have the student audit a course. Heckel replied that the intent of the "U" grade was to discourage a student from signing up for an audit and then not showing up. An audit appears on the student's transcript and indicates a certain skill was acquired. The student could mislead a potential employer if a "U" was not given for an unsatisfactory audit.

Allison asked for clarification of the present policy on taking a course for credit if the course was already audited. Nelson replied that present policy does not permit this.

Thompson asked about President Smith's statement that audited courses cannot be reported to the State as credit hours produced. Nelson replied that only students enrolled in a course for credit are funded by the state and, for this reason, receive priority over students auditing a course.

Proposal 9-78 was unanimously adopted by the following vote: For - 24; Against 0.

B. Proposal 10-78, Promotion Policy.

It was moved and seconded to adopt Proposal 10-78. Nelson stated that this is a revision of Proposal 5-78, which was referred back to committee.

Brown expressed interest in having the effort put into new courses, grants for instructional purposes, etc. be included on the Promotion Profile Form under Teaching and Instruction.

It was moved and seconded to editorially amend the Promotion Profile Form to add under the Teaching and Instruction heading:

Number of Proposals Funded
Total Funding Received ($1000)
Number of Publications in Refereed Journals

The amendment was adopted unanimously by voice vote.

Schultz raised the question that this proposal and also Proposal 13-78 and 14-78 contain language discriminatory towards the Research Faculty, which is one segment of and not an alternative to the Academic Faculty. The proposal does not consider promotions within the Research Faculty members; the form is not appropriate to evaluating Research Faculty. There are no tenured Research Faculty. The ranks of the Research Faculty are not the same as for other faculty. He recommended revision of the form to recognize the requirements for promotion for Research Faculty or the development of people required for each category would probably be inappropriate. Schultz was appointed to chair an ad hoc committee to study the promotion policy for Research Faculty and to prepare a separate proposal.

Proposal 10-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 18; Against - 3.

C. Proposal 11-78, Evening Examinations.

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 11-78 be adopted.

P. Boutilier commented that the proposal would be to the detriment of the Extended Day Program. The faculty in Mathematics voluntarily teach extended day courses, but only if the courses start early in the evening, say at 6 p.m. and end before 7:30 p.m.

Most of the conflicts being addressed by the proposal involve the 6 o'clock classes. Putting these classes after 7 p.m. will not help the Extended Day Program; there will be practically no faculty volunteering to teach these classes and mandatory teaching may result.

Nelson reported comments from Dean Biesiot to the effect that the School of Business is teaching extended day courses that start as early as 6:30 pm and others that are taught by the same instructor or are being taken by the same students that run from 7-8:30pm and 8:30-10:00pm. Delaying evening courses until after 7:30 pm. would create some hardships. Nelson also reported that Dean Biesiot and another faculty member in the School of Business pointed out that some of
their courses have both day and evening sections and that this proposal creates complications for examinations, i.e. BA215 with 120 students has two day sections and one evening section; the instructor believes in a common exam time for all the students out of fairness; and the only possible time would be during the "extended day" which is after 7:30pm since the evening course runs from 8:30-10:00pm.

Sachs protested on behalf of the music and drama programs because evening exams combined with the Extended Day Program are very disruptive to rehearsals and made things very difficult for the music and drama programs. He also commented that he teaches an extended day course which ends at 8:30pm and his day starts at 8:00am.; he would hate to see his day go on even later. Things get chaotic when complications arise with evening exams; his class for the next evening was cancelled to accommodate Dr. Berry's chemistry exam; some of his students will be in the Skits the following week. He felt that the proposal does not solve the problem.

Kapp reported that evening exams create many problems for the Athletic Department. More and more students are getting involved in athletic activities, particularly in Women's Athletics. The proposal is opposed by the Athletic Department.

Pintar commented that the 7:30pm time as the latest ending time for an evening examination is overly restrictive. There are many courses that have a minimum number of conflicts with extended day courses and thus could have evening exams after 7:30pm without creating any problems. He cited his course, CM302 as an example and commented that there are probably many others in the same situation. He recommended that the proposal be rewritten to give priority to extended day classes over evening exams after a certain time; but that where no conflict exists, evening exams should not be prohibited. He felt that the individual instructor could determine if conflicts exist and schedule the exam accordingly.

Brown commented that in the past years he had taken 7am and Saturday classes. He recommended that these times be considered as alternatives for both classes and exams.

A questions was raised on how the 7:30pm time referred to in the proposal came about. Heckel replied that this would allow two time slots for evening exams: 5:15-6:15pm and 6:30-7:30pm, Monday through Thursday. The interpretation of the 7:30pm time is that evening exams would have to end by 7:30pm. The reasons for the earlier time for exams were to "not chop out a hole" in the middle of the evening for a large number of students taking exams and to avoid conflicts with extended day courses.

Questions were raised on how large a course enrollment must be to qualify for an evening exam under the proposal, when is it "educationally expedient" to give an evening exam, and who determines these. This may leave things wide open for all instructors to give evening exams; so that the students will have evening exams Monday through Thursday, week after week. Nelson replied that the proposal does not force instructors to give evening exams and that many will choose not to do so. He views the proposal as a limitation on who qualifies to give evening exams. One senator felt that the proposal was an invitation to give evening exams.

In response to a request from Miller for student opinion, Thompson suggested Saturday morning exams. Miller had asked about 80 students for their opinions on the proposal. Three students replied that they would miss dinner but the students were not overly concerned. Heckel pointed out that Food Services had been consulted and the two time slots for evening exams would allow for dinner at the dormitories. Miller stated that he gives an evening exam rather than a class time exam at 8am because the students have more time to work on the exams.

Heckel commented that the proposal came about because there were problems with conflicts between evening exams and extended day courses, individual negotiations were going on to resolve these and the proposal was an attempt to finally solve the problems. The committee wants input on how to solve these problems if the proposal is defeated.

Brown recommended 7am classes in preference to evening classes.

Pintar asked if students are scheduled into extended day classes or is this completely voluntary. Nelson replied that some students are scheduled into some extended day classes.

Nelson commented that under the proposal some School of Business classes taken simultaneously would run from 7:30-9:00pm and 9:00-10:30pm, a half hour later than the present setup. It was pointed out that many laboratory courses have been running until 6:00pm for over 20 years and that this was never considered to conflict with the evening. Nelson stated that a basic presumption behind the Extended Day Program is that many of the courses would be taken by people in the community who are not full-time students and who work full-time during the day. It is possible for such a person to fulfill some of the degree requirements by taking evening classes. Scheduling the courses earlier in the evening would create problems for these people.

Another recommendation for Saturday exams was made. Thompson asked when Saturday classes were discontinued. It was stated that this happened gradually after 1966.

Proposal 11-78 was defeated by the following vote: For - 2; Against - 18.

D. Proposal 12-78, Scheduling Evening Examinations.
It was moved and seconded that Proposal 12-78 be adopted.

Carter asked who the "cognizant administration office" would be. Heckel replied that this would most likely be the Scheduling Office but that it was left vague deliberately. Someone would have to do the screening and assigning of priorities. In the past it has been pretty much a "first come first serve" policy on room scheduling.

Sachs pointed out that there is no clear priority for who gets a room - a scheduled class or an evening exam. Nelson commented that the room would already be scheduled for the class and could not be taken for an exam.

Carter asked when the scheduling would be done. An exam could have already been scheduled and then two weeks later an exam with a higher priority could "bump" the other exam. Heckel replied that the scheduling would be done in advance and would avoid this.

Proposal 12-78 was defeated by the following vote: For -6; Against - 10.

E. Proposal 13-78, Appointments to the University Sabbatical Leave Committee

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 13-78 be adopted.

Nelson stated that Dr. Lloyd Heldt, the Chairman of the Sabbatical Leave Committee was present to answer questions.

Sachs reported that the Humanities Department has no full professor and has had no faculty member on Sabbatical Leave. The proposal precludes a member of this department from serving on the committee.

It was moved by Sachs and seconded to editorially amend the proposal to change "Professor" to Associate or Full Professor."

Schultz stated his objection to discrimination in the proposal against the Research Faculty possibly due to ignorance of who constitutes the Academic Faculty. Research Faculty do not have the ranks of Associate or Full Professor nor do they receive tenure. A question was raised on the eligibility of Research Faculty for Sabbatical leave. Heldt replied that they are since Academic Faculty, which includes Research Faculty are. It was pointed out that the Sabbatical Leave Policy, proposal 4-59, does not include Research Faculty. It was also pointed out that a Research Faculty member with a Bachelor's degree is eligible for Sabbatical Leave. In response to a question from Nufer, Shetron stated that some Research Faculty have academic rank and tenure, others do not; a change was made several years ago at IMR and IWR to eliminate the academic ranks and the granting of tenure.

After some discussion of alternative wordings, Sachs amendment was withdrawn with the consent of the second.

It was moved by Schultz and seconded to editorially change "tenured member of the Academic Faculty with a rank of Professor" to: "...member of the Academic Faculty eligible for sabbatical leave . . ."

Brown was concerned about his eligibility to serve on the Committee since he had already received a Sabbatical Leave.

The amendment carried by the following vote: For - 17; Against - 4.

It was moved by Miller and seconded to editorially change "... one tenured professor . . . to: "one eligible candidate . . ."

The amendment was unanimously adopted by the following vote: For - 19; Against - 0.

Nufer suggested a statement to provide for representation from at least three colleges or schools. Nelson responded that there would be a problem with implementation of such a policy.

Brown wanted to amend the proposal to make a faculty member who has been on Sabbatical Leave eligible for the committee. It was pointed out that a faculty member who has been on Sabbatical Leave is still eligible for another Sabbatical Leave.

Proposal 13-78 was unanimously adopted as amended by the following vote: For - 19; Against - 0.

The amended proposal is:

Proposal 13-78

APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY SABBATICAL LEAVE COMMITTEE

Senate Policy 4-59, Sabbatical Leave Policy, is hereby amended to provide that members of the University Sabbatical Leave Committee shall serve for five year terms ending on July 1 and that each vacancy shall be filled with a member of the Academic Faculty eligible for sabbatical leave selected by the President of the University from a list of candidates submitted by the Senate. Each senator shall be permitted to nominate one eligible candidate. At a regular meeting of the Senate, each senator present shall be allowed to vote for three persons on a list of all persons nominated. The three persons receiving the largest number of votes shall be the candidates which the Senate submits to the President of the University.
F. Proposal 14-78, Faculty Appointments to the University Athletic Council.

It was moved and seconded that Proposal 14-78 be adopted.

The views of the present Chairman of the University Athletic Council were reported by Wiitanen:

*"Item 2 should be stricken from the proposal. There are a number of reasons for not having the chairman grouped with the rest of these people. First of all, the chairman is also the faculty representative for the university. If you wanted to leave it the way it is, you would have to divorce that job by amending this somehow. There is a very good reason for not divorcing the job, the chairman provides continuity. The schools that do not have the faculty representative as the chairman of their council are the one that are having all the eligibility problems, simply because they do not know what they are doing."*

Nelson replied that the Chairman serves at the pleasure of the President and the proposal requires that the chairman be a member of the Academic Faculty. The only time the Senate becomes involved is when the Chairman resigns or the President asks the Chairman to resign. Wiitanen expressed concern that the Chairman might not be the faculty representative because the President might wish that the faculty representative be someone other than the Chairman or someone other than a member of the list that's nominated by the Senate. It was finally agreed that under the proposal the President still has the prerogative of selecting a Chairman who is not on the list recommended by the Senate. Wiitanen pointed out that it is most advantageous that the Chairman be the faculty representative. Nelson stated that V. Pres. Lucier had reviewed the proposal and found it to be satisfactory.

Miller recommended and editorial amendment to remove the word "tenured" from the proposal. Nelson opposed this because of the NCAA concern for having members who will be beyond pressure. The word "tenured" was put in to guarantee that these people will be free from pressure from their peers, the alumni, the administration, etc. Although this eliminates faculty who have not been here for the required number of years to attain tenure, the intent is to have senior faculty on the Athletic Council.

Schultz again objected to discrimination against Research Faculty by the use of the word "tenured." Nelson replied that the faculty members on the Council are supposed to represent the academic interests of the university. This should limit the positions to Teaching Faculty. Sachs commented that the NCAA requirements must be met. Nelson stated that the NCAA constitution wants the Athletic Council to be independent of external forces and pressures so that over-zealous merchants and alumni do not detract the student athletes from working towards their degrees.

NCAA case history on Athletic Council shows that the NCAA is looking for councils that are free from all pressures. The present proposal would conform with NCAA requirements, deleting the word "tenured" may not.

Sachs stated that it would be unfair to an untenured Research Faculty member to be exposed to the pressures on an Athletic Council.

Proposal 14-78 was adopted by the following vote: For - 20, Against - 1.

Nufer asked if the Senate wanted to express the "Sense of the Senate" on the recent court suit lost by the University on release of salaries. V. Pres. Stein reported that Judge Condon ordered the University to reveal salaries by name for the last seven years. The University may appeal but this is not known for certain yet. Nufer wanted to know if the Senate was going to express itself on this matter. He was surprised that the Senate offered no expression on the loss of the suit, its feelings about the University going to court to defend this, the funding of the initial suit and the appeal, any advice to the administration, etc. Nufer also stated the concern of the Social Sciences faculty on the funding of the appeal and the source of the money for the appeal.

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Pintar
Secretary