MINUTES OF MEETING NUMBER 89  
OF THE  
SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY  

15 September 1976

(Senate Minute pages: 1176-1193)

Meeting No. 89 was called to order on Wednesday, September 15, 1976 at 7:10 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge by President L.M. Julien.

The roll was called by the Secretary. Twenty-seven members or alternates were present. Absent were Olson, C.K. (MG), Shetron, S.F. (FFC), Smith, R.L. (Pres.). R.E. Greuer (MG alternate) telephoned the Secretary before the meeting, expressing regrets that his department would be unrepresented at this meeting.

Acknowledgement of Visitors: The following visitors were in attendance: Reynolds, E. (Dept. of Nursing), Zaburunov, S. (Lode reporter).

The Minutes of Meeting No. 88 were approved after the following correction: Acknowledgement of Visitors. Delete the name of R. Brown; he was newly elected Senator-at-Large replacing R. Timm and not a visitor at the May meeting.

The Eighth Annual Report was approved after one objection was made to the wording of the first footnote on page 10, where 1975-76 Average Academic year Salaries are listed. One of the librarians requested that the word "plus" be replaced by the word "including" and that "academic" be inserted before the second use of the word "faculty" in order to make the meaning of the sentence more precise and accurate. After the two changes, the footnote is as follows:

*Academic faculty, including research and library personnel with academic faculty rank, as listed in the University catalog.

President's Report

1. Senators to meet members of Board of Control, December 3, 1976. President R.L. Smith has invited the Senate to meet the members of the Board of Control and have coffee with them the morning of the December 3 Board of Control meeting and the Senate officers have been invited to a luncheon with the Board of Control that same day. The coffee and luncheon had originally been planned for October but the Harrington Seminar and the October Board of Control meeting were scheduled the same week, and it was decided to have the coffee and luncheon in December.

2. Handbook of the Senate of Michigan Technological University. The Senate Council has prepared a Senate Handbook containing copies of all Senate Proposals. Each Senator will receive a copy of the Handbook at the October 20, 1976 meeting.

3. Reports on Senate Meetings to appear in Tech Topics. President Julien wrote a brief report of the May 5, 1976 Senate meeting which appeared in Tech Topics a few days after that meeting. He expressed the hope that future Senate officers would continue to issue such reports.

4. Constitutional Amendment to Provide Senate Representation for Newly Created Departments (Amendment V to the Constitution). The Election Committee has to conduct an election, and the Proposal must be ratified by the Academic Faculty and approved by the Board of Control before the Constitution can be amended.

5. Thank you to Officers and Senators. President Julien thanked the officers and the members of the Senate who have helped him during the last year.

Election of Officers

Booy read the report of the Nominations Committee. There were no additional nominations from the floor for the offices of president, vice president or secretary, and the nominations were closed. The election was conducted before the President gave his report. The ballots were counted with the following results announced by the outgoing President:

President: P.A. Nelson, 20     V.W. Snyder, 7  
Vice President: H.L. Sachs, 15     J.L. Carter, 13  
Secretary: E. Erickson, 25     D.A. Daavettila, 3

While the ballots were being counted, President Julien gave his report. At the conclusion of the President's Report, newly elected President P. Nelson took office and presided over the remainder of the meeting.

Reports on Meeting of the Academic Council. President Nelson was the observer to the Academic Council last year and gave the report. There has been one meeting of the Academic Council since the last Senate meeting. It was on Tuesday, June 15. He was unable to attend, but was given the agenda for the meeting. There were three items on the agenda:

1. Building security  
2. Discussion of the three Senate Proposals, 4-76, 5-76, and 7-76  
3. Discussion of the North Central Accreditation
P. Nelson made two comments on the Board of Control meetings. He said that to the best of his knowledge that Dr. Spain's presentation on a research project at the August Board meeting was the only time that he was aware of a faculty member presenting anything to the Board of Control during the past year. The Board seemed to be very interested in listening to what a faculty member had to say and they were very appreciative of his report to them. Nelson said that he hoped that in the future the Board will be given the opportunity to have more contact with members of the faculty -- perhaps having faculty present reports to them on various activities that they are involved in such as research or teaching programs.

Nelson also commented on the Director of Employee Relations report to the Board on equal employment opportunity and it became very clear that the Board of Control is most interested in this area and that they appear to be very interested in complying with not just the letter of the law but with the spirit of the law.

Miller asked whether Jim Spain's presentation was initiated by himself or by the Board. Nelson responded that he did not know but could find out.

Booy asked for more comments from Nelson on the Faculty Association Survey regarding release of salary information, stating that she did not remember such a specific survey.

Nelson said that he contacted Kevin Baldwin, Faculty Association President, after the Board of Control meeting and asked for more information on the survey. Baldwin said that a poll was taken by the Faculty Association and that about the 12th of June, President Smith asked the Faculty Association what the outcome of the poll was. The response was that the information had not been compiled yet, but that the results seemed to be running in the direction of opposition to release of a faculty member's own salary to the public. Nelson said that he has not seen a copy of this poll and Keith Baldwin was quite emphatic in stating that he was disturbed by the fact that reference to this poll or survey was made on the radio after the Board of Control meeting when the information that was provided to the President was carefully labeled as "preliminary results" and he said that the results of the poll have not yet been released to the faculty. Nelson said that apparently this is because the report is either still in preparation or waiting to be mailed out.

Booy asked who had been surveyed. Miller said that as far as he knew the complete faculty was polled via campus mail. Erickson said that Ruth Miller, newly elected President of the Faculty Association, was asked by President Smith for the results of the survey and she authorized release of preliminary results. Ruth had been unable to contact Keith Baldwin regarding President Smith's request. However, she did discuss the request with other Faculty Association officers before authorizing release of the information. The first time that Keith Baldwin heard the preliminary results of the poll was on the radio and the surprise was part of the reason why he was so disturbed.

Hauge asked whether the question of reverse discrimination was raised in the context of the label equal opportunity at the Board of Control meeting. Nelson responded that he did not know what the opinion of the Board of Control is regarding reverse discrimination and he was not aware of any specific attention to that particular area.

Committee Reports

A. Curricular Policy

President Nelson, chairman, gave the report. (The report is included as Appendix C of these minutes - Available by Request from the Senate Office). At the conclusion of the report, Nelson said that he is looking for a new chairman of the Committee. He also said that additional members are needed on the Committee in order to maintain adequate representation of the various curriculum areas.

B. Instructional Policy - No Report.

C. Institutional Evaluation

Senator Sachs, the new chairman, gave the report. Sachs reported that he is trying to rebuild the membership of the Committee. He hopes to have regularly scheduled meetings and that "things will get done from one meeting to the next." He said that the key issue is whether or not the Institutional Evaluation Committee has the right to exist. He said that the Audio-Visual Instructional Material Committee was dismissed after working for a couple of years when the Board of Control rejected Senate Proposal 4-75 Amendments to the Faculty Patent Policy. In his remarks, he implied that he did not want the same thing to happen to the Institutional Evaluation Committee.

Sachs said that the Committee needs to ask President Smith what areas of institutional evaluation the Committee has a right to examine. The Committee needs assurance from the President that it has the right to examine institutional evaluation procedures so that it can proceed. After getting the Committee together, the first task will be to get the President to come up with a statement.

President Nelson commented on Sachs' report. "According to the Constitution the role of the Senate is to advise the President. However, no one can stop us from expressing viewpoints to anyone we so desire and if the Senate is looking at certain questions which it believes are of vital concern to the University, no one on this campus can stop us from communicating with the Board of Control. We know that the Board of Control reads its mail from concerned citizens, because during the past year a substantial amount of time has been allocated to discussing the mail from one concerned citizen. Now certainly if the Senate of Michigan Technological University expresses its opinion in the form of letters to the Board of Control as it is our right as individuals to write, it is my sincere opinion that they will be read and that they will be read very carefully and I suspect if we have something to say that is reasonable and pertinent that perhaps we may be
invited to meet with them informally or in some other capacity. I am not claiming that the Senate has any rights which are not stated in the Constitution but nothing in the Constitution takes away our rights as concerned members of the academic community to do everything in our power to get our views across to people who can make decisions for us. I suspect that the Board of Control is not particularly aware of how intensely some members of the faculty feel about topics which may come under the jurisdiction of the Institutional Evaluation Committee and I do know from listening to various comments made during meetings that the Board is very concerned about the faculty. They are concerned about what the faculty thinks on things and I perceive that there is much we can do in this area without creating confrontation or anything of that kind."

Sachs said that the Committee needs access and that there is no point in trying to create means of evaluation if means already exist but are kept quiet. P. Nelson responded that one way to satisfy the Committee's information requirement is to ask to have a short meeting with President Smith.

One Senator said that he does not think that the Senate has to go to President Smith and ask for permission to evaluate parts of the institution. He suggested the type of evaluation in which one looks upwards, "as opposed to finding out how the University evaluates us looking downwards." He also said that the Committee can evaluate the excellence of Michigan Tech and its academic mission.

Another Senator said that Proposal 9-63, Appointment of Department Heads, comes under the Institutional Evaluation Committee. P. Nelson said that this Senate proposal involves department heads but does not apply to deans, vice presidents, or other administrators. P. Nelson responded that the Committee might think about coming up with a modified form of the proposal for possible consideration again.

D. Elections Committee -- No Report. R. Brown is the new chairman of the Committee.

E. Promotional Policy Review

Senator Hennessy, Committee Chairman, gave a brief report. The Committee has come up with two Proposals on Promotion Policy. He pointed out that the report of the Promotion Policy Review Committee is found on pages 1168-1170 of the Senate Minutes. President Nelson said that the two proposals would be discussed in more detail under the New Business portion of the meeting.

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

G. Smoking Committee

Senator Kauppila, the non-smoking co-chairperson, noted that Senator Booy, the smoking chairperson, was absent at the previous meeting and consequently could not comment on the survey results which had been presented at that time. He asked Senator Booy for any comments she might have. Booy said that "During the school year, 1975-76, at the request of the Department of Social Sciences a committee of two persons was appointed by the Faculty Senate to investigate the guidelines governing smoking at MTU. This was subsequently expanded to investigate possible changes in the guidelines. The non-smoking member of the Committee prepared a survey form which was distributed to the ME-EM department to evaluate attitudes towards smoking. Subsequently, this was sent to a large number of persons on campus. As the smoking member of the Committee, I wish to express most strongly my objection to the manner in which this was done. I was not informed that the questionnaire was being distributed nor consulted as to the persons receiving the questionnaire. I was given no first-hand information on the matter until September, 1976. On a small Committee it would seem reasonable that Committee members could coordinate investigatory efforts. My input as the smoking member of the Committee was completely ignored in the questionnaire 'Smoking and the Right be Breathe Clean Air.' In evaluating the answers to the questionnaire, several other points came to light. Many persons answering the survey agreed with me that both the title and the wording of questions and choices were biased against the smoker. Many persons, particularly smokers, found other odors (specifically smelly persons -- either unwashed or over-perfumed) much more or equally offensive. Bias against women smokers was brought to light -- apparently there are places on campus where women have been forbidden to smoke, but men permitted to. This would seem illegal. There was a libertarian group who opposed passing laws to limit social habits. The memory of the legal prohibition of alcohol and its effects might support this school of thought. Many smokers believe that they also have rights as well as do non-smokers. A question of the morality of imposing a non-smoking policy which may be based on particular religious beliefs was raised. This appears to be a highly emotional issue with hardened positions on both sides. As the smoking member of the Committee, I wish to reiterate my earlier statements that courtesy and consideration from both sides might be more effective than excessive legislation in a non-academic area. I find it appalling that 28 individuals felt they had a right to demand I drop a legal and personally-pleasurable activity in my own home. Aren't there enough police states in this world already? I feel that with the calcification of positions, perhaps this whole thing might best be dealt with by a fresh approach and therefore I resign from the Committee."

Kauppila stated that "I don't have such an eloquent speech prepared as my partner does nor do I intend to read it. However, I would like to point out a few things. There are some falsehoods in the statements that were made. One is the fact that she was informed that such a survey would be made. She was advised that this form would be submitted to the faculty. We tried to incorporate all the comments that she had made suggesting what changes should be coming into this form pertaining to smoking. There were some suggestions regarding body odors, etc. which do not pertain to smoking and which were deleted. This was to obtain information. Did we obtain information from faculty? I think we did. Is there a question of smoking and desire to breathe cleaner air? I think this point has been well brought across. Is there a strong feeling on this thing? I think several people put it very nicely in their comments: 'I don't spit in your water, why do you
smoke in my air?" There are some very strong feelings on smoking and its effect on people and I think that people themselves do have a right to ask for this. In certain cases, I really do feel they have a right to demand it and I believe that this is an important issue, a gut issue. I would like to add that those people who have smoked before and no longer smoke take the strongest stand."

Booy asked who the 554 persons were who got surveyed.

Kauppila replied that a University mailing list was used and that secretaries and graduate students who work as instructors have every bit the same right on this matter as faculty members.

Booy agreed that there was no hierarchy on this question, but added that it would be only fair to everyone concerned to know exactly who was surveyed.

Sachs noted that there were approximately 500 persons on the mailing list used for the Faculty Association's progressive dinner.

P. Nelson asked about the future of the Smoking Committee.

Kauppila stated that the information originally requested from the Committee by the Senate has been provided and that an assignment to suggest policy in this area has not been given.

Hauge suggested that the matter of smoking be considered further, particularly as it pertains to travel by smokers and non-smokers in the same University vehicle.

P. Nelson stated that we would keep the Committee in existence a little longer and asked Senator Hauge and other senators who would like to become involved with the Committee to meet with him after the meeting.

Brown noted that on several occasions while traveling with smokers and non-smokers by car, the smokers were content to only smoke when the car stopped for gas or coffee.

P. Nelson stated that ideally human compromise is a better solution than any kind of legislation.


Old Business

1. Appointment of Department Heads.

One Senator requested that the Senate make an inquiry into the status of

PROPOSAL 9-63
APPOINTMENT OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

Academic department heads shall be appointed by the administration for 5 year terms. Upon expiration of this term, the appointment shall be renewed or a new department head shall be selected by the administration after consultation with the faculty of the department.

MINUTES: 153, 160, 195, 205, 213
ADOPTED: 5-26-65

He suggested that perhaps the Institutional Evaluation Committee could make the inquiry. He commented that perhaps the review does occur on the administrative level but that he is not aware of any consultation with the faculty on a five-year basis.

President Nelson said that the Council will try to find out what the status of 9-63 is and will report on it at the next Senate meeting.

New Business

1. Proposal 1-77: Promotion Policy

Hennessy moved that Proposal 1-77 be passed. It was seconded by Tampas. President Nelson asked for discussion of the Proposal. Booy said that she is concerned with the problem of overt discrimination in all areas of employment, including such areas as recruitment, and the changing of criteria for a position right after it has been advertised; depending on the color, sex, height, weight, squint, whatever, of the individual involved in the application. She is also concerned about discrimination in promotional policy as to the possibility and/or history of gerrymandering of qualifications to make sure that the "out group does not get up and ahead." She said, "I think it is a good policy, but I feel that somewhere in the records of the Senate the potential for abuse in the setting of criteria should be recognized." A vote was taken on Proposal 1-77 and it passed 22 to 1.
2. Proposal 2-77, Promotion Policy.

Senator Hennessy moved adoption of Proposal 2-77. It was seconded by Booy.

Miller, as Chairman of the Professional Standards and Development Committee, said that he thinks promotions are based upon other criteria in addition to items 1-12 on the form and strongly objected to some of the items. He said that he thinks there are a lot of omissions and for that reason recommended that the Proposal not be approved until it can be further studied.

Booy said that it appears that there is a conflict between Proposals 1-77 and 2-77. In Proposal 1-77, it is recognized that individual departments within a college have at times vastly different, valid or not valid, criteria for promotion. In Proposal 2-77, a college-wide distribution is being look at. She described a hypothetical situation, in which a teacher looked at the criteria for promotion which would be listed on the form under 2-77, which is college-wide; and does exactly what the college wants but finds out that he has not met the criteria in the local department which has to first recommend him for promotion. She asked how this problem would be dealt with.

Hennessy said that the Promotion Policy Committee was concerned about two things. The individual with a legitimate complaint with regard to discrimination; presently, that individual would have a most difficult time in establishing any objective evidence and trying to document the fact. The report required under 2-77 would give him some factual evidence that he in fact is being discriminated against. If, within a college or school, there is a rigid requirement that a person will not be promoted unless he does research, evidence will immediately become available when one looks at the two columns on the chart. There should be more than one route to promotion. "There should be none of this thou shall be an outstanding teacher --otherwise you will not be promoted. There should be none of this thou shall go in three years one year's worth of sponsored research, or you don't get promoted." And the only way of arriving at whether or not that is happening or just how important that two things are is to observe the difference in the two columns.

One Senator suggested that the sample promoted or recommended and not promoted each year is too small to give a reasonable distribution. Hennessy agreed but that over a period of five years he thinks it would be large enough.

Tampas was against approval of 2-77, saying that recommendation could be made that each school or college have on file and available to its faculty members a list of criteria that they use in determining whether or not they are going to recommend someone for promotion. If an individual wanted to find out what kinds of activities he should be involved in if he expected to be considered for promotion, he could look at the list and could find out whether he is meeting the criteria or not. Under Proposal 1-77, different departments have different criteria; he questioned the need of doing an evaluation after people have either been promoted or not promoted to find out why they were or were not.

Hennessy responded that presently each department thinks is has a set of criteria, but the criteria have not been approved because the President "is leery of approving different criteria for different departments on a legal basis. That, per se, would constitute a basis for a charge of discrimination." Proposal 1-77 states that the promotees recognize and request that there be differences in the criteria applied from department to department. Part of the purpose of 1-77 is "to reinforce the President's hand . . . in any dealing in a future, legal argument." Presently, within many departments it is decided who is going to be recommended for promotion or who is not. The recommendation then goes to the various school and colleges. Hennessy said that his impression is that the schools are working harder at trying to get objective ways of evaluating the recommendations they have. The department heads make value judgments, and there is nothing wrong in value judgments, "except one can unwittingly establish a trend of a single path. You can create heroes in your own image," which is generally what happens in making value judgments. He said that this kind of report over a five-year period would show a pattern that is designed to show, and historically, over a thirty-year period, it might show a very interesting trend.

Hauge said that he thinks the principle involved in 2-77 seems to be a commendable one but thinks the form is a faulty one. For example, number 7, number of papers published in the last 3 years; he pointed out that this item deals with quality, nor quantity.

Sachs said that from the comments he thinks that the form is incomplete and unfinished at the present and moved that 2-77 be tabled until the Committee comes up with a better form which will be acceptable. The motion was seconded, a vote was taken, and Proposal 2-77 was tabled - 18 for, 4 against.

3. Hiring of New Personnel in the Physical Education Department

Senator ElRite indicated that he thinks that the Physical Education Department is being discriminated against by the University. He read the following statement regarding hiring of new personnel in his department, which the Administration gave the Department Head, and which was handed down to department faculty.

Hiring of New Personnel

"All new personnel will be hired on their ability to coach and to teach. A master's degree in physical education and coaching experience is preferred. Each person will be hired on a yearly basis and will not be put on the tenure track, but will have all other benefits and privileges of academic faculty." (This is quoted from "Michigan Technological University Physical Education and Athletics Policies and Procedures," September 1976).
He said that he thinks the physical education department is being discriminated against because the new personnel hired will not reach tenure. He said that if new faculty hired in other colleges and departments have the opportunity to get tenure, he does not see why newly hired physical education faculty do not get the same opportunity. He said that some of the department feels that there is discrimination and that it is "illegal to do this."

ElRite's statements elicited a lengthy discussion with numerous comments on tenure at Michigan Tech.

One Senator said that the new faculty in the Physical Education Department are being put on a win-loss record. Two Senators disagreed; one said that policy has not been on the books.

One Senator said that this might be a violation of the tenure policy that Tech has; he asked, "Is not an instructor on the tenure track just by virtue of his job description?" Mr. Romig responded that these persons are not being appointed instructors and that there are a lot of departments which have faculty assistants, teaching specialists. The University does not necessarily have to appoint a person as an instructor.

One Senator responded to Mr. Romig's statement raising the issue of appointing visiting faculty to circumvent tenure requirements.

One Senator said that according to the Faculty Handbook after seven years an instructor should receive tenure, and asked if, under the new policy in the Physical Education Department, the University would fire a coach after he has been here seven years even if he is not on tenure track. Mr. Romig responded that according to the Faculty Handbook if one is an instructor he has to be promoted or he is out after seven years. Thus, if a person is not hired as an instructor, he is not fired after seven years; he is kept. (In further discussion it was mentioned that according to the Faculty Handbook a newly appointed assistant professor must be promoted after five years and a newly appointed associate professor must be promoted within three years.)

Hauge said that there are two issues being discussed, and that the Senate should keep them separated; discrimination in the physical education department, and subversion of the tenure program within the University.

ElRite said that President Nelson, in the Board of Control report, said that the Board does not want discrimination, and that what is happening in the Physical Education Department seems to be in direct conflict with this idea. Nelson said the report referred to Title IX and the educational amendments that had to do with sex discrimination. Sloan commented that the situation in physical education may have impact on Title IX to the extent that the guidelines are formerly on tenure track. She said that it is her understanding that the female faculty in the physical education department do not have tenure. She added that as Tech becomes more coeducational more female faculty will be hired, and that Title IX might be involved. She said that "There tends to be a feeling around the University, I don't say that this is my feeling, that things like this are going to subvert tenure which might be extended to the non-tenure current hires." She added that all the tenured faculty in physical education are male and that the new policy could tend to work against females when there are no tenured female faculty.

Booy said, "I think this is an extremely dangerous precedent; today, Physical Education; tomorrow, entire schools . . . if we don't keep an eye on our brothers and sisters in physical education, tomorrow it's going to be us. Tenure could be destroyed piecemeal at Michigan Tech.

One Senator agreed with Booy and said that this could easily be extended to other departments. New titles could be created and other departments might not be allowed to hire instructors either.

Mr. Romig responded, "I assure you that was not the intent." The question raised was how the University wants to handle brand new assistant coaches and that was the motivation for the policy.

President Nelson said that clearly it was the will of the Senate that something should be done about this. He asked for suggestions as to which appropriate existing committee could handle the matter. Miller suggested combining the Professional Standards and Development Committee with the Promotional Policy Review Committee and volunteered to chair the new committee and to have it look into the situation. The motion was put to a vote and passed 22 to 0 with no opposition.

4. Affiliation of Michigan Technological University faculty members with MTU

Booy said that there has been some discussion in her department in the last few months about what exactly an MTU affiliation specifically is. There have been members of the Michigan Tech faculty who have strongly opposed Sanguine-Seafarer on the Upper Peninsula and/or elsewhere, and there are also those who strongly support Sanguine-Seafarer. Opponents very frequently have been identified on television, in the press, the radio, as Professor X of Michigan Tech or Professor Y of Michigan Tech representing Group Z, and there has been a Michigan Tech affiliation mentioned. Science Magazine, a common trade journal, publishes discussions on issues such as discrimination; Booy asked whether she could make her opinion known on that topic as Emmy Booy, Michigan Tech. The department's question is, under what circumstances is it appropriate to state their affiliation? She said, "I don't want to make a case for censorship but I think a clarification of at what point we're private citizens or Michigan Tech faculty might be rather helpful because there is a lot of political fallout on this issue and all these issues. When a person is (mentioned) in the media as being part of Michigan Tech, do we have to get permission beforehand from the University to state an opinion in the technical media, in the public media? Can we state something without fear of retribution except if we libel, slander, whatever. What is the current status of this policy?"
President Nelson said that the real issue is that in the media, a professor who wants to make a personal statement on a controversial issue might have the usual disclaimer stating that this does not represent his institution's opinion but is solely a personal thing, and the media, to save words, eliminates the disclaimer. Thus, the speaker's wishes can frequently be lost. In some forums, a person is required to present his institutional affiliation. For example, a professor who testifies before a Congressional Committee or a Subcommittee frequently is required to state that he is a professor at such and such an institution and that he has a Ph.D. Nelson said that he would try to find out more of the background and what existing policy is.

Sachs said that the Faculty Handbook states that a faculty member has the right to engage in political activity; that is, run for office, be a spokesman, or whatever, as a private citizen. "However, if you write a letter to somebody, you have an obligation not to put it on University stationery." One gets into difficulty when one makes a public statement and the media identifies that person as part of the institution. "They peg you . . . If you get the chance, and you don't always have, you should disclaim being a spokesman for the institution, that you are acting as a private citizen."

President Nelson said that it is a problem that is to some extent outside the control of faculty members but the Senate can take a closer look to see what policies may exist. The Senate can find out what policies other universities have in this area. "It's a problem that is germane to every university and some universities may have already found a way to live with this situation."

Brown said that the other night he appeared on Marquette television on the Town Meeting on the Air, and before going on the air, George Alexander, from the Environmental Protection Agency said that when Brown came on, "You will give your professional affiliation and you will give the organization which you represent. I gave my professional affiliation, Michigan Technological University; I told them I represented people against Sanguine-Seafarer. I did exactly as I was instructed by the man who was running the show." Brown also identified himself when he testified in court in Ontonagon on the same issue. He said, "I can't control what the press does, I can't control what the people in the court or the guy running the television show do."

Hauge said that he does not think there is any problem with Brown's being mistaken as speaking for the University. The problem is when Presidents speak, for example, the President of Michigan Technological University, perhaps, or the presidents of professional associations such as The American Sociological Association, The American Economic Association, or the American Political Science Association. He said that there have been occasions when the presidents of different associations, who all happened to have the same point of view, got together and made a joint statement and it sounded very much like they were speaking for their associations and they made no disclaimers. The American Sociological Association has taken the position that the members may vote on issues but the association cannot take positions.

After a rather lengthy meeting, it was voted to adjourn at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Erickson
Secretary