

## THE SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting No. 215

4 May 1994

## Synopsis: The Senate

- (1) corrected and approved the minutes of Meeting 213;
  - (2) heard a presentation on the Distinguished Teaching Awards;
  - (3) learned that Proposals 19-94, 20-94, and 22-94 had been sent to the administration;
  - (4) learned that Proposal 12-94 had been approved by the administration;
  - (5) learned that the administration had responded to Proposals 16-94 and 21-94;
  - (6) selected names of faculty to submit to President Tompkins for selection to the Athletic Council, Sabbatical Leave Committee, and General Education Committee;
  - (7) amended and approved Proposal 23-94 Scientific Misconduct Policy;
  - (8) amended and approved Proposal 18-94 PhD in Engineering - Computational Sciences and Engineering;
  - (9) received Proposals 24-94, 25-94, 26-94, 27-94, 28-94, and 30-94.
- 

## I. Call to Order

President Bornhorst called the meeting to order at 5:37 pm on Wednesday, 4 May 1994, in Room B37 of the Electrical Energy Resources Center.

## II. Roll Call of Members

Secretary Keen called the roll. 27 senators or alternates were present. Senators or alternate representatives from Chem Eng, Civil Eng, Met Eng, AF ROTC, Army ROTC, and KRC were absent. Absent liaison members: Dean of Engineering, and Staff Council. J. Cross was noted as an alternate liaison for CTS. Keen noted the presence of the new USG representative Aaron Dufrane.

## III. Respects for E. Vandette

Bornhorst noted the recent death of Ed Vandette (SS) and called for a moment of silence in memory of a colleague and former senator.

## IV. Introductions and Recognition of Visitors

Recognized visitors included T. Beasier (CS), J. O. Coleman (EE), M. Goodrich (Tech Topics), E. Horsch (Human Resources), M. Janners (Dean of Students), G. Jayaraman (ME-EM), A. Melton (CS Head), L. M. Ott (CS), D. Ouillette (Registrar's Office), W. Predebon (ME-EM), D. Reed (FR), and P. Sweany (CS).

## V. Agenda Adjustments

Bornhorst referred to the published agenda [Appendix A of these minutes] and proposed moving ahead the presentation by Predebon. Bornhorst called for agenda adjustments from the floor; there were none. Vanek MOVED to approve the adjusted agenda. Mroz seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the proposed adjustments. There were no objections, and Bornhorst declared the agenda

APPROVED as adjusted.

## VI. Approval of Minutes

Bornhorst referred to the Minutes of Meeting 213 attached to the agenda sent to senators, and called for corrections. Arici and Grzelak noted typographical errors. Keen noted that the page numbering was temporary pending collation of previous appendices.

Carstens MOVED to approve the corrected minutes; Grzelak seconded. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

## VII. New Business

### -Distinguished Teaching Awards

Bornhorst introduced W. Predebon for a presentation on the Distinguished Teaching Awards. Predebon distributed two handouts (Appendix B and Appendix C of these minutes), and said that he was recommending Senate establishment of a committee on teaching.

Predebon stated that the Distinguished Teaching Awards were under the purview of the Faculty Association, and that he had been administering them. To provide continuity for the awards, Predebon said he had suggested to the Association a joint committee with the Senate; the Association did not favor the suggestion. Now the Faculty Association is disbanding, and the proposed Senate committee would be responsible for maintaining the integrity and continuity of the awards.

Predebon said that the proposed committee might also address other issues in the quality of undergraduate and graduate teaching listed in the handouts. An Academy of Recipients of the Award was proposed as a means of using the expertise of the recipients. Predebon said that the Senate committee would be a way of monitoring the quality and integrity of the Distinguished Teaching Awards.

Bornhorst said that he had discussed the nature of the proposed committee with Predebon. One possibility included a committee composed of senators and past recipients of the Award. Bornhorst noted that the issue could not be ignored, because the Faculty Association was disbanding. Bornhorst called for questions.

Glime asked how the award would be given at the fall Convocation without a fall term evaluation, and what the role of ODK in the awards would be. Predebon said that the selection for the award this year would be made at the end of the spring quarter. The ODK organization has done the legwork of the awards, performing the in-class evaluations, and Predebon said he hoped they would continue to be part of the selection process.

Janners said some tasks of the proposed committee and of the Senate Instructional Policy Committee overlapped, and asked whether the award selection might be put under the Instructional Policy Committee, or if the proposed committee might take over some of the functions of the Instructional Policy Committee. Bornhorst said both options were reasonable.

Hubbard said the handouts indicated that evaluations from courses were the only criteria for selection for the award. Predebon said that the handouts were only suggestions to be looked at by the proposed committee, and that initial selection of candidates for the awards was a problem. Hubbard said it seemed contradictory to have a goal of diversity in recipients, yet base the selection on the standard course evaluation forms. Predebon said that the evaluation forms would not be the only criterion. Glime said that the standard evaluation forms were biased toward smaller classes, and asked whether there were other methods of nomination, including nominations by faculty and by alumni. Predebon said that the nomination procedures in the handouts had not intentionally eliminated these methods.

Carstens asked whether a good evaluation by a large class might bias the selection toward instructors with large classes. Predebon replied that the selection committee in the past had carefully

considered the types of courses the nominees taught. The initial screening had been based on nominations by 600 students, followed by classroom visits.

Bornhorst said that a decision was needed on dealing with the issue of taking over the award function, and that his initial response was to submit the problem to the Executive Committee. Heyman said that the proposals should be sent as a set of recommendations to the Instructional Policy Committee. Heuvers said that the Committee had a three-person subcommittee investigating teaching evaluation. Sewell said that student membership on the committee ought to be increased when dealing

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4472            Minutes of Senate Meeting 215            4 May 1994

with the issue. Predebon said that the current decision committee is split evenly between faculty and students.

Bornhorst said the issue would be sent to the Instructional Policy Committee. Predebon said the issue should not be allowed to slip. The funds for the award came from a member of the Faculty Association, and the opportunity to promote teaching effectiveness should be pursued. Sewell asked about the time line for the transfer of the function. Predebon said the committee or function should be established next year, and that he would work with the committee in its early stages. Boutilier said that Predebon deserved recognition for 6-8 years of his work on the award. [Applause.] Bornhorst thanked Predebon for his presentation.

#### VIII. Report of Senate President

1. Proposal 19-94 Policy on Class Attendance was submitted to the administration for approval [Appendix D of these minutes].
2. Proposal 20-94 Recommendation on Optional Retirement Furlough Program was submitted to the administration for approval [Appendix E of these minutes].
3. Proposal 22-94 University Senate Administrative Evaluation Policy was submitted to the administration for approval [Appendix F of these minutes].
4. Notice was received of administrative approval of Proposal 12-94 Plant Sciences Option for the BS in Biological Sciences [Appendix G of these minutes].
5. The administration has responded to Proposal 16-94 Recommendation for a Smoke-Free Campus [Appendix H of these minutes].
6. The administration has responded favorably to Proposal 21-94 Recommendation for a Staff Handbook [Appendix I of these minutes].
7. The Senate officers met with the Provost and discussed the Senate budget, the discrimination and harassment policy, the course change committee, and the interaction of the Senate with the budget development process. The Senate should recognize that its discussions played a role in formulation of the budget, particularly on the issue of additional faculty as opposed to more GTAs.
8. The minutes of the Staff Council meeting of March 14 contain two items of interest: (a) activities of a Wellness Committee, and (b) a discussion of the disposition of sick leave upon retirement.
9. The Executive Committee of the Senate met on May 4 to consider several items, including officer elections.

The Executive Committee had no objections to a proposal for assigning senators and alternates to committees for next year. Each new and continuing senator and alternate will be

asked to submit first, second, and third choices for committee service. The officers will formulate tentative assignments to be reviewed and modified by the Executive Committee. The modified list will be discussed and approved by the full Senate during the first meeting of fall term.

The Executive Committee discussed the Senate constitution and constituency. The bylaws had been updated when the Department of Fine Arts was created; further changes in the bylaws and constitution should wait for more review by the Committee.

10. Attachment A [Appendix J of these minutes] of the agenda is a response of the USG to the issue of high resolution grades. Heuvers as chair of the Instructional Policy Committee prepared a response [Appendix K of these minutes].

Bornhorst circulated copies of the memo from the Instructional Policy Committee, and opened the floor to questions. There were no questions.

## IX. Committee Reports

A. Elections Report. Bornhorst said that nominating petitions for the several university committees had been circulated to the constituency and had been received. He noted that the Senate was required to select the names to forward to the university president, who would select the actual committee members.

Heuvers MOVED to hold the election immediately. Roblee seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Committee on Academic Tenure: Bornhorst said that a nomination for Elizabeth Flynn had been received, and called for further nominations for the one vacancy on the Committee. There were no nominations. Jobst MOVED to close nominations. Arici seconded the motion. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote. Heyman noted that the academic faculty was required to vote on the election of members to the Committee on Academic Tenure.

Athletic Council: Bornhorst said that Randall Feisinger had been nominated for the single opening on the Council and called for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations. Bornhorst asked for objections to closing nominations. There were none. Feisinger was elected as the nominee to the Athletic Council by voice vote without dissent.

Sabbatical Leave Committee: Bornhorst said the Sandra Boschetto had been nominated for the single opening on the Sabbatical Leave Committee, and called for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations. Bornhorst declared the nominations closed, without objection. Boschetto was elected as the nominee to the Sabbatical Leave Committee by voice vote without dissent.

General Education Committee: Bornhorst noted that there were two vacancies on the Committee, and that nominations had been received for Jiquon Chen and Brad Baltensperger. Bornhorst called for nominations from the floor. There were no nominations. Bornhorst declared the nominations closed, without objection. Chen and Baltensperger were elected as the nominees to the General Education Committee by voice vote without dissent.

B. Election of Senate Officers Bornhorst said that the election of Senate officers by new and continuing senators would take place at 5:30 on 11 May, in a special meeting of the Senate. The regular Senate meeting would begin as soon as the special meeting was adjourned and would end at the regular 7:30 time.

Bornhorst said that some officer nominations had been received: for President, T. Bornhorst; for Vice-President, J. Heyman and G. Mroz; for Secretary, J. Jobst. Heuvers nominated J. Glime for Vice-President. Glime consented to stand for the election.

Bornhorst asked for further nominations. There were none.

Bornhorst asked for questions on the elections. Keen said that university policy required the Senate to submit three nominees to the university president for the Sabbatical Leave Committee, the Athletic Council, and the General Education Committee. He added that the president might ask the Senate for more than the single nominees just selected. Bornhorst said that he would ask President Tompkins personally about the matter.

X. Old Business (Part 1 of 2)

A. Proposal 23-94 Scientific Misconduct Policy. Bornhorst referred to the text of the proposal introduced at the previous meeting [Minutes, p.4441], and called for comments on the proposal. Keen complimented McKimpson on the careful preparation of the history and background of the proposal.

Beck asked about the connection between the investigation committee and the inquiry committee. McKimpson replied that the proposal was an effort to balance two conflicting goals. First was a need to obtain appropriate people who would fairly examine the issues. Second was a need to maintain confidentiality by minimizing the number of people involved. The role of the inquiry committee was to make recommendations to the administration for makeup of the investigating committee. Beck said that it was not clear that the members of the inquiry committee could not serve on the investigating committee, and that he was concerned about

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4473            Minutes of Senate Meeting 215            4 May 1994

the need for bringing fresh minds to the investigation. McKimpson said that the possibility of service on both committees had not been considered in writing the proposal.

Hubbard said that the list of specific misconduct did not include fraud such as that reported in a recent Newsweek involving a Texas A&M faculty member involved in a scheme for transforming lead into gold. He asked whether this would be covered under the proposal's listing of "deception". Bornhorst said that it appeared to be a case of misrepresentation. McKimpson said that a comma was needed in the sentence before "or misrepresentation" on the first page.

Whitman said that the Graduate Student Council had been asked to make their own Scientific Misconduct Policy for Graduate Students, and had developed a similar document. Whitman said that GSC would like the proposal to include a provision for graduate student members of the investigating committee if a graduate student is accused of scientific misconduct. Sewell asked whether the policy would apply also to professional staff. McKimpson said that the proposed policy was written to apply to all university personnel.

Leifer said that the policy needed to include provisions for legal counsel for the accused, and that there needed to be a strong emphasis on confidentiality to protect reputations of individuals falsely accused of misconduct. Leifer said that the proposal at the top of page 2 should be amended to read "The University shall make legal counsel available to the inquiry and investigating committees and to the accused." McKimpson said that the Research Policy Committee had extensively discussed the issue of providing legal counsel for some or all of the individuals involved. There were several reasons for not including provision for legal counsel: (a) fairness to the accuser if counsel is provided to the accused; (b) trying to insure that all the relevant facts will come out during the investigation; (c) conflict of interest, with the university providing counsel for an individual the university is

investigating; (d) significant expense is involved in providing counsel for several parties. McKimpson said that both committees were fact-finding bodies formed to make recommendations to the administration. Based on information received from the AAUP, there is not a legal requirement to allow counsel for the accused person.

McKimpson acknowledged the committee members involved in developing the misconduct policy: S. Bradley, J. Diebel, G. Jayaraman, D. Reed, X. Haung, D. Hubbard, G. Podila, and B. Sandberg.

Reed said that access to counsel for the investigating committee was to insure fairness, procedural propriety, and compliance with rules of evidence. The concern was to avoid prejudicing a future decision. Dobney said that the issue involved faculty self-governance - whether the faculty wanted to take the responsibility for these matters themselves, or whether they were going to allow the lawyers into the room. Dobney said that individuals would have legal recourse after any administrative decisions. Further, if legal counsel were permitted during the investigation, then a potential for abuse existed because of possible economic inequities between accuser and accused, for example between a graduate student and a full professor. Dobney said the University's lawyer did not agree with this position, although the AAUP lawyer did agree.

Leifer said that under the constitution, all accused persons are entitled to legal counsel. Mroz said the constitutional provision applied to a court of law, and the committee investigation would not be a court. Legal counsel also is not available to the accuser. Glime said that the administration should provide counsel to the committee if it is needed, because faculty are not trained in investigation. Without knowledge of the law, faculty do not know what questions can be asked of whom. The provision of counsel to the committee is a way of protecting the committee members.

Brokaw suggesting amending the proposal to indicate that the legal counsel is only for procedural matters. Glime suggested that wording at the top of p.2 be changed to "...counsel available for the Inquiry and Investigating Committees on procedural issues." Bornhorst asked for objections to making this an editorial correction. Hubbard said that the original wording was clear, and that all topics on which the committees needed advice should be included.

Bornhorst asked for a motion to approve the proposal. Mroz MOVED that the proposal be approved. Huang seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Beck asked whether the proposal should be amended to make the memberships of the three committees distinct, because people might carry baggage from one committee to another. McKimpson said the intent of the Research Policy Committee was to keep the memberships distinct, and that the proposal might be amended to make this explicit. He suggested altering the next to last paragraph on p.4 to read "This Investigating Committee will generally not include members of the same academic department... or be members of the Inquiry Committee,..." Beck suggested a similar alteration in the last paragraph of p.5 for the appeals committee. McKimpson said the wording there should be "...at least three impartial members not previously involved in these proceedings." Keen suggesting that the wording go into the following sentence, to read "This appeal committee shall consist of two university faculty/staff members who are not members of previous committees..."

McKimpson MOVED that the proposal be amended as suggested. Grzelak seconded the motion. Sewell asked whether the amendment implied the inclusion of a graduate student on the committee when a graduate student is involved. Bornhorst said it did not.

Bornhorst asked for a procedural backstep, and called for objections to the voting units listed on the proposal. Heuvers

MOVED to expand the voting units to the whole Senate. Sewell seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for objections to considering the proposed amendments as editorial changes. There were none. The motion to amend PASSED in a voice vote without objection.

Roblee said the proposal should be changed to require a graduate student on the committees when a graduate student is involved in the matter. McKimpson said such a change needed careful examination. The committees should be made of individuals who would search fairly for the facts, but who would be immune to influence. McKimpson said that a proposal to include a graduate student would be a substantive change, and that the proposal should be returned to the committee if such a change was voted. Reed said that graduate student or staff membership is not precluded by the proposal. Keen noted that graduate students have little time available for activities outside of their scholarly work, but that senior faculty may be able to devote the required time to an involved case of misconduct.

Dobney said that the interest in peer representation was understandable, but the committees were not juries. The tenured faculty are most immune to outside influence, and are likely to have given thought to questions of proper conduct and to have had experience in these matters.

Arici said that the proposal assumes that both accused and accuser are available to the committees. He asked what the procedure would be if this were not so, if for example the accused worked in a government lab and did not respond to a request to appear before the committee. Dobney replied that the investigation would be completed with the available facts, and then proceed to a legal remedy.

Glime said the policy should be passed as is, and that the graduate students should prepare a proposal to be dealt with later. Whitman said the Graduate Student Council had been asked by Dr. Lee to prepare their own misconduct policy; this was largely finished and would be brought to the Senate soon.

McKimpson MOVED an editorial change in the third paragraph on page 2, changing all four occurrences of "immediately" to "expeditiously". Arici seconded the motion. Hubbard asked

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4474            Minutes of Senate Meeting 215            4 May 1994

why an adverb was needed. Heyman said that dithering around was a classic method of covering-up. Hubbard asked whether an actual time limit should be set. Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to amend PASSED in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for further discussion of the motion to approve the proposal as amended. There was none. The motion PASSED in a voice vote without dissent.

B. Proposal 18-94 PhD in Engineering - Computational Sciences and Engineering. Bornhorst noted that a new version of Proposal 18-94 with editorial corrections [Appendix L of these minutes] had been circulated to the Senate since the previous meeting. Huang MOVED to approve Proposal 18-94. McKimpson seconded the motion. Bornhorst asked for objections to the determination of voting units. There were none.

Heuvers MOVED to table the motion until such time as the faculty vitae were available to the senators. Heuvers circulated two handouts [Appendix M and Appendix N of these minutes] in support of his motion. Arici seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion.

Heuvers displayed a copy of a proposal to unify the graduate programs of Chemistry and of Chemical Engineering, and stated that it had been placed on reserve in the library when it had been considered by the Senate. He said that standard operating policy in the Senate called for placing detailed proposals for PhD programs in the library and for circulating summary proposals to senators. Heuvers circulated a third handout [Appendix O of these minutes] saying it was a table of contents showing the types of material to be included in a proposal to be placed in the library, and noted that it included the faculty vitae, and a discussion of the research record.

Bornhorst asked whether the faculty of the Department of Computer Science were members of the Graduate Faculty. Melton replied that they were. Seel stated that a lengthy proposal was needed for establishing a new PhD program, but that Proposal 18-94 was for an option in an existing program and normally this did not require a detailed proposal.

Grimm said that the Curricular Policy Committee had followed the protocol of Proposal 3-84 and had not questioned the research qualifications of the faculty members listed in the proposal. The credibility of the current MS program supported the proposed PhD option. Keen said that, if the motion to table passed, he would ask a work-study student to check off the names of senators who came to the library to read the vitae.

Seel said that the option would be administered by the Dean of the College of Engineering, by the Dean of the Graduate School, and by the interdepartmental committee. The Department of Computer Sciences had worked with all three groups in developing the proposed option; it was not a unilateral initiative from the College of Sciences and Arts. Heuvers said that he had talked with former Senate President Adler, who agreed that the complete proposal should have been placed in the library.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to table FAILED in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the motion to approve Proposal 18-94. Leifer asked why the Computer Sciences Department did not just offer the PhD degree if it wanted to, and why the engineering departments did not offer an option in computational engineering if they thought it useful. Why was the combined umbrella degree needed? Seel replied that the broad-based computational initiative was long standing, and that this option was the last iteration in the process. Use of an existing PhD program was the most effective way of establishing the proposed program. Melton said that the objectives and quality of the proposed program could not be achieved in either computer science or in engineering alone. The interdisciplinary nature of the program was important.

Brokaw said it was hard to believe that there would be no extra cost in setting up the program. Seel said that under the current 5-year program of the College of Sciences and Arts, a core size of 10 faculty in CS was reasonably established. The department now has 9 faculty with 270 undergraduate majors and 25 graduate students. Adding a 10th faculty member will be part of the annual program development competition among the units of the College.

Arici said that the Senate at its last meeting had asked Melton for information on the research track record of the CS faculty, including research funding and publication record. Heuvers said the Senate was being asked to approve the proposal without seeing whether the research was present to support the proposal. Melton said that the cost would be minimal, because new faculty were not being hired and new equipment was not being requested. The faculty involved in the proposal were all members of the graduate faculty, with demonstrated abilities in research and in attracting funds.

Heuvers MOVED to amend the proposal editorially to read "At least two must be outside the department..." in the 6th line on p.5



of the proposal. Keen seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst asked for further discussion of the motion to approve Proposal 18-94. Grimm said that the proposal encourages collaboration among departments, and meets a need for interdisciplinary computational research in the university.

Bornhorst called for further discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED in a show-of-hands vote, 15-4.

Bornhorst called for objections to considering quickly several items of New Business before continuing with Old Business. There were no objections.

## XI. New Business

A. Proposal 24-94 Faculty Grievance Policy & Procedures. Bornhorst said that Proposal 24-94 [Appendix P of these minutes] had been circulated to senators 10 days before the Senate meeting scheduled for 11 May. The proposal would be considered as old business at that meeting.

B. Proposal 25-94 Course Grades. Bornhorst said that Proposal 25-94 [Appendix Q of these minutes] also had been circulated to senators 10 days before the Senate meeting scheduled for 11 May. The proposal would be considered then.

C. Proposal 26-94 Release of Grades - Right to Privacy. Bornhorst said that Proposal 26-94 [Appendix R of these minutes] also had been circulated to senators 10 days before the Senate meeting scheduled for 11 May. The proposal would be considered then.

D. Proposal 27-94 Midterm Grade Report Policy. Bornhorst said that Proposal 27-94 [Appendix S of these minutes] would similarly be considered at the meeting on 11 May.

E. Proposal 28-94 Rescission of Policy on Distribution of Grading Practices. Bornhorst said that Proposal 28-94 [Appendix T of these minutes] would similarly be considered at the meeting on 11 May.

F. Proposal 30-94 Record of Course Drops. Bornhorst said that Proposal 30-94 [Appendix U of these minutes] would similarly be considered at the meeting on 11 May.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the introduction of the several proposals. Sewell said that several of the proposals could have a large impact on students, who needed to have a chance to review them. She said the Senate should avoid the appearance of shoving these through without wanting input from students. Roblee said that USG had a member on the Instructional Policy Committee, so that USG had the opportunity to examine the proposals and provide input. Heuvers said that the proposals concerning students had been submitted to USG.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 4475            Minutes of Senate Meeting 215            4 May 1994

Heuvers distributed copies of some additional comments on Proposal 27-94 [Appendix V of these minutes] from Roblee, Glime and Jobst.

## XII. Old Business (Part 2 of 2)

C. Proposal 17-94 Policy on Academic Freedom. Bornhorst called for consideration of Proposal 17-94 introduced at the previous meeting [Minutes, p.4470]. Heuvers MOVED the approval of Proposal

17-94. Brokaw seconded the motion.

Bornhorst called for objections to the recommendation of voting units. Moore MOVED to expand the listing to Other Course-offering units. Grzelak seconded the motion. Bornhorst called for discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED without dissent in a voice vote.

Bornhorst called for discussion of the motion of approval. Sewell said that the proposal should include the whole campus, because other persons besides faculty are involved in research and teaching. Bornhorst noted that the policy was to be included in the faculty handbook, and that such a policy might wait for a staff handbook.

Moore said that Proposal 17-94 addresses students. Sewell said she was unclear about what was to be included in the Faculty Handbook and was to go into a staff handbook, and that professional staff needed to be included in a policy on academic freedom. Ott said that the policy needed to go into the Faculty Handbook, and that its application to staff was not clear. Keen said that the policy was essential for the Faculty Handbook as part of the faculty contract with the university. Sewell said the inclusion of library staff was not clear. Heuvers said the library staff teaches courses listed in the catalog.

Moore said that the Library's concern was not course offerings. Librarians require academic freedom to carry out their responsibilities in selecting materials for the Library.

Bornhorst asked for suggestions for rewording the proposal. Brokaw said that the first line of the proposal should include all members of the university community; everybody should be able to speak freely without concerns of attack. Seel said that this confuses two issues: the right of freedom of speech, and academic freedom of faculty regarding course content. Librarians should have the right to put any book on the shelf without interference.

Sewell said that a seminar offered by Counseling Services involved an evaluation instrument to which there was some objection. Current policy afforded the staff no protection.

#### XIII. Adjournment

Mroz MOVED that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded. Without opposition, Bornhorst declared the meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Secretary of the University Senate

.