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Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.
CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum to be present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Mr. Young, Ms. Lindstrom) to approve the minutes of the last meeting as distributed was approved.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REMARKS

President Budig stated that the Regents would be on campus in November. He stated that he would be continuing the orientation sessions with the Board of Regents members and that Dean Rives is working with the college deans on this matter. The President stated that the chairmen of the internal standing committees of the Senate would be included in the sessions this time.

REMARKS OF THE STUDENT ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

Mr. McConnell stated that applications for the student representative to the Board of Regents were now being taken with Friday, November 2 as the last day for filing. He stated that the Assembly had determined the screening committee procedures.

(Mr. Madore at this point raised a point of privilege. He asked if the Senate had mandated not to change the FSC guidelines so that the set of guidelines would last for a whole evaluation period. Dean Helgeson responded that he thought the term "mandated" may have crept into some FSC materials, but that there had been no vote of the Senate on this matter. However, he stated that the consensus of the Senate seemed to be that the Senators were happy that there was not going to be a change in the FSC Guidelines.)

ACTION ITEMS

1. Ad Hoc Procedures for the Selection of the Vidette Editor

A motion (Mr. Young, Ms. Workman) to accept the procedures for the selection of the Vidette editor as outlined in the memorandum to the Academic Senate from Mr. Young was made. Mr. Mead asked why the change was only for this year and
how this procedure was different from the previous procedures. Mr. Young responded that in the past the Publications Committee has established the procedures for the selection of the Vidette editor and has then carried out these procedures. He stated that this process was in line with the principle that the procedures are to be developed by the committee responsible for the matter. Mr. Young stated that problems regarding codification, student and faculty vacancies, and the absence of a chairman had made it necessary to set up a different process for this year. He reassured the Senate that the procedures have been discussed with members of the Publications Committee, the present Vidette editor, and with a representative of the Director of Information Services. Mr. Young stated that the subcommittee had found reasonably unanimous acceptance of this procedure as a good way to operate under the circumstances. A question was raised regarding the disposition of the recommendation of the Vidette Editor Selection Panel. Mr. Young stated that the disposition follows regular procedures and does not imply a veto power. The motion passed on a voice vote, with Ms. McMillan voting "no". (See Appendix A for procedures.)

2. Change in the By Laws of the Academic Senate

A motion (Mr. Roderick, Miss Rex) to adopt the ByLaw changes as they are stated in the October 23, 1973 memorandum from the Rules Committee was made. Mr. Johnston asked what the procedure was for getting another person on a committee when one member was dropped. The Chairman stated that this appointment would come through the same channel as the original appointment. Mr. Fuehrer asked why these absences had to be successive. Mr. Merker stated that the existing policy of three months was simply too long to wait. Mr. Mead asked for a clarification of Article II, Section 6. The Student Association Assembly would recommend students according to this provision. Mr. Mead questioned why other channels should be closed for the selection of student members. Ms. Workman called for a clarification of the relationship between the Student Association Assembly and the Senate and asked why the Student Association Assembly appoints members to Academic Senate committees. A discussion centering around the possibility of obtaining names from other sources than the Assembly occurred. Mr. McConnell pointed out that this was indeed not a policy change but that the student government had always provided names for the student membership of Senate committees. He stated that it was still part of the policy that these recommendations go to the Executive Committee which can approve or disapprove them. It was stated that the new policy was intended to give appointments from the Student Association legitimacy, but that it doesn't mean that only the Association can nominate students. In some cases a problem may arise where the Senate cannot wait for the screening process to be implemented; in these cases the Senate might directly appoint members. Mr. Merker reiterated his hope that we put a very heavy sanction on getting names from the Student Association Assembly. He stated that the Assembly has gone to a great deal of difficulty to set up ByLaws which establish an elaborate set of procedures for screening. Student Academic Senators play a major role in these procedures. He stressed that the revision does not state that the Assembly will appoint the members, only recommend them. It was stated
at this point that the Academic Senate should have the right to submit names on its own. Mr. Morris stated that occasionally the screening procedures are too slow and that this change would prohibit the Senate from using a different procedure. Mr. Merker stated that this would not preclude any Senator's right to nominate some one for a committee. Mr. Merker stated that if any Senator could nominate any person to a committee after the Student Association Assembly has spent time on the selection process, then we need to put special weight on nominations from the Student Association. Mr. Champagne suggested a change in the amendment so that it would read "... from various sources, including Standing Internal Senate Committees and the Student Association Assembly" with the full deletion of the underlined sentence. A motion (Mr. Champagne, Mr. Mead) to accept the change as outlined by Mr. Champagne was made. Mr. Young pointed out that then the Student Association Assembly could nominate everyone. It was stated that the intent of the original revision seemed to be to make appointments from Student Association mandatory while students could still appoint faculty members. Mr. McConnell described the process used by the Rules Committee in making faculty appointments. He stated that to follow a similar procedure for students would be impossible. Therefore screening procedures were established to make committee appointments open to all students. He described the screening procedure used by the Student Association and challenged any group to come up with any better method. Mr. Champagne amended his motion so that the second sentence would read: "The Executive Committee shall solicit names for proposed faculty, student, administrative, and staff members of appointed committees from various sources, including Standing Internal Senate Committees and the Student Association Assembly." Mr. Merker stated that there was a very specific reason why the phrase "as outlined in its ByLaws" was included in this revision. He stated that the Student Association needed the sanction of the Academic Senate to have its ByLaws take on any meaning. Mr. Sutherland stated that he appreciated the need for the Student Association to have some sanction to its bylaws. He asked if changing the revision would render the ByLaws inoperative. Mr. Morris pointed out that under the Champagne amendment the Student Association Assembly would receive the same sanction as the Standing Internal Committees of the Senate. Mr. Merker stated that it was unfair to discuss this in light of the lack of knowledge of the Student Association Assembly's ByLaws. He stated that this was not any sort of plot, but rather was a strong move on the part of students to try to better the process by which students are selected. There has traditionally been a lot of difficulty in selecting students to external committees. Mr. Merker suggested that action should be deferred on this point until copies of the Student Association ByLaws are distributed. Mr. Mead stated that he did not detect any concern about a plot, but that all that is being said does not preclude the Student Association from acting according to its ByLaws. He stated that he would merely like to open other channels for nominations. It was again pointed out that faculty and students decide together on faculty appointments, but only students would be deciding on student appointments. Mr. Merker asked that Article II, Section 6 be returned to the Rules Committee for further study. The motion (Mr. Merker, Mr. Young) to return Article II, Section 6 to the Rules Committee for further consideration carried.
The Senate moved on to a discussion of Section 13. Ms. Workman asked for a clarification of what would happen if somebody was absent from his internal committee for three meetings and was removed but was not absent from Senate meetings. Mr. Merker stated that the person’s seat would be in jeopardy. Mr. Merker outlined the process whereby one loses his seat: the member has to be absent for three successive meetings; have to not tell any one that he is going to miss the meetings. If he calls the Senate Office up to one full week after the meeting, then the absence is excused and doesn’t count against him. Ms. Amster stated that the purpose of the revision was to bring more harmony to the committees and the Senate. Ms. McMillan stated that this bylaw change does not take into account possible schedule conflicts. Mr. Roderick stated that if a Senator cannot be active on his committee because of a time conflict, then he should request a change in committee assignment to one in which he can be active. The possibility that one could be dropped from an internal committee while still being a Senator was discussed. The point was made that there is a difference between internal and external committee responsibility which this bylaw does not take into consideration. Mr. Roderick withdrew his motion and agreed to take Article II, Section 13 back to the Rules Committee for further consideration. The Senate approved the revisions in Article II, Section 7 and the final sentence of Article IV, Section 4. (For further discussion of this topic, see Vol. V, No. 3. See Appendix B for memorandum of October 23, 1973.)

3. Codification of the Professional Ethics Committee

A motion (Mr. Roderick, Ms. Amster) to adopt the codification of the Professional Ethics Committee as outlined in the memorandum of October 23, 1973 was made. Mr. Roderick stated that these procedures were drawn up by the University Council and that they had been accepted by this body. He stated that the only substantive changes were in Section C and in the addition of Section G. Mr. Gamsky asked what action is taken after the recommendations come to the Senate. The Chairman stated that the Committee can recommend censure or some other action; this recommendation is then sent to the President. Mr. Smith pointed out that the sentence in Section C about employing stenographic help as needed had been inadvertently omitted in the memorandum and asked that it be inserted. Mr. Sutherland stated that the formation of an Ethics Committee was an attempt to resolve certain allegations when one faculty member charges another faculty member with malfeasance. He stated that since this course of action can have grave consequences to the person, the aggrieved and accused parties should have one preemptory challenge of the membership of the Committee. Mr. Sutherland stated that although he did not see anything which would prohibit this action, he also did not see anything that would formally guarantee this right. It was pointed out that the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee does provide for a preemptory challenge in its procedures. A discussion occurred on whether or not the meetings should be private. Mr. Hicklin stated that he did not think that you could get people to serve on an Ethics Committee if the hearings were open. He stated that these procedures had been set up for a specific instance under the pressure of time. He stated that the original provision had been that the hearing would be open to faculty, but not to students or the press. It was pointed out that Section 8
would enable the committee to deal with the matter of preemptory challenges. Mr. Sutherland stated that people might be happier abiding by the decision of the Committee if the right to preemptory challenges was spelled out. Mr. Mead suggested that the report of the Ethics Committee should be made to the faculty members of the Academic Senate in executive session. Mr. Roderick agreed to the incorporation of this change into the original motion. The desire to have both sides agree before calling for an open hearing was discussed. A suggestion was made that the Committee decide if the hearings should be open. Ms. Chesebro questioned why the hearings should not be private. A motion (Ms. Chesebro, Mr. Fuehrer) that the hearings be private was approved, with Ms. Frankland abstaining. A motion (Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Gomsky) that the aggrieved and the accused parties shall each be allowed one preemptory challenge to the Committee membership; in which case the Chairperson of the Academic Senate shall replace the challenged member by random selection from the faculty members of the Academic Senate was approved. A question was raised if the Ethics Committee could hear cases involving deans or department heads. Mr. Hicklin stated that the ethics procedures apply to coequals. The Code of Ethics is written about how one operates as a faculty member and colleague. If the charge arises out of the Code of Ethics, then the Ethics Committee would handle the case. The Code of Ethics would preclude a department head from doing certain things. Complaints in these cases would be handled as between two members of the teaching profession. The motion to approve the codification of the Ethics Committee as amended was approved. (See Appendix C for codification.)

4. Recommendation to dissolve Academic Life and Student Organizations Board

A motion (Mr. Cetwinski, Mr. Roderick) to dissolve the Academic Life and Student Organizations Board was passed, with Ms. Chesebro asking that her "no" vote be recorded.

5. Change in the University Handbook: Student Records Policy

A motion (Mr. Cetwinski, Mr. Sutherland) that the change as outlined in the memorandum from the Student Affairs Committee be accepted was approved. (See Appendix D for the change in policy.)

6. Committee Appointments

A motion (Mr. Kachur, Ms. Amster) that the appointment of R. Dirks to the Library Committee and Lee Dohleman to the Council on University Studies be accepted by the Senate was approved.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Madore reported for the Faculty Affairs Committee. He stated that procedures to implement the Human Resources Management Study Group proposal were being sent
to the Executive Committee. He also stated that the committee was beginning its revision of the 1970 FSC-APT document and asked for input on that subject be submitted to the members of the committee.

Mr. Young reported for the Administrative Affairs Committee. He requested that Patent and Television Tape Policy (File No. 12.19.72.1) be removed from the calendar as a result of a meeting with Mr. Goleash and an agreement that no change was needed in the existing patent and television tape materials policy. A statement on copyright policy will be forthcoming. Mr. Young also stated that a policy on religious observances was approved at the Committee meeting tonight and will be transmitted to ExComm.

Mr. Edwards reported for the Committee on Constitutional and Governance Review. He stated that CCGR had asked for input as to the makeup of the committees, the placing of civil service personnel on academic committees, and other matters. He suggested that if anyone has input on these matters they contact the CCGR. A complete set of the CCGR minutes will be in the Secretary's Office.

Mr. Cetwinski asked the members of the Student Affairs Committee to meet for a short period after the meeting.

Mr. Madore asked the members of the Senate to discuss and make recommendations regarding the student membership on the Joint University Advisory Committee. Mr. Hicklin stated that there was not enough time or experience to know whether or not to continue the student membership.

Mr. Hicklin stated that there would be a meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Higher Education next Friday, November 2 in the Prairie Room B & C of the University, from 10 - 3 p.m.

Mr. Edwards reported that the Presidential Selection Committee had been meeting and is doing a great deal of review of candidates. The committee is well on its way and should have the selection made before the deadline.

Mr. Champagne asked that the Academic Affairs Committee meet for a short time after the meeting.

A motion (Mr. Madore, Mr. Cetwinski) to adjourn was approved. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Charles R. Hicklin, Secretary
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aker</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barford</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetwinski</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champagne</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesebro</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeMarini</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ficek</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedberg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuehrer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harpole</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachur</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberta</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindstrom</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinne</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tittle</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madore</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillian</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadors</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mensinger</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merker</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennels</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanTine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paladin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissmiller</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helgeson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ad Hoc Vidette Editor Selection Procedure

Acceptance of this procedure for the selection of the Vidette editor who will begin duties in January, 1974, is not meant to be a precedent for the future. This method is to be used for this year because the University Publications Committee has not been codified as to functions and membership, has several student and faculty vacancies, and has no chairman. This situation is coupled with the need to have a new Vidette editor named by the end of November in order to have a break-in period for the new editor.

I. Ad Hoc Vidette Editor Selection Panel

The actual selection of the new Vidette editor will be done by the Ad Hoc Vidette Editor Selection Panel (VESP) comprised of three newspaper journalists. The three journalists are to come from outside the Bloomington-Normal and ISU communities. One of the journalists on the panel should have experience with university newspapers, if possible.

II. Procedures of VESP

The VESP will evaluate the candidates by utilizing the following types of procedures:

- Application forms
- Letters of recommendation
- Open hearing
- Vidette staff opinion (written)
- Private interviews with the candidates

It is assumed that the VESP will develop its own format for the above procedures as well as its own set of selection criteria.

III. Disposition of VESP Selection

The name of the new Vidette editor as determined by the VESP will be sent to the Director of Information Services and, then, to the President.
IV. Selection of the VESP

The three journalists of the VESP shall be selected by a committee of five persons who are as follows:

- Director of Information Services, Chairman
- General Manager of the Vidette
- Editor of the Vidette
- One student selected from and by the Student Affairs Committee
- One faculty selected from the Publications Committee by the Administrative Affairs Committee
TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Rules Committee

RE: By-Laws Changes - Memos of 10/3/73 and 10/10/73

A further discussion by members of our committee has resulted in a refinement and clarification of our earlier recommendations. Please disregard the previous notices of 10/3/73 and 10/10/73. We hereby recommend four changes: (One underline means the statement is as it was in the memo of 10/10; two underlines means it has been changed.)

Selection of Committee Chairperson

Amend Article II, Section 7

Now reads:
(a) Each Senate Internal Standing Committee shall elect its chairman annually from among its members.

Recommended wording:
(a) Each Senate Internal Standing Committee shall elect one and only one chairperson from among its members. Committee chairpersons shall serve one year terms.

Rationale:
The purpose of this is to improve communication, both within each committee and between committees. This has been discussed with the current Co-Chairmen of the Student Affairs Committee and has their support; however, we recommend that this change take effect with the seating of the new Senate in March.

Replacement of Absent Committee Members

Amend Article II, Section 13

Now reads:
A person absent for a full semester (trimester) or longer, or on disability leave under the University Retirement System, shall be dropped from the committee automatically, and the person who replaces him shall complete his term on the committee.

Recommended wording:
A person absent without notification to the Academic Senate Office before one week after the committee meeting for three consecutive meetings of which he/she has been notified, or on disability leave under the University Retirement System, shall be deemed to have vacated his/her seat as provided for in the Senator vacancy and absences policy (By-Law 4.4), and the person who replaces him/her shall complete his/her term on the committee.

Rationale:
This change provides some requirements to attend internal and external committee meetings.
Selection of Committee Members

Amend Article II, Section 6, (second paragraph)

Now reads:
Appointed members of committees shall be appointed by action of the Academic Senate, upon recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall solicit names for proposed members of appointed committees from various sources, and in particular from Standing Internal Senate Committees. In making its recommendations to the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee shall specify which names were received from a given Standing Internal Senate Committee.

Recommended wording:
Appointed members of committees shall be appointed by action of the Academic Senate, upon recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall solicit names for proposed faculty, administrative, and staff members of appointed committees from various sources, and in particular from Standing Internal Senate Committees. Student members of committees shall be recommended by action of the Student Association Assembly as outlined in its By-Laws. In making its recommendations to the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee shall specify which names were received from a given Standing Internal Senate Committee or from the Student Association Assembly.

Rationale:
With the advent of Student Association Assembly and its detailed screening procedures, it seems reasonable that this association assume the responsibility of selecting student members for committees.

Vacancies and Absences

Add a new final sentence to Article IV, Section 4, Part (c) which shall read:
All rights and privileges of being a member shall be in full effect until a vacancy is certified.

Rationale:
In order to avoid confusion as to whether or not a person is eligible to vote, and to protect people who legitimately must miss meetings, it is important to retain their right to vote until their vacancy is certified.
Quorum for Business

The Rules Committee recommends no change; however, we wish to remind the Senate members that the following By-Law (Article II, Section 18) does exist and should be adhered to.

A quorum (a majority of the voting membership of a committee where not otherwise specified) must be present to conduct committee business.

We would appreciate it if you would look over other parts of the By-Laws, especially Article II, since the Rules Committee will be conducting further examination of the By-Laws of the Academic Senate in the near future.
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS COMMITTEE

Membership, Functions, and Procedures

A. The Chairperson of the Academic Senate shall appoint a Professional Ethics Committee which shall be empowered and charged to make investigations, as may be necessary, concerning practices of faculty members at Illinois State University which are in alleged violation of the Code of Ethics adopted by the University Council in May 1968 and amended by the Academic Senate in December 1970. To this end, the Committee is further empowered and charged to receive, entertain, and inquire into and take proof concerning complaints by members of the faculty against other members of the faculty at this University, and may take the evidence of witnesses and proceed as hereinafter provided.

B. In the conduct of such hearings, the Committee and the parties shall give due regard to the fact that membership in the academic profession carries with it special ethical responsibilities. The Committee and the parties should be guided by the Governing Policy for the Regency Universities of the State of Illinois adopted by the Board of Regents, the Code of Ethics adopted by the University Council and amended by the Academic Senate, and the "Statement on Professional Ethics" of the American Association of University Professors, adopted at its fifty-second annual meeting.

C. The Committee shall be comprised of five faculty members of the Academic Senate. The Committee shall be chaired by the Chairperson of the Academic Senate or his/her designee. The Committee will be randomly selected. A committee member will not serve a second time unless every eligible member has already served. Selected members may disqualify themselves with the permission of the Chairperson of the Academic Senate. The Committee may employ such stenographic help, aids and consultants as may be needed to perform its duties.

D. No complaint against any member of the faculty shall be entertained unless it is signed by the person or persons aggrieved and unless it is sufficiently clear and specific in its charges as reasonably to inform said faculty member of the acts of misconduct he is claimed to have committed.

E. The Committee is empowered to take and transcribe the evidence of the witnesses. The Committee shall report to the faculty members of the Academic Senate in executive session the failure or refusal of any person to attend and testify in response to any written request by the Committee. The hearings before the Committee shall be private.

F. The Committee shall employ the following rules of procedure and may liberally construe the same to the end that the controversies may be speedily and finally determined according to the substantive rights of the parties.

(1) The person accused shall be informed in writing at least five days before a hearing of the charges against him and upon what evidence the charges are based.

(2) The accused person may file a written answer to the charges against him. If such an answer is filed, a copy thereof shall be given to the complainant.
(3) The aggrieved and accused parties shall each be allowed one pre-emptory challenge to the Committee membership; in which case the Chairperson of the Academic Senate shall replace the challenged member by random selection from the faculty members of the Academic Senate.

(4) The Committee shall determine a specific time and place for the hearing and give at least three days written notice thereof to each party.

(5) Each party to the dispute shall have an opportunity to be heard by the Committee and to be represented by up to three advisors of their own choosing.

(6) Each party shall have the opportunity to examine all witnesses.

(7) At the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee shall report to the faculty members of the Academic Senate in executive session:

   a. its findings of fact;
   b. a summary of the evidence leading to its findings; and
   c. the recommendations of the Committee.

Committee decisions shall be reached by a majority vote.

(8) In any meeting of the faculty members of the Academic Senate where the report of the Committee is heard and acted upon, the parties to the dispute shall be given prior written notice thereof and an opportunity to be heard and to be represented by up to three advisors of their own choosing.

(9) The Committee shall make such additional rules and regulations as may reasonably be needed in order to conduct the hearing and investigation authorized herein.

G. If for any reason the above procedures cannot be followed, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall refer the matter to the Dean of the University, or his equivalent, who will be expected to follow these procedures to the extent possible.

--Adopted by the Academic Senate
   October 24, 1973
Change in University Handbook: Student Record Policy

d. Requests from Faculty Members. A faculty member may request information contained in permanent academic records when needed in discharge of his official duties. A faculty member may request confidential information with the student's consent or when a counselor, or dean, or other person is mutually involved with the student. (Strike underlined phrase)

--Approved by Academic Senate
October 24, 1973