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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.
February 9, 1977

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 7:00 p.m. in Stevenson 401.

Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Hicklin suggested that the minutes should report more discussion on the prevailing side of an argument to contain a better balance of argument. A motion (Frisch/Upton) to approve the minutes of January 26, 1977 with the deletion of the word "fair" on line 4, page 5, carried.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Cohen stated that this was the last meeting of the current Senate that he would chair. He will be out of town for the February 23 meeting.

Administrators' Remarks

Provost Horner said that the task of putting together the FY78 budget is a very long process and will probably continue through June. The governor has made his budgetary recommendations to the Board of Higher Education. Governor Thompson's recommendations are considerably lower than the Board of Higher Education's.

Student Body President's Remarks

There were no remarks.

Professional and Technical Staff Council's Remarks

Mr. Chris Schwe1le said that Wesley R. Hablow had been chosen by the Professional and Technical Staff Council as a nominee for administrative representative on the Presidential Search Committee.

ACTION ITEMS:

Election of Administrative Representatives to PSC

On two ballots, Hibbert Roberts (Chairperson of the Department of Political Science Department) and Charles Porter (Associate Director of Institutional Research and Computer Operations) were chosen as the administrative representatives to the Presidential Search Committee.

Election of Student Representatives to PSC

After ten ballots, David Van De Voort, Jerry Freed, and Lance Carlile were chosen as student representatives to the Presidential Search Committee.
David Van De Voort was elected on the first ballot. During the balloting for the remaining two representatives, suggestions were offered as to how to break the deadlock which resulted. Mr. Hicklin suggested Chairperson Cohen read the results of a ballot. Mr. Parr suggested dropping the person with the lowest number of votes. A motion (Bown/Campagna) to open discussion on the four candidates remaining on the ballot was made. Mr. Tarrant said the four candidates should be asked if they want discussion. Mr. Parr said equal time should be given to each candidate. Another motion was made (Cattell/Searight) to suspend the rules so the lowest two candidates could be dropped from the ballot. Mr. Hicklin cautioned against taking any precipitous moves that might be questionable because the results of this election go to the Board of Regents for their approval. Mr. Gordon (Parliamentarian) said a motion to suspend the rules is not debatable. A vote was taken and the motion failed. Mr. Bown asked to withdraw his motion to open discussion on the candidates, but Mr. Campagna didn't agree, so the motion stayed on the floor. A substitute motion for the Bown/Campagna motion was offered (Frisch/Tarrant) to substitute a two-minute speech by the four remaining candidates. A vote was taken on substituting the Frisch/Tarrant motion for that of Bown/Campagna, and it passed. The main motion now was to have the four candidates present a two-minute speech. Ms. Lohr, Mr. Reitan, Mr. Quane, and Mr. Carlile all spoke in opposition of a two-minute speech. Mr. Carlile said there is more to be considered than what a person can say in two minutes. If the candidates are going to be discussed at all, he said it should be done in an actual discussion. Ms. Frisch spoke in favor of the motion, saying that by balloting everyone was already considering the merits of the candidates. She said she would rather hear any further comments straight from the candidates. Mr. Jesse asked if all the candidates were in agreement about giving a two-minute speech. Mr. Carlile said he thought it was fine, but the Senate should discuss the candidates, too. Ms. Weseman agreed. This motion required 2/3 vote. On a show of hands, the Frisch/Tarrant motion failed.

Ratification of Civil Service and Alumni Representatives on PSC

A motion (Bown/Carroll) to approve the appointment of Floyd Clark (Coordinator of Management Systems—Institutional Research and Computer Operations) as the Civil Service Representative to the PSC carried. A motion (Hicklin/Gordon) to approve the appointment of William Kuhfuss (Class of 1934) as the Alumni representative to the PSC also carried.

Committee Appointments

On a motion (Frisch/Searight) committee appointments to the Entertainment Committee, Forum Committee, and the University Union/Auditorium Board were approved. (See appendix).

Due Process for Registered Student Organizations

Amendments to the Statement of Organizational Privileges and Responsibilities and to the University Handbook were submitted by Ms. Weseman of the Student Affairs Committee to obtain due process for registered student organizations. Mr. Carroll stated that these were well thought out amendments and he urged that they get passed. A motion (Weseman/Phillips) to adopt due process for registered student organizations carried. (See appendix).

Banning of Cigarette Sales

The proposal as submitted by the Administrative Affairs Committee to the
Senate to ban the sale of cigarettes on campus reads as follows: "The Academic Senate hereby resolves that the sale of cigarettes and other tobacco products be forbidden on University property as of March 1, 1977." A motion (Phillips/Collie) was made to adopt the proposal from the Administrative Affairs Committee to ban the sale of cigarettes on University property. Mr. Hicklin, a member of the Administrative Affairs Committee, said the reason this proposal was brought to the Senate was to show that a senator and a student can get a proposal out of a committee and that a proposal is not killed simply on its face value. Many things have come to the Senate that are out of the ordinary in the University, such as a proposal to eliminate all grades in the University. The Senate has never been protected from various types of proposals and has tried to consider all of them. Mr. Hicklin went on to say that originally he would not have supported this proposal, but after an article he read in the Vidette about hospitals selling cigarettes, he would support the proposal. Im the future, when cigarettes are banned everywhere, people will say, "How could I have voted any other way?" He said that Mr. Phillips brought this proposal before the Senate as a moral issue, and the Administrative Affairs Committee tried to back him up. Ms. Frisch expressed the opposite viewpoint saying that the University should not be involved in moral issues, nor should it begin legislating morality. Banning the sale of cigarettes on campus will only lead to banning more things. If the proposal passed, this would not stop smoking. People would still be smoking everywhere on campus. Mr. Campagna said that the University does legislate morality. When the University allows cigarettes to be sold, it's to legislate morality. He said this issue should be approached on the grounds of morality. Mr. Gordon said that he subscribes to any viewpoint that upholds the view that a person should look out for their own health. He said that he opposed the proposal because a person should be concerned with his or her own health. Statistics show that the sale of cigarettes has gone up, and by banning the sale of cigarettes on campus, this is not going to have a substantive effect on stopping people from smoking.

Mr. Tarrant said he would like to take out the morality aspect of the issue. Rather, people should look at this as a step in getting cigarettes banned from all public places. He said it is not only the people that smoke that get cancer, but non-smokers can suffer externalities, too. Therefore, he said that this issue should stem from the point of view of the public concern and health reasons. Ms. Lohr stated that it was not the intent of the proposal to prevent people from smoking, but to prevent them from obtaining cigarettes from Illinois State University. Mr. Parr asked who was responsible for the sale of cigarettes in the classrooms. Mr. Belshe answered that Stan Shuman makes arrangements with contracting agencies. Mr. Rhodes asked what is included in the items to be vended, and Mr. Belshe answered that it is usually the people in the buildings that decide what is to be vended. Mr. Wilson stated that he was glad this issue came up, because there is no issue that is not worth some consideration. However, he believed that this issue is being approached in the wrong way. Banning cigarette sales on campus will not reduce the amount of smoking; some kind of activity should be provided to replace smoking. He also said maybe the idea of separating smoking-from non-smoking rooms should be worked on. Mr. Phillips said this proposal was not meant to be a detriment to smoking or to keep people from obtaining cigarettes. It is not aimed at anything except the limits of what the University can sell to students. He said if the University is so anxious to sell something, they can make money on other items, such as contraceptives. He said that the question really is whether the University is going to take the responsibility of selling carcinogens to students. Mr. Hicklin said that some of the issues seemed to have gotten muddied in the process of debate.
He said the committee brought this out in the first place because of Mr. Phillips' feelings on the issue. From a historic point of view, in the future people will ask how the Senate could have voted any way but for the proposal. Ms. Frisch said that she could not predict the future, and doesn't think that anyone should vote on the proposal because of the future. Also, they shouldn't be concerned with the Senate's reputation. She went on to say that many other things are sold besides cigarettes that are bad for your health, including edible items. Mr. Phillips said that sometimes people have to be leaders and look ahead. He also said that smokers would have to ask themselves, "What is the common good?" as Senator Hicklin had suggested earlier.

Mr. Gordon said he had sympathy with the people that think about the health of a smoker. But if a smoker wants to get a cigarette and it is banned in a campus building, he could simply walk across the street to the Co-op. He stated that everyone is concerned with what the University does and makes possible, but that this particular step would have more symbolic than practical emphasis. He said that instead it would be better to emphasize to smokers that they should quit smoking and non-smoking areas should be legislated. Mr. Moonan agreed with Mr. Gordon, saying that this would merely be a symbolic gesture. It would enable the University to say that their hands are clean because they don't sell cigarettes. A motion (Lohr/Hicklin) to move the previous question carried. On a roll call vote, the proposal to ban the sale of cigarettes on University property failed (13-28-3).

INFORMATION ITEMS:

Evaluation of College Deans

The Evaluation of College Deans was written up by the Administrative Affairs Committee. Ms. Lohr stated that the committee put a lot of time and effort into the evaluation. She said that the evaluation would be sent out to members of the College FSC, Curriculum Committee, College Council, and to all chairpersons within the College. They will be sent back to Provost Horner and will be measured by him. Ms. Lohr also stated that the new evaluation was a remake of an older evaluation. The Administrative Affairs Committee tried to make the new evaluation more specific by eliminating the weaknesses and concentrating on the strengths of the old evaluation. Ms. McMahan asked what the "team" was on p. 2, C9. Cooperation with team. Ms. Lohr answered that this was a carryover from the old evaluation and would probably be eliminated since no one could define it. Provost Horner stated that he had never seen that particular evaluation before. Dean Helgeson had taken the one currently being used from a national journal. It was not designed locally. Mr. Rhodes asked who the "subordinates" are (p. 2, C8). Ms. Lohr said that would probably refer to the department chairpersons. Mr. Hickod asked why there was nothing relating to budgets in the evaluation. Mr. Hicklin responded that the people that fill out the dean evaluation are not able to observe directly the budgetary activities, nor do they have the expertise to make an evaluation. Also, the dean is not being judged on, "What have I brung you?" Mr. Hickod said he thought it was the intent of the evaluation to provide the dean with more resource allocation powers. Mr. Carlile asked if the committee gave consideration to faculty members. Ms. Lohr answered that questions on the evaluation will include faculty as well as students. Mr. Hicklin stated that the evaluation is only given to people that deal directly with the dean because they are competent to judge his performance. The average faculty member would have a difficult time considering if it was the dean or the department chairperson who had set the policy. Mr. Quane asked what "advanced degree program" was, (p. 3, 128). Ms. Lohr answered that this had also come from the old evaluation
form and could be struck. Mr. Wilson asked if this evaluation had been shown to FSC, College Councils, and Curriculum Committees to see if members of those committees felt comfortable with it. Ms. Lohr said several members had seen it and approved of it. Mr. Rhodes said that on p. 2, C11, there were too many different categories in one response. The "students", "faculty", and "staff" part of the question should be divided into three different questions. Provost Horner said he was a little worried about the design of the instrument. In the apparent design of this evaluation, a series of examples to illustrate the meaning of categories has been separated into separate questions. He said there should be at least one identifying instrument.

Mr. Gordon said that if "low success" appears as the lowest possible rating on this evaluation, it should be the same for the faculty and the administrative evaluations. Mr. Carlile suggested that instead of using "low success" as the lowest possible response, "failure" should be one of the possible responses. Especially on the overall rating, the person evaluating the dean should have the opportunity to say that he thought that particular dean was a total failure. Mr. Smith suggested that on this evaluation, ratings such as "insufficient success", "some merit", and "exceptional merit", might be used as on the faculty evaluations. Mr. Rhodes suggested that the Administrative Affairs Committee might consider using the words "moderately" or "average" in the middle of five responses, to have two higher and two lower ratings than the average. He also said maybe some professional people on campus should be consulted as to the ratings that should be used. Ms. Lohr said a dean evaluation had been in the making for the past three Senates, and it was about time something was done about it. Mr. Gordon asked what the basis was that mandated dean evaluations. Mr. Tarrant responded it was the Senate resolution of September 14, 1974. Mr. Hicklin said that if the Senate isn't really interested in dean evaluations, why should it have to do them. He said the Administrative Affairs Committee would love not doing it. A motion was made (Hicklin/Tarrant) to request a sense of the Senate resolution be made to have the dean evaluation questionnaire remain under the Academic Senate as guides to the committee. The motion passed.

By-Law Change (Seating of New Senators)

A By-Law change was submitted by the Rules Committee to change the date in the seating of new senators. The By-Law change reads as follows: P. 36, Article 4, Section 4.1, Add Section D; and P. 38, Article 4, Section 3, Part F -- "The newly elected Academic Senators will be seated at the first meeting of the Academic Senate in April. The old Academic Senate shall continue to serve through the month of March."

Library Representation on Senate

The request for Milner Library representation on the Academic Senate came from the Rules Committee. Ms. McMahan said the following sentence should be struck from the rationale, "The seat for Milner Library will be relinquished by the College of Arts and Sciences." Ms. McMahan said the Library had previously been considering that the library has representation in the College of Arts and Sciences, so the seat should come from there. But when the report got to the Executive Committee, it was decided that the seat should not come from the College of Arts & Sciences because no particular area should suffer. The present general ratio of faculty per senator is 1/32. Mr. Quane asked if it would be possible for the Rules Committee to have a new apportionment if this proposal would go into effect. Mr. Cohen answered that apportionment figures come from the Provost's Office based on faculty numbers. Mr. Quane
said there could be a reapportionment for some colleges, and the Senate should
know where the seats would fall before granting a permanent seat to the
Library. Mr. Hicklin said that the 32 lines mentioned in the information
item are professional library faculty. They are currently represented in
group B of the College of Arts and Sciences. Provost Horner said it is a
historical thing that the Library is now represented in the College of
Arts & Sciences, from the days when there was a Department of Library Science.
Mr. Rhodes asked if the Library is considered as a College or a department.
Mr. Joe Kraus of Milner Library said the Library reports to the Provost; it
is neither a department or a College. However, Provost Horner said that the
Library does, in fact, function like a College in FSC matters. Mr. Parr
suggested that the goal might be accomplished by considering Milner Library
as a College for Senate apportionment. This would be more flexible.

CAST By-Laws

The Rules Committee presented the CAST By-Laws to the Senate. Mr. Christiansen
questioned what "social probation" meant on p. 7, line 3 in the second full
paragraph. He also asked about line 4 in the same paragraph about why students
can serve for only one year and then be eligible for re-election. Mr. Carroll
said he would have this information ready at the next meeting, when CAST
By-Laws would be at the action stage.

Amendment to University Handbook re University Organizations

Ms. Weseman presented the proposed Amendments and Additions to the University
Handbook which came from the Student Affairs Committee. These amendments and
additions include (1) a change in the title of the section, (2) two additions
to the requirements for registration, (3) the addition of a responsibilities
statement which must be signed by the president/chairperson of an organization,
(4) inclusion of action that will be taken when the organization does not
supply updated information as it pertains to the requirements for registration,
and (5) inclusion of the Due Process Statement. Mr. Ray Throckmorton from the
University Union/Auditorium said that under the old way, it states that the
Program and Activity Board must be informed when a group is doing something
wrong. Now, under the new amendments, the organization must be informed
about its responsibility for conforming to all university, local community,
state or federal laws and regulations. Failure to supply the UP&TA Office
with updated information as it pertains to the requirements for registration
will result in a 30-day temporary suspension.

HEIT Division Proposal

Mr. Moonan of the Academic Affairs Committee was the reporting person for
the HEIT Division Proposal. He stated that the separation of HEIT is in
the Academic Plan. He said that the two departments, Home Economics and
Industrial Technology were combined in 1972, and when he looked back to find
the rationale, he was unable to find any. Now the Home Economics Department
is much stronger than it ever was. Mr. Moonan went over a few of the questions
that arose in the Academic Affairs Committee. This split will require $0
for new state resources for fiscal year 1978. No new courses or activities
are proposed in this request for separate departmental status of the two
academic areas. There has been a plan for the division of FTE. On p. 4,
#9, an important point is raised concerning the Accreditation by the American
Home Economics Association. Under the present circumstances of HEIT, Home
Economics cannot be accredited by the Home Economics Association. The Home
Economics people are very desirous of getting this accreditation. Ms. McMahan
asked where the money would come from for hiring another department chairperson, since this proposal came in with a $0 allocation. Dean Razor of the College of Applied Science and Technology said the departments will utilize FTE from indirect construction. They will not be asking for additional dollars. Ms. Upton of the Home Economics Department spoke in favor of the proposal. She said that Home Economics used to be teacher education oriented. The non-teaching program is growing very fast, and they now have more students in the non-teaching program than in the teacher education program. Also, there are numerous separate areas in Home Economics alone plus the various areas in the Industrial Technology Program. This makes it an impossible job for an administrator to satisfy all the needs of the faculty and students. Ms. Upton said that in the interest of the students, she thinks the separation will make Home Economics a much stronger department. Mr. Reitan asked if this proposal had been reviewed from a cost basis. Mr. Hickrod of the Budget Committee said they had come to the conclusion that it was a no-cost proposal. Mr. Reitan said there has got to be a cost somewhere, and he would like the Budget Committee to report on this. Provost Horner also said there will have to be costs, in the way of printing different stationary for the two different departments and hiring secretaries, but that the cost will be minimal. Dean Razor said he would be happy to provide more information on the cost of the proposal at the next meeting.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Communications

A sense of the Senate resolution was proposed by Mr. Christiansen and Ms. Weseman to be brought before the Board of Regents, opposing the $90 increase in tuition for ISU. Ms. Weseman said she thought the Senate should take a stance on this proposal. (Weseman/Carroll) moved a resolution that the Illinois State University Academic Senate strongly urges that the Board of Regents not support an increase in tuition and continue to seek the necessary appropriations from sources other than an increase in tuition to maintain and expand the present level of higher education in the Regency Universities. Mr. Reitan said this is a tremendously complicated matter and the Senate should not just jump into it after many boards have worked on it. It should be thoroughly discussed and debated. Mr. Hickrod expressed agreement with Mr. Reitan. Mr. Gordon said the Senate should consider the implications of the defeat of the resolution, which would be Senate support of an increase in tuition. Mr. Carroll said he hoped that the Senate would support the proposal. He said it was a very important issue because the proposed increase of $90 holds heavy implications for students. Mr. Parr through the Senate didn't have enough information to make a decision. He also said that if a positive motion is defeated, then the Senate has made no statement. Mr. Tarrant said maybe the Senate shouldn't just consider opposing a $90 increase in tuition; maybe the Senate should consider supporting no tuition for ISU since it is a public institution. Mr. Rhodes said he did not like being placed in the situation of being forced to vote on the spur of the moment. More information is needed. Mr. Carlile said that some of the senators were looking at the resolution as if the student senators did not have any judgment. He said all the resolution is trying to do is to ask the legislature to take the burden off of students and look for some other way to support education. Students can't handle an increase like this, and this resolution would be a way of letting the legislature know. Mr. Hicklin said that with this resolution, what the student senators are really saying to the faculty is that there
will be no more salary raises and other benefits because the legislature will not vote a salary raise unless there is also a raise in tuition. Mr. Carroll said that if the resolution was read carefully, they would notice that it is not saying that the Senate does not want faculty salary increases because the students do not want to pay. It is just a suggestion to the legislature to look for alternative funding. Mr. Christiansen said that the urgency to get the resolution passed quickly is because the Board of Regents is going to act on the tuition question at its next meeting February 17. Mr. Parr suggested that the resolution be tabled. A motion (Parr/Merriman) to table the resolution failed. Ms. Cook suggested that the wording of the resolution be changed, to delete the phrase "not support an increase in tuition and." Mr. Carlile expressed concern that the government support of education is getting lower and lower every year. If the $90 increase in tuition passes, some people won't be coming back to ISU next year. Some people won't come back anyway, because they won't be getting financial aid. Mr. Wilson said he would like to see some material on the long-run benefits of tuition and no tuition. (Carroll/Keeney) moved the previous question, and the motion carried. The Weseman/Carroll resolution with the phrase "not support an increase in tuition and" deleted carried on a roll call vote (26-1-14).

Chairperson Cohen announced that the annual Senate retreat will be held on March 2 at Ewing Castle for new and holdover senators.

Adjournment

A motion (Phillips/Frisch) to adjourn was approved at 10:10 p.m.

For the Academic Senate,

Ira Cohen, Chairperson
John K. Boaz, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>Motion #83</th>
<th>Motion #86</th>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Motion #</th>
<th>Motion #83</th>
<th>Motion #86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amster</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boaz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campagna</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardot</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlile</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattell</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christansen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeGrandpre</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisch</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicklin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickrod</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeney</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullen</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natale</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parr</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>A exc.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quane</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reitan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searight</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vybiral</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weseman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woerly</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belshe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budig</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Committee Appointments (Faculty)

**Entertainment Committee**

David Livers, C&I (1978)
Ted Jackson, Information Sciences (1978)
Len Schmaltz, Psychology (1977)

**University Forum Committee**

Charles Harris, English (1978)

**University Union/Auditorium Board**

John Kirk, Theatre (1979)
APPENDIX II

Amendments approved by the Academic Senate February 9, 1977

Amendment to University Handbook

Strike G and insert:

Registration of a student organization may be suspended through the following procedure:

1) Any complaint against a registered student organization shall be directed to the University Programs and Activities Office.

2) If informal discussions fail to resolve the complaint and the University Programs and Activities Office contemplates action against an organization, the complaint shall be referred to SCERB.

3) The SCERB Office will arrange for a hearing by the University Hearing Panel.

4) The University Hearing Panel shall hear the dispute and present its findings to the organization, the University Programs and Activities Office and the Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs.

5) The process for appeal shall be handled through SCERB.

6) The Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs will have final approval of any penalties directed toward an organization.

Amendment to Statement of Organizational Privileges and Responsibilities under responsibilities:

1) to inform members of the organization that they shall be responsible for conforming to all university, local community, state or federal laws and regulations, regardless of whether the university is informed of any infraction.

2) Registered organizations which receive student fee funds understand that if they are found in violation of any university, local community, state or federal laws and regulations, the violation will be referred to the appropriate program board allocating their funds for action.