

1969

August 11, 1969

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "August 11, 1969" (1969). *Minutes*. 401.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/401

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
Minutes of August 11, 1969

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lahey, Kluge, Whitlow, Holley, Hieronymus, Tingley, Crane, Palmer, Spaniol, Keiser.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sparks, Gover, Green, McCabe, Hattabaugh.

The minutes of July 28, 1969 were approved as published.

REPORTS:

- A. Mr. Palmer presented the minutes of the meeting of the Council of Instructional Officers of July 17. They were received. Parts of the proposed ten-year plan for the University were presented to the Senate. Among the many items of interest, a student body of 9,700, "about 46% freshmen and sophomores and about 54% juniors, seniors, and graduate students," is projected for 1973-74. The general philosophy of quality and relatively small size, of "infinite riches in a little room," will be continued. Primary emphasis will remain on teaching, but the importance of faculty research and publication will grow. Ten departments foresee the possibility of offering a Ph. D. in the period from 1974-79. The reports were received, and copies will be provided for Senators who request them.
- B. The Council on Faculty Research presented a short report. The primary concern of the committee during its four meetings in the spring quarter "was the continued consideration of proposed procedures for evaluation of completed research projects. No final conclusions were achieved . . ." The report was received and distributed.
- C. Miss Hieronymus reported that questions continue to be raised about the policies of special remuneration for department heads and administrators and the summer rotation plan. It was noted that department heads and administrators have been informed as to the exact amount they receive as "special" administrative compensation. The summer rotation plan apparently is being considered by the President. It was moved (Crane) and seconded (Kluge) that the Senate ask the Personnel Committee for more detailed information about the program of special remuneration for administrators. The motion passed by a vote of eight for, none opposed, and one present. Miss Hieronymus was instructed to seek more specific information about the state of the summer rotation plan.

COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. From the Student Senate, the minutes of the meeting of June 24, 1969. Received and distributed.
- B. From Vice President Zeigel, a memorandum covering a reprint from the Congressional Record of "Congress Looks at the Campus: The Brock Report on Student Unrest." The seven-page report is essentially in two parts. The first involves "Factors in Unrest," and eight problems "internal" to the university

and fourteen "external" issues are listed and discussed. The second concerns ten "ideas for consideration," concluding with the statement that, "To take an isolated view of our universities as the one weak link in our educational system is to unfairly single out college students, their parents, professors and school administrators."

- C. From Vice President Zeigel, a memorandum covering copies of two policies developed by the Council of Administrative Officers entitled "Procedures to be followed by administrators should interference with university operation occur." The first paper is subtitled "Obstruction" and the second, "Damage." The Vice President noted that the plans "are in a state of flux" because of "some six bills which have been passed by the General Assembly and now lie on the Governor's desk" and because of conversations with "legal personnel relative to the desirability for using an injunction to desist or to show cause why occupation of University facilities should continue." Received and circulated.
- D. From Ken Midkiff of the Student Senate, a copy of a letter to Mr. F. R. McKenna requesting a copy of his letter to the Faculty Senate suggesting the establishment of an arbitration board to hear appeals of decisions made by faculty councils which may have been influenced by "political pressures." Read and received.
- E. From F. R. McKenna, a copy of a memorandum to Ken Midkiff stating that Mr. McKenna did not care to release the letter referred to above because the desired discussion of the subject with the Faculty Senate had not taken place as yet. It was noted that Mr. McKenna had accepted an invitation to appear before the Senate at 1:30 p.m. to discuss his proposal. (He did not appear.)

NEW BUSINESS:

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, the first meeting of the fall quarter, would be from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. Wednesday, September 10, in the Heritage Room of the University Union. At that time consideration would be given to establishing regular meeting hours.

OLD BUSINESS:

The following report prepared by the Executive Committee in response to a request by the Council of Faculties for reaction to the Board of Governors' Policy Statement as to Campus Disturbances was distributed as a basis of discussion.

Questions raised concerning the Policy Statement as to Campus Disturbances

The following questions are raised concerning the Board of Governors' Policy statement, not without regard for the need for clear-cut policy regarding attitude and action in the event of campus violence. Rather the questions are raised because of some concern about the occasional lack of clarity, about the content of some specific provisions, about the general tone, and about the knowledge that the statement was drafted and distributed to all students who are pre-registered for fall quarter without opportunity for involvement of and assessment by the university faculty.

Most observers see student revolts as founded on student frustration, distrust and lack of identification with the established institutions. Among the issues involved are racial and ideological discrimination, poverty, the Vietnam war, and university cooperation with agencies and corporations dealing in such various activities as weapons and biological warfare research, or recruiting for corporations which deal in war manufacture which the students view as suspect or undesirable. Usually, the establishment is seen as the University administration. Then as problems closer to the student (e.g., housing, registration, poor teaching, or campus discrimination) arise, the same figures obtain as authority figures.

It would seem that a positive, open approach to the problem of campus disorders would be more effective in the long run than the repressive approach. The solutions for problems should be actively sought by the university community, the Board governing the university, and the state and federal governments. Time must be taken for faculty, students, and administration to participate in open and frank exchange concerning problems as they are viewed by students. The Amherst statement bears witness to the effectiveness of such an approach. (This statement was sent from the President of Amherst to President Nixon on May 2 and subsequently printed in the New Republic.) Such open exchange would help to close the gap between students and institutions, whether it is a gap caused by differing views of desirable student conduct, a gap caused by differing views of social problems, an existential gap caused by a need for philosophical-religious orientation, a gap caused by any other contemporary problem, or by local campus grievances. A repressive approach, which could result in driving the problems inward, thus causing frustration or apathy, or driving students to irresponsible violence, while appearing on the surface the most convenient approach, would ultimately prove to be least desirable.

As to specific problems within the Policy Statement of the Board of Governors, while it should be noted that wilful or malicious damage to university property cannot be tolerated, the question of trespass is seriously open to debate. On Page 2, the statement is made that the state is not constitutionally prohibited from controlling "the use of its own property for lawful, non-discriminatory purposes." The point of many sit-ins and debates is that the students feel that the state itself is discriminating in its use of public property, and the argument stands open. The invocation of Section 21-3 of the criminal code (to be quoted) would seem to hold the possibility of depriving students of the right of assembly (as in the case of an open-air meeting) -- even the possibility of arrest if a faculty member or student is walking through a building after the code has been read (as described on Page 3) or just walking down-stairs from a second story office into such an assembly. It would seem prudent then to consider dropping the use of Section 21-3 and to consider only the use of 21-1 and 21-2 in the case of campus disturbances.

Another serious violation of individual rights lies in the power of seeking injunction. It would seem desirable to delete the entire last sentence from the first paragraph on Page 3. The risk of using the injunctive process in campus situations would appear too great in view of its historical use in

frequent repression of legitimate but unpopular movements.

The purpose of the last paragraph on Page 3 is to indicate that freedom from double jeopardy is not applicable in the case of campus disturbances. In line 6 of the second paragraph, the deletion of "charged or" is desirable. It would preclude the use of criminal charges as an excuse or reason for dismissing activist students or professors.

In any case, the interpretation and use of the statement is most important. The use of the powers contained must be undertaken with great care and caution. The possibility of causing serious damage in a student life or a professional life, because of the expression of concern for issues felt by individuals to be important, places a heavy responsibility on the use of authority and police power. It is our belief that students and faculty alike, while not being allowed to destroy property, must be considered to be responsible, concerned citizens of the university community. The university must find avenues for response to -- not repression of -- the concerns they express.

It was decided to consider the report in sections. In response to the first three paragraphs, or introduction, it was noted that much like the Board's statement they did not deal with specification. However, the emphasis on prevention was approved with the suggestion that these paragraphs be indicated as "Introduction." It was moved (Kluge) and seconded (Lahey) that the first three paragraphs be accepted with the exception of the final sentence in the third paragraph. In its place should appear a sentence recommending the establishment by Faculty Senates and the Council of Faculties of student-faculty action groups to discuss specific methods to solve particular campus problems. The motion passed unanimously. Subsequent motions accepted the questioning of the emphasis on trespass law and suggested instead the consideration of the law prohibiting disturbing the peace as a basis for reacting to disturbances (paragraph 4), of the emphasis on the injunction (paragraph 5), and of the removal of the words "charged or" to eliminate the possibility of double jeopardy (paragraph 6). These motions carried by votes of eight for and one opposed. The sentiment expressed in the final paragraph was accepted by a vote of nine for and one opposed. The sentiment expressed in the final paragraph was accepted by a vote of nine for and one opposed. The general sentiment was that the Board's statement itself, its preparation with minimum consultation with faculty, and the fact that it was mailed to all freshmen entering universities under the Board's control constituted the administering of institutions ostensibly under local control. It was moved (Kluge) and seconded (Spaniol) that the above questions be considered by the Council of Faculties. Finally, it was suggested that the Senate concern itself with the details of the policy on campus disturbances developed at Eastern.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m. The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate is on Wednesday, September 10, from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

CALENDAR

September	University Calendar
October	Welfare
November	Budget
December	-----
January	-----
February	Welfare
March	Committee Nominations
April	Elections
May	Buildings and Grounds

AGENDA

1. Constitution
2. Major and minor committees and councils
3. Recognition of retiring faculty members
4. Campus disorders
5. Library
6. Parking

John H. Keiser
Secretary