The meeting came to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The Journal for May 7, 1969 was approved. Mr. John Risser, recently elected to complete the unexpired term of Mr. David Barrett, was introduced.

The Chairman called a recess to allow Father John Walsh, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Mr. Philip Faccenda, Special Assistant to the President, to address the Senate.

Father Walsh spoke about the work of the Curriculum Revision Committee of which he is chairman. He said that a report was in preparation under the direction of Professor John Meaney, the Executive Secretary of the Committee, and would soon be distributed to the faculty. The report endorses in principle a new type of residential college. It makes specific recommendations in respect to grading, schedules, calendar, counselling, educational media, philosophy and theology requirements, etc. It recommends, for example, that the number of required hours in philosophy and theology be reduced, not to de-emphasize these disciplines but to make them more significant for the student. It also recommends that classes be extended to 75 minute periods
and meet twice a week, that Saturday be a free day, and that the first semester terminate before the Christmas holidays. After his opening remarks, Father Walsh concluded with a brief question-answer period.

Mr. Faccenda spoke about the All-University Forum and said that it is perhaps unique in this country. It consists of three elected representatives and one ex officio member from each of the following bodies: trustees, administration, faculty, students, and alumni. The Forum will be a discussion group and not a legislative body. Hopefully, it will hold an organizational meeting on October 2, 1969 and a public meeting shortly thereafter. It will probably meet once every two months.

The business meeting continued at 9:00 P.M. The Secretary read a letter from Father Hesburgh (cf. Appendix I).

**Standing Committee Reports**

Professor Thomas Swartz, Chairman of the Committee for Student Affairs, reported that the Subcommittee on the Honor Council was still studying the honor concept and was not ready to report.

Professor Charles Allen of the ad hoc fact-finding committee regarding the Pornography Conference said that a report was ready and would appear shortly. Due to a shortage of funds, the circulation of the report would be limited. The Senate could, if it would be willing to bear the expense, have extra copies printed and distributed. The Chairman referred this matter to the discretion of the Executive Committee.
Treasurer's Report

Professor Salvatore Bella, Treasurer of the Senate, presented a report indicating a balance on hand of $2,145.46. He also reported that Father Jerome Wilson, the Vice President for Business Affairs, would discuss the replenishment of this fund at the meeting of the Vice Presidents Council.

Executive Committee

Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, reported that the committee met twice during the summer to discuss routine matters, for example, schedule of meetings and agenda, and new business, such as, the selection of representatives to the All-University Forum.

Professor Daniel Pasto presented the following motion from the Executive Committee:

Senate Representation on Other University Bodies

The Chairman of the Faculty Senate is an ex officio member of the Academic Council, the Student Life Council, and the All-University Forum. The Chairman of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs is an ex officio member of the Student Life Council. The ex officio position on the Academic Council is provided for in the Faculty Manual, those on the Student Life Council by an informal agreement that presumably is to be formalized in some manner; the composition of the All-University Forum has been stated in the President's letter announcing the formation of that body.

We endorse the principle of ex officio Senate representation on these bodies, and potentially, when appropriate, on other University bodies that may come into existence. But we question
whether the automatic designation of a particular officer or officers of the Senate to membership on these bodies provides the most effective representation, either from the viewpoint of the Senate or of the other body concerned. If these duties were spread among more persons, each might be able to devote more time, thought, and energy to the position to be filled. Because of background, interests and talents, other Senators might well be more appropriate for and effective in each of these various positions than would the officer now designated. In view of these considerations, we propose the following motion:

Be it moved that the Faculty Senate hereby expresses itself as endorsing the following principle: Whenever the Faculty Senate is to have ex officio representation on any other University body, the method by which the Senate representative or representatives are to be designated should be determined by the Faculty Senate. In order to put this principle into effect, be it further moved that the Chairman is hereby instructed to direct the appropriate committees to prepare resolutions for the consideration of the Senate, recommending whatever action they determine may be necessary in each given case to effect this end.

The motion was discussed and carried.

Professor Pasto continued with the following motion:

Revision of Subsection (b), Section 3, Article IV, of the Faculty Manual

There are some possible discrepancies between Subsection (b), Section 3, Article IV, of the Faculty Manual (dealing with the Faculty Senate) on the one hand and the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate on the other. These discrepancies relate to the scope of interest and responsibility of the Senate and to the disposition of the recommendations of the Senate. No operative difficulties have arisen to date, but we believe it best that all possibility of conflict between the two documents be eliminated. We therefore propose the following motion:

That the Committee on Faculty Affairs be directed to prepare, for consideration of the Senate, a resolution
recommending such rewording of Subsection (b), Section 3, Article IV of the Faculty Manual as they deem desirable, with the specific - but not necessarily sole - intent of eliminating from that Subsection any phraseology by which the Faculty Manual might conflict, or appear to conflict, with the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate.

The motion was discussed and carried.

New Business

The Chairman opened discussion on election procedures for faculty representation on the All-University Forum. In view of the unfeasibility of polling the entire faculty before the date set for the initial meeting of the Forum, Professor Robert Anthony, seconded by Professor John Oesterle, moved "that the three elected members to the Forum be elected from the present membership of the Faculty Senate for the first year".

Father James Burtchaell, seconded by Professor Donald Sniegowski, offered the following amendment: "For the first meeting, the chairmen of the three standing committees of the Senate be the elected faculty representatives to the University Forum; and that the Committee on University Administration submit to the Senate a proposal for future elections of such representatives". The amendment was defeated.

Professor Thomas Swartz, seconded by Professor Stephen Rogers, moved to amend the main motion as follows: "The three elected members to the University Forum be elected from the faculty at large by the present membership of the Faculty Senate for the first year". The main motion as amended was carried.
Elections

The following faculty members were nominated and elected to serve as faculty representatives to the All-University Forum: 1) Professor Donald Sniegowski, 2) Sister Suzanne Kelly, O.S.B., 3) Professor William D'Antonio.

The Chairman made mention of the following items of agenda for future meetings: 1. Existing practices and possible guidelines for the future regarding employment interviews of students on Campus. 2. Optimal use of the Athletic and Convocation Center by the faculty and their families. 3. The cancellation of the Juggler. 4. The questionable necessity of having a person outside a student's major department chair the examining board in the candidacy and final examination for the Ph. D. 5. Policy regarding undergraduate enrollment. 6. Feasibility of establishing a faculty lounge in each classroom building.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Appendix I

Letter of Father Hesburgh to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, dated June 14, 1969.

Thank you for sending me the Resolutions passed by the Faculty Senate at their meeting on May 7, 1969.

I am sharing I, Proposed Resolution on the Honor Council, with Father Walsh. II, Resolution on Student Publications, I am sharing with Phil Faccenda, my Assistant, and Father McCarragher. I should add that I generally favor this statement, but that the University and many of its personnel are maligned each year for failure to say what the canons of responsible journalism are. We are strong on the statement of freedom, and weak on the effectiveness of responsibility. I am hopeful that something might be done to equalize this balance next year.

III, Additional Resolution on Retirement Policies, I am sharing with Father Wilson who has been working on this matter.

IV, Resolution on R.O.T.C., does not seem to me to require referral at this time since the matter has already been settled by the Academic Council.

Once again, many thanks and all best wishes for a pleasant Summer.
The special meeting called by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate in compliance with Article III of the Bylaws of the Senate and in response to a petition made under these provisions came to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The Journal was approved. The Chairman announced the appointment of Professor Michael Francis to fill in the unexpired term of Father David Burrell and introduced two new representatives from the Institute for Studies in Education, Brother Anthony Ipsaro, S.M. (three year term) and Professor Sheridan McCabe (two year term).

The Senate approved Professor Donald Costello as the new representative to the Notre Dame - St. Mary's College Joint Committee. He will fill the vacancy left by Professor John Williams who resigned.

Copies of the final report of the Student Life Council Committee on the Student Union Academic Commission's Conference on Pornography and Censorship were distributed to the members of the Senate.
New Business

Professor William Eagan, Acting Chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs, presented the following motion on behalf of his Committee:

Resolution on Curriculum Revision

Be it resolved that the Academic Council take no action on the report of the University Curriculum Committee until the Colleges have had an opportunity to review or act upon the final report.

Professor Norman Haaser moved to amend the motion as follows:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the Academic Council take no action...

The motion as amended was discussed and carried unanimously. The Secretary was instructed to send a copy of the resolution to Father John Walsh and Father Ferdinand Brown.

The Chairman acting on a suggestion made by Professor Stephen Rogers said that he would try to obtain copies of the Curriculum Committee's report for the members of the Senate.

Professor Eagan made the following motion on behalf of the Committee on Student Affairs:

Resolution on Senate ex officio representatives to the Student Life Council

Be it resolved that the Senate recommend to the Student Life Council that, beginning with the next Senate election, the two ex officio members of the Senate to the SLC shall be the Vice-Chairman of the Senate and the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Student Affairs.
The motion was discussed and carried unanimously.

Professor Donald Sniegowski presented the following motion on behalf of the Committee on Student Affairs:

**Resolution on Student Publications Policy**

Resolved: That the Policy on Student Publications, as stated in *The Notre Dame Student Manual, 1969-1970*, be amended by inserting the following after the present four points of the policy:

5. The suspension or cancellation of a student publication for budgetary reasons shall be undertaken only after consultation with the tripartite board of directors and the editors and with other interested parties within the University at large.

Rationale: Presently, a student publication can be suspended or cancelled, for budgetary reasons, without consultation with anyone. This amendment would ensure that consultation with appropriate people take place. As a result of this consultation, the decision to suspend or cancel would become public, in some way, and public debate could take place concerning the reasoning behind the decision. Priorities of value could be checked and argued. It should be noted that the final decision to suspend or cancel a publication would still reside with the appropriate administrative body—the office of student affairs or the college or department or whatever administrative body is involved.

This amendment seems necessary when the recent suspension of the literary magazine, the *Juggler*, is recalled. On July 15, with no prior notice, the editor, Michael Patrick O'Connor, was informed by Father McCarragher that the budget for the *Juggler* was "temporarily suspended" and that he should "not make any commitments or spend any money for the 1969-1970 *Juggler*." The letter also stated that Father Hesburgh thought "we should close the *Juggler* next year." In late summer, the editor received a letter from Father Hesburgh in which he said that the Vice Presidents' Council met concerning budgetary difficulties and drew up "a long list of university activities which did not seem indispensable to the life of the University. The *Juggler* happened to be one of them." Early in this school year, the Student Life Council and the English Department, and many interested individuals, urged that the *Juggler* be reinstated. It was reinstated eventually by Father McCarragher.
But it remains that this kind of unilateral action does not allow for public knowledge and argument and therefore does not allow for consideration of possible alternatives which might be offered by those who are closest to and most knowledgeable about the publication. Further, this kind of action is detrimental to the spirit and orderly progress of any publication.

The motion was discussed and carried unanimously. The Secretary was instructed to send copies of the above two resolutions to the Chairman of the Student Life Council.

Standing Committee Report

Professor Donald Kommers, Chairman of the Committee on University Administration, reported that five subcommittees were set up to study the following problems: 1) Placement Bureau policy, 2) Use of the Athletic and Convocation Center by faculty families and its commercialization, 3) Policy in regard to undergraduate enrollment, 4) Campus planning and architecture, and 5) Campus Security.

Professor Haaser, seconded by Professor Kommers, moved to cancel the regularly scheduled November meeting. The motion was carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The following members were absent: Professors Allen, Borkowski, Conway (excused), Corbett (leave of absence), Flanigan (leave of absence), Hayes, Hunt, Jones, Long, Lucey, Montana, Nicgorski (leave of absence), O'Brien (excused), Richardson, Santos, Sereiko, Thornton, Williams, and Winkler.

The Journal was approved. A letter from the Vice President for Business Affairs was read (cf. Appendix I).

Father Burtchaell made a motion to commend the University Administration for its action in raising the minimum retirement income. Professor Eells, seconded by Professor Anthony, moved to commend the SLC Committee for its report on the SUAC Pornography and Censorship Conference. Both motions carried unanimously.

Standing Committee Reports

Professor Haaser, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, presented a report for discussion (cf. Appendix II). Professor Quigley moved that it
be incorporated in the Journal. Professor Oesterle seconded the motion which carried by a 23 - 16 vote.

Professor Tihen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, presented the following report of the Executive Committee:

Roll will be taken at all future meetings of the Senate (probably by asking members to sign an attendance sheet), and a list of members absent will be included in the Journal. When members are absent because they are on leave, out of town, ill, unavoidably committed otherwise, or for similar reasons, this will be noted provided the Chairman or Secretary are made aware of the circumstances.

The Senate will continue (or reinstate) the practice, initiated last year, of having an unofficial representative, a sort of liaison officer, to each Vice President of the University. These representatives will be selected by the appropriate standing committees.

A list will be prepared of the formal recommendations made to date by the Faculty Senate to other bodies or officers of the University, along with a record of the current status or eventual fate of each of these recommendations. This list will be kept current in the future.

Six faculty members will sit with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The Senate will, at its December 16 meeting, nominate and elect (from the entire faculty) the six persons to act in this capacity for the balance of the current year. In the future, three persons will be elected annually for a two-year term. Nominations and elections will be held in the same manner, and at the same time, as is currently the procedure for selecting faculty members of the Student Life Council, and as is anticipated for selection of faculty members of the All-University Forum.

The following faculty members were nominated and elected to serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees: Professors John Fitzgerald, LeClair Bells, Morton Fuchs, James Robinson, Timothy O'Meara, and Arthur Quigley.

Professor Haaser moved that the following resolution be adopted:
Whereas a discrepancy exists between the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Manual regarding the scope of interest and responsibility of the Senate and to the disposition of the recommendations of the Senate, be it resolved that:

Subsection (b), Section 3, Article IV, of the Faculty Manual be revised to read as follows:

Proposed Subsection (b) The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate is an organization composed of regular members of the faculty elected according to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate is conceived as an assembly through which the faculty can exercise a collective and independent voice in the governance of the University. In general, its function is to represent faculty opinion on matters affecting the academic process of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and student life. It shall be the responsibility of the Senate to receive and study proposals that may be initiated by other groups within the University community and that require faculty consideration. It shall be the responsibility of the Senate to initiate proposals in the interest of the University’s development and to evoke and utilize the knowledge and experience of the faculty in whatever way necessary in the formulation of such proposals.

Recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be submitted to the Academic Council or to a University officer or committee whose responsibility is relevant to the concerns of particular recommendations.

The Faculty Senate is composed of representatives elected by the Faculty of each College, the School of Law, the Computing Center, the University Library, and the Special Professional Faculty. Each of these academic divisions elects one representative to the Senate for every ten of its faculty members, except that each division is entitled to elect at least one representative. All members of the faculty are eligible to vote for Senate representatives, and all faculty of the rank of Assistant Professor, or its corresponding rank, or above, are eligible for election.

Members of the Senate are elected for terms of three years and may be re-elected. One-third are elected each year. The Senate elects its own officers and adopts its own rules of procedure.

The motion was discussed and carried unanimously.

Professor Kommers, Chairman of the Committee on University Administration, reported that a committee resolution on the policies of the Placement Bureau
would not be forthcoming until a joint committee of the Student Life Council and the Faculty Senate completed its study of the matter. He then initiated a discussion on the effectiveness of Senate action.

The Chairman called a recess to allow Messrs. David Johnson, and Edward McCartin of the Student Senate to address the Senate. The subsequent discussion touched on such matters as the suspension of 10 students resulting from the Dow Chemical Co. incident of Nov. 18, campus security, and the Black Studies Program.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Appendix I

Letter of Father Jerome Wilson to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, dated December 9, 1969.

I wish to inform you that at a meeting of the University Officers held on October 14, 1969, approval was given for raising the minimum retirement income to $5,500 per year for those faculty members having served twenty-five years or longer and whose benefits would be below this amount. This amount, of course, includes the Social Security benefits to which the retiree is entitled at the time of his retirement. The Council also approved granting two-thirds of this amount to the widow of the faculty member, provided, she was included in his TIAA retirement plans at the time of his retirement. The effective date for the increased amount is July 1, 1970.

I am sure you will advise the faculty senate of this change.
The Subcommittee on Scholarly Activities has considered the question of the extent to which an individual faculty member assigned to teach an undergraduate, required course is free to determine the subject matter content of the course. The related question of the necessity for individual teachers to follow a syllabus in multi-section courses was also considered.

The members of the Subcommittee think that these questions belong with the Committee on Administration of the University as much as they do with us. But the questions do have an important academic aspect, and accordingly we present the following opinion.

It is the duty of a teacher to follow rather closely the prescribed subject matter of a course in his lectures, classroom discussions and assignments. The subject matter of every course should be determined by the Department concerned and spelled-out briefly but accurately in the appropriate college catalogues. Teachers in multi-section courses should follow closely the syllabus approved by the Department and all interested teachers in the Department should have a voice in its formulation and in the choice of textbook used. Allowance must be made for individual style and manner of presentation of the subject matter. On rare occasions urgent issues of interest to the entire University community may take the place of the usual subject matter. Teachers are encouraged to keep abreast of student attitudes especially as they apply to university life, and informal pre-class dialogue may occasionally extend into the classroom time, but should never take up more than a very small fraction of the period. Formal teaching should be restricted to subject matter areas where the teacher has appropriate training and competence.
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The following members were absent: Professors Brinkley, Francis, Grande, Hunt, Jones, Kommers, Liu, Mueller, Richardson, Shapiro, Williams, and Winkler. The following members were excused or on leave of absence: Professor Corbett, Eells, Flanigan, Nicgorski, O'Brien, and Rogers.

The Journal was approved. A letter from Father Hesburgh was read (cf. Appendix I). The Chairman reported that further action on the amendment of the Faculty Manual would not take place until later in the year.

The Chairman announced the appointment of Professor John Koval to the Senate, Professor Josephine Ford to the Student Life Council, and Professor Edward Manier to the chairmanship of the Committee on Administration of the University.

Two graduate students, Mr. Robert Norris and Mr. Thomas Scheer, addressed the Senate during recess on the constitution, purpose, and achievements of the Graduate Student Union.
Professor Thomas Swartz, Chairman of the Committee on Student Affairs, presented the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that Article XIV of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the University of Notre Dame be amended to read:

The Senate shall be in recess whenever assembled to be addressed by one who is not a member. As a courtesy, official representatives from the Graduate Student Union and Student Senate shall be given speaking privileges.

Professor Joseph Brennan presented the following rationale for the resolution:

Since the Faculty Senate has invited the Graduate Student Union and the Student Senate to send representatives regularly to its meetings and to express their views on matters relevant to them, the procedure of formally recessing the Faculty Senate deliberations whenever student representatives wish to speak now threatens to become a cumbersome and embarrassing piece of legal machinery. The present necessity of resorting to this procedure in order to permit student representatives to speak is an unnecessary awkwardness and waste of time; but more importantly, it discourages the disposition to communicate and stifles any spontaneity of exchange. Most importantly of all, however, the present procedure is rather invidious in its implications, especially in view of the fact that the courtesy of speaking privileges has already been extended to faculty representatives at student deliberations.

Professor Edward Manier, seconded by Professor Swartz, moved a favorable consideration of the resolution by the Executive Committee with the following amendment:

"The Senate shall be in recess whenever assembled to be addressed by one who is not a member, except that, as a courtesy, official..."

The motion carried and the resolution was referred to the Executive Committee.
Professor Charles Allen, Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Student Affairs Committee and Student Life Council, presented a number of recommendations on the Placement Bureau. Since the Committee on Administration of the University had prepared a similar report, the two reports were combined. The individual reports and a record of the motions are contained in Appendix II. The report as amended and accepted by the Senate is as follows:

A placement bureau on a university campus, in addition to being a service for some students, is an important expression of the university's view of its relation to society at large. Consequently, the activities of such a placement bureau should always be in accord with the relevant standards and ideals of the university.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Placement Bureau be retained as an activity under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Public Relations and Development. It shall be his responsibility to see that the Placement Bureau is directed in a fashion responsive to the changing needs of the students and to the standards of the University.

2. That the Placement Bureau of the University move immediately and energetically to stimulate more active recruiting on this campus by public and private educational institutions for employment or graduate study, and by organizations directed primarily to the alleviation of social ills and to the improvement of the general quality of life in our society.

3. That the Placement Bureau expand its services relevant to summer employment by attempting to increase the number of prospective employers utilizing the service, particularly those of the sort mentioned in number 2, e.g., VISTA, CIAA.

4. That the University of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College explore the possibility of consolidating their placement activities into a single office, or at least of establishing reciprocity in the use of facilities and services.

5. The University must maintain its position as a forum for the free exchange of ideas. To this end, it must insure that spokesmen from both sides of employment issues can be heard in a reasonable and civilized manner. Therefore, it is recommended that the Placement Bureau seek out opportunities for such exchanges and may allocate funds for this purpose.
a) It is suggested that any firm or agency recruiting at the Placement Bureau may be asked to submit answers to questions formulated by a student-faculty committee, the composition of which is to be determined by the SLC. In the case of forms or agencies which fail, in the opinion of this committee, to provide adequate answers to these questions, funds may be made available for research and publication of information deemed pertinent by the committee.

b) That funds should be provided to study the feasibility of implementing the proposal of Father James Burtchaell which asks the University to assume leadership in taking steps to make available to all placement bureaus detailed social evaluations of various firms (Fr. Burtchaell's proposal to create an independent agency to evaluate the social contributions of firms and organizations is set forth in a memorandum dated January 20, 1970).

The Burtchaell Proposal

University Placement Bureaus have lately been targets of radical agitation on American campuses. Demonstration, obstruction, and vandalism have all been tactics of those struggling to prevent recruitment of students by commercial firms or governmental agencies they accuse of antisocial or immoral activities: manufacture of certain military weapons, industrial pollution of the environment, inadequate wages and working conditions, etc.

These tactics, especially the violent ones, are unwisely chosen. They are ineffective, since corporations and agencies barred from campus interviews do find other ways to contact and hire prospective graduates. Some radicals are satisfied if these negotiations are transferred off campus to nearby hotel rooms, feeling somehow that the university thus avoids being debauched. This is a curious and narrow view, that somehow immorality is not so galling if it is not underfoot. It reminds one of those who feel relieved that sexual promiscuity of students is transferred from the dormitories to those same hotel rooms; in either case there seems to be more concern for the campus than for the students.

Another objection to the siege of placement bureaus is that outrage and violence are often discharged without any adequate attempt to dissuade interviewees from seeking employment in allegedly exploitative firms. In any university or college where critical judgment is prized, those concerned about the placement issue should make it their first obligation to lay the facts of their case before their peers. Before resorting to the same abusive and violent behavior they claim to abhor, they should prove their accusations before those who seek employment. If the consciences of these fellow-students are so impervious to the truth that they will not pay any attention, then there is little hope for any of us.
On the other hand, many of them remain unpersuaded simply because most of the accusations they have heard against corporations have never been substantiated.

The universities have long ignored the problem now raised. They have never made it their business to look into the social policies and moral concern of the commercial and governmental enterprises which employ their graduates. A student going into an interview is provided with information about salary scales and increments, educational opportunities, medical, insurance, and retirement benefits, likelihood of transfers, and so forth. But there are other facts that should -- and increasingly do -- influence his decision: the firm's policy and record of cooperation with totalitarian governments, racially discriminatory employment, artificially planned obsolescence of manufactured goods, exploitation of underdeveloped countries, output of unsafe products, support of educational and municipal improvement, etc.

In recent decades we have seen a sudden contribution to social welfare from religious and federal initiatives. The churches have reminded us that though man does not live by bread alone, bread given in love is not bread alone. The state has given bread to millions. But it is business that makes men breadwinners and breadgivers. Commerce wields an enormous influence upon the quality of human life among our people -- it is the most massive agency of social welfare. All the more important, then, that corporate enterprises have a conscience that seeks more than profit on investment. And all the more important that the young university student seeking employment find out what sort of enterprise he is making common cause with. There are ethical considerations to be faced, and he needs help to do so.

How can the student even begin to inform himself about the conscience of a corporation? The accusations of the local S.D.S. chapter are about as dubious as the public-relations reassurances of the company recruiters. And even if he does his homework in Forbes, the Wall Street Journal, Ramparts, and I. F. Stones's Weekly, he is incapable of properly discounting all the vested interests and prejudices they represent. If the universities consider their placement bureaus as a service to their students, then the service is inadequate until it affords the students sufficient information to enable them to make an ethical appraisal of their prospective employers. Yet there are hundreds of corporations and agencies that recruit nationally; the task far exceeds the resources of any one university.

A scheme might be proposed, then whereby such a service could be provided. The University of Notre Dame might invite representatives of twenty major universities or colleges to confer and to form, through their placement bureaus, a placement foundation. Each year the foundation would invite all corporations who recruit personnel nationally to submit an account of their contributions to the public welfare. These statements would obviously be more thoroughly
researched than on-the-spot explanations of recruiters on the road. The foundation would simultaneously contract with a firm of consultants to submit evaluations of the social constructiveness of these same firms. The newly formed Council on Economic Priorities would seem eminently capable of performing such a service. These statements would be expected to present all pertinent data, especially whatever might be critical. Each year certain firms and agencies could be singled out for particularly close scrutiny. After the corporations and the evaluating Council would have submitted their respective statements, each would be allowed to append comments or rebuttal on the other's. The entire group of documents could then be gathered into a single volume -- let us call it The Green Book -- containing four statements about each firm: an internal statement on its social contributions, an externally researched critique, and an exchange of comment. The Green Book would finally be made available to every placement bureau in universities and colleges in the country. It would be re-edited annually.

Financing might be easily handled. Let us suppose 500 firms to be involved. Let us further suppose that the fee for services by the Council on Economic Priorities amounted to $75,000 per annum. If the subscription price for placement bureaus were set, say, at $100 (plus printing costs for supplementary copies), surely at least 750 of the more than 2,000 institutions of higher learning would consider it well worthwhile to subscribe to The Green Book, and to draw it to the attention of all students anticipating employment by the concerns involved.

Some individual schools would probably want to supplement The Green Book by research conducted locally by teams of faculty and students. They would be able to learn their methodology from the national operation, while the local findings could in turn be supplied to the Council on Economic Priorities to improve its report.

The ethical problems presented by recruitment of college students cannot be solved by reckless accusations or by violence. Ironically it is at the universities, which possess such informational resources, that there has been no methodical effort to bring to students the data they need to make conscientious decisions. Perhaps The Green Book would be a proper step to take.

6. That the Placement Bureau provide facilities where students interested in using the Bureau can meet with other members of the University interested in providing information concerning the corporate activities of employers using the Bureau.

7. In so far as much dissatisfaction with the Placement Bureau stems from misinformation, if not a complete lack of information, the committee recommends that the Vice President for Public Relations and Development, after weighing the recommendations in this report, direct the Placement Bureau to prepare a printed brochure summarizing its services, procedures and policies, for periodic distribution to all members of the University, including alumni.
8. It is recommended that it become a policy that the Director of the Placement Bureau shall invite all organizations interested in utilizing its facilities to send a representative to participate in open discussion with members of the University. The Director shall provide the members of the University community (particularly the Student Body President, the Graduate Student Union President and the Chairman of the Student Life Council) with a list of those organizations agreeing to participate. If a significant number of the community indicates a desire to attend, the Director shall make the necessary arrangements. In addition, upon request of 100 or more members of the University community, the Director of the Placement Bureau shall issue a special invitation to participate in such an open forum to the particular organization requested. The acceptance of such an invitation would in no wise be required for use of Placement Bureau facilities.

9. That the services of the Placement Bureau be available to all legitimate employers. Complaints against an organization or corporation which refuses, as a matter of settled policy and under all circumstances, to publicly disclose and discuss information concerning the place of its activities in American and international society may be placed before any of the following representative bodies: Student Life Council, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Graduate Student Union. If any one of the four acts affirmatively on the complaint, the Director of the Placement Bureau will inform that employer that a record of that action and the reasons for it will be transmitted to all students requesting interviews with that employer.

10. That the administrative officers of the Placement Bureau, after weighing these recommendations, prepare a report concerning the implementation of the recommendations and submit it to the Faculty Senate before August 1, 1970.

Professor Joseph Brennan seconded by Professor Thomas Swartz made the following motion:

Resolution Concerning Placement Bureau

It is recommended that the University Placement Bureau provide the forms and the facilities whereby graduating seniors may solicit and have placed on file a dossier of letters of recommendation and similar academic credentials which may be sent to graduate schools or prospective employers as the need may subsequently arise. For it frequently happens that students who go immediately into the service or some temporary employment after graduation find, when applying some years later for graduate school admission, fellowships or other occupation, that they need letters of recommendation from
their undergraduate professors; by such time, however, some faculty members may no longer be available and most of those who are will have only an uncertain recall of the student in his particular strengths and weaknesses.

The resolution carried.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Appendix I

Letter of Father Theodore Hesburgh to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate dated January 8, 1970.

Many thanks for sending me the Resolution on amending the Faculty Manual regarding the Faculty Senate. I'll bring this to the attention of the Academic Council.
Appendix II


1. While indeed the Placement Bureau is by no means endemic to the University, as university, it is not difficult to point to a number of other student services and activities which are not really essential and which, nevertheless, are directly or indirectly funded by the University. Each may be of use to only a fraction of the total student body (Sacred Heart Church and the Athletic and Convocation Center, for example). In the case of the Placement Bureau, about a third of all students use the facility.

It is impossible to judge what beneficial indirect effects accrue from the existence of the Placement Bureau, in terms of relationships - personal, professional and financial - among students, industrial and governmental officials, faculty and administration. The committee feels that abolition of the placement service at this time is unjustifiable and would be precipitous. Accordingly, the committee recommends the retention of the Placement Bureau as an activity under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Public Relations and Development, whose responsibility it should be to see that the Placement Bureau is directed in a fashion which is responsive to the changing needs of the students.

2. In view of the demand for good teachers by educational institutions throughout the nation, the importance of which is sharpened by the present economic climate, the committee recommends that the administration of the University stimulate without delay and to the greatest extent possible active recruiting on this campus by educational institutions and increase its facilities to provide information on placement of graduate students. The committee feels the present service conducted by the Placement Bureau at least gives the impression of a passive attitude. Visible attempts to improve the Educational Placement Service should be made.

3. The University must maintain its position as a forum for the free exchange of ideas. To this end, it must insure that spokesmen from both sides of employment issues can be heard in a reasonable and civilized manner. Therefore, it is recommended that the Placement Bureau seek out opportunities for such exchanges and allocate funds for this purpose.

As an example, funds could be provided to finance the implementation of the proposal of Father James Burtchaell which asks the University to assume leadership in taking steps to make available to all placement bureaus detailed social evaluations of various firms (Fr. Burtchaell's proposal to create an independent agency to evaluate the social contributions of firms and organizations is set forth in a memorandum dated January 20, 1970).
4. In regard to interviews commencing with those in the present spring semester, the committee recommends that interested members of this University (and only of this University) be allowed and indeed encouraged to man an area in the rotunda section of the Administration Building, preferably a room near the Placement Bureau office, in which area interviewing students and others could freely be presented on a person to person basis with information regarding the practices and policies of particular industrial and governmental organizations. It should be the responsibility of the Vice President for Public Relations and Development to provide the necessary facilities. The committee feels that such a group could serve a worthwhile educational function for everyone concerned which would in no way interfere with the normal activities of the Placement Bureau.

5. The committee recommends that the Director of the Placement Bureau encourage federal, state and local governmental agencies, graduate school recruiters, voluntary organizations, and other socially-oriented agencies and organizations to conduct interviews at Notre Dame. The Placement Bureau should also solicit, and provide in the Annex, information on such agencies which are unable to send recruiters to the campus. Few such opportunities presently are available here so that a gap exists in the present placement program. This is particularly true for graduates of the College of Arts and Letters to whom mainly sales or similar training programs constitute the presently available options.

6. A significant program of assistance to students in locating summer employment is presently conducted by the Placement Bureau. The committee recommends that a consolidation of summer employment opportunities of social service organizations, such as VISTA, CILA and other similar organizations, into the normal placement operation would represent a service to such organizations and to the students involved and would align the Placement Bureau much more closely with activities of growing concern to students and faculty. In addition, the committee recommends that a large number of companies be surveyed each October, not just whose which use the Placement Bureau, regarding the availability of summer employment programs. The Director of the Placement Bureau should work with the campus geographical clubs, in addition to normal channels, to assure widespread dissemination of this information.

7. At this time when the University is exploring its coeducational identity, it seems particularly appropriate that the committee recommend an immediate reciprocal open policy for the placement offices of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's. Thus it would be possible for students of either school to avail themselves of the services of the other's placement facility. Interviewing organizations should be alerted to this fact. Furthermore, the committee recommends that the University of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College explore the possibility of consolidating their placement activities into a single office.

8. In so far as much dissatisfaction with the Placement Bureau stems from misinformation, if not a complete lack of information, the committee recommends that the Vice President for Public Relations and Development,
after weighing the recommendations in this report, direct the Placement Bureau to prepare a printed brochure summarizing its services, procedures and policies, for periodic distribution to all members of the University, including alumni.

9. Given the University as a community in which open discussion is a hallmark, then where even the possibility of discussion is non-existent, the University should not involve itself. Because it is the stated policy of certain organizations and agencies, such as the Central Intelligence Agency, not to engage in discussion in any kind of forum, even for the sake of defending their actions and operations, these agencies should not be allowed to use campus interview facilities.

10. It is recommended that it become a policy that the Director of the Placement Bureau shall invite all organizations interested in utilizing its facilities to send a representative to participate in open discussion with members of the University. The Director shall provide the members of the University community (particularly the Student Body President, the Graduate Student Union President and the Chairman of the Student Life Council) with a list of those organizations agreeing to participate. If a significant number of the community indicates a desire to attend, the Director shall make the necessary arrangements. In addition, upon request of 100 or more members of the University community, the Director of the Placement Bureau shall issue a special invitation to participate in such an open forum to the particular organization requested. The acceptance of such an invitation would in no wise be required for use of Placement Bureau facilities.

February 16, 1970

The Faculty Senate Committee on the Administration of the University passed the following resolutions concerning the Placement Bureau:

A placement bureau on a university campus, in addition to being a service for some students, is an important expression of the university's view of its relation to society at large. Consequently, the activities of such a placement bureau should always be in accord with the relevant standards and ideals of the university.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Placement Bureau be retained as an activity under the jurisdiction of the Vice President for Public Relations and Development. It shall be his responsibility to see that the Placement Bureau is directed in a fashion responsive to the changing needs of the students and to the standards of the University.
2. That the Placement Bureau of the University move immediately and energetically to stimulate more active recruiting on this campus by public and private educational institutions for employment or graduate study, and by organizations directed primarily to the alleviation of social ills and to the improvement of the general quality of life in our society. (Combines 2 and 5 of SAC report.)

3. That the Placement Bureau expand its services relevant to summer employment by attempting to increase the number of prospective employers utilizing the service, particularly those of the sort mentioned in # 2, e.g., VISTA, CIIA. (Instead of SAC report, 6.)

4. That the University of Notre Dame and Saint Mary's College explore the possibility of consolidating their placement activities into a single office, or at least of establishing reciprocity in the use of facilities and services. (Replaces SLC report, 7.)

5. That any firm or agency recruiting at the Placement Bureau may be asked to submit answers to questions formulated by a student-faculty committee, the composition of which is to be determined by the SLC. In the case of firms or agencies which fail, in the opinion of this committee, to provide adequate answers to these questions, funds should be made available for research and publication of information deemed pertinent by the committee. (Replaces SAC, 3.)

6. That the Placement Bureau provide facilities where students interested in using the Bureau can meet with other members of the University interested in providing information concerning the corporate activities of employers using the Bureau. (Replaces SAC report, 4.)

7. That the Placement Bureau indicate to employers using its services that they are welcome to send spokesmen to the campus to discuss their corporate activities. (Replaces SAC, 10 in part.)

8. That the services of the Placement Bureau be available to all legitimate employers. However, an organization or corporation which refuses, as a matter of settled policy and under all circumstances, to publicly disclose and discuss information concerning the place of its activities in American and international society places itself at odds with the University's spirit of free and open inquiry. Such a complaint concerning any employer may be placed before any of the following representative bodies: Student Life Council, Faculty Senate, Student Senate. If any one of the three acts affirmatively on the complaint, the director of the Placement Bureau will inform that employer that a record of that action and the reasons for it will be transmitted to all students requesting interviews with that employer. (See SAC 9 and 10.)
9. That the administrative officers of the Placement Bureau, after weighing these recommendations, prepare a report concerning the implementation of the recommendations and submit it to the Faculty Senate before August 1, 1970. (See SAC 8.)

RECORD OF MOTIONS AND VOTING IN THE DISCUSSION ON THE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS (SAC) AND THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY (AUC)

Allen: Adoption of 1 SAC.  
Manier: Substitute 1 of AUC.  
MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of 2 & 5 of SAC.  
Manier: Substitute 2 of AUC for 2 & 5 of SAC.  
MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

Haaser-McLane: Refer reports to an ad hoc committee for coordination.  
DEFEATED.

Allen: Adoption of 3 of SAC.  
Montana-Haaser: Delete example. AMENDMENT CARRIED.  
Manier: Substitute 5 of AUC for 3 of SAC. AMENDMENT DEFEATED (28-14).  
Borkowski: Append 5 of AUC to 3 of SAC as subdivision 1. AMENDMENT CARRIED.  
Append the Burtchaell Proposal as subdivision 2. AMENDMENT CARRIED.  
MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of AUC 6 for SAC 4.  
Bella-Eagan: Reword "can meet" to read "may meet if they wish". AMENDMENT DEFEATED.  
MOTION CARRIED.

Allen: Substitute AUC 3 for SAC 6. CARRIED.

Allen: Substitute AUC 4 for SAC 7. CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of SAC 8. CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of AUC 9. CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of SAC 10. CARRIED.

Allen: Adoption of SAC 9. DEFEATED.
Manier: Adoption of AUC 8.
Stoll-Bella: Reword "disclose and discuss" to read "disclose or discuss".
AMENDMENT DEFEATED.
Montana: Reword "However, and organization..." to read "Complaints against an organization..."
Delete "...places itself at odds with the University's spirit of free and open inquiry. Such a complaint concerning any employer..."
Reword "...Student Senate. If any of the three..." to read "Student Senate, Graduate Student Union. If any of the four...
AMENDMENT CARRIED
MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED.

Quigley-Manier: Adoption of the entire report with an introduction from the AUC report.
CARRIED.
The meeting came to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The following members were absent: Professors Brinkley, Burtchaell, De Celles, Ford, Francis, Grande, Hunt, Ipsaro, Kommers, Liu, Montana, Richardson, Santos, Shapiro, Taliaferro, and Williams. The following members were excused or on leave of absence: Professors Corbett, Echelberger, Flanigan, Lawrence, McCabe, Nicgorski, and Winkler.

The Journal was approved. The Chairman announced the appointment of Professor George Hennion as alternate representative to the Student-Faculty Board of Traffic Appeals. He also instructed the Senate concerning nominations for faculty-wide elections (cf. Appendix I).

Standing Committee Reports

Professor Edward Manier, Chairman of the Committee on Administration of the University, reported on his Committee’s attempt to secure better use of the Athletic and Convocation Center and other University recreational facilities for faculty families.
Professor Norman Haaser, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, strongly urged support of legislation granting a federal charter to the College Benefit System of America, a nonprofit organization which is to replace the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America and College Retirement Equities Fund. To this end, his Committee wired the appropriate Congressmen to recommend favorable action (cf. Appendix II), and it proposed the following resolution:

"Resolved: that the Faculty Senate go on record in favor of HR9010 and that the Chairman of the Senate communicate with the appropriate persons to this effect."

The motion carried.

Professor Daniel Pasto, Vice-Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presented the following report from the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee moves that the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by the deletion of the present Article XIV and the substitution of the following:

XIV. The Senate shall be in recess whenever assembled to be addressed by a person who is not a member of the Senate. The Senate will welcome two official representatives each from the Graduate Student Union and the Student Government who will be accorded speaking privileges on the floor of the Senate while it is in formal session.

The motion carried by a 33-2 vote.

Professor Robert Anthony, Chairman of the Subcommittee on University Security, proposed the following motion:

It is the sense of the Faculty Senate that there should be an annual fee for campus parking permits for members of the teaching and research faculty, for professional staff members,
for members of the administration, and for all appropriate high-level personnel. It is suggested that this fee should be $10 per year. This fee should not be assessed for secretaries or for personnel employed on an hourly-rate basis. Funds obtained from the recommended assessment should be employed to augment the funds currently allotted for campus security and should not go into the general fund of the University.

The motion was discussed and defeated by a 32-5 vote.

Professor Edward Manier proposed the following motion on behalf of the Committee on the Administration of the University:

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a permanent University Architectural Planning Committee to advise the Administration on:

1. Priorities and planning for future buildings
2. Selection of architects
3. Supervision of construction, reconstruction and furnishing of buildings
4. Planning and utilization of grounds
5. Cooperation with the city and county regarding community development in adjacent neighborhoods

This Committee should include some faculty members who have professional competence in these matters.

The motion carried by a 35-2 vote.

**New Business**

Professor Edward Manier, seconded by Professor Norman Haaser, made a motion that the Chairman of the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee 1) to ascertain the most feasible program for gaining and implementing faculty participation in short and long range budgetary planning of the University, and 2) to report that program for action by the Senate.

The motion was discussed and carried by a 31-4 vote.
The meeting adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES ON VARIOUS BODIES

At the April meeting of the Faculty Senate, nominations will be made for persons to be elected by the faculty as a whole as faculty representatives on various bodies of the University. Senators are urged to consult with their constituency concerning appropriate persons to serve in these positions and to come to the April meeting prepared to present their nominations. In each case, there should probably be at least twice as many nominees as there are persons to be elected. Before making a nomination, you should have obtained from the person involved an expression of his willingness to be nominated and to serve if elected.

The positions concerned are:

1) Three faculty representatives to the Student Life Council to serve a two-year term beginning 1 June 1970, plus one to serve a one-year term. The person elected for one year will be completing the term of Prof. Charles Allen, who is resigning as of the end of the current school year. Incumbents whose terms are expiring are: Prof. James Burtchaell, Prof. William Bogan (completing the term to which Prof. Norling was originally elected), and Prof. James Massey. (Incumbents whose term runs another year are: Prof. Josephine Ford [completing the term to which Prof. Kommers was originally elected] and Prof. John Houck.)

2) Three persons to serve a one-year term on the University Forum. Presumably this term will begin 1 June 1970. However, no formal expiration date has been set; if it seems more appropriate, this term could begin 1 September. All three representatives will be elected annually with no terms carrying over. The three incumbents are: Prof. William D'Antonio, Prof. Suzanne Kelly, and Prof. Donald Sniegowski.

3) Six faculty members to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Again no formal statement has been made, but the terms would presumably begin as of 1 June 1970. The three persons receiving the greatest number of votes will serve a two-year term, the next three will serve a one-year term, and three will be elected annually for a two-year term hereafter. The incumbents selected by the Faculty Senate to serve on a temporary basis until faculty-wide elections could be held, are: Prof. LeClair Eells, Prof. John Fitzgerald, Prof. Morton Fuchs, Prof. Timothy O'Meara, Prof. Arthur Quigley, and Prof. James Robinson.

In none of these cases is there any prohibition against a person being re-elected if he is willing to continue in the position.
Appendix II

(1) The following night letter was sent on Monday evening March 16, 1970:

Honorable Andrew Jacobs
House Judiciary Committee
House Office Building
Washington, D. C.

In reference to H.R.9010 the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University of Notre Dame Faculty Senate, on behalf of the approximately 700 faculty members of the University of Notre Dame, strongly urges that a federal charter be granted to the College Benefit System of America.

Norman B. Haaser, Chairman
Faculty Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate
University of Notre Dame

(2) The same night letter was sent on March 16, 1970 to:

Honorable David W. Dennis
House Judiciary Committee
House Office Building
Washington, D. C.

(3) The following night letter was sent on March 16, 1970:

Honorable John Brademas
2134 Rayburn Building
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the University of Notre Dame Faculty Senate, on behalf of the approximately 700 faculty members of the University of Notre Dame, strongly urges passage of H.R.9010 to grant a federal charter to the College Benefit System of America. We understand that H.R. 9010 is scheduled for hearings starting March 17, 1970 before the House Judiciary Committee. Your support will be greatly appreciated.

Norman B. Haaser, Chairman
Faculty Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate
University of Notre Dame
The meeting came to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The Journal was approved. The Chairman acknowledged receipt of communications from Father Hesburgh, Senator Vance Hartke, and Congressman John Brademas.

Announcements by the Chairman included: 1) the resignation from the Faculty Senate of Professors Daniel Pasto and Samuel Shapiro; 2) the appointment of Professors Borkowski, Haaser (Chairman), Hennion, Henry, Lucey, Manier, and Oesterle to an ad hoc committee for ascertaining the most feasible program for gaining and implementing faculty participation in short and long range budgetary planning of the University.

Treasurer's Report

Professor Salvatore Bella, Treasurer of the Senate, reported: 1) a balance on hand of $1,642.49; 2) an average annual expenditure of $1,678.75; 3) a proposed budget for 1970-1971 of $1,715.00.
Standing Committee Reports

Professor Paul McLane, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Faculty Insurance, reported that a voluntary supplementary life insurance program for the faculty which is called VIP (Voluntary Individual Purchase) was under consideration by his subcommittee and would be reported on with appropriate recommendations at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate.

Professor LeClair Eells, Acting Chairman of the six-member faculty group to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, reported that the first meeting was scheduled for April 30.

New Business

The Senate nominated faculty representatives to the following bodies: Student Life Council, University Forum, six-member faculty group to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.

Secretary to the Faculty Senate
The special meeting of the Faculty Senate came to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Senate, presided.

The general purpose of the meeting, as explained by the Chairman, was to determine what response the Faculty Senate as a group should make in view of the current crisis on campus. Suggestions for effective and beneficial participation of the faculty in the student protest were offered by Professor James Massey, Professor William Storey, and Mr. Charles Ryan. Considerable discussion followed regarding the propriety of the Faculty Senate taking a stand on matters which might be construed as having political overtones.

To allow more informal debate, the Chairman formed a committee of the whole.

The following formal actions were taken by the Faculty Senate:

1. Professor Thomas Swartz moved that the Chairman of the Faculty Senate call a general meeting of the faculty on Wednesday, May 6, at 1:00 P.M. for the purpose of drafting a formal position of the University faculty on the current crisis facing the University.

The motion carried by a 23-14 vote.
2. Professor Arthur Quigley moved that the Senate go on record as stating that all faculty be urged to set aside "business as usual" on May 6 and 7 and participate in hall discussions and other activities with other members of the University community.

The motion carried by a 30-3 vote.

3. Professor Edward Manier moved that the Faculty Senate favorably recommend that the faculty as a whole endorse the six points of the Declaration of Father Hesburgh's address of May 4, 1970.

The motion carried on a roll call vote by 22-15. There were 3 abstentions.

4. Professor John Williams moved that classes at Notre Dame be suspended pending removal of the ROTC Program from this campus.

The motion was referred to the Committee on Administration of the University.

The Chairman appointed Professors Manier, McGlinn, McLane and Swartz to serve on an organizational committee for the faculty meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.

Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
May 6, 1970 - Washington Hall

The special meeting of the faculty, convoked by the Faculty Senate in accordance with Article IV, Section 3, Subsection (b) of the Faculty Manual, came to order at 1:00 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen presided.

Professor Edward Goerner of the Department of Government and International Studies moved the adoption of the following resolution:

Faculty Resolution of May 6, 1970

The faculty of the University of Notre Dame, conscious of the need for both order and effective action in this extraordinary moment in our history, and having met in extraordinary session, hereby publicly expresses its support for the Declaration made by the President of the University on May 4, 1970 concerning the war in Vietnam and the invasion of Cambodia, and it asks the President of the University, in concert with representatives of other universities if possible, to go to Washington in order to present the Declaration to the appropriate officers of the Congress and to urge the Congress to undertake, in pursuance of its constitutional responsibilities, a comprehensive and fundamental debate on the war to be concluded by a vote on such measures as may be necessary to achieve the aims of the Declaration.
The following speakers spoke in support of the resolution: Professors William Liu (Sociology), John Houck (Management), William Storey (Theology).

The following speakers spoke against the resolution: Professors Gerhart Niemeyer (Government), Bernard Norling (History), Alfons Beitzinger (Government).

Discussion was opened to the floor. The following speakers spoke in favor of the resolution: Professors Donald Kommers (Government), Raymond Fleming (Languages), Neil McCluskey (Education), Hansjurgen Verweyen (Theology), Vincent Lannie (Education), Ernest Bartell (Economics).

The following speakers opposed the resolution: Professors James Kohn (Chemical Engineering), M. M. Staples (Naval Science), Robert Waddick (Assistant Dean, Arts and Letters), Michael Delich (Mechanical Engineering), William Eagan (Management), Richard Lamanna (Sociology).

The resolution carried by a vote of 217 - 134. There were 6 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Acting Secretary
May 6, 1970 - Washington Hall

The special meeting of the faculty, convoked by the Faculty Senate in accordance with Article IV, Section 3, Subsection (b) of the Faculty Manual, came to order at 1:00 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen presided.

Professor Edward Goerner of the Department of Government and International Studies moved the adoption of the following resolution:

**Student Life Council Resolution of May 4**

We call upon the student body through its officers, the officers of the administration, and the faculty to plan and set aside Wednesday and Thursday, May 6 and 7, as days for speeches, teach-ins, and liturgical ceremonies to express the deep feelings and reservations about our government's recent actions in Indo-China. We hope that these days will embody the spirit of the declaration written by Father Hesburgh and endorsed by the Student Life Council. The Student Life Council hereby designates Mr. Krashna, Mr. Winings, Professor Houck, and Mr. Faccenda as an ad hoc committee to use their best efforts to see that this resolution is implemented.

The following speakers spoke in support of the resolution: Professors William Liu (Sociology), John Houck (Management), William Storey (Theology).
The following speakers spoke against the resolution: Professors Gerhart Niemeyer (Government), Bernard Norling (History), Alfons Beitzinger (Government).

Discussion was opened to the floor. The following speakers spoke in favor of the resolution: Professors Donald Kommers (Government), Raymond Fleming (Languages), Neil McCluskey (Education), Hansjurgen Verweyen (Theology), Vincent Lannie (Education), Ernest Bartell (Economics).

The following speakers opposed the resolution: Professors James Kohn (Chemical Engineering), M. M. Staples (Naval Science), Robert Waddick (Assistant Dean, Arts and Letters), Michael Delich (Mechanical Engineering), William Eagan (Management), Richard Lamanna (Sociology).

The resolution carried by a vote of 217 - 134. There were 6 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Acting Secretary
May 13, 1970 - Room 202 - Center for Continuing Education

The Senate was called to order at 7:30 P.M. Professor Joseph Tihen, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, presided. The Journals of April 14 and May 5 were approved.

The Chairman summarized communications from Professor James Massey, Chairman of the Student Life Council, regarding the establishment of a "University Ombudsman Service", from Professor Joseph Hogan, Dean of the College of Engineering, concerning the implementation of the faculty leave-of-absence policy, and from Professor James Robinson, Chairman of the Department of English, regarding faculty participation in budgetary considerations. The Secretary read a letter from Mr. James Frick, Vice President for Public Relations and Development (cf. Appendix I).

Standing Committee Reports

Professor Paul McLane, Chairman of an ad hoc subcommittee for evaluating supplementary insurance plans for the faculty, reported favorably on the concept of such voluntary insurance. Specific mention of any insurance firm was withheld pending further investigation of the various plans. The report
was accepted on a motion by Professor Norman Haaser, seconded by Professor Robert Goodfellow.

Professor LeClair Eells presented a brief report on the faculty-trustee meeting of April 30 and suggested that future meetings be limited to considerations of general policy matters.

Professor Norman Haaser, Chairman of the Committee on Faculty Affairs, raised the question of education for the children of disabled, retired, and deceased faculty members. Discussion revealed that while no general provision is made for this type of assistance it is at present being given on an ad hoc basis.

Professor Bernard Wostmann, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Architectural Planning, spoke about the current situation concerning the disposition of the old field house.

Professor Edward Manier, Chairman of the Committee on Administration of the University, reported that further consideration regarding the implementation of the May 7, 1969 resolution of the Faculty Senate concerning the ROTC was pending before his committee.

**Election of Officers**

The following officers were elected by the Senate:

- Professor John Oesterle - Chairman
- Professor Eugene Henry - Vice Chairman
- Professor Salvatore Bella - Treasurer
- Reverend Leonard Banas, C.S.C. - Secretary
Professor Thomas Swartz, seconded by Professor Norman Haaser, moved that the Faculty Senate express its appreciation to the President and the Academic Council for their intelligent and sensitive handling of the events and issues of May 4 to May 11. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
(Rev.) Leonard N. Banas, C.S.C.
Secretary to the Faculty Senate
Letter of Mr. James W. Frick to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate dated April 27, 1970.

I am writing with reference to the "Resolution Concerning Placement Bureau" offered by Professor Joseph Brennan, seconded by Professor Thomas Swartz and carried by the Faculty Senate at its meeting of February 17, 1970. Its text appears on page 7 of the Journal recording the proceedings of that date.

As you know, the academic credentials of a Notre Dame graduate are filed permanently in the Academic Affairs office. A transcript of credits and grades may be forwarded, at his request, at any time to a graduate school or prospective employer.

Regarding letters of recommendation, I personally feel that it is the responsibility of the individual not only to obtain them from his undergraduate professors, but also to retain and safeguard them for possible future use in years to come. It will not be possible for the Placement Bureau to set up files for this purpose, as the resolution proposes.

However, the Notre Dame Alumni Association establishes a file for every alumnus with whom it has correspondence or about whom it receives information. In deference to the Faculty Senate resolution, we would be happy to safeguard the letters of recommendation of an alumnus in his Alumni Association file. In this way the purpose of the resolution would be accomplished substantially without creating a whole new system of files in the Placement Bureau.

I trust that this counter-proposal will be acceptable to the Faculty Senate and those who sponsored the original resolution.