

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

SUMMARY OF AGENDA

DECEMBER 5, 1994

- I. **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**
- II. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:** November 7, 1994
- III. **REMARKS BY UNIVERSITY PROVOST SCHIAVELLI**
- IV. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Senate President McLaughlin  
**ANNOUNCEMENT FOR CHALLENGE**  
Revision of the B.A. in Women's Studies
- V. **OLD BUSINESS - None**
- VI. **NEW BUSINESS**
  - A. Recommendation from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events
  - B. Recommendation regarding a policy statement on Freedom of Inquiry and Expression
  - C. Introduction of new business





# University of Delaware

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
219 MCDOWELL HALL  
NEWARK, DELAWARE 19716

(302) 451-2921  
(302) 451-2922

November 21, 1994

TO: All Faculty Members

FROM: Thomas S. Angell, Vice President  
University Faculty Senate

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "T. Angell", written over the printed name.

SUBJECT: Regular Faculty Senate Meeting, December 5, 1994

In accordance with Section IV, paragraph 6 of the Constitution, the regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on Monday, December 5, 1994 at 4:00 p.m. in room 110 Memorial Hall. The agenda will be as follows:

## AGENDA

- I. Adoption of the Agenda.
- II. Approval of the minutes of the Senate meeting of November 7, 1994.
- III. Remarks by University Provost Schiavelli.
- IV. Announcements: Senate President McLaughlin  
Announcement for Challenge  
Revision of the B.A. in Women's Studies (Attachment 1)
- V. Old Business - None
- VI. New Business
  - A. Recommendation from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events. (The Ad Hoc Committee's final report is Attachment 2.)

WHEREAS, the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events has filed its final report with the Executive Committee, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee has received and discussed that report, and

WHEREAS, an open hearing on the contents of the report was held on October 5, 1994, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events is hereby discharged with the thanks of the Faculty Senate.

B. Recommendation from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the adoption of a Statement on Freedom of Inquiry and Expression.

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has discussed the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events, and the comments made at the Open Hearing on October 5, 1994, and

WHEREAS, the Statement on Freedom of Inquiry and Expression as stated in the Official Student Handbook, pages 25-26, addresses the problems raised in those forums, be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the following modified version of the Statement on Freedom of Inquiry and Expression be adopted by the Faculty Senate for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook, after paragraph 2 of Section II.II, page II-3:

Members of the University Community are free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly and privately in a responsible way. They are free to support causes by orderly means including any means of peaceful assembly or advocacy which do not infringe upon the rights or freedoms of others.

Members of the University Community are allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. Guest appearances must not interfere with the University's regular instructional, research, and service programs. Except for ceremonial occasions, invited speakers should be prepared for a reasonable public discussion of their expressed views.

Invited speakers are accorded the full courtesy and protection appropriate to a University community. Individuals or groups who engage in actions designed to obstruct or in any way to prevent the speaker from speaking are subject to discipline and to financial responsibility in the event of damage to property or person.

The institutional control of campus facilities is not to be used as a device of censorship. Sponsorship of guest speakers does not imply approval or endorsement of the views expressed, either by the sponsoring unit or the University.

- C. Such items as may come before the Senate. (No motion introduced under new business, except a motion to refer to committee, shall be acted upon until the next meeting of the Senate.)

TA/rg

Attachments: Committee Activities Reports

1. Revision of the B.S in Women's Studies
2. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Freedom of Inquiry in Public Events

# COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES REPORT

## ACADEMIC APPEALS, COMMITTEE ON (Palaniappa Krishnan)

The committee is in the process of hearing an academic appeal at the Step 4 level.

## ACADEMIC PRIORITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE (Kenneth Lomax)

Nothing to report at this time.

## DIVERSITY AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, COMMITTEE ON (Hilton Brown)

Ongoing discussions of the charge and work of this Committee with respect to the 1990 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Affirmative Action Plan. This Committee is in the process of rewriting our charge and name.

## EDUCATION, COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON (Harrison Hall)

1. New degree program: Bachelor of Environmental Engineering
2. Merger of Animal Science and Food Science Departments

## INSTRUCTIONAL, COMPUTING, AND RESEARCH SUPPORT SERVICES, COMMITTEE ON (Alexander Cheng)

1. Discussing University computer system security
2. Discussing Bookstore renovation

## LIBRARY COMMITTEE (Antony Beris)

Discussion of proposal to extend from one to two months the graduate students' borrowing privileges.

## RESEARCH, COMMITTEE ON (Charles Robinson)

Nothing to report. We will try to have our first meeting in December.

## STUDENT LIFE, COMMITTEE ON (Bonnie Kime Scott)

1. Discussing verification of Excused Absence Due to Illness
2. Discussing Dean of Students' Office probation
3. Conducting V. P. for Student Life Search

## UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES, COMMITTEE ON (Rivers Singleton)

Discussing permanent approval of Major in Apparel Design



WOMEN'S STUDIES  
INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM

333 Smith Hall  
University of Delaware  
Newark, Delaware 19716-2506  
Ph: 302/831-8474

February 4, 1992

TO: Barbara Viera, Chair  
Undergraduate Studies Committee  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Jessica Schiffman, Program Coordinator (cc)  
Women's Studies

SUBJECT: Adjustments to Major Requirements

I have spoken with the Arts and Science office and they me inform me that you should be made aware of the following changes:

1. "Women and Violence" (WOMS 240) has been added to the list of available Social Science electives.
2. Under Women's Studies Elective Requirements, the text has been changed for clarity. The text now reads:

Nine additional credits in courses in Women's Studies or cross-listed with Women's Studies. These may include, but are not limited to, courses listed under Women's Studies Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science-Related Distribution Requirements which have not been used to satisfy those requirements.

cc: Jama Allegretto

Contents

I. Five-Point Charge to the Committee, with Recommendations or Summary Responses 3

II. Proposed Statement on Freedom of Expression in Public Events 5

III. Background Information: Activities of the Committee, and Explanation of the Responses and Recommendations 7

Report of the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee  
on Freedom of Expression in Public Events

May 16, 1994

Members of the Committee:

- Robert F. Brown, University Honors Program (Chair) *Robert F. Brown*
- Joann E. Browning, Theatre *Joann E. Browning*
- Berena S. Chapp, University Gallery *Berena S. Chapp*
- Yvonne E. Edgell, Center for Black Culture *Yvonne E. Edgell*
- Thomas M. Hart, Jr., Undergraduate Student *Thomas M. Hart, Jr.*
- Bernard L. Kadian, English *Bernard L. Kadian*
- Scott F. Mason, Perkins Student Center *Scott F. Mason*
- Fredericka E. Scripps, Graduate Student *Fredericka E. Scripps*
- W. Gary Smith, Plant and Soil Science *W. Gary Smith*



1. Five-Point Charge to the Committee with Recommendations or Summary Responses

1. Consider the advisability of writing a statement on "Freedom of Expression in an Educational Setting." The recent "Statement of Responsibility," approved by the Faculty Senate in May, 1993, should be consulted as background, perhaps serving as a model.

Recommendation:

We drafted a statement which we submit to the University Senate to consider for adoption as official University policy, for educational use as directed to all members of the University community as well as to any outside persons or groups who might raise questions or express concern about public events that occur under the sponsorship of departments, programs or other units of the University, or of registered student organizations and chartered Greek organizations.

2. Suggest ways that dissenting opinions, or a full range of opinions related to specific public events, can be given a forum. This could take several forms (e.g., a set of guidelines drafted by the Ad Hoc Committee, a new Faculty Senate Coordinating Committee on Campus Events to facilitate and diversify arrangements for public events [there is a model at Duke University], a new charge to CAPE [Faculty Senate Committee on Cultural Activities and Public Events] encouraging the funding of workshops to accompany exhibitions, speakers, etc. Overall "balance" may or may not be a desirable or reasonable expectation for the University.

Response:

We do not endorse the creation of a new body, or the authorization of any existing body, that would attempt to control or to manage the array of campus public events so as to insure "balance" over time or with respect to the content of a particular program, or that would counterprogram with the aim of neutralizing or rebutting a particular program deemed objectionable.

Recommendation:

If the University as such wishes to take a strong stance--e.g., in favor of diversity, tolerance, mutual understanding, and related educational values--it might well do so in public events under its official sponsorship (as distinct from events sponsored by constituent academic or program units, student organizations and the like). University-sponsored events of this sort should be planned in advance and conducted for their own sake; they should not be targeted against other, particular public events; they would instead comprise an ongoing series designed to foster a certain campus climate; they might best occur under the aegis of the Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity or some

other entity that would be provided with a budget to mount programming having this aim.

Further Comment:

Controversial, even objectionable or offensive, public events can be of educational value, if those who hold other views respond creatively to them. The preceding response and recommendation pertaining to this charge are not meant to discourage individuals or groups from organizing workshops, protests, course-related activities, or other events that respond critically to controversial public events. They are only meant to discourage the University as such from so responding to particular campus public events, in a way that could be construed as censorship or other inhibition of the free expression of ideas.

3. Suggest ways that one or more annual events, speakers series, or coordinated exhibitions and events can be encouraged in times of constrained budgets. We have received one suggestion that Attorney General Janet Reno be invited to the Bob Carpenter Center this spring to re-enforce the precedent set by Former President Jimmy Carter in spring 1993. President Roselle was supportive, and suggested that this could be one aspect of the Ad Hoc Committee's work.

Response:

We have no objection if the administration wishes to provide the necessary funding for an occasional speaker of the stature of those persons mentioned in the charge, as a way of creating a special, high-profile public event. We do not, however, think that, in times of budgetary constraints, large fees paid to the sorts of celebrities handled by lecture bureaus and furnishing the programs for the sorts of speakers series that used to be standard fare on college campuses is money well spent. Therefore, we decline to make any specific recommendation pertinent to this charge. (Since this response is self-explanatory, there is no further comment about it in the remainder of this report.)

- 4.

Suggest ways that the full schedule of exhibitions, performances, and events can be better communicated, and discussion intensified. The use of new technologies available on campus (e.g., cable to students' rooms) should be considered.

Response:

This element of our charge now seems to be the task of the Entertainment Events Committee, chaired by Lynda Ruggerio, which was established subsequent to the creation of our committee. We interacted with that committee. One possible concern that we have in this area is that the centralized scheduling and publicity operations it is charged with designing could become, by plan or

by inadvertence, an instrument of censorship that disadvantages or prevents certain sorts of public events, based on program content or sponsorship. This concern is discussed below in our report.

5. Provide guidance to student organizations in the selection of guest speakers. Concern has been expressed that media hype too often brings speakers from expensive agencies, who then offer disappointing or dated intellectual content in their lectures.
- Response:
- Guidance of this sort is already taking place. It is properly the role of the advisor to the particular group, and of the Student Activities Office, to provide this guidance. In fact, however, relatively little in the way of University funds goes to guest speakers sponsored by registered student organizations. Those organizations that manage to sponsor expensive speakers appear to raise most of the needed funds from donors outside the University community. They are entitled to secure speakers of their choice if they can find a way to cover the expenses entailed by doing so. We believe that the procedures and controls of the system for allocating programming funds to registered student organizations are working well as presently constituted.

#### 11. Proposed Statement on Freedom of Expression in Public Events at the University

Freedom of expression in public events at the University of Delaware should be preserved and fostered, as something both essential to the well-being of the academic enterprise and protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Public events at the University comprise lectures, performances, exhibitions, and similar programs that are open to the campus and wider communities and that are sponsored by the University itself, or by one or more of its constituent departments, programs or units or by registered student organizations or chartered Greek organizations. The array of public events may explore new frontiers, celebrate individuality and community, and mirror the diversity of ideas and values present in our society and our world. Such events, which taken as a whole reflect the rich fabric of diverse ideas, experiences, passions, and commitments that undergirds our free society, are not presented without risk of controversy or of giving offense to some. But the educational and spiritual loss attendant upon efforts at censorship of particular events is the greater risk. The University therefore welcomes the free and open expression of diverse ideas in its public events. Although some individuals or groups, within or outside the University, may deem certain speakers, performances or exhibitions to be offensive, that in itself is not reason for prohibiting, censoring or otherwise restricting them.

This commitment to freedom of expression in public events includes the following provisos:

1. Scheduling and conduct of a public event, and the obtaining of funds to finance it, shall take place according to the regulations and procedures established by various University facilities, units or organizations. These regulations and procedures shall be enforced or implemented in a fair and evenhanded way for all eligible sponsoring groups. In particular, every effort should be made to provide a safe and suitable venue for a particular event, one appropriate to its nature and requirements and one spacious enough to accommodate the anticipated audience.
2. The first proviso does not contravene the right and the responsibility of exercising curatorial judgment regarding artistic quality by those credentialed professionals who manage certain exhibit or performance venues, so long as this is done according to established procedures and is not a device for censorship based on program content. Nor does it contravene the ability of the University to control or limit access to certain special facilities, again according to established and published procedures, fairly applied.
3. Publicity shall not be hampered so as to restrict public knowledge of, or access to, any public event.
4. Freedom of expression in a public event is not authorization to violate general University policies governing health and safety, or to violate local, state, or federal laws and codes as they may apply to the exercise of free speech or to artistic performances or exhibitions.
5. The right of others to take exception to a lecture, performance, exhibition, or other public program must be preserved. But this right shall be exercised only by means that do not hinder the free expression of ideas within the context of the program, performance, or exhibition itself and that are not employed within the space or room in which the event takes place; exercise of this right also must not involve intimidation, harassment, defacing of property, or physical violence.
6. It shall be the responsibility of the sponsoring organization, and of those actually presenting the public event, to avoid, in the publicity or in the event itself, any suggestion that the University of Delaware as such endorses, is responsible for, or is to be represented by, the views or attitudes expressed by the event.

The University believes that commitment to these principles is the best way in which to foster a campus environment that is free and fair to all, and that provides the best educational setting for all.

## II. Background Information: Activities of the Committee, and Explanation of the Responses and Recommendations

### 1. Concerns Leading to the Formation of the Committee

Emphasis on increasing and promoting diversity in the campus community has a double effect. On the one hand, it fosters an environment in which persons and groups with different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, with different political, moral or other sorts of commitments, feel free to express openly these features of their identities; it seeks to establish an environment in which all persons can feel comfortable, in which mutual tolerance and respect is the prevailing attitude. On the other hand, emphasis on diversity increases the likelihood that the forthright expression of deeply-held convictions or disparate social values will result in controversy, with views or attitudes espoused by some taken to be offensive to others. The resulting clash of opinions or values is sometimes played out in public events at the University and in the responses to them, both on the campus and in the wider community.

Two public events in particular stood out as foci of controversy during the 1992-93 academic year. One was the faculty art exhibition in the University Gallery, with the display of homoerotic paintings by Hilton Brown and the posting of a message of protest against them by another faculty member, adjacent to his own art work. The other was the Leonard Jeffries lecture, with protests mounted by some members of the Jewish community and others. These events, as well as some others with a lower profile, vividly raised several concerns.

Some people on the campus apparently thought that responses to such public events should have taken one or another of the following forms. One kind of response might be censorship, the preventing or discouraging of certain types of programs or performances from occurring on the campus. Another response might be the orchestrating of other events to surround a predictably controversial public event, with the purpose of providing a forum for the expression of opposing views, either for general education purposes or even as an explicit tactic for neutralizing or discrediting the views expressed in the controversial public event.

Two other and related concerns also lie behind the charge to the committee. The first is that student organizations might not be prudent in their choices of guest speakers to bring to campus. The second is that perhaps the overall array of public events in the course of a year needs to be managed in such a way as to promote or insure "balance" among viewpoints.

These are the main issues with which the committee wrestled, in devising a statement on "Freedom of Expression in Public Events" and in deciding how to respond to the other elements in its charge.

### 2. Resume of Committee Activities

We met seven times between mid-December and mid-May. Subcommittees held additional meetings. We interacted with persons invited to meetings to share their views with us or to furnish information: Rabbi Stephen Booth of Hillel, who was involved in the Jeffries controversy; Professor Hilton Brown, a principal in the faculty art exhibition controversy; and Ms. Lynda Ruggerio, chairperson of the Entertainment Events Committee. We received information about efforts to respond to, or manage, controversy at other institutions.

The committee members themselves brought a good deal of expertise to the task. Our number includes persons with direct involvement in, and knowledge of:

- 1) The faculty art exhibition and Jeffries controversies.
- 2) The presentation of public events involving theatre and the visual arts.
- 3) The operation of student organizations and the funding procedures for their activities--from the diverse standpoints of Student Life professionals who work with student organizations, and of an undergraduate who is a leader in the College Republicans student organization that brings major speakers to the campus.
- 4) The Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Student Union, the Black Student Union, and the Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity.
- 5) Free speech issues as they impact campus and public life.

The processes of consultation with others and of collecting information have been helpful; but they have not dictated our conclusions in any straightforward manner. This report is perhaps not exactly as each one of us would have written it individually, based on her or his own views and experiences. It does, however, represent a high degree of consensus. It is the product of our collective judgment and, we hope, "good sense" about the matters we have been asked to consider.

### 3. Freedom of Expression in Public Events

Several points need to be kept clearly in mind in considering the proposed statement on freedom of expression.

The first point is that this report concerns only "public events," a term that receives further specification in the statement

itself. These are events mainly and usually falling under the heading of extracurricular activities. Although instructional activities in the narrow sense and extracurricular events sometimes overlap, and although we certainly hope that the broad range of campus extracurricular activities will prove to be "educational" for all participants, this report is not concerned with classroom, library or laboratory work as such, with academic freedom as it pertains to faculty or student work in instructional or research settings.

A second point is that the statement complements sections of the Official Student Handbook that deal with some of the same issues. The key passage in the Handbook is the section on "Freedom of Inquiry and Expression" (pages 24-25 of the 1993-94 edition); other sections deal with related operations of registered student organizations and chartered Greek organizations. We do not believe that there is any conflict between the proposed statement on "Freedom of Expression in Public Events" and provisions in the student handbook dealing with the same matters. But the proposed statement is not therefore redundant, for it embraces some elements not covered by Student Handbook provisions and it applies to all campus entities, not just to student organizations.

A third point involves distinctions that should be kept in mind, distinctions among different categories of sponsoring organizations. The University as such, represented by officers of the central administration, can extend official sponsorship to public events of its planning or choosing and can, if it wishes, indicate that the views expressed in or by such events are indeed the views or official position of the University. No other group can do this. A second category comprises University employees who participate in the sponsorship or performance of public events by campus units or organizations with which they are associated. Some of these persons enjoy the full protection of academic freedom; others do not. While all in this category ought to enjoy full freedom of expression with respect to public events, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect that any and every way of exercising that freedom would be devoid of consequences as to how one is viewed by employer and fellow employees. The third category embraces students who are not employees of the University and thus not subject to sanctions from it as employer. These people are the freest with respect to untrammelled participation in controversial public events. By the same token, they have no entitlement whatsoever to represent events they sponsor as representing the position of the University as such, and for this reason they must be especially careful not to do so.

A fourth point is the reminder that no outside person or group is entitled to stage a public event on the campus unless it is invited and sponsored by a constituent unit of the University or by a recognized student organization. So the proposed statement is not about any right of the general public to free expression in

public events at the University, but only about the sponsorship rights of certain campus groups.

With these preliminaries out of the way, we can emphasize the main point of this section of the report. It is quite simply that the committee regards the principle of freedom of expression as of paramount importance, as something absolutely central to the proper functioning of an institution of higher education. The principle does not, to be sure, override the responsibility to obey just laws or to abide by reasonable regulations for the appropriate exercise of free expression, regulations fairly applied to all (as instanced in the provisos of the proposed statement). But it does override a concern (however otherwise laudable) to establish an assuredly comfortable campus environment, a concern to avoid or to blunt the sometimes harsh side effects of the clash of ideas and values (including unwelcome or objectionable ones). It most certainly overrides efforts to enforce a uniform standard of beliefs, attitudes, and lifestyles, even if only by the device of trying to censor, or to keep from the marketplace of ideas, other sorts of alternatives. Because of the paramount place of free expression in higher education, the committee has written a proposed statement that enunciates it in no uncertain terms, and a report that, throughout, resists the tendency to dilute it for the sake of some other (and, we believe, lesser) social or educational value.

(NOTE: One member of the committee thinks that free speech and artistic expression are sufficiently different from one another, particularly with respect to obscenity issues and the law, so that a separate statement on freedom of expression is needed for each class of public event. The rest of the committee does not think that separate statements are necessary.)

#### Efforts to Insure Programming "Balance" or to Counteract Obligations to Public Events

Several higher education institutions have been in the news for their efforts to manage or to control controversial public events by various devices. One is to try to insure overall program balance by controlling the funding or scheduling processes at work, so as to limit artificially the number of programs of a certain type or ideological stripe that can take place, and to stimulate artificially the number occurring of a different (presumably more desirable) type. Another device is to insist that an individual program be "balanced," through mandating that it include, for instance, rebuttal of a controversial speaker by a respondent of a different viewpoint. Our committee does not recommend or support either of these tactics, because they represent improper interference in the marketplace of ideas. The array of programs sponsored should reflect the wishes and energies of the sponsoring groups; if the result is three conservative program topics for each liberal program topic, or vice versa, then

so be it; the remedy is not centralized interference with the dynamics of this marketplace, but instead the resolve of under-represented groups, if they wish it, to become more aggressive in sponsorship of public events. Furthermore, a sponsoring group should be able to put on the program it wishes and not have to incorporate in it an opposing perspective; rebuttal, if it is to occur, should be someone else's job. (Requirements of some external funding agencies do require "balance" in particular programs or series that they support.)

A somewhat different tactic would be for the institution to combat "objectionable" public events that run counter to its own official stance, by mounting counterprogramming directed explicitly at those events--concurrent or subsequent rebuttal lectures, workshops and the like. The committee likewise does not recommend or support that tactic. Employing it opens the door to possible abuses that endanger the principle of free expression. Who is to decide, and on what basis, just which controversial public events are so offensive or so misguided as to deserve being so targeted? Why is the ideological SWAT team called into action against my group's public event but not against yours? A higher education institution is entitled to articulate and to advocate certain sorts of values, and to clearly disassociate its official position from that of others antithetical to it. But we believe it should do so in a way different from this.

Our recommendation on these matters is that the University not implement a procedure for reacting to particular public events deemed objectionable, by a counterprogramming tactic aimed at rebutting, quarantining or neutralizing those particular events. Instead, if it wishes to do so, it should express affirmatively those values and perspectives it seeks to promote, by sponsoring its own ongoing series of public events designed to foster the campus climate it desires to have. An official University body, such as the Commission to Promote Racial and Cultural Diversity, should be the sponsor for such a series, and should have a budget for doing so.

The fact that the committee discourages the University as such from counterprogramming directed against particular public events is by no means a suggestion that constituent groups within the University should not do so. Indeed, quite the contrary. Critical responses to a particular public event--opposing lectures, workshops, protests, and so forth--that are orchestrated by other organizations or by faculty or staff, for instance, for academic or other purposes, are part of the rich fabric of campus life and are to be encouraged. The only caveat is that they should arise out of the free marketplace of ideas instead of coming into being from some official institutional mandate.

## 5. Coordinated Scheduling and Publicity for Campus Public Events

Our conversation with Lynda Ruggerio, chairperson of the Entertainment Events Committee, raised one significant concern. That committee is exploring, among other matters, the possibility of a centralized and coordinated scheduling process for public entertainment events at major University venues. It is also exploring the creation of a newsletter, to be distributed widely on a regular basis, that would publish a calendar of upcoming public events at the University. It is also exploring the creation of a central location for ticket sales for all campus public events for which tickets are needed. It is also exploring the possibility of coordinated advertising for public events, so that lower rates can be obtained for larger volume advertising placement and so that uniform aesthetic and other standards can be upheld for media advertising bearing the University's name and insignia. All these are evidently laudable aims.

Our committee's concern--one that was novel to the Entertainment Events Committee, since it approaches these matters from a different angle--is that such a centralization of power and functions opens the door to censorship. Here are examples of questions that don't admit of easy answers, under the arrangements being considered. Would a newsletter distributed to the general public contain a listing of all upcoming campus public events, including those on topics, or with titles or descriptions, that many in the wider community might find offensive? Would a sponsoring group's wishes about how its event should be advertised or described be thwarted by design or "decency" standards enforced by those directing the coordinated publicity process? Would it become too difficult to gain a venue for a controversial program under a centrally-managed scheduling procedure? Issues such as these need to be addressed in some suitable way, else the contemplated system of coordination might, by inadvertence or by design, result in a serious threat to the freedom of expression in public events.

## 6. Funding for Student Organization Sponsorship of Public Events

The committee believes that the system in place for the funding of registered student organizations is a sound one; we do not advocate changes in it. Hence the remainder of this final section of the report seeks only to describe succinctly the outlines of this system, for the benefit of those who may be unfamiliar with it. Fuller information can be obtained from the Student Activities Office, 306 Perkins Student Center, which comes under the jurisdiction of Dr. Marilyn S. Prime, Student Center Director.

(NOTE: The one committee member who is critical of the present funding system bases that view not on particular features of the system's operation but on the conviction that no student organization should receive financial support from a comprehensive fee charged to all students.)

Registered student organizations may seek funding for their activities by participating in the annual Spring Allocation Process. Funds for this purpose derive from the comprehensive student fee charged to all full-time undergraduates. Each organization submits a detailed budget request to the Student Center Allocation Board (comprised of four undergraduate students and three Student Life professionals) and, if the total of funds requested exceeds \$1250, it must also make its case at a budget hearing. Budget requests can and do include line items for support of public events (guest speakers and other kinds of events); allocated funds may not, however, be spent on religious activities or on activities involving support for partisan politics. These budget requests are carefully scrutinized by the Student Center Allocation Board, which makes the decisions regarding how much funding each organization actually gets. Such decisions are made according to appropriate principles, and take into account the particular organization's past record (if any) of fiscal management and campus citizenship in abiding by regulations governing student organizations.

Some generalizations about this procedure are the following. Most student organizations do not typically devote a substantial share of their requested funding to public events; the majority of funds received from this source go to support other sorts of activities. The budget requests do not typically indicate particular guest speakers to be invited or other specific public event programming contemplated; they simply indicate categories and numbers of activities planned. So the Student Center Allocation Board is in no position, and does not wish, to exercise censorship with respect to program content (other than enforcing the exclusion of support for religious activities or partisan politics); in fact, it would be unrealistic to expect the student organizations to know or to specify so far in advance the precise list of paid guest speakers to be invited or other public events to be presented.

The consequence of these arrangements is something of a free market with respect to public events. Each student organization invites the guest speakers, or presents the other types of public events, that it chooses to, within the limits of its budget allocation and other means of access to financial resources. The resulting array of public events sponsored by these student organizations is simply the outcome of all the individual groups' decisions, is whatever it turns out to be, without any centralized attempt to shape the menu of events; and that is how it should be.

One further piece of information is needed to complete the picture. How in fact does a student organization cover the cost of, for instance, a guest speaker who commands more than a minimal honorarium? Typically it approaches others to be contributing co-sponsors. It might get modest contributions from academic departments or other kinds of University units that believe the

speaker is of interest to them and worthy of support. It might get contributions from off-campus individuals or groups. (Student religious or partisan political activities that cannot get Student Center Allocated Funding for their speakers typically rely on off-campus contributors.) The point is that all these other sorts of contributions are freely-given, and are won by the resourcefulness and persuasiveness of the primary sponsoring organization.