

# Davis agrees to talk

Michael Davis, the University of Michigan graduate student who was denied a job as a philosophy instructor at the University of Nebraska, said Tuesday evening he has tentatively agreed to speak at the Nebraska Union Thursday, Oct. 29.

In a telephone interview from his Ann Arbor, Mich., home, Davis said he would probably arrive on campus Wednesday, Oct. 28, staying at least through Friday.

"This appearance is subject to working out details," he

said. "But I'll probably be there." The question of exactly which student group would sponsor Davis' appearance, or how the appearance would be paid for, remained uncertain Tuesday night.

The invitation Davis has accepted came from a new student organization, the Free Speech Movement, that gained tentative approval only last week.

Davis said he has talked by telephone with officers of the Free Speech Movement. The

group would like the Davis speech to be financed by student fees allocated by the Union Program Council.

Although most speakers coming to campus demand a fee in addition to expenses, Davis has said he would come to campus only for expenses — estimated by students to be less than \$200.

However Dave Ratliff, a junior in Arts and Sciences and treasurer of the Free Speech Movement, said if necessary the group will raise the money by soliciting donations "from

anybody wishing to give."

The Free Speech Movement, like any other approved student organization, has the right to sponsor the Davis speech, as well as to use Nebraska Union facilities for his appearance.

The Free Speech Movement's request that student fees be used to pay for the appearance was dealt a setback at the Tuesday night meeting of the Union Program Council. The group voted 6-3 to table until next week a motion which

Turn to page 3

## NEBRASKAN

WED., OCT. 14, 1970

LINCOLN, NEB.

VOL. 94, NO. 17



Further construction projects . . . are up in the air because the Regents Monday deferred action on the capital construction.

# Standards set for faculty

"There are no established standards for judging actions of faculty members; no provision for penalties; and no procedures for determining whether a faculty or staff member has acted improperly."—Page 26 of the report of the Regents' special commission that studied the May anti-war protests.

by JOHN DVORAK  
Nebraskan Staff Writer

In its 101 years of existence the University has never had a written policy that attempted to outline the responsibilities and define the proper conduct of its teachers.

Such a policy would have been helpful in past years. Now, particularly since the strike activities of last spring and the subsequent case of Steven L. Rozman, assistant professor of political science, many members of the University community from the Board of Regents on down, feel such a policy is essential.

Rozman was accused by the Regents of improper conduct during the strike activities. The Board then ordered the administration to refer Rozman "to the appropriate faculty committee" for sanction.

But what was the appropriate committee?

What were appropriate sanctions?

Were, in fact, any sanctions necessary and proper?

After much discussion, Campus President Joseph Soshnik handed the Rozman case to the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure.

The chairman of that group, Robert E. Dewey, admitted the

case was unprecedented and he was unsure how to proceed.

So at the Tuesday afternoon Faculty Senate meeting, a step was taken to eliminate at least some of the doubt and confusion when future instances similar to the Rozman case arise.

A "Statement of Faculty Responsibilities and Conduct" was presented publicly for the first time.

The tentative draft presented Tuesday afternoon lists five general responsibilities of faculty members — everything from "upholding and defending academic freedom" to "observing those regulations duly established for the general welfare of the University."

It also lists five examples of prohibited conduct for faculty members:

—Intentional obstruction or disruption of teaching or other educational activities,

—Intentional obstruction which unreasonably interferes with the freedom of movement on campus,

—Possession or use of fire arms, explosives, dangerous chemicals or other dangerous weapons contrary to law,

—Intentional detention or physical abuse of any person,

—Malicious damage or

Turn to page 8

# Soshnik creates ad hoc disruption committee

Campus President Joseph Soshnik announced Monday that he will create an ad hoc committee to review the University's policy on campus disruptions.

"I believe that the document should be reviewed by the total university community if any changes are to be made," Soshnik said at Monday's Board of Regents meeting.

"We have a good document," added the Campus President, "but it can be improved."

The Spelts Commission, which investigated last spring's disturbances on the Lincoln campus, recommended that the University's "Response to Disruptive Action" policy should be clarified. The Commission noted that University administrators were hampered in dealing with the ROTC building occupation last May because of ambiguity in the policy.

In separate action Monday the Board of Regents granted more time to a faculty committee to prepare its report on Stephen L. Rozman, assistant professor of political science.

The Spelts Commission labeled Rozman's actions during last spring's disturbances as "highly inappropriate for a

teacher." The Regents later directed the faculty committee to study Rozman's case and recommend what sanctions, if any, should be applied against Rozman.

Regent Richard L. Herman of Omaha said that Rozman should be notified that he might not be rehired if the faculty committee's report is not completed by Dec. 15. That is the date when the Board usually notifies faculty members who aren't going to be rehired.

However, Soshnik said Dec. 15 is not a final deadline to notify faculty members who aren't going to be retained.

University Chancellor Durward B. Varner said that he was not optimistic that the faculty committee's report will be completed by the November Regents' meeting. But he said the report should be available by December.

The Board also Monday deferred any action on revision of the 1971-73 University capital construction budget. The Regents' original \$24 million budget request did not include the \$8.6 million in building projects which were invalidated by the State Supreme Court. Included in these projects was the addition to Love

Memorial Library on the City Campus.

The projects blocked by the court now have a price tag of

Turn to page 2

## J. Edgar Gade to the rescue

# The case of the black case

The case of the mysterious black briefcase provoked hearty laughter from Campus Security Chief Gail Gade, Regent Richard Herman of Omaha and other high University officials after the Board of Regents meeting Monday.

But nobody was laughing over the black briefcase an hour earlier.

The incident, which shows the great University concern over bombs, potential bombs and bomb threats, began just a few minutes after the Regents meeting commenced at 10 a.m. in the Chancellor's office suite on the Administration Building's second floor.

Students had crowded into the meeting; some were sitting on the floor, other were standing near a wall. While the

Regents were discussing University of Nebraska at Omaha matters, two young men who appeared to be students suddenly left the meeting.

Behind where one of them had been sitting was a black briefcase, resting against the wall with no owner in sight.

Gade, who watched the two students leave, immediately spotted the briefcase. After studying it, he whispered to some students nearby. But none owned it or knew who did.

Gade then conferred in whispers with Chancellor D. B. Varner, Corporation Secretary G. Robert Ross and Board of Regents President Robert Raun of Minden.

After more consultations in the chancellor's private office next door, and more study of the owner-less black brief case,

it was decided to remove the object from the room.

Unknown to most of the 50 people at the meeting, Gade gingerly picked up the brief case and slowly carried it away. He stashed it in the tiny private bathroom adjoining the chancellor's office. The bathroom door was then shut and Gade, still a bit nervous, waited until the end of the Regents meeting.

It is not known exactly when Regent Herman noticed that his black briefcase, which contained some papers and had been placed against the wall before the meeting was missing.

But it was the great laughter, as well as with great respect for the ever-suspicious and watchful Gade, that Herman retrieved his briefcase from the Chancellor's private bathroom.