

FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA

January 29, 1952

1. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of January 15, 1952
2. Discussion of the role of intercollegiate athletics
(Committee on Faculty-
Student Relations, and
Professor Heiser)
3. Discussion of social security benefits for faculty members
(Professor Akana)
4. Proposal for a committee to codify the action of the Faculty Council
(Agenda Committee)
5. Date for the annual Air Force inspection
(F.T. Reed)
6. New Policy with regard to time limits and grades for those withdrawing from classes.
(Deans Waggoner and Ashton)
(Unfinished Business)

COMMUNICATIONS RECEIVED

The following communication, dated January 18, 1952 has been received from Professor Fuchs:

The attached copy of a letter Dean Shoemaker and I sent to the Daily Student yesterday is for the information of the Council. We should appreciate your calling it to the attention of the members of the Council in whatever way may be most appropriate. As you may know, the letter resulted in an editorial in yesterday's Student which corrected the misinformation in the previous day's article but did not refer to the letter or to the additional information contained in the letter concerning future plans and policies.

/s/ R. F. F.
R. F. F.

The attached letter is as follows:

Editor, Indiana Daily Student:

For whatever reason, the featured story in this morning's Daily Student (January 16) is seriously in error concerning the action of the Faculty Council yesterday with respect to Senior Class Day. Since that action was taken, as the story states, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations, concurred in by the Dean of Students, and is part of a larger effort of the Committee to assist in developing a sound program for senior class observances, we should appreciate your giving prominent attention in the Daily Student to the information contained in this letter, or to the letter itself, at the first opportunity.

The action of the Faculty Council was not, as today's story states, to establish a "cut day" for the present February class. It was to establish a substitute for the "cut day" which June classes have had during the past two years and to apply this substitute to both the February and the June class this year. The written statement furnished a representative of the Senior Class by the Dean of Students immediately following Faculty Council action was essentially to this effect.

As the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations recommended, the Council removed Senior Class Day from the University calendar and abolished it as a "cut day." Instead, it authorized the Dean of Students to inform the faculty of the day when the Senior Class planned its major annual observance so that the members of the faculty might take this information into account in dealing with the absences of Seniors from classes. Information is sent in the same manner with regard to the trips of athletic teams, concert groups, etc.

A "cut day," as this term has been used in recent years, means a day as to which faculty members are required to adjust their work to student absences from class. In discussions which the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations had before formulating its recommendations to the Faculty Council, nobody thought that cut days for Seniors in connection with Senior Week were either necessary or desirable. Nobody thought a "walkout" from classes was appropriate.

Some members of the Committee doubted whether any special recognition need be given to Senior Class Day, since class attendance is enforced at Indiana University only in the discretion of faculty members, and students who are absent for good reason are usually excused by their instructors, subject to

their completing the required work. Seniors probably could have satisfactory class days on this basis. The Committee felt, however, and the Faculty Council agreed, that recognition should be given to the Class Days this year to a greater extent by calling the attention of the faculty specifically to them.

At the earlier suggestion of the Faculty Council and upon the request of the present Senior Class officers, the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations has undertaken to assist in developing generally satisfactory plans for senior class observances. The feeling of the Committee, including students as well as faculty, is that these observances should follow, rather than precede, the final examinations. The Committee decided at its meeting this month to work toward this end in future years. In its action yesterday, the Faculty Council emphasized the same point by deciding not to extend the same recognition as this year to future Senior Class Days.

The present February and June classes are to be congratulated upon their excellent plans for Senior Week each semester. The June class of its own volition decided some time ago to transfer one event to the post-examination period. Future classes must consider whether, in light of the Faculty Council's latest action, they wish to retain any pre-examination program without special provision as to class attendance. The Committee on Faculty-Student Relations will continue to assist to the best of its ability in working out a satisfactory program, if those immediately interested desire it to do so.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Ralph F. Fuchs
Chairman of Committee on Faculty-
Student Relations

/s/ R. L. Shoemaker
Dean of Students

Suggestions to the Agenda Committee regarding topics for the Agenda are included in four communications received from Dean Briscoe. Two of these communications originated with Dean Briscoe himself; one suggestion came from President Wells, and one from Dean Ashton. The two communications from Dean Briscoe are as follows:

January 14, 1952

The following suggestions have been made to me for inclusion on the Council's agenda, and I pass them on to you:

1. Instructional policy:
 - (a) Scattered courses versus concentration in relatively small number of courses, as 5 three-hour courses versus 3 five hour courses.
2. Criteria for the evaluation and assignment of faculty.
3. Priority of development of areas in the University.
4. Honesty in examinations.

/s/ HTB
H.T.B.

January 11, 1952
Dear Professor Fox:

I wish to submit the following topics for the agenda of the Faculty Council meetings during the current year. Whenever these are read to the Council, I shall be glad to explain them in greater detail if I am present at the meetings. Some of these topics have been suggested and committees have been appointed for their consideration in the past, but we have never had any report on them.

1. University wide control of curriculum. Who has the authority to approve finally the addition of courses and expansion of curriculum?
2. Functions of the Junior Division.
3. Provisions for the general educational development of all students. Should we have special general education programs for some students?
4. Development and use of teaching techniques to make students more responsible for their own education.
5. The development of programs built around areas of study rather than within single departments and schools.
6. Development of new programs and curricula, e. g. archeology, television, etc.
7. A review and evaluation of our facilities for research and our needs for further research development.

/s/ HTB
H.T.B.

President Well's suggestion is as follows:

To: Dean H.T. Briscoe

From: President H. B Wells
December 20, 1951

One of the things we might put on our list for faculty discussion would be ways and means of bringing those members from the Indianapolis divisions into contact with the Bloomington faculty and vice versa.

/s/ H. B W

Dean Ashton's suggestion is a proposal for studying the question of short sessions, intersessions, and credit for workshops and institutes. According to Dean Ashton, one student is reported to have received $13\frac{1}{2}$ hours credit last summer.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

CALLIED MEETING - JANUARY 29, 1952

Convened: 3:30 P.M.

Presiding: President Wells

Absent: Deans Bain, Mine, Sikes, VanNuys, Weimer, Witham, and Wright; Dr. Miller; Professors Anderson, Foust, Franzen, Houk, Kiger, Silverstein, Stover, and Yellen

Alternates Present: Professor Prickett for Dean Weimer; Dean Holmstedt for Dean Wright; Mr. Craig for Dr. Miller; Professor Crawford for Professors Anderson and Houk; and Professor Jung for Professor Franzen

Visitors Present: Dean Ashton, Professor Heiser, and Professor Meessen

Items of Business

1. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of January 15, 1952.
2. Discussion of the role of Intercollegiate Athletics
3. Announcement of a committee to study the general problem of promotions

ACTION OF THE COUNCIL

1. The minutes of the meeting of January 15, 1952 were approved.
2. The President called upon Professor Heiser to open the discussion on Athletic Policy. Professor Heiser had directed a communication to the Council in which he had raised two questions: first, what is the relationship of the Athletic Committee to the Faculty as a whole; and, second, what is the policy regarding allocation of seats at athletic events? Professor Heiser wanted to know how the seats were assigned, and also whether the faculty and general public are treated in the same manner in such allocation.

President Wells then called upon Professor Meessen to speak for the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations. (Professor Meessen was representing this committee in the absence of Professor Fuchs, who had previously presented to the Council a communication from the Committee dealing with athletic policy. For a full text of the communication, see the minutes of the faculty council for January 15, page 3)

Professor Meessen pointed out that the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations had had a number of meetings for the purpose of studying some of the problems of athletic policy. One of the problems had reference to the treatment of non-recruited athletes. There seemed to be some feeling on the part of students that non-recruited athletes are not given the same attention and opportunity as recruited athletes. Another problem was the concern for the discipline being maintained by those holding athletic

scholarships. It had been claimed by students that some of these athletes occasionally "go wild in the Dorms".

The President then called for comments from others. Dean Holmstedt felt that the fundamental question should be: What is the controlling purpose of athletics? Does the program exist primarily for educational purposes, or for purely entertainment purposes? Is the program primarily for students, or for alumni? He thought that when these questions were answered, the question of where control should be would likewise be answered.

Professor Weatherwax was concerned with the attitude of some athletes regarding school work missed when they are off-campus necessarily for athletic events. He was of the opinion that some of these athletes feel that they should not have to make up such work.

President Wells pointed out that some of the questions being raised were questions of fact, and could possibly be answered immediately by members of the Committee. Later, a list of questions might be referred to the Athletics Committee, which in turn could be given the opportunity for a prepared statement. Professor Mee, chairman of the Athletic Committee, was unable to be present, but two members of the Committee, Professors Breneman and Long, are Council members and were present. The President then asked Professor Breneman if he wished to discuss any of the questions.

Professor Breneman pointed out that he had not prepared a statement for the Council. However, since he previously had been chairman of the Athletics Committee, he felt he probably should assume some responsibility in helping clarify certain points regarding questions which had been raised. According to him there are three methods practiced at various institutions in assuring faculty control of athletics: one, the athletic committee reports to the faculty as a whole; two, the committee reports to a faculty senate or council such as our own; and, three, the committee itself is set up so that it has a majority of faculty members. Our own plan conforms to the third one above, which is also the plan followed by about half of the institutions in the Big 10.

Previous to this year, the Athletics Committee here had been quite large. A reorganization this year reduced the Committee to five faculty members and four alumni, a total of nine members. At present, this committee reports directly to the President. However, Professor Breneman stated, he felt that much of the action of the Athletic Committee might well be discussed with the Council. Examples would include such things as rules regarding eligibility and required progress toward degrees, and decisions on such questions as participation in the Rose Bowl. Professor Breneman also pointed out that the alumni members often are inclined to be very strict and sound in establishing and upholding high standards of scholarship and deportment for athletes.

President Wells stated that he had always considered the Athletic Committee as a faculty committee, subject to the wishes of the faculty. The functions and responsibilities of this committee had been established when the Conference was organized and, of course, before we had a faculty council. He would welcome the practice of regular reports to the Council, and discussion of special interest issues in that body. He was of the opinion that we probably have not utilized such procedures as much as we should. Professor

Breneman felt that much misunderstanding on the part of the faculty could be avoided by such discussions with Council.

Professor Breneman then told how the committee had operated in the selection of Mr. Crimmins, the new football coach. Coach Smith had set high standards in this field, and the Committee had made sure that these standards would be preserved. The committee was satisfied that the new coach was as interested in maintaining high standards of scholarship and conduct as he was in winning games.

On the question of participation by non-recruited athletes, Mr. Crimmins had expressed the desire for a general call for such students. While at Notre Dame, the new coach had had the responsibility of interviewing such team candidates, so he should be well qualified to handle the situation here. Also, the idea of developing B-squad competition was being seriously proposed and considered. The new coach favors this as a means of furthering the development of an enlarged program.

Regarding problems of discipline, Professor Breneman stated that a number of squad members have been eliminated quietly, from time to time, because of poor citizenship. On the occasion of his first meeting with the squad, Mr. Crimmins had laid down specifically his expectations for training. He was definitely opposed to drinking, to smoking in public, and to any behavior which would put the athletes in a questionable social light.

Regarding eligibility rules, Professor Breneman was aware that there are some flaws in the present system, but he was also sure that the Big 10 Conference system is the best in the country. Athletes are obligated to pass all their courses. In addition, there has been an attempt to have athletes take courses in their field of proficiency and interest, regardless of the difficulty of the courses. In other words, there is little attempt to suggest a specified pattern of easy courses for athletes. If a course is failed, it must be taken over, or another course may be substituted provided that special permission is granted by the dean of the school in which the student is enrolled. The new coach is in favor of maintaining these policies.

Professor Mann asked a question in regard to course load of athletes. He himself was of the opinion that a full load during a season of competition would be too much, considering the time which athletes must devote to competitive sports. According to Professor Breneman, an athlete must carry a minimum of 12 hours work per semester. He must have completed 40 per cent of the number of hours for graduation before he is eligible to play a second varsity season, and 60 per cent to be eligible for the third year of sports participation at the varsity level. This prevents enrollment in the University for the sole purpose of athletic participation. Actually, some other sports require more time than football. All seven of the seniors on the basketball squad last year graduated, which is evidence of maintained standards.

Professor Breneman stated that both the coaches and the athletes are told to clear absences with their professors, and the students are expected to make up work which has been missed. No coach is allowed to ask for special favors for the students. This was in answer to Professor Weatherwax's question.

In regard to participation for all students in competitive sports, the biggest problem is lack of facilities to handle large groups. Last winter, according to Professor Breneman, there were 72 intramural teams using our limited facilities to play basketball. Our swimming pool is not regulation in size. We do not have enough practice fields for football and must, therefore, limit the size of the squad. Plans are now being made to provide more adequate facilities as soon as possible.

Professor Breneman was of the opinion that seating for football games has been improved to the general satisfaction of the faculty and alumni. A committee is now working to develop a satisfactory plan for seating at basketball games. One plan under consideration calls for rotation of seating from game to game.

President Wells thanked Professor Breneman for his statements, which he considered were pointed and clear even though they were made extemporaneously. He added a further comment about facilities, pointing out that we have the same indoor facilities and less outdoor facilities than existed at the time when enrollment was approximately only 3,000 students. These crowded conditions lead to difficulty and frustration.

3. In setting up a committee to study the general problem of promotions, President Wells stated that he had been guided by two principles: first, he wished to avoid appointment of anyone who had offered suggestions or proposals in regard to this problem, in order that such persons would be free to present their viewpoints to the Committee; second, he had kept the committee membership within the membership of the Faculty Council. The committee membership was announced as follows:

Dean Frank T. Gucker
Professor Newell Long
Professor Harold F. Lusk
Dean Leon H. Wallace
Professor William R. Breneman, Chairman

The Council adjourned at 4:15 P.M. in order to attend a called meeting of the General Faculty.

William H. Fox
Secretary to the Faculty Council