

November 24, 1954

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

The Faculty Council will meet on Tuesday, November 30, 1954 at 3:30 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room.

The following items are on the agenda:

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 16, 1954.
- 2) Consideration of the Report of the Committee on the Junior Division (Pratt) by the Faculty Council as a Committee of the Whole.
- 3) Official recognition of student organizations:
 - a. Resolution of American Association of University Professors, Indiana University Chapter, adopted on May 24, 1954. (Wattson)
 - b. Letter from the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations, dated June 11, 1954 (Fuchs).
- 4) Enforcement of campus parking regulations:
 - a. Letter from the Committee on Faculty-Student Relations, dated June 11, 1954 (Fuchs).
- 5) Discussion of the President's address on the State of the University.
- 6) Reports of the several divisions of the University.
- 7) Proposal by the Policy Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences for the establishment of an annual lectureship.

Notes on the agenda:

- 2) Refer to Report of the Committee on the Junior Division previously distributed to members of the Council.
- 3) Refer to agenda notes for meeting of October 19, 1954.
- 4) Refer to agenda notes for meeting of November 2, 1954.
- 5) A copy of the President's address may be obtained by application to the President's office.
- 7) Refer to agenda notes for meeting of November 2, 1954.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

November 30, 1954

These minutes are distributed to the Faculty subject to modification and approval at the next meeting of the Council.

The Council convened at 3:30 p.m., with President Wells presiding.

Members absent: Dean Van Nuys, Professor Mann, Vice President Franklin, and Professor Houk.

Alternates present: Dean Collins for Dean Briscoe, Professor Watson for Dean Bain, Dr. Van Huysen for Dean Hine, Dean Shaffer for Dean Shoemaker, Mr. Scherer for Mr. Harrell.

Professor Torrey and Assistant Dean Tarter were present by invitation.

Items of Business

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 16, 1954.
2. Discussion of the report of the Committee on the Junior Division (as a Committee of the Whole).

Action of the Council

1. The minutes of the meeting of November 16, 1954 were approved.
2. The Council adjourned and reconvened at once as a Committee of the Whole. Professor Fox presided as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. He ruled that in the Committee of the Whole motions carry by majority vote.

Professor Pratt, Chairman of the Committee on the Junior Division, presented a statement interpreting some implications of the Committee's report in relation to previous discussion. He said that the purpose of education at the level of the baccalaureate degree demands some general education and that the general education of students is an all-University responsibility. Complete autonomy of any school or division in this matter he held to be inconsistent with the nature of the problem. He said that control of the curriculum is legally in the hands of the University Faculty and that the Faculty Council is by delegation the proper body to legislate on matters such as a basic University curriculum. He recognized, however, that the planning of professional curricula has been delegated by usage to the faculties of the professional schools. Thus there is conflict between the demands and the control of general education and of professional education. The conflict should not be resolved in legalistic terms, but through the meeting of faculty minds. The full text of Professor Pratt's statement is appended to these minutes.

Professor Long expressed opposition to recommendations 7, 8 and 9 in the Report on the grounds that a) the subject is not a Junior Division problem, b) the recommendations violate the autonomy of the Schools, and c) doubt that the proposed basic curriculum might not prove satisfactory. He urged the need for experimentation and the development of courses of study to serve the needs of general education.

Dean Weimer said that the problem may not be one of a single basic curriculum, but one of several basic curricula because the need for general education may be different for persons differently oriented professionally. He advocated study of the problem by faculty groups in the several schools and opposed adoption of a program in principle without this study.

Further discussion centered on the question whether adoption of recommendation 7 would have the effect of imposing a basic curriculum on the several schools and divisions of the University. Dean Patty thought that it would, and said that it was wrong for any central group such as the Faculty Council to dictate to the entire University. Professor Pratt denied that recommendation 7 would impose a curriculum and said that it involved only approval in principle of a basic University curriculum. He said that reference to a curriculum "of the type described above" was intended only to indicate the general nature of a basic curriculum.

Several members objected to the linking of approval in principle with a curriculum of the type set forth in the report. Dean Weimer said that there may be approval of general education in principle but the question of type of general education program should be a subject for consideration by faculty groups. Dean Wright said that acceptance of the language of recommendation 7 would limit further consideration to a curriculum of the type described and preclude any other approach to the problem. He said this was far too restrictive.

Professor Shrigley discussed the recommendations from the standpoint of professional training in medicine. He felt that the Report establishes a basis for discussion and supported the thesis that requirements for the baccalaureate degree are of concern to the entire University. He suggested that in some instances where the requirements for professional education preclude meeting proper standards for the baccalaureate degree a professional designation be given instead, as in certain nursing curricula.

Professor Watson commented on the particular problem of general education in programs of professional training in music. He said that the Music faculty has certain insights into the needs of students for general education that should be taken into account in formulating a basic curriculum. He thought that we should take account of studies of this problem made at other institutions. There was some discussion of the significance of these studies.

The discussion returned to the type of curriculum described by the Committee. Dean Braden said that some courses have already been designed particularly to serve the purpose of general education. Professor Anderson suggested that the courses designated in the Committee's curriculum should be considered as indicating areas of knowledge desirable for a program of general education.

Professor Veatch asked whether the various issues that have arisen in discussion could not be resolved by the procedure set forth in recommendation 8. There was further objection that the terms of referral to the various undergraduate schools are too restrictive. Members of the Committee replied that they were intended to be broad and not to limit consideration of the problem.

Dean Weimer questioned the desirability of the concept of a single basic curriculum. Dean Collins thought that some courses might be basic for all students and other courses would be required only in specific circumstances. Professor Pratt agreed that a basic curriculum might well include options and alternative choices.

Professor Stoner said that there seemed to be general agreement on the desirability of general education and of study of the problem of formulating a basic curriculum; that the differences concern only procedure. He thought that these differences could be worked out by conferences between the faculties of the schools and the Committee on Curricular Policies and Educational Programs.

It was moved (Stoner, Work) that THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMEND TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDATIONS 7, 8 and 9 IN THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUNIOR DIVISION.

It was moved (Breneman, Cleland) THAT RECOMMENDATION 7 BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS: THE FACULTY COUNCIL APPROVE THE PRINCIPLE OF ADOPTING A BASIC CURRICULUM TO BE REQUIRED OF ALL STUDENTS RECEIVING UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES FROM THE UNIVERSITY.

It was moved (Breneman, Wright) THAT RECOMMENDATION 8 BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS: THE VARIOUS UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS BE ASKED TO CONFER AND WORK WITH THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR POLICIES AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR THE FORMULATION OF A BASIC CURRICULUM IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDY.

The motion to amend recommendation 7 was carried.

The motion to amend recommendation 8 was carried.

The motion to recommend acceptance of recommendations 7, 8 and 9, as amended, was carried.

The Committee of the Whole adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Harry Sauvain
Secretary