

AGENDA

Faculty Council

Tuesday, May 1, 1962

Ballantine Hall 8

3:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes for April 17. ✓
2. Continued discussion of the Student Senate mandate to reduce the age from 23 to 21 years for off-campus residence of single, undergraduate students. *Defered*
3. Announcement of the results of the elections for the Faculty Council 1962-63--Professor Remak, Chairman of the Elections Committee. ✓
4. Election of officers of the Faculty Council (agenda committee, parliamentarian, secretary) for 1962-63--Professor Fay, Chairman of the Nominations Committee.
5. Election of a new member to the Athletics Committee--Professor Auer.
6. Report of the committee for a proposed scholarly journal--Mrs. Miriam Sturgeon.

Agenda Committee

Shelby D. Gerking  
C. Leonard Lundin  
Leo Fay, Chairman

Members of the Faculty Council who expect to be represented by an alternate are asked to call the Secretary's Office (Ext. 577) beforehand and report the name of the alternate.

RECEIVED  
MAY 1 1962  
YAM



AGENDA

Faculty Council

Tuesday, May 1, 1962

Ballantine Hall 8

3:30 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes for April 17.
2. Continued discussion of the Student Senate mandate to reduce the age from 23 to 21 years for off-campus residence of single, undergraduate students.
3. Announcement of the results of the elections for the Faculty Council 1962-63--Professor Rusk, Chairman of the Elections Committee.
4. Election of officers of the Faculty Council (agenda committee, parliamentarian, secretary) for 1962-63--Professor Fay, Chairman of the Nominations Committee.
5. Election of a new member to the Athletics Committee--Professor Amer.
6. Report of the committee for a proposed scholarly journal--Mrs. William Sturgeon.

Agenda Committee

Shelby D. Gerking  
C. Leonard Lundin  
Leo Fay, Chairman

Members of the Faculty Council who expect to be represented by an alternate are asked to call the Secretary's Office (Ext. 577) beforehand and report the name of the alternate.

RECEIVED  
MAY 2 1962  
ARTS AND SCIENCES



CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

May 1, 1962

---

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

---

President Wells called the Council to order at 3:33 p.m.

Members absent, no alternates: Dean Daniels, Dean Hine, Dean VanNuys, Dean Weimer, Professor Hanson, Professor Hickam, Professor Kelling, Professor Mitchell.

Alternates present: Miss Duncan for Dean Higgins, Professor Richey for Dean Shane, Professor Moody for Professor Auer, Professor Hedges for Professor Lewis.

Visitors present: Professor Edwin H. Cady, Dean Byron Doenges, Mr. John Hicks, Mrs. Miriam Sturgeon.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes for April 17.
2. Comments by the President.
3. Continued discussion of the Student Senate mandate to reduce the age from 23 to 21 years for off-campus residence of single, undergraduate students. (See Faculty Council Document 18, 1961/62, attached.)
4. Announcement of the results of the elections for the Faculty Council for 1962-63--Professor Remak, Chairman of the Elections Committee.
5. Election of officers of the Faculty Council (Agenda Committee, Parliamentarian, Secretary) for 1962-63--Professor Fay, Chairman of the Nominations Committee.
6. Election of a new member to the Athletics Committee--Professor Auer.
7. Report of the committee for a proposed scholarly journal--Mrs. Miriam Sturgeon. (See Faculty Council Document 19, 1961/62, attached.)



ACTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

1. Professor Lundin pointed out a typographical error in Item 8, page 6, which should be corrected to read that there has been an increased appropriation for the "liaison librarians in history and English on the Bloomington campus" rather than libraries. With this correction, the Minutes of April 17, 1962, were approved as distributed.
2. The President informed the Council that he had a number of comments that he had wished to make for several meetings. To insure getting to them, he thought it wise to make them at the beginning of this meeting.

As a result of his visit to Pakistan he wished to commend the people on the I.U. projects for their excellent work. The University is well represented there as well as in its other foreign commitments. All members of the University family can take pride in what their colleagues are accomplishing overseas. Although they often have little to work with, they nevertheless manage to do superior work, which reflects very favorably on I.U. Visiting our foreign activities has reinforced the President's strong belief in the importance of the study of various languages and cultures at Indiana University.

Secondly, the President observed that the University has been successful in building a cosmopolitan faculty with a variety of cultural backgrounds represented. It is his feeling, however, that we are lagging somewhat in recruiting negro faculty. This may be the result of social forces that have made it difficult for negroes to achieve higher levels of education. Nevertheless, in his judgment, it behooves us to search out negro scholars as possible candidates for faculty positions.

The President went on to remind the faculty of the impact in recent years of a new kind of freshman on the college scene. Meeting the demands of these students will be one of the most important challenges in higher education during the immediate future. We may have to revise our ideas of the kind of professor and the level of work that will satisfy the expectations of this new student.

The President announced that an official University guestbook has been procured to be kept in the Tarkington Desk in the Memorial Room of the Union. It is his hope that when illustrious visitors are to be ceremoniously received, that a University official or a faculty member, as a representative of the University, will see that they sign the guestbook. The use of the guestbook is to be inaugurated at commencement with the signatures of the distinguished service professors, the governor, the president of the student body and other distinguished persons participating in the commencement activities.

The President reported a current struggle in Congress concerning the indirect costs of research grants to colleges and universities. An attempt is being made to limit overhead allowances to such an extent that it would be difficult for universities to meet expenses. This is a matter of great concern to universities and colleges about the nation. If any faculty are in a position to express their point of view in regard to this matter, it would be appropriate for them to do so.



3. On the basis of a letter from James Polk, (See Faculty Council Document 18, 1961/62, attached), requesting that the Faculty Council take no action concerning the student senate mandate to reduce the minimum age for living in off-campus housing to 21 years, Dean Braden moved and Professor Sutton seconded a motion that the matter be deferred until later. The motion carried unanimously.
4. The report of the Elections Committee was presented by Professor Remak, Chairman, (Professor Daugherty, Professor Vitaliano). Before presenting the list of elected members to the Council, Professor Remak reviewed the results of both the nominations ballot and the final ballot. 328 nominations ballots were received, which means that a mere 25 per cent of the faculty voted. Of those who did vote, 44 ballots were voided because they contained no signature on the envelope and several others were received late--by as much as ten days after the deadline of April 4. Of the 25 candidates for the Faculty Council nominated from the campus, the one receiving the highest number of votes got 22, and two received 10 each for the last nomination.

557 members, or 47 per cent of the faculty voted on the final ballot. Of these, 80 had to be voided since they were in unsigned envelopes. Unenviable as this might be, it represents a marked improvement over last year when approximately 200 ballots were voided for the same reason. As Professor Remak expressed it, we have moved up from a D- to a C- performance. The Committee, acting in a generous spirit, decided to accept ballots and envelopes on which the name of the voter was typed or rubber stamped. Apparently some faculty members, knowing their own handwriting all too well, felt that this was the only way in which they could attain legibility.

The provision for signatures on the envelope has been a beneficial one in the judgment of the Committee. Not only does it offer some protection against misuse of the ballot, but it enables the committee to save at least part of the ballots in the rather frequent occasion when a faculty member is so carried away by his voting opportunity that he votes wherever there is a blank space--campus, extension, and Indianapolis candidates. By identifying the name on the envelope the Committee was able to discard that part of the ballot for which the faculty member had no business voting and was able to save the legitimate part.

The Committee was somewhat concerned by a number of ballots which were almost identical, written by the same hand, but with different typewritten names of the voter on the individual envelopes. These were accepted with some hesitation this time, but the Committee wishes to urge that the next time the voter actually sign the envelope in ink. One ballot had to be discarded when a new faculty member was created by combining the first name of one candidate with the last name of another. This was no time for candidates with split personalities.

Having gotten all of these weighty matters off his chest, Professor Remak announced the result of the election.

Secretary of the Faculty: Henry B. Veatch

Parliamentarian of the Faculty: Joseph L. Sutton



Faculty Council: Edwin H. Cady, Warner O. Chapman, Ralph F. Fuchs, John P. Lewis, Robert Milisen, Sid Robinson, Roger W. Russell, Joseph L. Sutton.

Professor Remak announced that of these eight, five had been elected for the first time to a full term on the Faculty Council.

Since in the past there have consistently been vacancies among the members of the Faculty Council on the Bloomington Campus due to sabbaticals, leaves, etc., the Elections Committee felt that it should forewarn three potential candidates that they might be called upon to serve (in that order): Austin V. Clifford, Leonard Lundin, and Charles W. Hagen.

Division of University Extension: Robert Greenleaf

Indianapolis Faculties: Cleon Foust

In response to the President's question, Professor Remak reported that a somewhat smaller proportion of the faculty voted this year than last.

5. Professor Fay presented the slate of candidates of the Nominations Committee (Professors Breneman, Remak and Fay) for the Agenda Committee.

Professor Byrum Carter  
Professor Karl F. Schuessler  
Professor Leo Fay

Professor Breneman pointed out that the slate was consistant with a recommendation of the Council's Self-Survey Committee that a representative of the Agenda Committee serve a second year to insure continuity. Professor Warner Chapman was nominated as Council Parliamentarian. As there were no additional nominations from the floor, Professor Vitaliano moved and Professor Richey seconded a motion that a unanimous ballot be cast. Thus, the Council had its agenda committee and parliamentarian for the coming year.

Professor Fay, on behalf of his committee, next submitted the names of Professor Byrum Carter and Professor John P. Lewis as nominees for Secretary of the Council for 1962-63. As there were no additional nominees from the floor, a secret election was held in which Professor Carter was elected to be Secretary for the forthcoming year.

6. In the absence of Professor Auer, Chairman, the report of the Nominations Committee for the election of a new member to the Athletics Committee was presented by Professor Gerking (third member, Dean Braden). The names of Professor Leslie L. Waters (Business) and Professor Newell Long (Music) were placed in nomination. In a secret election, Professor Waters was elected as a faculty representative on the Athletics Committee.

While the ballots were being counted, the President, looking about the room, noticed that eight members of the Council were absent without alternates and an additional four were absent, but had sent alternates to represent them. The President expressed his concern that this absenteeism represented one-fourth of the Council membership and suggested that the Council might want to discuss this matter at some time in the future.



7. The report of the Committee for a proposed scholarly journal was presented by Mrs. Sturgeon (See Faculty Council Document 19, 1961/62, attached). Other members present were Professor Cady, Dean Doenges, Dean Ashton, and Mr. Hicks. Mrs. Sturgeon presented the report of her committee by reviewing the material contained in Faculty Council Document 19. After presenting her report she commented that the 25 members of her committee had spent long hours on their deliberations and hoped that they could be dismissed with the acceptance of this report.

The President commended the Committee for its yeomen service and expressed the appreciation of the Faculty Council for their work. He then asked whether the Committee had taken into consideration the important journal of the School of Business, Business Horizons. Mrs. Sturgeon replied that they had and that they thought it was a very imposing journal.

Reacting to a question from the President, Professor Mee reported that Business Horizons was supported almost entirely by subscription. Professor Gerking asked whether it was totally self-supporting and Professor Mee replied that it was not quite, but that it is not supported by funds from the University's general budget. The intent is that it will soon be self-supporting.

The President reported that at a recent meeting of the Council of Ten, a good bit of time was spent in discussing a journal to be developed by the Big Ten and by the University of Chicago, to be called Harvest. Dean Collins, as our representative on the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, reported that this journal has been discussed by the C.I.C. on two or three occasions. It comes closest to the prestige journal suggested by Mrs. Sturgeon's Committee. It will select articles written by faculty of the member institutions, as well as reprints of articles of interest in this area. The University of Chicago journal's Context and Outlook are reasonable prototypes of what the C.I.C. is planning.

In addition to articles, a series of profiles of outstanding faculty will also be included. The President reported that, in addition, scholarly articles of the faculty of the eleven member institutions will be scanned, and outstanding ones reprinted. He then asked Dean Collins how far along this project was.

Dean Collins replied that he didn't know, as the C.I.C. was waiting for a report from the Council of Ten. The President replied that action comes slowly in this organization but that the presidents did endorse budget proposals of the C.I.C., thus insuring its continuance now that it is no longer supported by the Carnegie Foundation.

Dean Collins raised the question as to how much income might be expected from the various journals proposed by the Committee. Mrs. Sturgeon replied that she had no idea and turned the question to Mr. Hicks, who felt that any income would be relatively small.

The President expressed his feeling that a good general journal well produced would be an important asset to the University.

Dean Gucker asked whether there was agreement within the Committee as to which of the three proposals they would recommend. Mrs. Sturgeon replied that the



Committee had met three times with different people present each time. Although they could arrive at agreement, the agreement was different at each meeting.

Professor Buehrig asked what the essential difference was between the second (prestige journal) and third proposals (expansion of the Alumni Review) other than cost. Mrs. Sturgeon replied that they were different at the point of the editorial leadership provided, and asked Dean Ashton to speak to this point. Dean Ashton expressed the opinion that the prestige journal would be a totally professional job and as a result would require more of a professional staff. While it is true that the articles might be somewhat comparable, the total effort would be to develop a distinctly prestige product. The business manager would also serve as a promotions manager, being responsible for the development and maintenance of a subscription list in addition to other duties. Professor Buehrig suggested that we could conceivably start with the third alternative which involved expanding the Alumni Review and in time, as experience merited, move to the prestige journal.

Dean Ashton replied that we might well start in a moderate way but that he was against this, feeling that the modest start would put its stamp upon the journal and hence the project would be handicapped right from the beginning.

Professor Gerking suggested that it was not clear as to what kind of audience the Committee had in mind. Each proposal seemed to be aimed at a different audience. He suggested that it would be helpful to know more precisely what kind of audience we are trying to serve.

Professor Cady replied that there had been a good bit of discussion on this point at the Committee meetings but that it is difficult at this point to determine the audience. Are we addressing a regional or a national audience? Reprints might be of appeal to a national group whereas a journal more comparable to the Virginia Quarterly Review would be of greater interest to a regional audience.

Professor Gerking suggested that a journal following the lead of the Scientific American, which has eliminated professional jargon might have national appeal.

Professor Buehrig suggested that as a minimum projection we might think of a quality magazine with our own alumni as the prospective clientele. He sees this as a very worthwhile purpose within practical limits. It might have larger appeal to libraries and colleges. He raised the question whether such a magazine would conflict with the existing alumni magazine. It was Mrs. Sturgeon's opinion that it would not.

The President pointed out that in the past the Alumni Quarterly had carried substantial articles as well as news items. The alumni felt that the news suffered and the new alumni journal was formed as a consequence. The move suggested by Professor Buehrig would represent a return to the two types of content but would be made available within two different journals. He reported that the alumni magazine now circulates to 20,000 people.

Professor Schuessler took advantage of a lull in the discussion to make a plug for a shorter magazine. He sees no particular virtue in a 96-page format, feeling that there is much of value in the present 32 pages which one can read in one sitting with definite feelings of accomplishment. The shorter format would cause writers to discipline themselves also.



The President expressed his feeling that we have an opportunity to spawn and sponsor a great publication if we can find the road we want to take.

Professor Veatch expressed his sympathy with Professor Buehrig's viewpoint that the Alumni Review, which is now functioning well, could be developed easily along the line suggested by the Committee. He then formed a question to Professor Cady. "In the report of your Committee there is indication that you are in sympathy with the Parker proposal to reprint articles from scholarly journals. Others suggest that the response to this idea has not been well received. Do you know of any evidence to support your point of view?"

Professor Cady, grinning widely, replied that he had learned long ago not to predict what magazines or books will sell and suggested that the horses would represent a better bet. Being as naive about the horses as he was dubious about the proposal, Professor Veatch questioned this at least for himself.

Professor Cady went on to say that he saw two major advantages in Professor Parker's idea. First, it had not been tried, and secondly, the idea came out of a thorough study of existing journals. It has the advantage of an inside and considered point of view, neither of which predicts popular success.

Professor Vitaliano raised the question whether this proposal would really have a high appeal to the scholar. Professor Appleman suggested that while Professor Parker's proposal was exciting in one way, it suggested something quite different from the other two proposals in regard to Indiana University. The other proposals would, he felt, present I.U. in a better way.

Professor Buehrig suggested that from this point of view the third alternative has the most to offer. Professor Appleman replied that this might result in too soft a sell for I.U.'s image and raised a question as to whether the Committee had considered a marriage of the prestige journal and an expansion of the Alumni Review. Might the Review be built into a prestige journal by doing more with it than suggested in the Committee's report?

Dean Ashton replied that this was consistent with his point of view. If we use the Review it should be a prestigious effort.

As the hour was late and the Council was not ready for action, the President appointed an ad hoc committee to prepare a specific proposal for Council's consideration at its next meeting. The committee consists of Professor Buehrig, Chairman, Mrs. Sturgeon, Professor Veatch, Dean Ashton, and Professor Cady.

The President once more expressed his personal appreciation and that of the Faculty Council to the Chairman and the members of her committee for their excellent work. Thus, having fulfilled its responsibility, the committee was discharged.

The President informed the Council that the report on building priorities might be available for discussion at the May 15 meeting in which case, the Council would be in longer session, from 3:00-5:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Leo Fay, Secretary