

Notice of Meeting

Faculty Council

15 December 1964

3:30 p.m. Ballantine 08

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of 17 November and 1 December.
2. President's business.
3. Resumption of discussion of Report on Status of Lecturers, Fac. Doc. No. 8, 1964-65.
4. Elections to Faculty Board of Review.

RECEIVED

DEC 8 - 1964

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER

Notice of Meeting
Faculty Council
15 December 1964
3:30 p.m. Ballantine 08

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of 17 November and 1 December.
2. President's business.
3. Reception of discussion of Report on Status of
Instructors, Inc. Dec. No. 8, 1964-65.
4. Elections to Faculty Board of Review.



CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council
15 December 1964

These minutes have been approved by the Council.

Members absent, no alternate: Dean John W. Ashton
Dean Wilfred C. Bain
Dean John I. Nurnberger
Dr. George Lukemeyer
Professor Leo Fay

Alternates present: Professor Bernard Loft for Dean Daniels
Dean Dan Orescanin for Dean Higgins
Dean Ralph McDonald for Dean Hine
Professor Robert Richey for Dean Shane

Visitor present: Professor Taulman Miller

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of 17 November and 1 December.
 2. President's business.
 3. Resumption of discussion of Report on Status of Lecturers, Fac. Doc. No. 8, 1964-65.
 4. Elections to Faculty Board of Review
-

1. The Faculty Council was called to order by President Stahr at 3:38 p.m. After accepting a request from Professor Lundin for the deletion of a phrase from the draft minutes of 17 November, the Council approved both sets of minutes as distributed.

2. President Stahr repeated his announcement, made in his State of the University address at the general Faculty meeting on December 14, of the appointment of Professors William Breneman (Zoology), York Willbern (Government), and George Wilson (Transportation) to the three-man central committee to conduct the self-survey, with Professor Willbern as chairman.

The second item dealt with the distribution to the faculty of his State of the University address. Deans and departmental chairmen are sent copies of the report automatically; it was agreed that it would be sent to other faculty members at their request as in the past, a notice for such requests to go out with these minutes.

3. Because Dean Heffner had presided at the last meeting when the Report on the Status of Lecturers was first discussed, President Stahr asked him to preside over the remainder of the discussion this afternoon. Dean Heffner asked Professor Taulman Miller to open the consideration of the specific recommendations as had been agreed upon at the last meeting. First, Professor Miller said he felt that an ambiguity existed in the committee's broad proposal for elimination of the title of lecturer: it was intended to apply only to the group of newly recruited young teaching staff members lacking the terminal degree, not to those distinguished persons brought in on part-time or temporary basis. He is convinced now, too, that to use the title of instructor for these new teachers is not wise in view of the competitive academic market. And finally, he said he wanted to repeat that the reason the specific recommendations were made was that the treatment of the lecturers who were eagerly recruited and sought after and who assumed full-time teaching duties was not justified.

Turning to the first point--the lack of voting privilege for lecturers (p. 5)--Dean Heffner asked for comments. President Stahr asked if this disenfranchisement prevented the lecturer from voting on departmental matters or only on general faculty matters and for representation on the Council. Dean Heffner answered that the constitutional provisions do not affect departmental practices. There was no further discussion of this first point so it was taken by consent that this recommendation meets with the approval of the Council (no recommendation to amend the Constitution to make full-time lecturers voting members of the faculty, but that consideration be given to the disenfranchised segment of the teaching staff in any comprehensive University survey of academic personnel policies and practices).

The second recommendation (p. 6) urged the continuing practice of sending the Faculty Council minutes to full-time lecturers. Dean Heffner reviewed the rather complicated matter of distribution of minutes to both regular faculty and others not faculty but involved in University policies and decisions. Dean Gucker expressed approval of the recommendation but questioned the advisability and necessity of sending the minutes to research associates, especially those who are here for just a short time. Professor Gaither reviewed the background of the charge made last spring to the current Agenda Committee to make recommendations for a tighter security in distribution of the minutes. Aware that cutting down on numbers did not necessarily ensure security, it had, however, among other recommendations, suggested the elimination of lecturers and research associates from the mailing list. Dean Heffner suggested that what is needed really is an administrative review of the categories of the mailing list and categories of appointments with a view to retaining those of the full-time teaching staff moving toward regular faculty status and dropping those who have no need to be fully informed. Professor Vitaliano, as a member of the Agenda Committee, explained that the Committee felt strongly that those not going to be faculty should not receive the minutes. He knew of certain research associates who, after the leaks last spring, said they wished they had not received the minutes.

Professor Carter then spoke to a strong support of the recommendation as crucial to providing full information to full-time lecturers and to treating them equally. To Professor Auer's suggestion that some part-time teaching staff receive the minutes and that departmental chairmen could best make recommendations in these cases, Dean Heffner answered that such a plan would not be feasible and would amount to setting up a different category of appointment. Professor Pratt observed that the mailing list as set up in Duplicating requires us to work by categories, not by individual names. Commenting on the wider implications of the mailing list, Dean Heffner reported that the Agenda Committee had also been concerned about those outside Bloomington not receiving the minutes in individual addressed envelopes. A new technique for distribution of minutes outside Bloomington is in order. A question from President Stahr asked for a clarification of the consensus on this recommendation--are we or are we not saying all lecturers are to receive the minutes, or just those who are full-time teachers? Dean Heffner answered that he took the consensus to be that lecturers who are in regular process toward faculty rank should receive the minutes, and some procedure toward this end will have to be worked out. The recommendation that full-time teaching lecturers should continue to receive the minutes was accepted by consent.

The next item, consideration of tenure policy (p. 6), Professor Taulman Miller pointed out is not really a formal recommendation for change, but rather a comment that the University's requiring the terminal degree is a reasonable and proper basis for differentiation, and that until an individual completes this requirement it is not proper to count time as a lecturer toward tenure. Dean Heffner observed that there is always open the option of giving credit toward tenure for service as a lecturer or for granting tenure at an earlier date than at the expiration of the probationary period. This recommendation or comment does not rule out counting this period toward tenure--it simply does not rule it in. Dean Gucker rose to say that he took particular exception to that part of the last sentence of the committee's statement beginning "that careful consideration be given to counting time in the lecturer status as service toward tenure at the time when a deserving individual's title is changed from lecturer to instructor or professor." He sees such a policy taking away incentive to finish the degree. He would rather see the possibility of tenure being given at any time when an individual has proved himself. A man working on a degree is not making a contribution as a scholar.

Dean Heffner said that he had read the statement of the committee as applying to specific actions by deans and chairmen, that in each individual case careful consideration should be given, rather than establishing this as a general university policy. Professor Miller was asked to clarify the statement. He said the intent simply was to allow recommendation for tenure earlier if it was justified. Dean Gucker replied that if this were the case then the statement needs not to be made and is undesirable, for the lecturer will assume then his time at that level will count. Professor Miller was agreeable to ending the sentence after "excerpt," deleting that part in question.

Professor Carter observed that the recommendation as he reads it is really a recommendation to continue with our same tenure policy, but that the sentence immediately preceding the one under discussion ("There is no excuse for using the lecturer status to evade the requirements of the tenure policy.") actually raises a question not concerned with the lecturer as we have been discussing him but refers to those with the terminal degree appointed as lecturers. Dean Gucker stated that in such cases as those he is familiar with, the appointment was so made for the benefit of the individual; further, he said he felt that if a person is going to be given all the privileges of an assistant professor, then he should be so appointed, but if he does not qualify he should be appointed as an instructor to compete in the regular process. The implication here he feels is to evade the requirements of the tenure policy. Dean Braden offered the possibility that this statement applies to a person who will have completed tenure time with another one year appointment, but it is decided not to give him tenure and appoint him as a lecturer to give him time to look for another job. Dean Gucker and Professor Gerking both agreed with this interpretation but were not certain if the title of lecturer was the one to be used in these cases. Professor Miller recalled that a member of the committee felt he had known of cases in which the title was used to evade giving tenure and that is how the statement got into the report. Dean Pinnell said he felt that the forces of competition now work against situations like this.

Prompted by Dean Heffner, Professor Carter offered a motion that no changes be made in the tenure policy (seconded by Professor Bowman). When Professor Gerking pointed out that this motion does not eliminate the subject sentence, Dean Heffner explained that it cannot be eliminated from the report but that Council action is on the motion not on the committee's recommendation. After further discussion by President Stahr, Professors Bowman, Carter, and Remak on how the sentence might be changed to preserve its intent but delete what is objectionable in it and of cases in the past when this situation did maintain, the question for the motion was called for. The motion was carried unanimously.

The next recommendation for consideration was that dealing with notice of termination of appointment (p. 7). Dean Heffner felt this was a very important recommendation--that full-time lecturers be treated in exactly the same way as regular faculty members in a probationary status. If he is in his first or second year as lecturer he will be given notice no later than 15 March of the year his appointment expires; if he has served more than two years he will be given notice by 1 June of the year preceding the termination. Professor Miller reiterated the desirability for fair and equitable treatment. To Professor Pratt's question of whether this is not what we are doing now, Dean Heffner answered that there is no regular procedure for handling reappointment of lecturers, that they are not on the lists going out to deans and chairmen. They have no assurance that they will be notified early of termination of appointment. Professor Day moved and Professor Pratt seconded that we accept the recommendation presented by the committee.

Dean Gucker asked to speak against the motion. Why should a lecturer be given an extra year's notice for not completing his degree? In addition, the adoption of this policy will make an excessive amount of work for the administrative offices. Dean Heffner could not see how the lecturer is fundamentally different from the instructor in this matter. Dean Gucker answered that he thought it seemed unnecessary to give this notice to an instructor who has a one-year appointment or to anyone who knows he is here for only one year. Professor Day said that this notice would not be necessary if the letter of appointment states that it is for one year and one year only. Dean Heffner replied that all appointments for lecturer are for one year even though there may be an understanding that the appointment may be renewed; in cases where the appointment is clearly stated as being for one year only, there might be no necessity for early notice. Dean Gucker answered that he felt he had been put in the position of dealing roughly with or insulting those who had accepted one-year-only appointments when he had to notify them that they would not be reappointed. President Stahr raised the question of whether notice had not already been given long before March if the initial appointment states that it is for a year. Professor Remak felt that Dean Gucker's point does not apply to visiting appointments because they are not probationary. That extra work may be involved is no reason not to give minimum protection to a lecturer while he looks for a job.

Dean Heffner said he felt it was a matter of working out a special technique for visiting appointments, but the ordinary lecturer deserves the same consideration as the instructor. The present situation he feels is wrong. Professor Pratt agreed with Dean Gucker that it is awkward and embarrassing to notify a person he does not have something he did not expect to have, but this embarrassment is small compared to the need to treat these ordinary lecturers with the requirements of basic humanity.

Dean Gucker declined Dean Heffner's invitation to amend the motion--he just wanted to speak in opposition to it, especially as it applies to the one-year cases. Perhaps, if the motion goes through, more pressure will be put on chairmen to remove lecturers in "limbo status" at the end of two years. Dean Pinnell asked if the original letter of appointment indicates the appointment is only for one year must we still send a notice of termination by 1 March? The individual is entitled to protection but it does seem redundant to notify him 1 July and again 1 March. If the department wants this man for another year it ought to have to compete for him. A lecturer should not get the idea he will be appointed over and over. Restrictions to short-term (one academic year) appointments would be to the benefit of the individual and the administration. Dean Heffner was not sure such a restriction would solve anything: we are restricted to one year appointments at present, even for instructors, and yet we have given them this guarantee beyond the expiration of their technical period of appointment. Again Dean Pinnell repeated that his question is if we indicate at the time of appointment that the appointment is for a precise length do we still have to send a second notice by the following March? Dean Heffner thought a technique could be worked out for

an initial appointment which will specify that the appointment is for a definite period only.

Professor Carter interposed at this point to say that there are really two points before us; one, the technique of appointment, which might be solved by appointing people as visiting appointees; two, the question of a warning period for termination of appointment for lecturers. He proposed an amendment to the motion, to change the 1 June date to 15 December. This gives the individual three additional months to be on the market and keeps it within the one-year frame, rather than making it a two-year extension as Dean Gucker had suggested in his opposition to the motion. The motion for amendment was seconded by Professor Auer.

In the discussion that followed, it was made clear that two years of service means academic years for people on ten months appointments and calendar years for people on twelve months appointments, and that the only real obstacle to accepting the 15 December date as proposed would be the heightened pressure of meeting another deadline. Dean Pinnell pointed out that the individual concerned would actually benefit because he could take better advantage of professional meetings to look for another job. Protection of the individual in the competitive market requires earlier notice of termination. Dean Heffner then called for the vote on the Carter amendment to the motion. It carried with one dissenting vote, that of Professor Pratt.

Professor Byrnes asked when the new date would be effective. Dean Heffner replied that since the statement on notification of termination of appointment is not a part of the constitution, all that is required is that the Council action be sent to President Stahr for presentation to the Board of Trustees. Since today is the fifteenth of December and the next Board meeting will not be held until January, the new date of notice cannot become effective until next year.

Discussion on the motion as amended was then in order. In answer to questions from President Stahr, Dean Heffner affirmed that this does not change the treatment of instructors in the matter of termination notice: the lecturer after two years service will be notified by 15 December whereas the instructor in the same situation will be notified a year preceding the termination date. Answers to questions from Professor Gerking made clear that this motion will not make any changes in the tenure policy, only add a new category to the statement on notification of termination. Professor Day's motion to accept the committee's recommendation was called for. It was unanimously accepted.

In moving to the next recommendation, retirement benefits (p. 8), Dean Heffner suggested that the Retirement and Insurance Committee would want to consider the implications in actual implementation of any policy determined by the Council today. Professor Miller said some of his committee members were somewhat hesitant about the recommendation to admit lecturers to participation in the TIAA program under the eligibility rules now applicable to instructors until

it was recognized that about 85% of the full-time lecturers have been in that rank only three years or less. There would be no substantial increase in the number of TIAA participants in any given year except possibly the first. To Dean Heffner's suggestion that the recommendation would increase the number of participants in those cases in which a lecturer becomes an instructor after two or three years service, since he now has to wait an additional three, by present policies affecting eligibility that might make a six-year waiting period instead of three, Professor Miller reported that Mr. Barker of Insurance had assured him that no one is to serve two waiting periods--the maximum in any case is three years. Professor Bowman asked if there were a percentage figure for lecturers who become assistant professor rather than instructors. Professor Miller had none but guessed it was quite large. Dean Gucker thought it must be close to 100 per cent now.

Another factor to be taken into consideration here, Dean Heffner said, is the requirement by present rules for lecturers to enroll in the Public Employees Retirement Fund, whereas instructors are not so required. This means enrolling in one plan and then two or three years later transferring funds and enrolling in another. This makes for a complication, and some have objected to it. It was then taken by consent to ask the Retirement and Insurance Committee to make an early recommendation to us on the basis of this recommendation of the committee.

The next recommendation, that "all-campus" parking permits be issued to full-time lecturers (p. 9), was presented for discussion. Dean Heffner was of the opinion that this recommendation might come under the jurisdiction of the Parking Committee and that we should ask for a report from it on the committee's recommendation. Professor Carter stated that in practice the lecturers do get all-campus parking permits but the procedure should be regularized; he therefore moved the adoption of the recommendation (seconded by an unidentified voice). Dean Gucker wanted to know why full-time research associates were discriminated against and would add them to the category of lecturers for parking permits. Professor Hagen reported that he thought research associates got zone permits; he felt the distinction here is someone on the teaching staff called on to move about on campus--between the all-campus permit and the zone permit. This is why, Dean Heffner said, he felt the Council might not wish to act without hearing from the Parking Committee. Professor Delbert Miller wondered how many research associates there were and how many more spaces would be needed. The thing to know it was answered is how many research associates now do not have parking permits. It was asked whether they got the same consideration as faculty. Dean Heffner guessed they got zone permits rather than campus permits. The motion was then called for and unanimously passed.

When Dean Heffner observed that there were two more recommendations to be discussed, Professor Carter proposed postponing consideration of them until the next meeting, for the time was almost up and the elected members still had the business of electing mem-

bers to the Faculty Board of Review. This suggestion was agreeable to all, including Professor Taulman Miller who must return to the next meeting. The formal body adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

4. The elected members of the Council remained to cast ballots for members for the Faculty Board of Review nominated by the Agenda Committee as charged at the 17 November meeting. Those elected to serve from 1 February 1965 through 31 January 1966 were Assistant Professor Earl Floyd, Associate Professors Eugene Bayless and Janet McLean, and Professors Alfred Lindesmith and Val Nolan, the latter also to be presiding member.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Gaither, Secretary

bers to the Faculty Board of Review. This suggestion was agreeable to all, including Professor Taulman Miller who must return to the next meeting. The formal body adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

4. The elected members of the Council remained to cast ballots for members for the Faculty Board of Review nominated by the Agenda Committee as charged at the 17 November meeting. Those elected to serve from 1 February 1965 through 31 January 1966 were Assistant Professor Earl Floyd, Associate Professors Eugene Bayless and Janet McLean, and Professors Alfred Lindesmith and Val Nolan, the latter also to be presiding member.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Galtner, Secretary

DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE
DEVELOPMENT
JAN 13 1965