

✓
NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, 18 May 1965

3:30 p.m.

Ballantine 8

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of 4 May 1965
2. Recommendation for changing rules for withdrawal from and adding courses, Fac. Doc. No. 19, 1964-65 (attached)
3. Discussion of President Stahr's report on parking plan, (see minutes of 4 May 1965)
4. President's business

The Agenda Committee,

Leo Fay
Charles Vitaliano
Mary Gaither, Chairman

CONFIDENTIAL
Minutes of the Faculty Council
18 May 1965

These minutes have been approved by the Faculty Council.

Members absent, no alternate: Dean Maynard K. Hine
Dean Glenn Irwin
Professor Shelby Gerking
Professor Robert Greenleaf

Alternates present: Dean Ray Heffner for President Stahr
Dean Charles Webb for Dean Bain
Dean John Endwright for Dean Daniels
Dean Rufus Reiberg for Dean Higgins
Professor Robert Richey for Dean Shane
Dean John Porter for Dean Pinnell
Professor Harry Pratter for Dean Wallace
Professor Raymond Smith for Professor Auer
Professor Robert Shellhamer for Dr. Lukemeyer

Visitors present: Deans Warner Chapman, Philip Peak, and Robert Shaffer
Mr. Charles Harrell, Registrar
Messrs. Howell H. Brooks, Chairman, and Robert Jordan of the Parking Study Committee

Agenda

1. Approval of the minutes of 4 May 1965
2. Announcement from Convocations Committee on Viet Nam discussion
3. Memorial Resolution for Dean Byron F. Laird
4. Announcement of Nominations Committee for Council Officer Elections
5. Proposal for changing rules governing withdrawals and addition of courses, Fac. Doc. 19, 1964-65
6. Discussion of new parking proposal.

1. In the absence of President Stahr, Dean Heffner presided and called the Council to order at 3:36 p.m. As there were no corrections, the minutes stood approved as distributed in draft.

2. Dean Heffner recalled that at the last meeting there had been considerable discussion of the desirability of inviting to speak here a prominent person holding a different view from that of the State Department team on Viet Nam. Professor Buehrig, as a member of the Convocations Committee, announced that Professor Dickerson had succeeded in reaching Senator Morse and learned that

he could come to Indiana University to speak on 27 June, after the adjournment of the current semester, but that he was not available for an earlier date. Dean Heffner remarked that it was an unfortunate date for our administrative officials, for they will be meeting on that date with the Board of Trustees at Camp Brosius. However, that date is the first Sunday of the summer term and it is desirable to present on the Convocation Series a speaker of note early in the summer. Although this matter is not official Council business, Dean Heffner said, unless there is objection the Convocations Committee will invite Senator Morse to speak on 27 June. There were no objections.

3. Dean Reiberg then presented a memorial resolution for Dean Byron K. Laird, after which the Council signified its acceptance by standing in a moment of silence.

4. Dean Heffner announced that President Stahr wished it known that the Agenda Committee (Professors Fay, Vitaliano, and Gaither, Chairman) had been appointed as the Nominations Committee for Council Office Elections. Professor Remak, in answer to his expressed concern, was assured that the respective members would overcome their own modesty to insure that one of them would be nominated for a place on the next Agenda Committee to maintain a desired continuity.

5. Proposal for changing rules for withdrawals and addition of courses.

In his presentation of the proposal relating to withdrawals (see Fac. Doc. 19, 1964-65), Mr. Harrell noted that the new rules would reduce the number of weeks governing the automatic "W" from four to three, and change "the student shall be required to show adequate reasons for withdrawal to the dean of his school" (p. 60 of Handbook) to "withdrawal is permitted only if the dean of the student's school approves on the basis of urgent reasons relating to the student's health or equivalent distress." This latter change, Mr. Harrell noted, is to aid the deans in determining cause for withdrawal after the official time period and to help establish a uniformity of practice from school to school. The third change, which relates to adding a course, would require the instructor of the course to be added to originate the request that an exception be made for the student wishing to add the course (see pp. 21-22 of Handbook).

Discussion.

A question from Professor Hagen made it clear that the change under consideration applied only to undergraduate students. Graduate students are governed by rules of the Graduate School and of the other graduate divisions. Professor Carter said the rules for the Graduate School were roughly equivalent except that the four-weeks period operates, but an exception is made for the student who "tests out" of his language requirement. Dean Chapman noted that this is spelled out in a letter from Dean Curtis of 13 January 1965. Dean Heffner added that the Graduate Council is now considering some additional changes.

"Health and equivalent distress."

Dean Gucker inquired as to the exact meaning of "health or equivalent distress." Both Mr. Harrell and Dean Peak gave instances of students' being allowed to withdraw after the official time period on the basis of proved hardship at home and extreme psychological disturbance. Professor Carter said he was willing to vote for the changes recommended but he would hope that the administrators of this ruling will allow considerable latitude in some cases in the interpretation of "equivalent distress." He could see it easily and honestly being taken to mean for a student that a given course is boring and intellectually unstimulating. Dean Gucker felt that such boredom would evince itself in the first three weeks period, but Professor Carter was not at all sure and emphasized that he just wanted in some cases legitimate excuses recognized. Professor Remak supported Professor Carter's stand, but for a different interpretation: sometimes a student discovers, especially in foreign languages, that he should have taken a more advanced course, and he should be allowed to withdraw from the present course and enroll in the more desirable one.

Motion.

Professor Carter moved that the recommendations of the committee to change the rules governing withdrawals and addition of courses be accepted. This was seconded by Professor Gurd.

"Not in attendance during the last several weeks."

Referring to the last sentence of the proposed paragraph E, Professor Byrnes asked if there were many problems of the kind described as "not in attendance during the last several weeks." Both Mr. Harrell and Dean Porter felt there were not many, but pointed out there was a procedure already set up to deal with this situation (this assumes the student misses the final examination). Professor Byrnes' inquiry drew Professor Remak's attention to the phrase "several weeks." He felt this gives too much latitude and might make for pressure on instructors. We ought to find out what has happened to the student in these weeks. He would suggest a shorter and more specific limit--two weeks. Dean Peak pointed out that the present regulation reads only "late in the semester." Dean Porter suggested that in cases where the instructor does not take attendance, he will not know the student has been absent until he does not show up for the final. And the student will get caught by the Dean of Students Committee on Absences, observed Professor Smith. But only if he petitions for a make-up examination, answered Dean Chapman.

This prompted Dean Chapman then to urge the use of Incomplete instead of F in these cases. Some instructors, he felt, use the F too quickly for the student who misses the final and then must change the grade after the student goes through the regular procedure of making up the examination. He would recommend a review of the more extensive use of Incomplete as a time-saver as much as anything else. Professor Remak observed that for one faculty member giving a rash F there are at least three students trying to get away with an Incomplete to avoid a poor grade.

Amendment to the motion.

Professor Remak moved that the motion to accept the recommendations be amended to substitute "two weeks" for "several weeks" in paragraph E. This was seconded by Professor Byrnes.

Dean Gucker wanted to know if this included the final examination period, but Professor Remak stated it was to include only the teaching weeks of the semester. Dean Peak stated that this was made clear by the third paragraph on p. 21 which states the rules governing the student's removal of an Incomplete given because he missed the final examination--his absence must be cleared by the Dean of Students Committee on Absences. To clear the air and put the discussion in context, Dean Heffner then read aloud the section from the Handbook on the grade of Incomplete, noting that "within two semesters of subsequent residence" has been changed to "one calendar year." He stated that there are thus routine procedures for changing the Incomplete to an F for the student who does not satisfy the committee that his absence was legitimate.

Changing his tack, Professor Remak said he would like a firmer statement than "believes" in the last sentence of paragraph E. He would not object to "several weeks" if something like "reliably informed" were used instead of "believe." Dean Peak pointed out that the crux of the matter lies in the proof of absence beyond the student's control being obtained in any case before a final decision is made. There is protection to the student before the grade becomes final. Yet, Professor Remak said that he found it very difficult to believe that a student unavoidably detained from class for two or three weeks could not get word, directly or indirectly, to his instructor of the reasons for this absence.

Returning to the amendment before the Council, Mr. Harrell said that "two weeks" would work very well in discovering the delinquents, and Dean Peak said it would not rule out cases of absences of three weeks. In answer to Professor Hagen's question of whether the adoption of the amendment would eliminate the possibility of giving an Incomplete prior to the final two-week period, Dean Heffner summarized the meaning of the proposed change: A faculty member is not allowed to give an Incomplete unless he is satisfied that the student has reason for failure to complete the work for the course, but in the last few weeks of the semester he may give the grade of Incomplete even if he is not completely satisfied, because there is another procedure by which the case can be reviewed by the Dean of Students Committee and some satisfaction given. Any time before this last period it would be up to the Instructor to satisfy himself that the purposes for the Incomplete have been met. Dean Peak agreed with this interpretation and added that the idea is to protect the student and at the same time not force the faculty member to make a decision when he does not have the time to get all the information.

At this point Mr. Harrell asked if just "late in the semester" as it now reads would not serve the purpose without spelling out the exact length of time. Dean Peak asked if this would imply the

student missed the final examination? What if he misses the last three weeks of classes but takes the final? Mr. Harrell said the implication of the statement was that he missed also the final. Professor Carter then stated he saw no reason to change the words. The controlling question here is the final examination and there are procedures to cover that if it is missed. For his own part, if a student missed the last three weeks of class, took the final, and passed that would be fine. However, if this same student missed the final he would want to know if it was missed deliberately. Such a permissive policy, Professor Remak contended, would not work in the foreign language area where oral recitation and aural comprehension are often crucial parts of the class work.

Professor Remak then withdrew his amendment, with the approval of the second, and moved as a substitute amendment that "reliably informed" be substituted for "believe." There was no second. Dean Braden asked if there was not a presumption that a faculty member's belief is based on reliable information from the Dean of Students? Professor Byrnes moved that "has reason to believe" be substituted for "believe." This was seconded by Professor Remak.

The question was called for, and the motion carried by a vote of 23 to 3. Those voting NO were Dean Gucker and Professors Day and Pratt. AYE votes were cast by the remainder with no abstentions.

Original motion.

Moving now to the original motion, Professor Richey noted that the committee had made no recommendations for either the inter-session or the post-session. Mr. Harrell replied that no consideration had been given to these two short sessions, for they presented no problem. Dean Porter observed that a withdrawal in either of these sessions is tantamount to withdrawing from the University rather than just reducing his load.

The question was called for, and the motion to accept the recommendation of the committee with the amended phrase "has reason to believe" was passed unanimously.

6. New Parking Proposal.

Dean Heffner introduced Mr. Brooks, chairman of the Parking Study Committee, and another of its members, Mr. Robert Jordan, to answer questions from the Council on the summary of its report presented at the last meeting by President Stahr. At Dean Heffner's request the other members of the committee were identified: E.P. Bardwell, William Hepley (for just this report), Lawrence Hudson, Hall King, Robert Richey, Howard Rostorfer, Karl Schuessler, William Spannuth, Robert Stout, Robert Sturgeon, Leslie Waters, and Charles Webb.

Mr. Brooks prefaced the discussion with some general remarks on the report. He noted that it had been drafted in a short time with reference to some of its recommendations. The committee felt its basic decision centered on whether we can afford to continue to offer free surface parking and at the same time finance high-rise garages. Its assumption was that Indiana had waited longer than it should and longer than other large universities to solve the parking distress on campus.

Discussion--need and alternatives.

Professor Pratt opened the discussion with the observation that many of us dislike seeing the multi-level garages come, both because of their expense and because of their unattractiveness. He would hope that with the University in lovely natural surroundings, relatively unspoiled by features of the large metropolises, we would not have to come to this as a solution. He inquired if consideration had been given to other possibilities such as the effect of eliminating cars for all undergraduates or allowing faculty members a permit for only one car. Would any measures of this kind have any appreciable effect upon the problem?

Mr. Brooks answered that these possibilities were considered, but the elimination of student cars not seriously. Certain students, such as handicapped ones, have to be taken care of, but the elimination of student cars in itself will not help the parking situation for faculty and staff on the central campus and near perimeter. He noted that this academic year there have been issued 7000 student permits and 6600 faculty and staff all-campus and zone permits for a total of 6515 spaces which include 4004 open (unrestricted) spaces in various areas such as around the residence halls. Thus, even if the student cars were not permitted we would still have the same problem.

In view of these figures, Professor Vitaliano wondered if restricting faculty and staff to only one permit might not help. Mr. Brooks had no figures on how many had more than one car, but said the committee saw no reason why an individual might not purchase a permit for each of his cars, but each permit would cost the full fee. However, in cases where an individual might own more than one car but not use the same one each time he came to the campus, he might purchase just one permit and receive a special decal. This would be a magnetic detachable decal, transferable from one car to another. Mr. Brooks was unable to tell Professor Carter what percentage of student cars belonged to graduate students. Dean Braden observed that since the 4000 open spaces are around the resident halls and student areas, we are really talking about 2500 spaces for 6600 cars. Mr. Brooks was not sure of the number of staff permits and number of faculty permits in answer to Professor Robinson's question, but Dean Heffner stated that we have approximately 1300 full-time faculty on the campus. Whether permits for graduate TAs and Research Associates would be included in faculty he did not know.

Financing.

Professor Delbert Miller said he was not concerned about the lack of architectural beauty of parking garages, for he had seen some attractive ones, but he was concerned about the financing. He said that to his knowledge no large employer in the Bloomington-Indianapolis area fails to provide free parking for his employees. Why should the University's employees be forced to bear the expense of parking? Do federal and state employees pay for their parking? Can no other plan for financing than the one proposed be presented? Mr. Brooks answered that the details of financing have not been worked out yet. Most other academic institutions are financing their parking facilities by fees from those who use the facilities. Other than an outright gift for the purpose, what alternative is

there? State funds allocated for other purposes cannot be used to finance parking facilities.

At this point Dean Heffner recalled President Stahr's comments at the last meeting relative to this matter--should the entire staff, faculty and student body be assessed or just those who use the facilities? If we use state funds we will be using funds appropriated for other purposes such as salaries, instruction, equipment, etc.

Professor Vitaliano returned to the matter of the two-car family. Would it help any if we allowed only one car per faculty or staff person at the established rate as now but charge extra for the second or even a third car? To Professor Day's question of the likelihood of a person having more than one car at a time on campus, Professor Vitaliano said it often happens when two people from the same family are employed by the University but on different schedules and at different locations.

Dean Braden wished to speak to the point raised by Professor Miller. He did not think we can accept the broad assertion that an employer provides parking for his employees. Does Ayres, for instance, provide parking for its employees? And surely the spaces around the State House cannot accommodate all the employees there. If you locate in a rural area where land is plentiful, you might be able to provide parking. But, in effect, when we buy products on the market we are helping those businesses, who do, provide parking. We have the option to provide parking only if we use fee income or appropriated income. We operate on a very tight budget, too tight to allow us to build new parking facilities and do all the other things we need and want to do. Mr. Brooks said that since we are a state institution we should make comparisons, not with private business, but with other comparable institutions. Other universities seem to have been successful in solving this problem and moving from free to paid parking. Dean Heffner asked Mr. Brooks if it is true that Indiana was the only Big Ten school with no schedule of parking fees; Mr. Brooks replied that he thought this was true.

Future planning and potential problems.

Professor Byrnes observed that buildings were put up here on the assumption that this is an automotive country. Observe the lack of sidewalks around the new buildings, especially at University School, now two years old--and the lack of bicycle paths. And there seem to be no plans for them. The time is coming when all student cars will be prohibited and a student will find himself in a dormitory two miles away from campus with no bicycle paths or enough safe walks. One of the reasons there is so much travel by car here is that bicycle riding is hazardous. He would recommend a study of campus facilities with a view to planning for more walks and making bicycle lanes, and this to be done in cooperation with the city authorities; the eastern expansion of the city is also without walks and bicycle paths.

Dean Heffner said the Johnson, Johnson, and Roy survey and report did take these matters into account. It considered the whole

question of traffic flow including pedestrian and vehicular traffic and attempted to do just what Professor Byrnes has suggested. It would be desirable he felt to have a fuller account of the study presented to the Council. Mr. Brooks added that the study had recommended working with the city and that already some of its suggestions had gone into effect, such as making Third, Atwater, Indiana, and Dunn Streets one-way. Also, Dean Heffner said, while the principal charge to the group was study of traffic flow, it had also taken into account the preservation of the green areas and the planning for pleasant walking.

Professor Hagen raised the question of whether the fee for the most desirable parking areas would amount to a hunting license or will it assure the individual a space? Mr. Brooks said the committee wished to eliminate the hunting aspect as much as possible. The irregular pattern of traffic, unlike that of an industrial plant, for example, will help some. Statistics from the National Parking Association show university uses of parking can be accommodated if space is oversold by about 20%. To keep the lots full and usable to maximum efficiency some overselling is required. However, this is still in the planning stages. He added that six new parking garages would provide a total of 2100-3000 spaces. If we had those now plus what we already have we would be caught up only to what we need today.

Dean Heffner reported that experience shows that even a slight overselling gives the purchaser a very good expectation of finding space near where he needs to be. Reserving space costs more and is inefficient if there is only partial use. Professor Hagen said that if the paying of the fee did not do more than at present to assure availability of space, there would still be problems; he felt, however, that the notion of the detachable decal was a good one.

Mr. Jordan pointed out that our problem now is that our lots are over-issued 120%. The new plan should reduce this, especially with the free parking at the Field House with the shuttle bus service. Professor Buehrig thought that the charge of a substantial fee would undoubtedly reduce the demand for decals to the point where it would work to the advantage of relieving the space situation. Mr. Jordan agreed and said the committee had felt this also and that it thought that car pools would thus be encouraged.

Provision for further discussion.

So many other questions, some specific, others general, came up that Dean Heffner suggested again the desirability of having the Johnson, Johnson and Roy report in full presented at the last meeting if time permitted. In answer to Professor Carter's question of whether it is intended to move ahead with this parking arrangement before next fall, Dean Heffner said that President Stahr would like the fullest discussion possible. Do we accept this plan, do we go along as we are now, can we suggest alternatives? This report is one proposal for solving the dilemma. Professor Carter felt that unless the desire is to implement this plan as of September 1965, it could well carry over until next fall since it has come up so late. It is a matter of just when a decision is necessary. Dean Heffner answered that some questions are crucial

for next September, and there is need to provide more parking as soon as possible.

As there is already a full agenda for the 1 June meeting, it was proposed by Professor Bowman that we extend the Council meeting on that date in order to cover the material. Dean Shaffer observed that since there are no classes that week we could begin an hour earlier. It was taken by consent to begin the meeting on 1 June at 2:30 instead of 3:30 so that we might consider the Johnson, Johnson, and Roy report.

Trying to reduce the problem to its literal, practical aspects, Dean Braden stated that no one has a real proposal or mission, but if we are going to get some more parking by dramatic means it is going to cost money. If we get it by other means, it means going out from the campus because real estate close in costs too much to put into surface parking. On campus we can raze the Campus Club and thereby extend the Union Parking Lot, and probably find 20 or so other spaces here and there. If we are going to move we have to start at the beginning of a semester. But we do not have to move any time--we can just continue as we are and try to make the best of it.

Professor Carter proposed that in preparation for the 1 June meeting that the committee identify the crucial decisions for next fall and provide some kind of graphic presentation for the total plan. And Professor Byrnes asked if some estimate could be made of what the impact of fees would be if they were initiated next fall. A large enough number of parkers might be scared out so that the building of the garages could be delayed. It is true some might be scared out, Mr. Brooks said, but not enough. The University of Michigan now has five garages and is planning another and doing it with fees. Dean Braden suggested the comparable building of residence halls--one helps to build others.

Other questions on fees and prime spaces were asked, the answers to which had already been given in President Stahr's summary last meeting. Finally, Professor Vitaliano asked how it would be judged what is prime space and what is not with reference to where an individual needs to go. He felt that space should be reserved for personnel according to where he worked; prime space for one might be peripheral for another. For example, Ballantine parking would be prime space for anyone who taught or worked in that building, while space at the Geology building, prime for the geologists, would be peripheral for the Ballantine parkers. There was no immediate answer to this question.

The meeting concluded with a reminder from Dean Heffner that we would meet at 2:30 on 1 June to allow first the discussion of the parking problem. Professor Remak urged, in preparation for this discussion, the earliest possible distribution to the entire faculty of the minutes of 4 May which contain President Stahr's summary of the parking report.

The Council adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Gaither, Secretary