

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, 19 October 1965

3:30 p.m.

Ballantine 8

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 5, 1965
2. President's business
3. Honors Division      Fac. Doc. No. 2, 1965-66
4. The status of grade reports at mid-term
5. Half-hour credit penalty for late registration of undergraduates

Agenda Committee,

Mary Gaither  
Norman T. Pratt  
Shelby D. Gerking, Chairman



CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

19 October 1965

Approved by the Faculty Council, 16 November 1965

Members absent, no alternates: Vice President Lynne Merritt  
Dean Glenn Irwin  
Professor Quentin Hope  
Professor Stanley Ballinger  
Professor Sid Robinson

Alternates present: Dean Joseph Hartley for Vice-President Ray L. Heffner  
Professor Robert Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine  
Professor Patricia Hayes for Dean Emily Holmquist  
Dean Warner Chapman for Dean Joseph L. Sutton  
Professor Hanne Hicks for Dean Philip Peak  
Professor Owen Thomas for Professor Mary Gaither  
Professor Kennon Shank for Professor Robert Milisen  
Professor Eugene Murray for Professor Sylvia Bowman  
Professor Lloyd Ahlf for Professor Keith Lorentzen  
Professor Ward W. Moore for Professor George Lukemeyer

Visitors present: Registrar Charles Harrell, Dean John Snyder

---

Agenda

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 5, 1965
2. President's business
3. Honors Division Fac. Doc. No. 2, 1965-66
4. The status of grade reports at midterm
5. Half-hour credit penalty for late registration of undergraduates



President Stahr opened the October 19, 1965, meeting of the Faculty Council at 3:34 p.m.

The minutes of the October 5, 1965, meeting were approved without change by the Council

#### PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

President Stahr relayed a message from the Agenda Committee to the effect that items were needed for future meetings of the Council and the general faculty. Members were requested to submit items of business to the Secretary. Business usually accumulates during the latter part of the academic year and the agenda is not crowded for the first few meetings

The Faculty Parking Appeals Committee was the next item of business. President Stahr reported that he had been asked to obtain the opinion of the Council about the possibility of allowing the members of the Committee, other than the Chairman, to be anonymous. An anonymous committee would reduce substantially the tension underlying the personal and often delicate relationships encountered by the Committee members with their colleagues. Perhaps, the President stated, the membership of the Committee could be made known to the Council or to the Agenda Committee in order to insure that it would adequately express faculty opinion. In the discussion that followed, Professor Day said he was sympathetic with the problem, but was hesitant to accept a solution that involved anonymous membership. He asked whether or not the membership of the Committee could be made known, but that votes could be taken anonymously. This would relieve the burden of decision from the individual Committee members. Professor Wilson offered, with tongue in cheek, that he would be more willing to abolish the parking violations than the public nature of the Appeals Committee. Professor Fuchs asked about the operation of the Committee. Does it accept written appeals? Perhaps the Committee might seek relief by accepting only written documents which clearly stated a faculty member's position with regard to an alleged violation. Professor Yamaguchi offered the suggestion that members of the Committee have shorter terms. At least each member would have fewer enemies after his term was completed.

President Stahr, at this point, sensed the feeling of the Council that an anonymous committee would be against its wishes. This opinion would be passed on to the present committee.

The dedication of the Kokomo Regional Campus was drawn to the attention of the Council by President Stahr. The dedication is scheduled for Friday, November 12, 1965, at 3:00 p.m. An academic procession and a short program will be followed by a reception and tours of the building. The hope was expressed that members of the Council could attend. His personal invitation was extended to members of the Faculty who would be warmly welcomed. Dean Higgins' office could be contacted for information concerning academic dress and transportation.



President Stahr asked the Secretary to present a statement concerning the delivery of parking decals from the Division of Safety. The Secretary read a communication from Professor Yamaguchi and several of his colleagues in the Psychology Department, and a reply from Mr. Spanmuth, Director of the Division of Safety.

# INDIANA UNIVERSITY

## Interdepartmental Communication

To: Professor Shelby Gerking      From: Dr. Yamaguchi et al.

Chairman, Faculty Council      Dept: Psychology  
 Agenda Committee  
 Agenda Request: Parking  
 Permit Pick-up      Date: Sept. 13, 1965

One of the rules governing the issuing of Parking Permits is as follows:

"All decals and parking permits are to be secured in person at the office of the Division of Safety."  
 (Faculty Handbook, 1962, p.45)

There is good reason to believe that there is considerable sentiment in the University community to eliminate the "in person" feature of this rule. Such a change would allow, for example, the head secretary of a department to be authorized to pick up permits for members of a department.

To this, or some similar end, we, the undersigned faculty members, request that your committee place the parking permit pick-up problem on the agenda of the Faculty Council.

# INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Department of Safety

October 11, 1965

Professor Shelby Gerking  
 Secretary, Faculty Council  
 Jordan Hall, Room 005

Dear Professor Gerking:

In reply to our telephone conversation concerning the issuance of decals by the Safety Department, I wish to advise that all eligible faculty and staff members, or their representatives, may pick up the parking permits at this office.



When a representative calls for the decal, they must bring with them the completed vehicle registration form.

Sincerely yours,

Signed: William G. Spannuth

Professor Chapman asked whether or not the U.S. mail could be used for the delivery of decals. President Stahr replied that he was not prepared to answer the question and asked the Secretary to communicate with Mr. Spannuth about this possibility.

#### HONORS DIVISION

Dean Chapman opened the discussion about the Honors Division by saying that he welcomed comments and criticism of the proposal from members of the Council. Professor Pratt responded that he was certain that faculty opinion was wholeheartedly in favor of increasing the significance of our honors program. He would like to inquire, however, what is proposed to increase its significance, and to make it more highly respected than it is at the present time. What were the specific steps that were being contemplated in this regard? Dean Chapman replied that the administrative structure of the program was, at present, not adequate to keep in close contact with honor students and to develop a positive attitude throughout the state toward the interest of the University in the superior student. He has encountered many instances where high school counsellors lack sufficient information about Indiana University's offerings for superior students. For example, the Honors College at Michigan State University and the University Honors Program at the University of Illinois seem to be better known than the program at Indiana University.

In reply to the second question, the University Honors Committee has considered a number of steps that could be taken toward improving the program. These include:

1. The developing, but yet not complete nor fully satisfactory, merit scholarship program of the University Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aids.
2. The initiation of Academic Dormitory Units for superior undergraduates, undertaken in conjunction with the Halls of Residence.
3. The strong impetus given this year to the inauguration of overseas campuses for Indiana students in France, Germany, and Spain by the Foreign Campus Study Committee.
4. The introduction into the regular curricula of the Departments of Economics, Fine Arts, and History of substantive courses taught in French and Spanish.



5. The broad expansion of the program of placement and advanced credit for superior matriculants at Indiana University.
6. The very successful revamping and revitalizing this year of the Indiana High School Achievement Program under Dean Braden and Mr. Arthur Glover as a service to the high schools of the state and their students.
7. The continued development of Special Honors Colloquia for superior students in the College of Arts and Sciences.
8. The encouragement and co-sponsoring of the newly inaugurated Honors Program of the School of Education.
9. The development of a statewide Honors conference involving the 33 collegiate institutions in the State of Indiana

Professor Pratt repeated the question about what the Honors Division might do for the superior student that is not now being done. Professor Chapman felt that more faculty time should be devoted to the development of the program. More intimate contacts with honor students is required. More staff must be assigned to get the full benefit from the programs we now have under way. Possibly funds could be formally assigned by the Honors Division to various departments for the work that is done in developing special programs and special courses. At present the departments absorb costs of this nature. Such an investment of money and manpower would not only benefit the students but would improve our image among the citizens of the State. Dean Braden emphasized that the Honors Program at I.U. was already of a very high caliber, compared with that at many other campuses.

Professor Day was certain that the Faculty would heartily endorse the Honors Division. The Division should provide the framework for future developments in this field. It was his impression that students and their parents were aware of the honors program but that our version is much more amateurish than that at some other institutions.

Professor Fay brought up the point that was discussed to some extent in the previous meeting. It concerned the statement on page 2 of the report that the Honors Division will have a "supervisory relationship to the whole range of services and courses available to the students." Dean Chapman referred to his remark in the last meeting in which he felt that the word "coordinating" should be substituted for the word "supervisory," and reiterated his position that honors courses must be developed within departments and that the role of the Honors Division should be to encourage, but not to supervise such developments.

Professor Miller foresaw a possible conflict between the Honors Division and the Junior Division. Dean Chapman replied that the Honors Committee foresaw a tripartite responsibility for honors students that included the University Honors Committee, the Office of Scholarship and Financial Aid, and the Junior Division. The three are not equally represented at the present time in the



in the relationships with superintendents. The Distinguished Scholastic Program, which includes the Arthur R. Metz, General Motors, and Della J. Evans Scholarships, is a case in point. For example, the 80 prospective scholars who were brought to the campus last spring were presented with a program that mentioned opportunities for honor students for only five minutes. At this point President Stahr announced that a dinner will be given on October 28, 1965, for those on the campus who already hold these scholarships.

Professor Willbern offered the comment that the Honors Division proposal, as it stands, is very flexible and offers a great deal of leeway for policy decisions to be made as the Division develops. He asked the question: "Is it implicit in the document that permission from the Honors Division must be acquired before an honors course can be offered?" Professor Chapman replied that no such requirement was contemplated. The present University Honors Committee did not want to build an image of a super department, and he felt that the Honors Division would feel the same way. The principal attitudes of the Division would be to stimulate, initiate, and coordinate honors programs. No supervisory role is contemplated.

Professor Thomas wished more information about the possibility of providing funds to departments for the development of honors programs. Would this be in the form of a fraction of a faculty member's salary? Dean Chapman's answer included the statement that honors programs develop more rapidly in departments willing to assume the obligation for them. At the present time the honors program is financed by departmental budgets. It may be possible in the future for the Honors Division to ask for released time for Faculty to participate in honors work, and to recompense the departments for that time.

At this point Dean Snyder referred back to Professor Miller's question about a possible conflict between the Honors Division and the Junior Division. In his opinion no such conflict would develop, since an honors program, financial aid and other attractions are all important in recruiting superior students. He was most interested in the development of honors courses in the freshman year. He felt that the Honors Division would bring various lines of development together, would fix responsibility for these lines of development, and would offer the possibility of securing a director to develop an imaginative program.

Professor Pratt referred to the appointment of an honors faculty which was mentioned on page 2 of the report. The role of such a faculty was the subject of his inquiry. Would its primary purpose be to communicate within the program, and to ferment new ideas? Dean Chapman answered that this was indeed true and that a larger consulting body should stimulate activity.

President Stahr asked what steps the Council wished to take about this matter. Dean Braden repeated his statement that the function of this discussion was to seek advice and criticism of the Division from the Faculty before it pushed ahead, and Dean Chapman reaffirmed this position. The discussion was summarized by President Stahr as follows: the purpose of this proposal was to formalize an activity that the University had been carrying on in a less formal way for some time; the



Division was a mechanism for improving and expanding an existing program; with the Division in operation all of the University community would be aware of this specialized offering.

PROFESSOR DAY MOVED THAT THE COUNCIL ENDORSE THE PROPOSAL FOR AN HONORS DIVISION. PROFESSOR PRATT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### STATUS OF GRADE REPORTS AT MIDTERM

Mr. Harrell, the Registrar, was asked to begin the discussion about midterm grade reports. He began by citing statistics regarding the issuance of "smoke-ups." A year ago 6,836 students received 11,262 "smoke-ups" More were given to freshmen than to any other class, but even the Graduate School issued 149. A "smoke-up" is defined as performance of less than "C" quality. This appears as the letter "U" in the grade column of the midterm report sheets. The Junior Division follows a somewhat different practice inasmuch as the professors estimate a grade on punch cards that are supplied for each individual. These grades are then transmitted to both the students and the parents. Mr. Harrell was emphatic in stating that the practice of giving "smoke-ups" is not uniform and for this reason many students are misled about their midterm grade position.

There is no uniform method of reporting midterm grades among the various schools. The Junior Division mails copies of the grades to both the students and the parents. The College of Arts and Sciences makes no report to the parents, and the students must pick up their midterm grade reports at the College Office. The School of Business reports no "smoke-ups" in 300 and 400 courses, but in 100 and 200 courses a report is made to the students but not to the parents. The School of Education mails "smoke-ups" to students and parents of students who are less than 21 years of age. If three or more "smoke-ups" are encountered, the student must report for an interview so that the seriousness of his situation may be impressed upon him. The School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation performs in the same manner as the School of Education in this regard. School of Music students must pick up their grade reports at the School Office; no report is mailed to either the student or his parents. The Graduate School does not mail midterm reports to the parents, but the student and his major department receive a notice of unsatisfactory performance.

As a result of this non-uniform practice, students do not know whether or not they have been given a "smoke-up." Mr. Harrell pointed out that the issuance of an unsatisfactory grade is a considerable load in the Registrar's office, but played no part in the final record of the student.

Dean Braden enlarged upon Mr. Harrell's comments by saying that the confusion is even greater than he reported. Faculty reporting of midterm grades is even more variable than that of the various schools. Either the faculty should be more serious about this matter or dispense with the midterm grades completely. It was interesting to learn that no one knew when or how midterm grades originated and that the mechanism for terminating them was uncertain as a consequence.



Dean Bain was embarrassed to learn that he was not familiar with the process of issuing "smoke-ups" in the School of Music. Letters were apparently sent out in the past but were dispensed with at some later date. It was his feeling that a student's performance was not affected by the issuance of smoke-ups."

Professor Wilson asked about the "cost-benefit ratio." Mr. Harrell estimated an expenditure of between \$500 to \$750 for paper alone. Including the postage required to send letters to the students and parents, probably \$1000 to \$1500 would be a proper estimate of total cost each semester.

Professor Cady remarked that the cost in faculty time should be considered also. How could students be misled, when an unsatisfactory examination grade is evidence of poor performance? A student is surely aware of his position whether or not a "smoke-up" is given. Mr. Harrell concurred with Professor Cady's position. The Registrar expanded his remarks by explaining that probably a relatively small portion of the Faculty takes a serious interest in midterm grades because a considered judgment of performance is difficult to make during the first few weeks of a course.

Dean Pinnell felt that "smoke-ups" were more valuable for freshmen than for upper-division students. Mr. Harrell agreed and described again the Junior Division practice of reporting estimated grades at midterm. Professor Thomas inserted the comment that it was very difficult to write grades on the punch cards that the Junior Division provided.

"Smoke-ups" were very beneficial, Dean Higgins felt, in the regional campuses, especially with respect to part-time students.

Dean Bain then took the position that "smoke-ups" are needed to combat the image of impersonality that characterizes large universities in comparison with the small colleges. Small colleges often use this as an argument for attracting students. Mr. Harrell was quick to reply that our system is already quite impersonal. The grade is reported on an IBM printed form, and a mimeographed letter is sent out to the parents.

Professor Ahlf found that "smoke-ups" were not a success at the regional campuses because students who were chronically absent failed to appear at the time the "smoke-ups" were issued. Some comic relief was offered by Professor Cady who asked about the origin of the word "smoke-up." No one in the room offered an explanation. Professor Miller was pleased that "smoke-ups" were not sent to the parents of students over 21. The "smoke-up" of a 60 year-old student was sent home by mistake and greatly disturbed the 85 year-old mother!

Returning to more serious matters, Mr. Harrell felt that students know very well how they stand in their classes, and that "smoke-ups" simply repeat a fact already known to the student. The consensus of the Council seemed to favor the opinion that the method of issuing "smoke-ups" is outmoded, President Stahr stated, but some substitute for the system was required. Such a substitute should



make every effort to increase the personal relationship between the faculty member and the student. Perhaps the same purpose could be achieved, Professor Willbern observed, by a letter to the faculty at the proper time, stating the obligations they have to the students in reporting unsatisfactory work. In a sense the "pink-sheet" serves the same purpose at the present time; that is, a formal reminder that the student should be informed about his academic progress.

In contrast to many of the remarks that had been made, Professor Byrnes felt that midterm grade reports were of extremely great value. His interpretation of the word "smoke-up" was a reference to an old Indian signal of warning. Experience as a professor and as a parent with students in college had taught him that midterm grades were of enormous value. In his opinion all grades should be reported, good or poor. In this way each student is regularly evaluated between the beginning and the end of the term. This is not only very useful for the student but also a valuable exercise for the faculty member. Mr. Harrell raised no quarrel with professor Byrnes' statement, but repeated that if we are to continue the "smoke-up" system, everyone must cooperate and the system must be made more uniform.

Professor Wilson returned to a point made earlier, that the student should be aware of his position at all times as a result of examination. Professor Byrnes replied that a grade is often not based entirely on examination. Discussion in class sometimes plays a significant part in determining the performance of the student. Professor Wilson felt that the examination is a more objective way of testing a student's ability than a subjective evaluation of his ability to reply to questions posed in class discussion. He repeated his position that the "smoke-up" procedure was superfluous and that students know from their performance on examinations where they stand in relation to the rest of the class.

Professor Yamaguchi asked if there was a possibility that the office of the Dean of Faculties could request faculty members to report to each student the performance on each examination as well as his standing in relation to the rest of the class up to that point. In that way the burden of decision would rest entirely with the student, where it belongs, and there would be no need for machinery like the "smoke-up" system. Dean Hartley replied that it would be very difficult to require faculty members to issue reports of this kind. Mr. Harrell stated again that the midterm grade report is not mandatory at the present time, and Dean Hartley felt that mandatory reports would be very difficult to place into effect.

Dean Chapman was not impressed with student interest in midterm reports since only a few Arts and Sciences students pick up their reports at the office. If reports of this kind are to be issued, they should be sent in some automated fashion rather than imposing a cumbersome, time-consuming, hand-sorting mechanism on the offices of various Schools and Colleges of the University. Professor Day felt that it might be possible to issue two copies of the grade reports to the student, and the student should have the responsibility of sending a copy to his parents. This suggestion met with derisive remarks from various Council members.



Dean Braden reiterated the fact that reporting was not consistent, and that somewhat less than 50% of the instructors were reporting the midterm grades in any form.

DEAN BRADEN MOVED THAT THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF REQUESTING FACULTY MEMBERS TO REPORT MIDTERM GRADES INDICATING UNSATISFACTORY WORK BE TERMINATED EXCEPT FOR STUDENT IN THE JUNIOR DIVISION. DEAN PINNELL SECONDED THE MOTION AND A DISCUSSION FOLLOWED.

Professor Byrnes enlarged upon his previous opinion that midterm grades are of great value. Small colleges often mail cards with grades to both the student and the parents. There is no substitute for the personal touch. Before we abandon our present system we should consider what advantages it has. The Council should be aware that the termination of mid-term grade reports is removing the faculty just one more step from the students.

Professor Wilson asked whether midterm grades were reported with more regularity at the freshman level. Mr. Harrell reported that this was indeed the case. Thereupon he went into detail concerning the process of reporting freshman grades. These records are available to high school principals at their conference on the campus during the first semester. A few faculty members who teach Junior Division students fail to give midterm grades, and a blank appears on the grade report opposite that course. Dean Braden said that mid-term grade reporting is very complete by Junior Division instructors. Dean Daniels has found that parents appreciate this interest in their children, and President Stahr said that he had received letters to this effect also. Professor Byrnes was dismayed at the lack of grade reporting by the faculty and said that this should be reported to the Committee on Improvement of Teaching. Mr. Harrell said that we should not make a blanket indictment, since there were many courses in which midterm grades simply were not a realistic evaluation of a student's performance.

The question was called forth and the motion was put to a vote. The results were as follows (some of the Council members had left the meeting before the vote was taken):

Affirmative:

Negative

Dean Hartley  
Dean Braden  
Dean Daniels  
Dean Higgins  
Professor Bogan  
Professor Hayes  
Dean Pinnell  
Dean Shull  
Dean Chapman  
Professor Hicks  
Provost Penrod

Dean Bain  
Professor Byrnes  
Professor Pratt  
Professor Miller  
Professor Segar



Professor Thomas  
Professor Gurd  
Professor Turner  
Professor Otteson  
Professor Fay  
Professor Murray  
Professor Willbern  
Professor Cady  
Professor Day  
Professor Ahlf  
Professor Moore  
Professor Solt  
Professor Wilson  
Professor Yamaguchi

Professor Solt did not feel that the matter should be dropped completely. The problem should be turned over to the Committee on Improvement of Teaching. "Smoke-ups" were too impersonal, he felt, and this fact caused him to vote affirmatively on the motion just passed. He was not entirely satisfied with his decision unless there was provision for a less objectionable system. President Stahr suggested at this point that an ad hoc Committee be appointed composed of those who were opposed to the motion and those who felt like professor Solt, in order to frame some method of accomplishing the objectives now served by the "smoke-up" system, but which would be accepted more uniformly by the faculty. He suggested further that this group should report their results to the Committee on Improvement of Teaching.

DEAN BRADEN MOVED THAT PRESIDENT STAHR'S PROPOSAL BE FOLLOWED. PROFESSOR DAY SECONDED THE MOTION, AND IT WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE COUNCIL.

President Stahr entertained a motion to adjourn at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelby D. Gerking, Secretary



NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

AGENDA

There will be no meeting of  
the Faculty Council on November  
2, 1965, due to lack of items of  
business.