

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, 4 January 1966

Ballantine 8

3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Grades certification and diplomas for students graduating in June, 1966
2. Time of Commencement -- see Fac. Council Doc. No. 6
3. Procedures for broad faculty involvement about decisions for new academic programs -- see Faculty Council Documents No. 7 and No. 8

Faculty Council documents No. 7 and No. 8 are enclosed for your information concerning the third item on the agenda, "Procedures for broad faculty involvement about decisions for new academic programs."

The Agenda Committee feels that the broad question of faculty involvement as raised by Professor Remak should have priority over the more specific question about the Division of General and Technological Studies presented by Professor Fuchs. The Committee is also in receipt of a memorandum from Professors David, Gross, and Halpern of the Department of English regarding the Honors Division. This communication is not circulated at this time, since the writers will meet with the University Honors Committee about their concerns.

Also attached is the response of the Commencement Committee to Professor Remak's letter of June 8, 1964, with regard to the rescheduling of Commencement Exercises.

Agenda Committee,

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



CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

4 January 1966

Members absent, no alternate: Dean Maynard Hine  
Dean Emily Holmquist  
Provost Kenneth Penrod  
Professor Leo C. Fay  
Professor Quentin Hope  
Professor Leo Solt

Alternates present: Vice President Ray L. Heffner for President Elvis J. Stahr  
Dean Hartley for Vice-President Ray L. Heffner  
Professor Philip Smith for Professor Richard L. Turner  
Professor Albert Herring for Professor Schuyler Otteson  
Professor Byrum Carter for Professor Edwin H. Cady  
Professor York Willbern for Professor George W. Wilson

Visitors present: Registrar Charles Harrell, Professor Henry Remak,  
Alumni Secretary Claude Rich

---

Agenda

1. Grades certification and diplomas for students graduating in June 1966
2. Time of Commencement -- See Fac. Council Doc. No. 7
3. Procedures for broad faculty involvement about decisions for new academic programs -- see Faculty Council Documents No. 8 and No. 9



The January 4, 1966 meeting of the Faculty Council was called to order at 3:37 p.m. by Vice-President and Dean of Faculties Heffner in the absence of President Stahr.

Dean Heffner announced the selection by the Agenda Committee of Professor Yamaguchi to the Joint Faculty Council-Staff Council Committee on partial fee remission for faculty and staff children.

Also announced was the distribution of the ballot on the 60-minute class period within the next two days. The replies from the faculty would be tabulated and the results announced by the Agenda Committee at the January 18, meeting. The information accompanying the ballot included (1) an excerpt from the minutes of the June 1, 1965 meeting, (2) a report on the 60-minute class period from the University Study Committee, and (3) the December 7, 1965 minutes. With regard to the latter item, it was pointed out that these minutes were being distributed without the approval of the Council due to time pressure in preparing the ballot materials. They will be acted upon at the January 18, 1966 meeting.

A document numbering error was corrected. The Memorial Resolution to Judge Sherman Minton is to be numbered Faculty Council Document No. 6; the statement about commencement is No. 7; the "Remak letter" is No. 8; and the "Fuchs letter" is No. 9.

#### TIME OF COMMENCEMENT and GRADES CERTIFICATION AND DIPLOMAS

##### FOR STUDENTS GRADUATING IN JUNE, 1966

Dean Heffner proposed that the first two items on the Agenda be considered together, because they are intimately related. Alumni Secretary Rich was called upon to report on the thinking of the Commencement Committee, of which he is Chairman, concerning the possible time change in Commencement (see Fac. Council Doc. No. 7). Mr Rich replied that it was not possible to schedule Commencement on Sunday evening for reasons stated in the Document. Professor Remak was called upon for his comments, since his June 8, 1965 letter prompted the issue. Points #1 and #2 of the Commencement Committee he felt were pertinent and meaningful but the remainder were not substantial arguments against changing the time of Commencement from Monday morning until Sunday afternoon. Point #2 is a strong objection to his proposal. The Commencement Committee feels that the morning ceremony makes it possible for families and friends to drive early in the day to Bloomington and return to their homes before late at night. He repeated the arguments which were contained in his original letter that it would be more convenient on several counts to hold the commencement on Sunday afternoon. He offered still another suggestion to make the Commencement ceremony more convenient for all concerned. Might it not be possible to divide the ceremony into two groups or more in order to hold the ceremony in the Auditorium. This question was not commented upon, but Dean Heffner offered the information that a University Events Building has been proposed as a part of the sesquicentennial building program.



Registrar Harrell introduced the problem of Grades Certification and Diplomas for students graduating in June, 1966. The Calendar for 1965-66 does not allow sufficient time between the end of final examination and commencement day to provide for certification of graduates, and for the distribution of diplomas as a part of the ceremony. This is a temporary problem that should be decided for the 1966 Commencement only. Mr. Harrell offered 8 alternatives from which the Council could choose. He preferred an alternative which kept the regular examination schedule intact but allowed early examination to potential graduates whose examinations are scheduled in the last two days. Dean Daniels proposed the following motion:

THE ALTERNATIVE PREFERRED BY REGISTRAR HARRELL BE ADOPTED. DEAN PEAK SECONDED THE MOTION.

In the resulting discussion, Mr. Harrell pointed out that very few graduating students have examinations on the last two days of the examination schedule. Only 7:30 and 3:30 classes had examinations during that time, and it was his impression that few graduating students would be involved.

Professor Milisen asked about the amount of time between the last examination and Commencement. Perhaps grades for graduating students could be certified by working overtime. Mr. Harrell reported that the certification procedure involved very careful and meticulous work involving long hours. This time could not be made up by working longer hours. The staff was already taxed to the limit and usually worked until 2 a.m. during this period.

Professor Robinson asked whether or not Commencement could be postponed an extra day. Mr. Rich replied that a postponement would be detrimental to the success of commencement week-end. Fewer seniors would attend as well as fewer parents, relatives and faculty members. Dean Heffner referred to the traditional meeting of the Board of Trustees on Friday of that week-end and their attendance at the ceremony on Monday. Hotel space in the Union is committed for other activities beginning on Tuesday and would not be available for persons who wish to stay overnight Monday.

Dean Sutton felt that the only alternative that would solve the problem would be mailing the diplomas. The certification procedure might be speeded up if students could be encouraged to return their diploma application forms more rapidly. Perhaps the Departments could call this matter to the attention of the graduating seniors in order to speed this process. A further complication was added by Mr. Harrell who said that some problems arise from courses being completed at other universities whose credit is to be applied to graduation in June. Virtually nothing could be done to alleviate this problem. The situation might be eased if the Deans could supply tentative lists of graduating seniors to the Registrar somewhat earlier than is presently accomplished. A list of graduating seniors whose examinations are scheduled on June 6, 7, (Monday and Tuesday) could then be furnished each faculty member sooner than is done under the present system. The faculty member would be in a better position to decide how to handle these problem cases.



On this point in the discussion the question was called for and the following vote was taken:

## AFFIRMATIVE

## NEGATIVE

|                        |                     |             |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Dean Heffner           | Professor Herring   | Dean Sutton |
| Dean Hartley           | Professor Pratt     |             |
| Vice President Merritt | Professor Robinson  |             |
| Dean Braden            | Professor Bowman    |             |
| Dean Bain              | Professor Breneman  |             |
| Dean Daniels           | Professor Carter    |             |
| Dean Higgins           | Professor Day       |             |
| Dean Irwin             | Professor Fuchs     |             |
| Dean Pinnell           | Professor Gerking   |             |
| Dean Shull             | Professor Lorentzen |             |
| Dean Wallace           | Dr. Lukemeyer       |             |
| Dean Peak              | Professor Miller    |             |
| Professor Ballinger    | Professor Segar     |             |
| Professor Byrnes       | Professor Willbern  |             |
| Professor Gaither      | Professor Yamaguchi |             |
| Professor Greenleaf    |                     |             |
| Professor Gurd         |                     |             |
| Professor Smith        |                     |             |
| Professor Milisen      |                     |             |

Dean Heffner again raised the question about the report of the Commencement Committee. Since no one questioned the report, it was accepted by consent.

## PROCEDURES FOR BROAD FACULTY INVOLVEMENT ABOUT DECISIONS FOR NEW

## ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Dean Heffner introduced the topic by referring to the letters of Professor Remak and Professor Fuchs reproduced here as Fac. Council Doc. Nos. 8 and 9. President Stahr was not able to attend the meeting, but he had made a statement on the subject at a meeting of the University Committee on International Affairs, December 20, 1965. The remarks were taped and later transcribed. Dean Heffner read President Stahr's comments to the Council, and they are appended to these minutes.

Professor Remak was asked to introduce the subject. He was extremely pleased by President Stahr's statement, and wanted his letter to be received in the same mood. The letter was not to be construed as acrimonious but as a constructive effort to raise the question about proper procedures to be followed in the future for broad faculty involvement about decisions for new academic programs. The lack of faculty involvement was not to be attributed to any one person or group of persons; perhaps every member of the faculty is at fault to some degree for failing to recognize the problem sooner.

The University has operated under the principle that the curriculum, academic programs, establishment of new divisions, etc., are under faculty control. The



present procedure works for the addition of new courses and for the planning and establishment of new programs when existing departments cooperate. The procedures do not operate satisfactorily, however, for the establishment of new Departments, Institutes, Centers etc. The difficulty stems from the fact that some offer no courses, and, therefore, no elected body reviews their influence on the academic program. It was Professor Remak's feeling that any agency that influences the Academic program should be reviewed by the Faculty, and this review must be meaningful and representative. The faculty, he reported, is somewhat apprehensive about decisions that are made by appointed committees, since they may be biased in favor of a new program. Persons appointed to such committees are usually favorable toward the issue in question.

Any procedure that is adopted for a future course of action must protect the assets which we now possess. These include a spontaneity on the part of the faculty for proposing new ideas that affect academic progress. It has been to the University's great advantage that new ideas spring from all levels of the administrative and faculty hierarchy. Secondly, the decision-making process has not been confined to rigid channels. This flexibility has been an advantage in the past and should not be overlooked when new procedures are proposed. With the degree of elasticity which now exists, however, some enterprises financed from governmental or foundation sources may tend to be adopted without realizing their full implications. They may be temporarily attractive but act to dilute faculty energy over the course of time.

Any system adopted to involve the faculty in the consideration of new programs should include a fair balance between appointed and elected committees. It would be one of the functions of the committees to keep the faculty informed about their progress and to consult the faculty whenever they need advice. A final decision would then have general faculty support.

Three steps were suggested by Professor Remak to involve the faculty in the decision-making process,

1. After an initial discussion period, which usually starts informally among a few faculty members, a point is reached where a committee is formed. The formation of the committee should be announced promptly to the faculty.
2. If the deliberation of the committee is protracted, at least one report should be made to the Faculty Council to state the progress of the committee. The Council could be asked for its opinion at a time when the committee had not completely formulated its position.
3. The final recommendations of the committee should be discussed by the Faculty Council before approval by the Board of Trustees.

No procedure can cover all eventualities; delicate cases which may not be advisable to publicize are bound to arise. Nevertheless, a real concern, uneasiness, and alarm exists among the faculty about the present manner in which the academic programs are adopted.



Professor Fuchs agreed with Professor Remak's remarks. The issue he raised in connection with the adoption of the Division of General and Technical Studies was one which the faculty should have considered. Not only was there unrest in the faculty in this regard, but he sensed a degree of student unrest. Many statements were being made on the campus to the effect that students should participate more actively in determining academic policies. He felt that this issue should come up in the Council also.

Dean Heffner remarked that President Stahr had expressed the feeling that Professor Fuchs was quite right when he stated in his letter that, "perhaps the true situation is that the Board of Trustees has approved the establishment of the Division of General and Technical Studies, provided a workable program for the Division can be developed. If so, the ultimate establishment of the Division, as well as the nature of the possible future program for such a Division, will rest on what is now done." The Board of Trustees originally approved the Division as a matter of principle. It was quite appropriate that the Faculty Council appoint a Committee to work with Deans Braden and Mee in the development of the program of the new Division.

Dean Braden likened the action of the Board of Trustees to the issuance of a charter. If the Faculty feels that the Division should be implemented, it should have a voice in determining its course of action. The birth of an idea which led to the new Division took place in the Science Advisory Committee when discussing the possibilities of an applied science program. The last Indiana Legislature raised questions about the future of vocational and technical education at about the same time and the concept broadened. Possibly the University could help the state get a necessary job accomplished without creating a network of new institutions. It was highly problematical that the plan could have been proposed effectively unless the Board of Trustees had approved the idea in principle. Faculty opinion was sought by bringing the issue to the Council. Dean Braden concluded that a committee formed by the Council to advise about the Division might have been anticipated.

Professor Pratt reported that most of the issues that arise could be handled by the procedures recommended by Professor Remak. Nevertheless, very troublesome cases occur in a fast-moving university. Administrative officers are often asked to react quickly to an issue that may be brought up by a legislative committee, and adequate time is not available to inquire about faculty opinion and to enlist their cooperation. Perhaps some small faculty group might act as a sounding board for rapidly moving questions.

Professor Ballinger reported his experience at a AAUP state conference which dealt with the problem of University government and involved questions of faculty participation. The group concluded that no clear procedure was followed in decision-making at our institution. Only formal bodies, such as the Faculty Council have designated responsibilities, and yet decisions are made at a remarkably large number of levels. The local AAUP chapter requested a few years ago that the committee structure of the university be studied. We are not in a position to tackle the present question about procedures of broad faculty involvement, he stated, since past decision-making processes are not understood.



In response to a question from Dean Heffner, Professor Willbern stated that the University Study Committee did not have much to contribute to the discussion. The University has grown rapidly and has become a very complex institution. It is difficult to "touch all bases" when a new program is under consideration; in fact it is not always known just what bases to touch. The University now enjoys a high degree of confidence between the faculty and administrative officers. This mutual confidence is tremendously important to foster.

Professor Ballinger wondered whether or not it would be possible to appraise the activities of the Faculty Council in the last few years in order to learn whether or not the Council had actually considered significant questions.

In this connection Dean Heffner pointed out that the Faculty Council has not been considered the appropriate body to consider new academic programs, since the various Schools and Divisions had a considerable degree of autonomy in this respect. The Committee on Curricular Policy and Educational Programs is often used to consider programs which involve excursions into new academic areas.

Dean Peak noted that the Council has the machinery to operate when some program runs counter to the overall objectives of the University. The voice of the faculty can be heard under these circumstances. The Council in his opinion, should stay alive to the total University program and, although it is not considered as a group to initiate creative ideas, it should be sensitive to new developments.

Professor Gaither remarked that Professor Remak's letter was prompted by the way in which certain programs were brought to the attention of the faculty. The Board of Trustees had acted before the faculty was informed. In this sense the faculty was told of the decision after the fact. Professor Remak responded that this was indeed true and he repeated his early feelings that a meaningful participation by the faculty would lead to more general support for new programs. Fast-moving decisions are difficult to handle and perhaps, he suggested, the Agenda Committee could act as a sounding board for such quick reactions. The Agenda Committee was the subject of some further comment by Dean Heffner, who reported that it was the wish of President Stahr that it consider itself as a nominating group. Nominations for the Athletics Committee and Public Performances Committee must be made soon.

Professor Breneman agreed with Professor Willbern that it is difficult to "touch all bases", in order to enlist faculty cooperation, but he did not agree with Professor Ballinger that the Council failed to consider important items. Policies on promotions and tenure were revised during the last few years, and an entirely new procedure of electing the Athletics Committee was formulated by Council action, among the other important issues. He conceded that the Council wasted time occasionally, but it should be recognized as a body which could discuss such important issues as had been raised by Professors Remak and Fuchs. Professor Fuchs agreed with Professor Breneman on this point and expressed his opinion that the Council is dealing each year with matters of growing importance.

Professor Milisen remarked that most academic programs are initiated by the Faculty. The faculty is, therefore, concerned at the outset of planning new programs. After a certain stage the implementation of these programs becomes an



administrative matter. Programs that originate from outside the University are subject to question in this regard and should be reviewed carefully by the faculty. His confidence in the administration was expressed. The central administration must be allowed to make many decisions, in his opinion, since they have a better overview of university activities than most faculty members.

Professor Ballinger desired that his earlier remarks should not be construed as relating to any conflict between the faculty and the administration. The decision-making process is not clear, he repeated, and a systematic analysis of our procedures should be made. Professor Willbern reiterated his remarks that a considerable degree of mutual confidence now exists between faculty and administration, and that the university family should be willing to trust either committee action or the decision of deans. If at any time in the future the opinions of certain people are being avoided simply because they may cause problems, it will be regarded as a dangerous situation.

It was Professor Miller's opinion that the subject of the two divisions, Honors Division and Division of General and Technical Studies, had been extensively discussed by at least two large committees. The Honors Committee had discussed the most appropriate way to further its objectives for a period of years. In addition Professor Miller had been a member of the Science Advisory Committee when it originated the discussion of technical education. The problem, as he saw it, was that the large size of the University had contributed to a breakdown of communication between these committees and the faculty in general.

Dean Heffner reported that some problems had arisen in connection with the formation of the International Affairs Center, although it was his opinion that its formation had been discussed at length by one of the largest committees in the University, the University Committee on International Affairs. Professor Byrnes reminded the group that certain academic programs such as those in folklore, Latin-American studies, African studies, etc.... were never discussed in the Graduate Council. He felt that since these programs are graduate programs, they should have been approved by the Graduate Council. The Faculty Council is, therefore, not the only duly constituted body that is being by-passed when decisions about new academic programs are made.

Dean Heffner had asked various deans for a list of their new programs, and he had received more than 40 which are new within the last year or in the process of discussion at the present time. Each case appeared to be unique, and it might be difficult to fit them into any rigid framework which was established for insuring broad faculty involvement.

Professor Carter felt that the phrase "faculty involvement" had been used in two different ways. To some, faculty involvement meant a large group of the faculty such as the Committee on International Affairs; to others it meant the entire faculty. In the former case a large number of faculty members are involved, but the general faculty is not kept informed. Questions are not raised that should be raised by the general faculty. Often the lines of communications are broken and the faculty member who has no direct interest in the question involved but whose program might



be affected is not given an opportunity to raise his voice. Major developments initiated by the administration should be placed before the general faculty, and the mutual confidence that was referred to by Professor Willbern will then be achieved.

Professor Greenleaf felt that the Council and the University should thank Professors Remak and Fuchs for bringing such a crucial question to the attention of both the faculty and the administration.

Dean Heffner wished to learn the feeling of the Council. Did they wish to continue the subject at the next meeting and consider the specific recommendations contained in Professors Remak's and Fuchs' remarks? Dean Daniels felt that the issue was so far-reaching that the matter needed to be explored more thoroughly. Dean Daniels remarks were taken as a consensus of Faculty Council opinion and the subject was continued to the next meeting.

Dean Heffner adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Shelby D. Gerking  
Secretary