

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, 31 May 1966

Ballantine 8

3:30 p.m.

→ Agenda

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 1966
2. Memorial Resolution on the death of Wallace O. Yoder
3. Consideration of the calendar for 1967-1968
4. Report of the Advisory Committee on General and Technical Studies
5. Priority of capital construction budget request
6. Results of balloting for members of Faculty Council
7. Report of the Agenda Committee on nominations for officers of the Council
8. President's business

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council
May 31, 1966

Not Yet Approved by the Faculty Council

Members absent, no alternate: Professor Robert W. Greenleaf
Professor Edwin H. Cady

Alternates present: Dean Richard Curtis for Vice President Lynne Merritt
Dean Paul Klinge for Dean Samuel E. Braden
Professor John Daugherty for Dean Arthur S. Daniels
Professor Robert Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
Professor John M. Thompson for Professor Robert F. Byrnes
Professor Philip Headings for Professor Sylvia Bowman
Professor Herman Feldman for Professor Keith Lorentzen

Visitors present: Professor Edward Bair
Vice-President Donald Clark
Professor Robert Walden
Dean Robert Shaffer
Registrar Charles Harrell

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 1966
2. Memorial Resolution on the death of Wallace O. Yoder
3. Consideration of the calendar for 1967-1968
4. Report of the Advisory Committee on General and Technical Studies
5. Priority of capital construction budget request
6. Results of balloting for members of Faculty Council
7. Report of the Agenda Committee on nominations for officers of the Council
8. President's business

President Stahr called the May 31, 1966, meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 3:39 p.m. after a number of documents to be used during the meeting had been distributed to the Council members.

Approval of the May 17, 1966, minutes was called for. Professor Ballinger suggested two minor changes on page 4 to improve the accuracy of his statements, and the minutes were approved as amended.

Professor Walden read a memorial resolution on the death of Professor Wallace Yoder (Faculty Council Document No. 31). The Council approved the resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

PRIORITY OF CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUESTS

President Stahr introduced the subject by stating that the material distributed to the Council as Faculty Council Document No. 33 included priority of capital construction requests for the 1967-1969 biennium for academic facilities on the Bloomington campus only. This particular priority list did not include any Medical Center requests, nor did it include any for the Regional Campuses or for housing.

President Stahr reminded the Council that a ten-year program of academic construction was initiated in the 1950's. This program actually took twelve years to complete, and soon after President Stahr's arrival on the campus, a new ten-year program was begun. Like the first, it involved the four state institutions who, on the basis of lengthy but intensive studies, agreed upon the total sum to be requested. This latter ten-year program amounted to \$239.5 million for academic and campus development.

The 1963 legislature fell considerably short of appropriating one-fifth of that figure; it supplied \$20 million toward the total. The 1965 session appropriated \$10 million but authorized \$30 million in addition in the form of revenue bonds. The total of \$40 million was close to one-fifth of the total. The legislature also authorized funds for the general operating budget to cover the interest on the revenue bonds. The bonds thus enable the four state institutions to construct buildings much earlier than would be possible with state appropriations only. President Stahr felt that the bonding route as a supplement to appropriation has been a wise move.

Unfortunately, a considerable amount of inflation has occurred since the ten-year construction program was developed. Up to this point, the \$239.5 million has been reduced by \$60 million through legislative appropriation and authorization of revenue bonds, making the remainder of \$179.5 million. A part of the gains has been lost, however, through a 20% inflation in building costs so that in actuality the total now required to finish the ten-year building program is about \$213.5 million. If the several Boards of Trustees approve the plans that the four administrations are ready to recommend, the 1967 legislative session will be approached for about \$71 million for the four state schools, or about one-third of the remaining \$213.5 million, with the rest to be sought from the two next succeeding legislatures.

President Stahr reminded the Council that there has been an infusion of federal facility funds into the state since the ten-year program began; the

funds that have been available to Indiana University up to the present time have been used to help initiate the construction of the new library which also required most of the University's bonding authority for the current biennium.

The development of programs and projections of enrollment are under biennial review by the four state institutions. These factors determine the proportion of the total request that each school obtains, and the percentage varies from one biennium to another. On the basis of negotiations among the four state universities, Indiana University's share in the next biennium is likely to be 28.71%. Using this factor, I.U.'s share will be \$20.5 million, if appropriations and/or bonding should amount to \$71 million as currently being planned. By sheer coincidence, our specific needs for the 1967-1969 projects, as seen by the administration, comes very close to this figure.

President Stahr emphasized that the figures appearing on the priority list were only rough estimates. It should be recalled that cost projections are made one to three years in advance, and it is not possible to do more than provide an educated guess at this point. He felt that the figures should not be frozen in detail because of a variety of factors not under our control. Inflation cannot be predicted, and the exact levels of federal funding are unknown. Thus, it is necessary to revise cost estimates and priorities to meet conditions as they develop.

The justifications for each item on the list (the justifications do not appear in the material circulated to the general faculty) are still in very rough form, and President Stahr asked the Council to suggest improvements.

Two years ago, when the Council approved the priority of the construction program, it was anticipated that the new library would eat up nearly all of the academic construction funds that could be foreseen, and this has been true. The proposed 1967-1969 program will only begin to alleviate the needs for new classrooms and other types of academic facilities. There is, President Stahr continued, an obvious emphasis in the proposed program on the natural sciences. He stressed that this aspect of the total academic program probably needed relatively more strengthening than any other, facility-wise.

Professor Day asked about the duplication of land acquisition between category 8b and category 1. In explaining this apparent contradiction, President Stahr explained that the a,b,c system is not fixed and arose because of the necessity for "interleafing" rehabilitation projects with new construction projects and planning projects originally on separate study lists. The numbering system will be smoothed out after final approval. Dean Heffner answered Professor Day's question further by stating that category 8b represents land acquisition for this biennium into a different sequence in the construction schedule since the acquisition of some of this land is essential at the present time as some other aspects of campus development. President Stahr continued by pointing out that the construction of a new general classroom building or buildings is effectively postponed until the 1969-1971 biennium if this priority list is approved. The structure has not been planned in detail, and no department or academic program has been assigned such space at this stage of the planning. This category (8) in the capital construction request may help alleviate the large classroom problem, among others. Professor Day, it will be recalled, was chairman of a committee on improvement of large classroom facilities, and the report of this committee had called for substantial

improvement in many large classrooms for more efficient and effective teaching. Professor Day commented that the total budget for the general classroom building might be broken into several pieces in order that more versatile functions could be assigned to these funds. President Stahr agreed and pointed out that the large general classroom building needs may change in the next few years due to other developments which are anticipated, such as the experimental college recommended by the Self-Study Committee. This is but another reason, along with the unpredictability of federal matching programs, why the capital construction requests should not be frozen into the precise terms stated in the material circulated to the Council.

Professor Robinson asked about the status of rehabilitating Myers Hall. Dean Heffner reminded Professor Robinson that this was in the current biennial program, that a site visit had been made, and that the project could proceed if the federal grant was obtained.

Professor Breneman referred to a report of the Physical Plant Sub-Committee of the Self-Study Committee which identified a number of classrooms with 200% *54%* of the student capacity at which they are usually utilized. It would be possible to increase the number of classrooms by partitioning these under-utilized rooms. There was no provision in the proposed capital construction request for this purpose except category 8. President Stahr said that this report had not been available to the administration as yet, but it sounded most useful. Professor Breneman reported that the Physical Plant Sub-Committee had identified the rooms. He moved:

SERIOUS CONSIDERATION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO REHABILITATING CERTAIN CLASSROOMS FOR MORE EFFICIENT USE OF STUDENT STATIONS AND CLASSROOM SPACE. THESE ROOMS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED BY THE PHYSICAL PLANT SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE.

Dean Peak seconded the motion, and it was passed by consent.

Registrar Harrell hoped that folding partitions might be used so that the rooms could be made available for the one large class that might be scheduled in that room. He was confident that adequate sound control could be provided by a folding partition arrangement. There was general agreement though not without some comment that certain professors have voices which might well carry into adjoining rooms unless well shielded.

President Stahr called for a motion to approve the priority list in principle without freezing individual items due to factors beyond the University's control. He cited as reasons the changing levels of outside support funds and changing needs for both new and existing programs.

In the discussion that followed, Dean Shull felt that the justification for the Jordan Hall addition needed some review. The \$4.2 million needed for an additional 50,000 square feet was not in line with the estimated expenditure for the new addition to the Chemistry Building. President Stahr reminded the Council that the addition to the Chemistry Building was to be handled by a financing system called the "reinstatable alternate." This system bridges two biennial appropriation periods. Bids on the whole project are acquired while only a portion of the funds to finance the project are available. The

advantage of this system is a better quality bid since the square footage is larger for the total project than for the individual parts; a bid at one time is likely to be lower than at a later time (in a period of inflation), and most companies are more eager to become involved in larger building projects. Professor Day moved:

THE COUNCIL ENDORSES THE PRIORITY OF THE PROPOSED CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUESTS BUT RECOGNIZES THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY TO MEET THE NEEDS OF CHANGING CONDITIONS.

Professor Yamaguchi seconded the motion, and in the discussion that followed, Professor Ballinger raised the question how he could rationalize his vote since he was given no opportunity to study alternatives that might be considered. He recognized that there was a strategic need for the Council to endorse the priority list. President Stahr replied that each person would have to interpret his own vote. All of the items mentioned in the list are, in the opinion of the administration and, he thought, of the Council, needed; certain items might be eliminated by group agreement if he were wrong on the latter point, but it would be very complex and time consuming to shift very many items within the priority list. Professor Ballinger repeated that it was extremely difficult to make a rational judgement about this matter on the spur of the moment. President Stahr agreed and stated that the condensed time schedule imposed by the State Budget Office this year had produced an extremely harrowing spring for all budget officers and budget-request staff.

Professor Barber asked about the central chilled-water plant mentioned in the priority list. Mr. Clark responded by explaining that the plant was needed to achieve maximum economy for air-conditioned areas. Professor Barber then asked which four buildings in the northwest dormitory area would be serviced by the plant. Mr. Clark replied that new dormitories are anticipated in this area, and possibly an additional classroom building associated with them to help form one or more new experimental colleges.

President Stahr called for a vote on the proposed construction program as amended by Professor Breneman and Professor Day's suggestions, and the Council responded unanimously in the affirmative.

President Stahr reported on the proposed budget requests for the Regional Campuses and the Medical Center for the Council's information. The Regional Campus construction program was broken down into the needs for the separate campuses. The Indianapolis campus estimates a total need for \$12.1 million; the Southeastern campus, \$2.0 million; the Northwest campus, \$5.75 million (\$2.0 million has already been funded); Fort Wayne, \$2.75 million; South Bend, \$6.0 million; and Eastern, \$800,000. There is a potential of \$4.0 million from federal funds, making a total bonding request for the regional campuses of \$23.4 million. President Stahr reminded the Council that \$4.50 of each \$15.00, the cost per credit hour at the regional campuses, is earmarked for construction purposes. No appropriated funds are likely to be requested for this construction. All of it will be done by bonding except an amount that may be requested from the legislature for bond financing.

The Medical Center will require about \$19 million from state funds. The federal government is much more generous in financing this type of construction,

and the \$19 million to be requested from the state is its share of \$42.5 million worth of projects. President Stahr continued by saying that this biennium is a critical one in the development of the Medical Center. The mission accepted has gotten dangerously ahead of the resources available. This has occurred gradually, but it has not built to a peak. In future years, the need for state appropriations should be reduced to about \$10 million or less per biennium if the present request is honored. It was made clear that this was Medical Center effort and not the Medical School only. For example, the new hospital which demands a great deal of these funds is of interest to the Medical School, the School of Nursing, the School of Dentistry, and other programs at the center. Some of the other projects are exclusively non-medical school.

CONSIDERATION OF THE 1967-1968 CALENDAR

Registrar Harrell opened the discussion by reporting that exams end on June 4 of the second semester 1968, and commencement occurs on June 10 (see the 1967-1968 calendar which is attached as Faculty Council Document No. 34). Six days separate these two dates, and this should be sufficient time to certify senior grades for graduation. Mr. Harrell assured the Council that he would not ask the adoption of another calendar which would require early senior examinations as did the current one. Mr. Harrell admitted that his advice had been in error about recommending early exams; both faculty and students were agreed that this year's system was not satisfactory.

Mr. Harrell presented a resolution by the Student Senate which asked for dismissal of classes at noon on Good Friday, 1967. Good Friday occurs March 24 in 1967, and Easter occurs on March 26. The present schedule calls for Easter vacation to begin Friday afternoon after the last class on March 24. The Student Senate pointed out that Good Friday is a holiday recognized by the closing of government offices, and the Senate felt that the dismissal of classes on Good Friday balanced off dismissing classes on Founder's Day. (The Secretary is not clear about the logic of the Student Senate in this regard). Mr. Harrell also reported that Monsignor Kilfoil of the local Catholic Church gave him permission to comment that Thursday before Good Friday is also an important religious day for members of the Catholic faith. Monsignor Kilfoil would prefer to close classes on Wednesday evening. Mr. Harrell continued by commenting that dismissal of classes on Good Friday was not a problem in 1968 since the vacation period begins before that day. Mr. Harrell then gave a history of the time of Easter vacation by reciting the students' desires to travel on Easter in preference to Good Friday. Easter vacation has shifted a good deal as a result of shifts in the Easter date and of student discontent with this portion of the calendar. It has been the Calendar Committee's policy to respect student wishes in this regard whenever it can be done without loss of class days.

President Stahr summarized the presentation by stating that two problems are now before the Council: the adoption of the 1967-1968 calendar and the question as to whether classes should be dismissed at noon on Good Friday, 1967.

Mr. Harrell, examining the calendar once again, brought it to the Council's attention that the period of time between the end of classes and the beginning of examinations in 1968 was shorter than it was this year when, during the unusually long "lull," student demonstrations nearly got out of hand.

Dean Peak moved:

THE FACULTY COUNCIL ADOPTS THE 1967-1968 CALENDAR.

Dean Bain seconded the motion, and the discussion continued.

Professor Gaither wished to learn whether or not the dates of advanced registration in December and May could be put into the calendar. This is information that both the faculty and students find valuable. Mr. Harrell explained that this had not been done because different schools have different counseling schedules, but he did know the dates when the computer would be used, and these dates could be put into the calendar. Some universities, he continued, put a great many events into the calendar.

Professor Yamaguchi suggested that a day be kept available between the end of classes and examinations for review but that the notation "Review Day" be withdrawn from the calendar since it gave the impression to some people outside the University that the students reviewed their subject matter only one day each semester. Mr. Harrell was quite willing to eliminate "Review Day," explaining that it was merely a vestigial remnant of a reading period in a former era. Students greatly desire a day for review and have a strong feeling that they profit from this period of study.

President Stahr wished to learn the Council's reaction about deleting Review Day from the Calendar statement (though without eliminating the day itself) and adding the dates for preregistration.

Dean Sutton asked how the senior grade conflict problem will be resolved. Will, for example, Arts and Sciences be able to certify senior grades by the graduation deadline? Mr. Harrell said that he has consulted with his staff and learned that senior grades could be entered on the computer print-out after each day of examinations and transmitted to the deans' offices. Therefore, on the last day of examinations, only a relatively few senior grades would be left for check and certification. Senior grades can probably be certified in time to prepare diplomas for graduation. Professor Hope reminded Mr. Harrell that Master's Degrees presented the same problem. Mr. Harrell again returned to a former theme by admitting that much confusion resulted from the arrangement made this year.

The Secretary asked Mr. Harrell the reason why Memorial Day was considered an "examination holiday" whereas it had not been considered as such in several earlier years. Mr. Harrell explained that the American Legion had exerted pressure on the University to recognize Memorial Day as a holiday since it is widely recognized by others. The American Legion felt that the University was unpatriotic if it did not do so. The Calendar Committee felt that the University should not be subjected to such criticism unless necessary and has recognized the American Legion's desires for the last few years.

The question was called for, and the calendar as amended was approved by the Council. The decision to dismiss classes on Good Friday, 1967, was postponed.

INTERIM REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE DIVISION OF GENERAL AND TECHNICAL STUDIES

Professor Bair, chairman of the Advisory Committee, began by apologizing for not distributing his report ahead of time. He explained that Dean Mee had been out of town, and he wished to consult with him about the contents of the report before the Council received it. The report appears in the minutes as Faculty Council Document No. 35. The Committee has dealt principally with questions of selecting and initiating new programs for the Division. This has been recognized as a complex problem, and the programs to be initiated are not easily identified. Therefore, discussion is still in the elementary stage. The Committee has tried to develop and polarize issues that were important both to the Division and to the relation between the Division and the University's objectives. Typical of the problems is that some programs which are most easily justified on the basis of community needs and desires of the prospective students are not in line with some of the current interests of the University. The training of scientific technicians is made difficult by the fact that there is no backlog of experience and no precedents for this type of education. Funds are not yet available; there are no reliable guides for employment; and no tested curricula exist.

President Stahr commended the Committee for undertaking a strenuous load of work and noted that the middle paragraph on page 7 designated the Committee as a Curriculum Policy Committee. Professor Bair explained that this was an expedient measure. Since the Division does not yet have its own faculty, someone must do this job.

Professor Barber asked, in reference to the third paragraph on page 5, whether or not the research into curriculum, testing, etc. is to be done by the Division faculty. Professor Bair replied that it is anticipated that the Division faculty would perform such research. Professor Barber then asked if the Division faculty would carry on research in their own subjects, and Professor Bair replied that this was probably not likely. At this time, Dean Klinge repeated Professor Bair's observation that there are no time-honored curricula that have been developed for this type of education. The absence of research in this area is quite apparent. How is a laboratory technician produced? The development of curricula, etc., is actually one of the functions of the Division. Possibly the Audio-visual Center and the School of Education, where specialists in these areas exist, will be called upon to aid in this work. It is, nevertheless, the Division's responsibility to initiate such studies.

Professor Miller asked what consideration has been given to initial appointments on the Division faculty. Does the responsibility lie with the Committee in consultation with the Dean? Professor Bair replied that the Committee has made no recommendation on this point. The Committee feels it is not qualified to undertake the recruitment of faculty. The academic mother departments are better qualified to do this work. President Stahr observed that some subjects to be taught in the Division might have no mother department. Dean Heffner reviewed the faculty appointment procedures up to this time. He explained that about five faculty appointments are pending approval by the Board of Trustees; these faculty are to be added to the Fort Wayne Regional Campus. The fields to be represented are office technology, accounting technology,

and marketing technology. These faculty appointments were recommended by Dean Mee, approved by Dean Braden, and reviewed by the Dean of Faculties. It was Dean Heffner's opinion that it was better procedure to follow this administrative route during the initial phases of the Division than to require review by a faculty committee of members who were unfamiliar with the actual needs and programs. The Committee could better function to advise on specifications for the position.

Dean Holmquist asked whether the admission standards for the Division are different than for the rest of the University and whether the basic courses would differ from those taught in other parts of the University. Professor Bair replied that admission standards, as approved by the Board of Trustees, will indeed be different, and the supportive courses might be special courses. Dean Klinge amplified this statement by stating that in all probability the basic courses would be different from those taught in other parts of the University simply because the admission standards would not be the same and the educational objectives would be different.

Professor Barber asked what kinds of people would be available as faculty. Community colleges have sometimes robbed high schools of their most distinguished teachers, and he wondered if there were other sources that could be tapped. Professor Bair replied that the recruitment of faculty depends on what programs were developed. Dean Klinge answered that industry was a source of teachers for certain technical courses. A company, for example, might release a man to teach a course to prospective technicians. This does not settle the question as to who would teach supportive courses. Perhaps the part-time services of a high school teacher would be needed in this case.

Dean Heffner gave two examples of persons who are being considered for faculty appointments. One is a young woman in business education with experience as a high school teacher who has also served as a business manager of a college in Sierra Leone. Another is an experienced businessman who decided rather late in life to obtain a doctor's degree in education. This man combines technical knowledge as a businessman with experience in educational practice. Professor Barber commented at this point that it appeared that the University might be able to locate talent which is not now being brought to bear on this type of education.

President Stahr suggested that the Council simply receive the report without necessarily endorsing its contents since it is an interim report.

RESULTS OF BALLOTING FOR FACULTY COUNCIL

Professor Hope presented the results of the election to the Faculty Council which appears as Faculty Council Document No. 36. The Elections Committee wished to alter the election procedure by requiring both (a) the printing or typing of the faculty member's name on the outside of the return envelope and (b) his signature. They also wished to require that the ballots be received by a certain deadline date rather than returned by this date. The Committee found itself unable to read many of the signatures that appeared on the envelopes and thus questioned the authenticity of some of the votes. There followed a considerable discussion of the merits of both the signature and the printing or typing of the name, and it was finally suggested by Professor Turner that an easy solution might be to print the name from an

addressograph plate on the same return envelope. The faculty member could then countersign above his name for identification purposes. It was not determined if this was a feasible solution to the problem, but it was agreed that this problem could be solved in some fashion.

Professor Lukemeyer reported that the ballots were sometimes received at the Indianapolis Medical School Campus after the deadline date for their return. Dean Heffner reported the procedure of sending the ballots in bulk to the Deans of off-campus centers where they were presumably distributed to each of the faculty members. This procedure should be altered in the future so that mail of any serious consequence could be delivered individually. The Committee on Faculty Communications will consider this problem. Professor Klinge reported that the I.U. Foundation now has on tape the Regional Campus address of each off-campus faculty member and this might serve a useful purpose in individual mailings.

Professor Hope moved:

IN THE FUTURE FACULTY MEMBERS SHOULD COUNTERSIGN THE OUTSIDE ENVELOPE OVER A TYPED OR PRINTED STATEMENT OF HIS NAME. THE BALLOT SHOULD CONTAIN THE STATEMENT THAT IT SHOULD BE RECEIVED RATHER THAN RETURNED BY A CERTAIN DEADLINE DATE.

Professor Hope's motion was accepted unanimously by the Council.

The Secretary reported a motion prepared by the Agenda Committee regarding the nomination and election procedures. The Agenda Committee is acutely aware that many of the same persons are repeatedly elected to the Council and that the Council is in danger of being considered a self-perpetuating body. The Committee feels that the vigor of the Council and the respect it commands from the faculty depend in part on recruiting new people for service. The system of nominations and election at large may be a factor contributing to the present situation.

The Agenda Committee moved:

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL BE APPOINTED TO REVIEW NOMINATION AND ELECTION PRACTICES AND TO REPORT THE RESULT OF THEIR FINDINGS SOMETIME DURING THE FALL SEMESTER, 1966.

Dean Bain seconded the motion, and it was passed by the Council unanimously.

RESULTS OF BALLOTING FOR OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL

The Agenda Committee prepared two nominations for each office of the Faculty Council with the provision that two members of the Agenda Committee are to consist of the newly elected secretary and the immediate past secretary. The Council elected its officers by secret ballot as follows: Secretary, Professor Yamaguchi; Parliamentarian, Professor Fuchs; Agenda Committee, Professor Yamaguchi, chairman, Professor Gerking, and Professor Miller.

SCHOOL STATUS FOR DIVISION OF LIBRARY SCIENCE
AND DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICE

President Stahr reminded the Council that summary reports on the status of the Divisions of Library Science and Social Service were circulated several weeks ago with the minutes. The Search and Screening Committees appointed to review candidates for the directors of these Divisions have reported that they need clarification of the status of these Divisions for recruitment purposes. In their judgement, an outstanding person could more easily be persuaded to serve as a dean of a School than as a director of a Division. The change to School status was contemplated in the near future anyway (by the Study Committee). President Stahr reported that the Dean of Faculties had recommended that each of the two Divisions be raised to School level and that the Search and Screening Committees be empowered to search for deans for each. The present Division of Library Science would be called the Graduate Library School, and the present Division of Social Service would gain the title of Graduate School of Social Service. These name changes would be presented to the Board of Trustees on June 10, and if they approve, the changes will be announced at Commencement. President Stahr felt that this would be an exciting development, not only for the directors of these two Divisions, but for their faculty, students, and alumnus. Both directors have contributed greatly to the development of each Division to School status, and they deserve to receive the title of dean before they retire. It was felt also that the programs of both Divisions have suffered in recent years because of their uncertain status in the University. President Stahr reminded the Council that the new deans would not be members of the Council until each School had a faculty of at least 30 members.

President Stahr called upon Dean Peak to review the status of the present Division of Library Science. Dean Peak responded that the Division was a cooperative effort between the Graduate School and the School of Education. The faculty of the Division is in the School of Education whereas the professional degree in library science is offered through the Graduate School. Dean Heffner commented that a Master of Arts Degree is now given in Library Science but that this should actually be an M.S. degree, since it is a professional degree. The new dean should, with his faculty, develop a professional curriculum for this purpose. There would, of course, be a continuing association with other parts of the University for supporting courses.

Dean Sutton was asked to explain the present relation of the Division of Social Service to the College of Arts and Sciences. He reported that the Division of Social Service was much like that of the Division of Library Science; it was principally a graduate professional program with a few undergraduate courses. The Division was located in Indianapolis, and this physical separation from the main campus has been a strain on the program development. The faculty is associated with the College of Arts and Sciences purely for budgetary convenience. The degree, as in the case of the Division of Library Science, is offered by the Graduate School, and Dean Shull has responsibility for program development. There are few such Divisions left in the United States in social work education; many Divisions have gained School status and several others are in the process of acquiring School status within their respective universities. It was repeated again that the uncertain status of the Division had become handicapped on faculty recruitment and otherwise.

Professor Pratt stated that there still seems to be an anomaly since both Divisions are graduate schools only. Dean Heffner emphasized that a few undergraduate courses were given but that the new Schools should be regarded as professional schools at the graduate level. Professor Pratt asked whether or not each of the new schools would be in complete charge of their own curriculum including undergraduate courses. Dean Heffner replied that Schools will depend on the College of Arts and Sciences for undergraduate supporting courses and general undergraduate program supervision, but they would set their own standards for professional degrees in library science and social service. The Graduate School Council would no longer have jurisdiction over the M.S. degree in either social service or library science, though of course it would at the Ph.D. level. Professor Pratt replied that his question was aimed at whether or not the present Divisions would attain full School or College status. President Stahr replied that each would still need help from the College of Arts and Sciences, etc. for supporting courses. Each of the new Schools might be compared to the School of Business if the latter should cut down drastically on its undergraduate program.

Dean Heffner hoped that Dean Merritt would initiate the previously authorized Council on Advanced Studies which would act in an advisory capacity for new graduate professional programs of this sort. Dean Peak moved:

THE FACULTY COUNCIL ENDORSES THE CHANGE FROM THE DIVISION OF LIBRARY SCIENCE TO THE GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL.

Dean Shull seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously by the Council. Dean Sutton moved:

THE FACULTY COUNCIL ENDORSES THE CHANGE FROM THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICE TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

Dean Shull seconded the motion, and it was accepted unanimously by the Council.

COMMUNICATION FROM AAUP

President Stahr introduced the discussion of Faculty Council Document No. 32. This communication stems from the local AAUP chapter's interest in the University's position regarding controversial organizations, particularly the W. E. B. DuBois Club. President Stahr was not certain if the statement would help or hinder in achieving the desired results but did not want to overlook it. Professor Pratt restated in simplified terms his interpretation of the University's position with respect to the decision of the Subversive Activities Control Board on the status of the W. E. B. DuBois Club. It was his understanding that if the Board identified the DuBois Club as a Communist organization, the University would withdraw recognition of the Club. President Stahr replied that this was indeed a reasonable interpretation, but it was not entirely accurate. If the Subversive Activities Control Board identified the DuBois Club as a Communist organization, the Dean of Students would take action to suspend the Club, but this would simply initiate the proceedings of de-registration. The guidelines for registration of campus organizations are loose; both within and without the guidelines there is some room for judgement as to what the University should support and what it should not support. For example,

one of the requirements of registration is that the objectives of any organization should not be contrary to University regulations. This would leave some room for interpretation as to what University "regulations" are to be referred to. Nevertheless, a finding against the DuBois Club by the Subversive Activities Control Board would be reason to raise a serious question about its continuance on the campus as a University-supported organization.

Professor Pratt recognized that he had oversimplified the case and that there was more flexibility in University action than he had stated. He also pointed out that the language in the third paragraph of the AAUP statement is also cautious.

President Stahr recognized that there were some faculty groups which felt that the University should tolerate any group of students regardless of their aims or interests but need not support them in order to tolerate them. There are others which felt that students not only should be free to organize on any basis for any reason, but they cannot be "free" unless the University supports them logistically. Still others feel that the criteria for registered (supported) student organizations should be spelled out more clearly since some are valuable but not all necessarily are.

Professor Pratt felt the issue was too difficult for the Council to resolve at this late hour. He felt a great conflict in his own mind between the notion of absolute freedom on one hand and "the law of the land" on the other.

Dean Pinnell asked what action the AAUP desired in this regard. President Stahr explained his interpretation that the local AAUP chapter genuinely desired to be helpful. The document was sent to him to interpret in whichever way he found it most useful to achieve the purposes of the faculty and the administration to maintain essential freedom of inquiry. Professor Fuchs confirmed this interpretation by replying that the chapter wished to be as helpful as they could under the circumstances. As far as the action of the Council is concerned, it should depend upon the President's desires.

President Stahr thought the statement might be helpful to him, but raising the question and discussing it in the Council might be just as helpful as a formal endorsement of precise language by the Council, probably more so. He could mention that the AAUP chapter had drafted the statement and that it had been discussed by the Faculty Council who found itself in general agreement with its apparent philosophy.

Professor Day responded by saying that he was in hearty agreement with the statement, and he felt it only natural an AAUP chapter or any other similar group would wish to be as helpful as they could in this tense situation.

Dean Holmquist felt that the third paragraph contained a real caution to the President, and Dean Pinnell concurred that the paragraph contained a recommendation that might reduce the President's flexibility in dealing with the situation. It was his feeling that the first two paragraphs were excellent and could be accepted without serious question. President Stahr said he greatly appreciated those paragraphs but thought the Council had previously been more than generous on this score.

POLICY OF THE UNIVERSITY IN RELATION TO THE STATE
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

President Stahr reported that he had been told there was a possibility that the State Selective Service Headquarters would shortly request that the class standing of all male college students in the State be sent by their respective institutions to their respective local Selective Service Boards. In consultation with the Deans' Council, it had been decided today that the University should adhere to its policy of not releasing information of this kind without the student's request. Most institutions, he reported, are believed to be taking the same position. It is possible, however, that the University will be criticized for not cooperating in this regard if its position is misunderstood. The University will make an attempt to convince the authorities not to request this information in this way, and it will try to convince other institutions to agree to the same principle as stated above. The situation becomes complicated by the fact that many outside agencies and employers often inquire as to a student's grade average, class standing, or general performance or other information of this sort. It has probably been the policy not only of the University but of individual faculty members to supply such information freely, either on request of the student or of another institution or inquirer where the student might be applying for something. The right of privacy is never a simple matter, and this issue will have to be handled with good sense, but a student's record is, in a sense, his own property. President Stahr would take the absence of dissent as concurrence, with regard to furnishing information to the Selective Service only on request of the student. There was no dissent .

The Secretary wishes to thank the Agenda Committee, Mary Gaither and Norman Pratt, for their help and cooperation during the academic year. They willingly gave their advice and counsel on a variety of issues at inconvenient times. The Secretary appreciates the benefit of their experience in attempting to plan each Council meeting as effectively and efficiently as possible.

The Council adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelby D. Gerking,
Secretary