

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, November 15, 1966

Ballantine 8

3:30 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 1, 1966
2. Report on the University Events Building
3. Report of the Faculty Council Committee on Nominations and Elections (see Fac. Council Doc. No. 7)
4. Report of the Committee on Self Study Implementation (see Fac. Council Doc. No. 8)
5. Report of the Committee on News Releases
6. President's Business
7. Continued discussion of University Curricular policy

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

November 15, 1966

Members absent, no alternate: Dean Maynard Hine
Dean Glenn Irwin
Provost Kenneth E. Penrod
Professor Edwin H. Cady

Alternates present: Dean Byrum E. Carter for President Elvis
J. Stahr
Dean Charles W. Hagen for Dean Joseph L.
Sutton
Dean Shirley H. Engle for Dean Lynne L.
Merritt
Dean Charles H. Webb for Dean Wilfred C.
Bain
Dean Lawrence C. Larson for Dean Smith
Higgins
Professor Edith J. Green for Dean Emily
Holmquist
Dean Edley W. Martin for Dean W. George
Pinnell
Professor James D. Woolf for Professor
Sylvia Bowman
Professor Lloyd R. Ahlf for Professor
Keith Lorentzen
Professor Fritz F.K. Ringer for Professor
Henry H.H. Remak
Professor Delbert C. Miller for Professor
Charles J. Vitaliano
Professor Elmus R. Wicker for Professor
George Wilson

Visitors: Mr. J.W. Orwig, Director of Athletics.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 1, 1966.
2. Report on the University Events Building.
3. Report of the Faculty Council Committee on Nominations and Elections (see Fac. Council Doc. No. 7).
4. Report of the Committee on Self Study Implementation (See Fac. Council Doc. No. 8)
5. Report of the Committee on News Releases.
6. President's Business.
7. Continued discussion of University Curricular policy.

Dean Byrum Carter, in the absence of both President Stahr and Dean Sutton, chaired the November 15, 1966 meeting of the Faculty Council and called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Four minor corrections were made in the minutes of the meeting of November 1, 1966 and the minutes were approved as corrected.

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

Dean Carter reported for President Stahr on the appointment of a nominating committee for the Faculty Council. This committee will consist of Professors Fay, Fuchs, and Pratt. It will serve for the remainder of the academic year and its immediate assignment is to prepare a slate of eight nominees for the Advisory Committee for the Dean of Faculties. In the absence of specific instructions from President Stahr, Dean Carter asked Professor Fuchs to serve as Chairman of this committee.

AGENDA COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Professor Gerking raised an item of Agenda Committee business which was not on the agenda for the meeting but which he felt was related to the appointment of a nominating committee. Speaking for the Agenda Committee (Gerking, Miller, and Yamaguchi) Professor Gerking stated that this committee has been requested during the past two to three years to accept work assignments which it felt it should not undertake on the basis of the constitution of the Faculty Council. The most recent assignment made by the Council, that of studying the publicity problem, is not one of the constitutionally defined functions of the committee. There has also been a request from President Stahr that the Agenda Committee be the nominating committee for the Council. The Agenda Committee's feeling is that it might suggest, but not form a motion, that what the Council really wants is not an agenda committee but an executive committee.

In recent meetings of the Council there has been some discussion concerning matters requiring emergency legislation at times when no one is empowered to take legislative action. An executive committee might take over the function of emergency legislation as well as handling special problems such as the publicity problem and such matters of routine as nominations. An executive committee might possibly have been the type of committee that the Dean of Faculties wanted. In the future, the Council members of the Advisory Committee for the Dean of Faculties might be selected from the membership of an executive committee, if one were created.

Professor Gerking continued with a question raised by the Agenda Committee: has the Faculty Council outgrown the Agenda Committee? The Council's membership has grown and its responsibilities have increased. The Agenda Committee's functions and responsibilities, however, are clearly defined and delimited by the constitution, and this committee has sufficient work arising from its duties so defined.

Professor Gerking reiterated that the Agenda Committee did not wish to make a motion but simply wanted to suggest, at the present time, that it might be desirable to change the constitution to create an executive committee with broader functions than the current Agenda Committee.

REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY EVENTS BUILDING

Mr. J.W. Orwig, Director of Athletics, was present as a guest of the Council to describe the plans, current status, and intended use of the University Events Building which, according to Mr. Orwig, now has the official name of Assembly Hall.

Mr. Orwig began his presentation by citing the contribution of Mr. Paul J. Harrell, who, as Athletic Building Coordinator, has been intimately connected with the plans for the building since 1957.

In 1957, the Board of Trustees decided to move the center of the varsity sports program activity to an undeveloped site north on Fee Lane, approximately 7 blocks from the academic campus. At that time, plans were made for an athletic building complex that included a football stadium, a fieldhouse, and a third building then designated as a sports arena. The total estimated cost of these three structures plus the HPER Building was approximately \$22,000,000. Since it was felt that it would be difficult to float a bond issue for this amount, construction of the sports arena was postponed until such time as the need for it was greater and financing more feasible. That time has come. Approval for construction has been given by the Board of Trustees, the Governor of the State, and the Administrative Building Council for the State of Indiana. The plans are now in the hands of the architectural firm of Eggars and Higgins in New York and it is hoped that construction on the building will commence by the middle of April, 1967.

As a visual aid device, Mr. Orwig brought along a model. A model of the building, that is. Two changes in the plan as shown in the model have been made, one forced by stone, the other by law. The basement level of the building will be sunk approximately 8 feet less than originally planned in order to save approximately \$500,000 in blasting and excavation costs. To provide the proper amount of exit space as required by fire laws, exterior stairwells will be added to two sides of the building.

The building will be located between the fieldhouse and the stadium and will have three levels, a partly subterranean lower level, a main floor, and a balcony. For basketball games, the seating capacity will be approximately 18,000 with approximately 11,000 seats on the main floor, 5,500 in the balcony, and space for 1,800 spectators in pull-out bleachers in the end zone areas. All seats in the main floor and balcony will be theatre seats with arm rests, but only the main floor seats will be cushioned. Balcony seats will be made of plastic.

As for structural characteristics, the building will utilize the suspended bridge system which neither Mr. Orwig nor the Secretary understand very clearly. Evidently, the building will have no pilings and will be hung or hung together by steel cables.

Assembly Hall, aside from serving as a basketball arena, will also serve as an auditorium and theatre. It will also house events with large space or seating requirements such as assemblies, convocations, conferences, dances, performances, races (Little 500 and Miniature 500), and shows. Some of the space and facilities will be used for HPER classes and intramural athletic events. The building, which will be air conditioned, will also have a dining room that can be divided into two smaller dining rooms with a combined capacity of 250. Dining room facilities will be available to the faculty and other university personnel.

Facilities directly related to the Athletic Department include a large reception area and 25 offices for the department staff, a photography laboratory, a press box with 49 spaces, 2 training rooms, physician's office, trainer's office, rehabilitation room, 8 varsity locker rooms, equipment room, laundry, officials' room, and six classrooms.

Mr. Orwig asked members of the Council if they had any questions or comments. Professor Day asked if Assembly Hall would have murals or other decorative features. Only pictures have been planned for so far, said Mr. Orwig, but he thought that having murals was a good thought since there would be ample wall space on the interior wall of the concourses. Professor Hope asked how the building will be financed. Mr. Orwig answered that as in the case of the HPER Building, Fieldhouse and the Stadium, Assembly Hall will be financed by a bond issue with the bonds retired through student fee monies and the interest paid out of Athletic Department revenues. As Mr. Orwig understood it, the bond issue for Assembly Hall will not increase the student fee rate.

Mr. Orwig concluded his presentation with the hope that construction will be completed in 30 months to allow the 1969-70 basketball season to start in the new facility.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Dean Carter called upon Professor Hope, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, (other members, Gerking and Lukemeyer) to report for his committee. Since the Committee's report, Faculty Council Document No. 7, had been circulated earlier to the members of the Council, Professor Hope presented a brief summary. The Committee recommended that the period of ineligibility

for re-election to the Council be extended from one to two years. Also, his committee wished to call the attention of the faculty to the fact that the same twenty to thirty people have been on the Council for a long time and if the faculty wished to do something about this, the best way would be to vote for other people.

Professor Hope proposed the following motion:

THE PERIOD OF INELIGIBILITY AFTER TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS
ON THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE EXTENDED FROM ONE TO TWO YEARS.

The motion was seconded by Dean Braden.

The Secretary asked if the motion was a matter involving a change in the by-laws of the constitution. The parliamentarian began his search through the Faculty Handbook for the appropriate information and the discussion proceeded on the substance of the Hope Committee's recommendation.

Professor Solt had a question. Had the Committee considered the possibility of not have a two-year term immediately renewable? The committee had considered this possibility but felt that the Council benefited from the possibility, at least, of a member serving 4 consecutive years because it usually requires a new member some time to become accustomed to the operation of the Council. The Committee felt that a Council member could serve more effectively after two years of immediately prior membership in the Council. To Professor Solt's next question as to whether or not the committee had considered proposing a four-year term of office, Professor Hope answered that it had not, that it had briefly considered the possibilities of a three-year term but rejected it since it seemed too long.

Professor Byrnes felt that the function of the Council, not just its membership, should be appraised. He would have been happier if the Hope Committee had made some suggestions or recommendations reflecting some particular view of the Council's function. The background of the appointment of this committee and the establishment of its mission was the feeling of the Council last year, that too many familiar faces were turning up in the membership. But this fact, in Professor Byrnes' opinion, raised the question of what the function of the Council is. Furthermore, he thought that the Faculty Handbook gives a grossly inadequate description of the Council's functions.

Professor Byrnes continued by raising some questions. Should the Council be a body which represents a wide range of faculty opinion as a kind of sounding board for issues which may be of interest but not necessarily of significance to the University? Should it, instead, be a legislative body as the Faculty Handbook suggests? If the Council is to be a representative body could not the whole

system of representation be changed? Had the committee thought of proportional representation by fields of study so that, for example, the 19 Bloomington representatives might come from the four areas of humanities, natural sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences with no less than four representatives from each area? Or had the committee considered rank as a basis for representation whereby, for example, there would be no more than 10 full professors, no less than 4 assistant professors, and no less than 5 associate professors?

Professor Hope responded by saying that the committee had thought of ways whereby the Council could be made more representative but had discarded these ideas after brief consideration since changes would result in more complicated ballots that would tend to discourage voting. If proportional representation beyond what we now have is instituted, Professor Hope thought that a nominating committee would be needed to simplify the whole balloting and voting procedure and the present system of obtaining nominations at large could not be used. Professor Byrnes felt that although the facts in the Hope Committee's report were illuminating, if a study had been made of departmental representation, the results would probably indicate that certain departments in the College had a virtual monopoly in representation. He did not know if this was good or bad but if we are interested in seeing new faces, we need a new arrangement.

Dean Shull felt that a move in the direction of Professor Byrnes' comments was very much in order if the Council is to become a more effective university body. The Hope Committee's recommendation, he felt, was at least in the right direction but constituted only a very small step. Its proposal would mean that an individual could serve 8 out of 10 years instead of 8 out of 9 years.

Earlier in the discussion, Professor Byrnes had stated that fields of study within the College could be used as a basis for broader representation. Dean Martin, alternate for Dean Pinnell, spoke to this. As a representative not in the College, he seconded Professor Byrnes' suggestion. He wished to note, however, that the implication of Professor Byrnes' remarks, namely, that the University is the College was a concept he objected to strenuously. Aside from that, he thought that Professor Byrnes' point was an excellent one, which was even more excellent for those outside of the College. Professor Byrnes replied that he simply used the College as an example he knew best and that whatever numbers are used to peg representation should apply across the University.

Professor Hope added the information that the data on representativeness of Council membership, although not closely studied by his Committee, suggested that the College has been overrepresented whereas the Schools of Education and HPER have been under-

represented. Assistant and Associate Professors have also been underrepresented. Professor Byrnes added that age groups are underrepresented. So is sex, added Professor Gerking.

Professor Gerking continued. There are many ways in which the the faculty can be categorized and the basic question is what kind of categories are desirable. As for assistant professors as a category, there are a number of faculty who object to decisions being made by assistant professors without tenure and there are relatively few assistant professors with tenure.

There then developed some rapid-fire repartee on representativeness and poverty: The only group that is well represented are the deans (Dean Martin); The deans like the poor, we will always have with us (Professor Byrnes); And we are poor. Some think in both ways (Dean Carter).

The parliamentarian then made his report. The legal status of the Hope Committee's recommendation would clearly involve a constitutional amendment. The form of the motion, a point raised by Professor Miller, should be changed to a recommendation to the faculty that the constitutional amendment be adopted.

Dean Shull was of the opinion that since a constitutional amendment was at issue, the Council should explore the question further in more detail. Professor Turner, however, felt that it would be well to proceed now on the Hope Committee's recommendation since a consideration of changes of the magnitude suggested by Professor Byrnes would be a lengthy process. Professor Hope felt that a self-study, in a sense, of the Faculty Council to determine its function would be necessary before the question of representation could be decided.

Professor Byrnes commented that he had no particular objection to the motion but as Dean Shull had mentioned, it did not constitute a large step and he was not in favor in principle of an ineligibility rule. The Committee's proposal he felt was not a great step forward or backward. This, Professor Gerking stated, commenting on Professor Byrnes last remark, was in the committee's view, the beauty of its proposal. Since it did not sense any faculty desire for major changes, its proposal was on the quiet side.

Professors Gerking and Byrnes were in close agreement, however, on their views for a need to further explore the organization and the functions of the Council.

Dean Martin spoke against the motion. He felt the motion would adversely affect minority groups since they could gain representation on the Council only through a few people well-known throughout the faculty, particularly the faculty in the College.

Dean Braden had some comments. As he recalled, when the constitution was drafted, the question of proportional representation was rather carefully considered but the faculty did not accept it. Since then, on occasions of drafting other constitutions, proportional representation has not been favored. We have tried to keep ourselves as one faculty but if this is not the case, a complete restudy of the constitution may be necessary. However, the motion forces us a little way in the direction of expanding the number of people considered in a given election and can cause more people to take an interest in Council elections.

Professor Hope then withdrew his motion since it seemed clear to him that a broader study of the problem was wanted. Dean Braden withdrew his second but stated he did so with no enthusiasm.

Withdrawal of the motion was accepted by consent.

Dean Carter then asked the Council if it wished to propose an alternative to the Hope Committee's proposal.

Professor Solt wondered if Dean Shull might have something to contribute since the Graduate School Council is considering a change in its representation. Dean Shull felt that the Council will move in the direction of proportional representation although the final vote on a proposal has not been taken. He added, however, that the Graduate Council and the Faculty Council are quite different bodies. It was his personal opinion that the Faculty Council has suffered severely from the lack of a particular kind of representativeness, one that would allow anyone on the Faculty who wished to talk to a Council member about Council business to know readily whom to approach. Although he favored a system of nomination by area and election at large he felt that the particular mechanism of nomination and election was unimportant as long as the result would be that a faculty member could say, "this is the Council representative to whom I can make a statement."

Professor Fuchs proposed a motion which in its final form was:

THE PRESIDENT SHALL APPOINT A COMMITTEE OF SEVEN MEMBERS TO MAKE A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL AND TO REPORT ITS STUDY AND PROPOSALS TO THE COUNCIL WITH THE SCOPE OF ITS STUDY TO INCLUDE THE COUNCIL'S FUNCTIONS, RESPONSIBILITIES, ORGANIZATION, COMPOSITION, AND MANNER OF SELECTION, OF ITS MEMBERS.

Professor Long seconded the motion.

The original motion made by Professor Fuchs differed from the final amended motion on two points. The Committee on Nominations and Elections was asked to go back to work and the scope of study was limited to the Council's composition and the manner of selection

of its members. Professor Gerking felt that the Committee on Nominations and Elections, since it was only a three-man committee, did not have sufficiently broad representation for the proposed task. He, as did Professor Byrnes, felt that the scope of the study should be extended to include the Council's functions, responsibilities and organization. These sentiments were accepted by Professor Fuchs and Long as amendments to the original motion.

In the brief discussion that followed, Professor Wicker asked if there were any reasons for the Faculty Council not being included in the Self-Survey. Professor Breneman stated that it was entirely a matter of time limitation for the completion of the Self-Study Report. Professor Day contributed the historical fact that according to Professor Weatherwax, April, 1967 will mark the 20th anniversary of the Faculty Council.

The question was called for and Professor Fuchs motion was accepted unanimously.

REPORT ON THE COMMITTEE ON SELF-STUDY IMPLEMENTATION

Professor Saltzman, Chairman of a three-man committee appointed to formulate the Council's procedure in considering the Self-Study Report indicated that his committee's written report (Fac. Coun. Doc. No. 8) differed from the verbal report presented at the Council meeting on Nov. 1, 1966 on two matters. First, the current recommendation of the committee was that the Council would approve all Self-Study recommendations before any implementation of these recommendations commenced. Second, only the proposals, not entire sections, of the Self-Study Report would be duplicated for distribution to the faculty through the Council minutes. Professor Saltzman moved that:

THE FACULTY COUNCIL SHALL ACCEPT THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO FORMULATE THE COUNCIL'S PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT. (Fac. Coun. Doc. No. 8, 1966-67.)

Professor Solt seconded the motion.

Dean Carter asked if all Self-Study recommendations, even those that have already been implemented, were to be reported back to the Council. Some recommendations, particularly those pertaining to administrative procedures and on-going systems might have already been implemented. Professor Saltzman felt that all recommendations should be reported to the Council in order to insure an exhaustive coverage of the Self-Study Report and also to fully inform the faculty. Dean Hagen asked if the Council's approval would pertain to the desirability of a Self-Study recommendation as well as the appropriateness of a particular agency to implement approved proposals. Professor Saltzman answered in the affirmative.

Professor Fuchs felt that he did not understand one particular sentence in the report, the first sentence on page two. (Note: In the present amended report the sentence reads: "After due consideration of the recommendations, the Faculty Council will return to the committee a list of those referrals which have been approved by the Faculty Council and which were, therefore, ready for further action." In the original report, this sentence read, "After due consideration of a recommendation, the Faculty Council would return to the committee a list of those proposals which were approved by the Faculty Council and by the Board of Trustees, where appropriate, and which will, therefore, be ready for implementation.") Professor Saltzman rephrased the sentence by stating that if there are some proposals which the Council deliberates and then decides should be implemented and if they are proposals that require Board approval before implementation such approval should be sought before the proposal is sent back to the sub-committee for implementation.

Professor Saltzman continued. When a report is presented to the Council by a sub-committee, the report will indicate the sub-committee's opinion as to which proposals the Council should deliberate and which other proposals could be sent to implementing agencies of the University without Council deliberation. At this point the Council can concur or disagree with the sub-committee. But it will send back to the committee, which will become a supervisory committee at this point, those proposals which the Council feels can be implemented without deliberation. Proposals retained by the Council can have two general outcomes. Those not approved will not be sent to the sub-committee for implementation. Those that are approved, however, will be sent back to the sub-committee for supervisory implementation. A variant of the latter alternative would be a Council approved proposal requiring approval by the Board of Trustees before it could be implemented. What a sub-committee will do, then, is the beginning work in deciding which agency is best suited to carry out each proposal, and whether or not the Council should consider a particular proposal. The Council then decides whether it agrees or does not agree with these suggestions.

The question of the kind of supervisory function a sub-committee would have was discussed. Dean Hagen felt that it should be more of a watch-dog or advisory nature rather than a supervisory one. Professor Saltzman agreed. Once a proposal is referred to an implementing agency, the sub-committee's function would simply be to report on progress or the lack of it and perhaps to prod. "Pray" is a better word, felt Professor Byrnes, who also felt that reviewing progress on implementation might more reasonably be a function of the Office of the Dean of Faculties than of the proposed sub-committees. Some concern was expressed, particularly by Dean Martin, that the Saltzman Committee proposal would require a great deal of the Council's time and thus tend to postpone the implementation of Self-Study proposals. Professor Saltzman and Dean Shull expressed the expectation that even though all proposals will

come to the attention of the Council, only a limited number of them would be selected by the Council for its agenda. Dean Hagen, speaking for the Office of the Dean of Faculties, said that since early this summer, his Office has intended to reduce the Self-Study Report to its proposals but work has been delayed. He thought that delays in his office could be just as great as those that might be occasioned by the mechanism proposed by the Saltzman committee. From this point of view, he approved the proposal.

Professor Fuchs again called attention to the sentence he had referred to earlier in the discussion and said that its meanings were still not clear to him. Dean Hagen felt that perhaps too much was covered in that sentence and thought it would be better if that portion of the report dealt with the allocation of proposals rather than the proposals themselves.

Professor Byrnes again spoke to the point that it would be desirable to designate a specific administrative officer, perhaps an Associate Dean of Faculties, as the individual specifically responsible for fulfilling the wishes of the Council on proposals it recommended. Dean Hagen felt that this might well be done in specific cases but not all approved proposals would be appropriate referrals to the Office of the Dean of Faculties or to a Vice President. Many of them could be referred directly to the Registrar, for example. Furthermore, there are a number of standing committees to which certain proposals or groups of proposals could be referred for advice. Additional committees might be appointed to handle the preliminary work necessary before some proposals could actually be implemented. Dean Hagen felt that the Saltzman Committee report proposed a good mechanism for establishing a pattern of allocations.

The motion to accept the Saltzman Committee proposal was called for and was unanimously approved. By consent, rewording, as suggested by Dean Hagen, of the sentence on page two of the report was left to Dean Hagen, Professor Saltzman, and the Secretary.

Professor Saltzman then called the attention of the Council to an additional item of business which his committee felt should be considered immediately, namely, the Self-Study Committee's proposal of establishing a number of undergraduate colleges. In order to handle this proposal in the same manner as other proposals, it would be necessary to appoint a three-man sub-committee with the chairman from the Council membership and two members from the faculty at large to inform the faculty of the proposal, to solicit faculty reactions, and to present these reactions in Council when it is discussed. Professor Saltzman moved that:

THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE OF THE COUNCIL SHALL PREPARE A SLATE OF CANDIDATES FOR A COMMITTEE ON THE SELF-STUDY REPORT PROPOSALS ON REORGANIZATION FOR UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION.

The motion was seconded by Professor Byrnes and was unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION OF UNIVERSITY CURRICULAR POLICY

Dean Hagen stated that the CIC Report he mentioned at the last meeting of the Council will be assigned to the University Committee on Curricular Programs and Educational Policies for its consideration. The committee's recommendations, if any, will be reported to the Council.

The brevity of Dean Hagen's statement may have been influenced by Dean Carter's comment at 4:57 p.m. that he was interested in a reinvigoration of the principle that the Council adjourn at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry G. Yamaguchi, Secretary