

RECEIVED

DEC 2 1966

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, December 6, 1966

Ballantine 8

3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of November 15, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for Arthur S. Daniels.
3. Nominating Committee Report.
4. Agenda Committee Report on Faculty Council news releases.
5. President's Business.

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

December 6, 1966

Members absent, no alternate: Professor Robert H. Shellhamer
Professor Robert C. Turner

Alternates present: Dean Ralph E. McDonald for Dean Maynard Hine
Professor Charles L. Lundin for Professor
Leo Solt
Professor Howard S. Gordon for Professor
George W. Wilson

Visitors: Mr. Earl M. Hoff, Editor, News Bureau

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of November 15, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for Arthur S. Daniels.
3. Nominating Committee Report.
4. Agenda Committee Report on Faculty Council news releases.
5. President's business.

The December 6, 1966 meeting of the Faculty Council was called to order by President Stahr at 3:35 p.m.

The minutes of the meeting of November 15, 1966 were approved as distributed.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR ARTHURS S. DANIELS

Professor J. Keogh Rash read a memorial resolution (Faculty Council Document No.9) on the death of Arthur S. Daniels. The Council signified its adoption of the resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Fuchs, Chairman of the Nominating Committee (other members, Professors Fay and Pratt), presented his committee's report on two current assignments from the Council. The first was to nominate faculty members to be elected to the newly created Advisory Committee to the Dean of Faculties. The Nominating Committee wished to postpone its presentation of a slate of nominees for this committee for two weeks. The second assignment was to nominate candidates for a committee on the proposal to establish residential colleges. The Nominating Committee had some procedural recommendations as well as nominations to make for this committee.

At its last meeting, the Council adopted a motion to establish the latter committee but did not specify that its membership would be elected by the whole Council or by the elected members of the Council. The Nominating Committee's recommendation was that the election for this committee should be by the full Council because the establishment of new undergraduate colleges, if it takes place, is not a matter of peculiar concern to the faculty as distinguished from the administrative officers. The Nominating Committee felt that the united judgment of the whole academic community was needed on this subject, including the choice of this committee.

As for the membership of this committee, the motion adopted at the last meeting of the Council was in the context of a discussion based on the report of the Implementing Committee that would have caused this committee to be composed of three members, a member of the Council and two members drawn from the remainder of the faculty. The Nominating Committee, after canvassing the possibilities and considering the nature of the task this committee will undertake, felt that it should have five members. For other areas of the Self Study Report, three-member committees might still suffice.

Professor Fuchs reported that his committee felt very strongly that in this instance in particular, the Council should not confine

itself to the presented slate of nominees since a three-member nominating committee cannot have sufficient knowledge of the faculty to feel at all certain that its nominations are necessarily the best ones.

The Nominating Committee, in putting together its nominations, sought to bring in the element of youth to some extent and felt that the ranks below the rank of Full Professor should be especially well represented. It was prepared to present a slate of nine nominations, eight of them in pairs with one pair from the School of Education, and the other three from the College of Arts and Science and the Business School. In the latter category, one pair was from the Social Sciences including Business, another from the Humanities and the third from the Physical Sciences. The committee's suggestion was that the selection choice in the election should be between the nominees within a pair together with any nominations from the floor. For a member from the Council, the committee did not feel it needed to provide for a contested election and preferred to nominate a single name subject to nomination from the floor.

Professor Remak was proposed as the committee member from the Council. Through his work as Chairman of the Committee on Teaching, he had been much involved in matters relevant to the undergraduate colleges proposal and would be able to carry his leadership into this new area effectively. The Nominating Committee was aware of a problem in connection with its nomination of Professor Remak in that he was scheduled to leave the country in April to return in the summer and then take a sabbatical leave. The committee felt, however, that a substitution or replacement could be worked out in the future.

Professor Fuchs reported that his committee had made no provision for a chairman in its nominations but wished to suggest that Professor Remak as the Council member on the committee call it together and that the committee elect its own chairman.

A list of nominees was then passed around to the members of the Council. In addition to Professor Remak, this list presented, in pairs, the following members of the faculty:

1. Clinton I. Chase, Associate Professor of Educational Psychology and Robert B. McQuigg, Assistant Professor of Education;
2. Philip D. Appleman, Associate Professor of English, and Richard F. O'Gorman, Associate Professor of French and Italian;
3. Samuel M. Loescher, Professor of Economics, and Ira Horowitz, Professor of Business Administration; and
4. Marvin Carmack, Professor of Chemistry, and John B. Droste, Associate Professor of Geology.

Professor Fuchs then moved and Professor Fay seconded that:

THE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES SHALL BE A FIVE-MEMBER INSTEAD OF A THREE-MEMBER COMMITTEE.

(Secretary's note: The language of Professor Fuchs' motion was that the new Committee on Undergraduate Colleges be made a five-member instead of a three-member committee. Later discussion on the name of this committee resulted in agreement to use Professor Pratt's suggestion of the name Committee on Undergraduate Residential Colleges.)

The motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Fuchs then returned to the question of the electorate in establishing the membership of this committee and asked if the Council would like a motion even though one might not be necessary. To President Stahr's comment, "You are the Parliamentarian," Professor Fuchs promptly supplied a motion which Professor Remak seconded. The motion was:

THE ENTIRE COUNCIL SHALL BE THE ELECTING BODY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES.

Professor Fuchs commented that the Nominating Committee had not discussed the manner of choice for the other Self Study committees but in his personal opinion, they should be appointed. President Stahr reviewed the action of the Council on this point and remarked that his understanding was that the Saltzman Committee would from time to time bring to the Council a mission for a committee and at such time the Council would have the opportunity of deciding on the manner of selection of these committees. Professor Saltzman agreed.

The motion to have the entire Council vote on nominations to the Committee on Undergraduate Residential Colleges was passed unanimously.

Professor Fuchs then called the attention of the Council to the slate of nominees and asked for discussion and additional names.

Regarding the chairmanship of this committee, Professor Saltzman commented that although it would be different from the other committees yet to be established, the Self Study Implementation Committee's Report which was adopted by the Council suggested that the chairman of the three-man committees be members of the Council. President Stahr and Professor Fuchs agreed that the rule of designating a chairman had already been established and could be used in this instance unless there were objections. There were none and by general consent it was decided that the committee member from the Faculty Council would be the chairman of this committee.

The nomination of Professor Carmack elicited some discussion. Dean Carter informed the Council that Professor Carmack was currently on a leave of absence. Professor Fuchs commented that his committee consulted The Register for information on faculty on leave and did not check with the individuals nominated since the committee did not feel it could go through the process of overcoming a great many objections. In the committee's view, election by the Council should not necessarily mean that the person should feel he was drafted into service but that for a job like this, there should be an opportunity for an individual who really cannot undertake this task to be excused. It seemed to Professor Fuchs that Professor Carmack was eliminated as a nominee by the fact that he was on leave.

Dean Sutton pointed out that the Nominating Committee could not have known about Professor Carmack's situation since it developed very late relative to the beginning of the academic year. President Stahr commented that it might be noted that The Register is reliable but not infallible. Nor up to date, added Dean Sutton.

Professor Hope then nominated Professor Gerking in lieu of Professor Carmack.

President Stahr reminded the Council that although the Nominating Committee had made the recommendation that voting be by pairs or groupings of nominees no action had been taken as yet by the Council to require this. Professor Fuchs felt that a rule was necessary. Professor Fuchs proposed and Professor Fay seconded the following motion:

VOTING ON THE FOUR NON-COUNCIL MEMBERS OF THE UNDER-GRADUATE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES COMMITTEE SHALL BE BY PAIRS OR GROUPINGS OF NOMINEES.

The motion was unanimously passed.

Regarding Professor Gerking's nomination, Professor Day stated that while he had the highest regard for him, he wondered if the Nominating Committee intended that more than one member of the Council should be on the committee. Professor Fuchs responded that his committee followed the Implementing Committee's recommendation of one Council member per committee, but did not know if this rule of procedure would be binding in the present case. President Stahr commented that he understood the Council's previous action to mean that for a three-man committee, there would be only one Council member but that for a committee of five members, nothing had been established except that the chairmanship should be held by a Council member. Professor Gerking stated that rather than complicate matters, he wished to withdraw from consideration. President Stahr stated that he did not wish to argue the point but thought that a ratio of two Council members to three non-Council members on a committee of five was fairly close

to the ratio of one to two on a three-man committee. Dean Carter felt that there would be some wisdom in saving Council members for future use on other committees because if the Implementing Committee proposed to establish a large number of committees, every elected member of the Council might be called upon to serve on a committee as its chairman. President Stahr asked if there were any objections to Professor Gerking's withdrawal. There were none and Professor Hope withdrew his nomination. Discussion on the Gerking nomination ended with a comment from the nominee himself regarding what he perceived to be the dynamics of the situation: the Council was trying to salve his feelings because he and the other members of the Committee on Nominations and Elections were so drastically defeated at the last meeting of the Council.

The name of William W. Eidson, Associate Professor of Physics, was proposed by Dean Sutton as a nominee to replace Professor Carmack on the ballot. Dean Sutton also commented in response to Professor Fuchs' request for discussion on the character of his committee's choices that he noticed that the Biological Sciences were not included. Professor Breneman felt that if it were done, the size of the Committee would increase. Dean Sutton, however, offered the suggestion that a nominee from the Biological Sciences could be paired with one from the Physical Sciences so that the Council could "at least get a shot at a biologist." President Stahr offered the thought that perhaps the biological viewpoint would emerge in the consultations the new committee will undoubtedly have with the Self Study Committee which has biological representation in the person of Professor Breneman. Professor Remak offered the thought that perhaps Professor Appleman could be considered not only as a nominee representing Humanities but also Biology because of his recent book, The Silent Explosion.

The question of student involvement in the work of this committee was raised by Professor Byrnes. He asked if any thought had been given to having a student on this committee. Since students will be living in these colleges, they will probably have ideas to contribute. Dean Carter felt that clearly this committee would need to consult students among others as it considered its program. But possibly, the committee's deliberations would carry through the present academic year. If so, the usual problem of student representation, i.e., the turnover of generations, would arise. He favored not having students directly on the committee but involving them in a consultative capacity as the committee engaged in its deliberations. Dean Sutton mentioned two student committees that could be useful in this regard--the Academic Board of Review and the Advisory Committee to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. President Stahr hoped that the Council would agree with Professor Byrnes that this is a remarkably appropriate area for student involvement and that greater involvement might result if instead of having several students on the committee, the committee itself were charged with the responsibility of consulting broadly with the student body. Dean Sutton felt that it was absolutely a requirement that students be con-

sulted. In hitting the "rubber chicken circuit" in the dormitories and the fraternity and sorority houses, he had detected an air of disquiet, particularly among those in the fraternity and sorority group who wonder if there is any way in which they can be accommodated in a residential college situation and how residential colleges will affect them. He strongly favored an extensive look at student views. Professor Remak stated that as the possible chairman of the committee he would like to have one or two students made official members of the committee. He felt that if there were any committee on which students should be equals of the faculty, it was this committee. His preference was for two students, one male, the other female, and both juniors. Dean Braden wondered if it would not be desirable to ask the Student Affairs Committee, which is composed of six students and six faculty members, to nominate or appoint two students. Professor Auer, Chairman of the Committee, indicated, after a quick visual check of sentiment of Council members on this committee, that his committee would be willing to nominate two students if it were asked by the Council to do so.

Dean Braden then moved and Professor Vitaliano seconded that:

THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE SHALL NAME TWO MEMBERS OF THE JUNIOR CLASS, ONE A MALE AND THE OTHER A FEMALE WITH ONE A MEMBER OF A FRATERNITY OR A SORORITY AND THE OTHER A NON-FRATERNITY OR -SORORITY STUDENT, TO SERVE ON THE UNDERGRADUATE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES COMMITTEE.

As a matter of information Professor Miller asked if this committee will be involved with matters of budget and if so if this would be a problem with student members on the committee. He stated that it was not obvious to him as to whether or not there would be any difficulties. President Stahr commented that the plans for the residential colleges will clearly have budget implications. The Saltzman Committee Report and the discussion of it in Council would suggest, he felt, that the function of this committee will be to further the development of recommendations already made by the Self Study Report, to undertake such additional planning as might be necessary, and to formulate plans which the Council and eventually, if appropriate, the Board of Trustees might have to consider. In the process of discharging this function, the committee itself would not necessarily do all the work but the Budget Office, Physical Plant and other agencies would need to be consulted by the committee in order for it to develop plans ready for implementation. President Stahr then asked Professor Saltzman for his comments. Professor Saltzman's response was that although the primary function of the other committees that will be established will be to receive comments from the faculty and to represent the faculty at Council meetings, this particular proposal of the Self Study Report, that of establishing undergraduate residential colleges, was a matter referred directly to the Council. Therefore, the proposal should be treated like any other proposal coming to the Council; details of procedure were open for discussion.

Professor Miller commented that he was in favor of having students on the Committee and had raised the matter of budget involvement simply as a point of information. Dean Sutton envisaged that after the committee developed a plan and procedure, it would need to consult, perhaps through the committee chairman, some appropriate agency in the University to determine the budget implications of its proposals. The plans might need to be tailored or reduced in scope or phased in over a period of time to fit the budget realities. Such budget considerations, however, will be in relatively gross terms. Professor Auer felt that a splendid opportunity had been created to begin the educational process for a son and a daughter of taxpayers on the cost of education and innovation in education. There ought not be any secret as to the cost of education, he thought.

Professor Breneman urged full speed ahead. He reported that a great deal of work had gone into the Self Study Committee's recommendation to establish these colleges and that the committee regarded it as its number one recommendation. He hoped for an early report from the new committee and cautioned against over-concern with details of procedure. Professor Brynes felt that perhaps a forty-day limit could be set for the committee's work. He added: "It is very rainy weather. We are doing this two-by-two and it does remind me of the Ark." With this, Dean Braden's motion was called and was passed unanimously.

Balloting on the nominees for the Committee on Undergraduate Residential Colleges was done by the entire membership of the Council (Secretary's note: the results of the election were reported at the end of the meeting, but are presented here for continuity). The nominees elected in the contested elections were: Professors Appleman, Chase, Eidson, and Horowitz. Professor Remak was "overwhelmingly elected."

AGENDA COMMITTEE REPORT ON FACULTY COUNCIL NEWS RELEASES

The Agenda Committee was instructed by the Council at its meeting of November 1, 1966 to make policy and procedural recommendations regarding news releases and to ask Mr. James Jordan to draft some sample releases. These samples plus a memorandum from Mr. Jordan to the Agenda Committee (Fac. Council Document No. 10) were distributed to the members of the Council and Professor Miller presented the Agenda Committee's report.

The Agenda Committee met twice on this assignment, once by itself and on the second occasion with Mr. Jordan. These discussions pointed out certain difficulties. Quick release of news has obvious advantages in terms of newsworthiness, keeping everyone informed, and lending a sense of action to the Council. On the other hand, there was one rather serious concern on the part of the committee. Some faculty members might be upset to read about Council business in the newspapers at the same time that

everybody else in the community or state read about it. The committee initially thought, therefore, that there should be a delay in the release of news items until the day after the Council minutes were distributed to the members of the faculty. But this would require a three to four week delay with two weeks for approval of the minutes and one to two weeks for the mechanics of duplication and distribution. By then, news items would no longer be newsworthy. The committee ended its discussion with Mr. Jordan by asking him to prepare a memorandum as well as some sample news releases. His point of view, as expressed in this memorandum, is that a news item would not be newsworthy after several weeks and should be released quite early and done so with Council approval.

Professor Miller had two motions to present. The first one was that: Mr. Jordan or his representative shall be asked to attend all future Faculty Council meetings in order to interpret first-hand the sense of the discussion and actions of the Council and to prepare news items on all matters deemed appropriate and newsworthy. Dean Carter seconded this motion. (Secretary's note: Later events led to a change in the form of this motion.)

Professor Miller requested discussion of this motion before presentation of the second motion. Professor Day asked if the second motion would indicate who will determine what is newsworthy and what actually will be reported. Professor Miller's answer was that it would and do so and in a manner consistent with Mr. Jordan's memorandum.

Dean Sutton raised the question of the public press. He did not doubt the integrity of the public press but the motion, if approved, might raise the possibility that their reporters will also wish to be present. At the meetings of the Board of Trustees, representatives of the Indianapolis News, Indianapolis Star, Bloomington Herald Telephone, Bloomington Tribune, Indiana Daily Student and The Spectator, as well as Mr. Hoff and company are present. Presence of the public press in Council meetings would not necessarily be a bad thing. It would, however, change somewhat the character of the discussions. Professor Miller made some comments on this point. The motion specifically mentioned Mr. Jordan or his representative. The Agenda Committee discussed the possibility of its proposal leading to representation from the press at large but felt that this would not be proper procedure simply because it would reduce freedom of discussion. It could happen that the public press will request representation in which case the Council might need to reconsider the question. President Stahr commented that pending such time it would be reasonable to assume that the likelihood of the press requesting representation would not necessarily be increased by their getting the news from the News Bureau a little faster.

The question was called and the motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Miller then proceeded to his second motion which was that:

IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THE PUBLICATION OF NEWSWORTHY COUNCIL BUSINESS WHILE MAINTAINING COUNCIL CONTROL, ITEMS WHICH ARE SENSITIVE WITH REGARD TO TIMING OR CONTENT SHOULD BE CLEARED BY THE UNIVERSITY REPORTER WITH THE COUNCIL OR ITS DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES EITHER DURING THE MEETING ITSELF OR BEFORE A WRITE-UP IS RELEASED TO THE PRESS.

Professor Breneman seconded the motion.

Professor Miller commented on the intent of the motion. On any completely routine matter, for example, the Council's recent decision on students returning home on election day, the University reporter would be able to release a news item immediately. For more sensitive matters, the Council might take direct action immediately after it acts on a particular motion as to whether or not news of it should be released. In the absence of such action on matters judged to be sensitive by the University reporter, he could consult the Council at its next meeting or a designated representative of the Council. Professor Miller added that the motion did not spell out the identity of the designated representative of the Council. The Agenda Committee felt that it should not be that entity. As for the University reporter deciding what is routine and what is not, the committee felt that the Council would have full confidence in his ability to make this judgment.

Dean Pinnell thought that the proposal transferred, perhaps unintentionally, the responsibility from the Council to an individual for making the judgment as to whether an item was sensitive or not. He was very sympathetic with the point of the motion but was not certain that it could be carried out with equity for all persons concerned.

Professor Remak stated that he realized that the Agenda Committee did not wish to be encumbered of more work than it already has but he felt that this committee should clear every news release for at least a few years. This process, he felt, would not be too time consuming. He also felt that if Mr. Jordan could not be present at all Council meetings, the Council, not Mr. Jordan, should decide on his alternate. On this point, President Stahr asked Professor Miller what modifications of the motion would be required if Professor Remak's last point were inserted as an amendment. Professor Miller thought that no change would be made in the motion under consideration but a modification of the previous motion which had already been accepted would be necessary. President Stahr asked Professor Remak if he wished to move reconsideration of the first motion. Professor Remak said he did and explained that when the first motion was being discussed he was a little "intimidated."

Once the uproar subsided, Dean Sutton suggested that in the first motion, instead of specifying "Mr. Jordan or his representative" the statement "Mr. Jordan or such representatives as have been certified to and accepted by the Faculty Council" could be substituted. Professor Remak agreed and added that in a particular year there might be a faculty member in the Journalism or English Departments who might be a very good alternate for Mr. Jordan. President Stahr thought that if the troublesome point was the fact that the alternate reporter might need to exercise his judgment as to what was sensitive or not, the Council could instruct the alternate to clear all news articles with Mr. Jordan or with himself or anybody else the Council wished to designate. He thought that this might be a cumbersome procedure, but possibly desirable since new ground was being broken.

Professor Miller stated that the Agenda Committee had no particular ax to grind and reminded the Council that the committee was following through on the Council's instruction to prepare a recommendation. However, he wished to call the Council's attention to Mr. Jordan's opinion expressed in his memorandum that the reporter should be a person who is skilled in interpreting the University to the public. A professor of Journalism or English might not have this skill, whereas professionals such as Mr. Hoff and Mr. White would.

For proper procedure in considering an amendment to the first motion, Professor Miller, with Professor Breneman's consent, withdrew his second motion.

Professor Vitaliano moved and Professor Remak seconded a reconsideration of the first motion. The motion to reconsider was approved unanimously.

Professor Miller then proposed a revised version of his first motion and moved that:

MR. JORDAN OR ONE OF SUCH REPRESENTATIVES AS HAVE BEEN CERTIFIED TO AND ACCEPTED BY THE FACULTY COUNCIL SHALL BE ASKED TO ATTEND ALL FUTURE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS IN ORDER TO INTERPRET FIRST-HAND THE SENSE OF THE DISCUSSION AND ACTION OF THE COUNCIL AND TO PREPARE NEWS ITEMS ON ALL MATTERS DEEMED APPROPRIATE AND NEWSWORTHY.

Dean Carter seconded the motion, which was unanimously accepted.

Professor Miller then reintroduced the motion which has been referred to above (p. 9) as the second motion. Dean Carter seconded the motion.

Dean Bain opened the resumption of discussion on this motion and offered the opinion that it was the business of the Council to determine what is sensitive and what is not. Dean Pinnell was

interested in the question of whether or not the proposal would put the reporter in a difficult position with the news services and the Council. Could he serve both masters without running afoul of either or both? President Stahr asked if these problems could be handled by requiring that all releases be cleared by the Council or its representatives. Professor Miller thought that altering the motion to accommodate this would be simple. Professor Gerking, another member of the Agenda Committee, mentioned that the committee wanted to avoid two things, first, establishing another committee and second, the necessity of the whole Council approving all news items. To do this, the committee wished to put the onus on Mr. Jordan's office and to have him primarily be the judge of what was sensitive. The committee felt that the Council itself was not the best judge as to what was sensitive. Dean Pinnell thought that the Council could use Mr. Jordan as its agent and use his judgment as to what is newsworthy and proper timing and when Mr. Jordan's ideas on these matters came into conflict with those of the Council, the policy under which he is to operate could be clarified. Professor Gerking commented that the Agenda Committee visualized that Mr. Jordan or his representative, by being present at the Council meetings, could ask the Council for its reactions on the newsworthiness and sensitivity aspects of any matter under discussion. The reporter could get advice quickly and could react quickly without going through a committee procedure.

Professor Remak felt that the Council had a choice between two evils. Nobody wants more committees, but in such a sensitive area, he favored having all the news releases checked, at least for a year or two, by the Agenda Committee or some other committee. He felt that there would not be very many news releases and that the checking process would not be too time consuming and would not delay articles for more than a day or two. Professor Gerking, however, was of the opinion that the mechanics of such a routine would not be simple and the task would not be easy.

Dean Carter spoke in favor of the motion. He saw nothing in the motion that would prevent the Council from instructing Mr. Jordan or his representative from the News Bureau that something was of such significance that it ought to be published. On the matter of the ability to assess sensitive issues, it will be easy for the Council to indicate that it wishes publicity to be withheld on a certain issue because this will be said during the course of discussion. Professor Remak, however, was concerned not only about what might be published but also about what might be said in the articles. Clearing an article through a committee would alleviate his concern on this point and would also give some protection to the reporter. President Stahr commented that one of the protections the reporter would have is that no matter what he says, the press will probably not print it that way; as a matter of professional pride, the press rewrites nearly everything. Professor Miller commented that precisely the points that

Professor Remak raised were considerations that the Agenda Committee discussed with Mr. Jordan. With all this in mind, Mr. Jordan wrote his memorandum. He feels that news requires immediate release but that anything sensitive should be cleared. Professor Miller added his opinion that no Council member is as qualified by experience to know what will be a sensitive issue as Mr. Jordan is.

President Stahr asked for a rereading of the motion. When this was done, he commented that the only unanswered aspect of the motion was who the representative of the Council shall be. Professor Bowman thought that logically the representative of the Council should be the President's Office because it has a more general view and has awareness of situations related to sensitivity that the faculty might know nothing about.

Professor Byrnes expressed opposition to the motion. He understood the reason for it but felt it was too restrictive and almost a vote of no confidence in a highly skilled reporter. Professor Miller pointed out that Mr. Jordan himself wanted help from the Council in instances when he might be uncertain. Professor Byrnes felt that a problem of even greater seriousness was potential faculty resentment over reading about Council business in the newspapers instead of in a regular official University news release through official channels. He asked if there had been any thought of the possibility of having news releases produced and put into the faculty mail perhaps through the Faculty Newsletter at exactly the same time releases are given to the press. This procedure might reduce or eliminate the complaint of prior release through non-University channels. President Stahr thought that Professor Byrnes' point of concern, a matter of sensitivity of timing, could be remedied by Council action as provided for by the motion. The Council could instruct the reporter to delay public release of a particular item until the faculty was informed.

Professor Breneman felt that the procedures suggested by the motion should be given a trial and if they did not work satisfactorily, they could be abandoned at any time. Professor Gerking commented that he felt the President hit the nail on the head when he said that we are breaking new ground. We do not know exactly how the proposal will work but if the Council is not satisfied with it after it is established the Council could modify it.

Professor Cady had some comments. What the Council was concerned about and what made Professor Remak feel uncomfortable was an item of hidden agenda, a matter which the Agenda Committee has been addressing itself to and which concerns the whole future of the Council. We are changing the nature of the Council. It is a different kind of body with somewhat different kinds of functions and with somewhat different relationships to the faculty

and the institution at large from the body that it once was. This change is probably irreversible. The Council could not refrain from adopting the proposal on an experimental basis at least because the Council is changing, not only in its relationship to the institution, but also in its external relationships. The Council is no longer simply an internal body, and no longer a kind of gentlemen's faculty discussion club, which in a sense it once was. He was in favor of the proposal.

Professor Byrnes said that he was in favor of news releases, but felt the suggested procedure was cumbersome. He preferred having a motion to the effect that Mr. Jordan or his certified representative attend Council meetings and prepare news releases with due regard to informing the faculty first.

Professor Auer commented that these minutes will show our great concern that the faculty know what the Council does. He thought that if there is any faith in the Council, the Council's concern revealed through the minutes will satisfy those who share Professor Byrnes' concern. He suggested that the Council might vote on the motion.

Professor Remak commented that he was willing to take a chance on the proposal.

The question was put to the Council and the motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry G. Yamaguchi, Secretary