

12/20/876

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council
Tuesday, December 20, 1966
Ballanine 8
3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of December 6, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for Ruth M. Griswold.
3. Memorial resolution for Hanne J. Hicks.
4. Secretary's business.
5. Nominating Committee report.
6. President's business.
7. Self Study Implementation Committee report.
8. "Smoke-up" Committee report. (See attached memoranda)

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

December 20, 1966

RECEIVED
JAN 23 1967
REGIONAL CAMPUS

Members absent, no alternate:

Dean William B. Harvey
Dean Harrison Shull
Professor Sylvia Bowman
Professor William R. Breneman
Professor Ward W. Moore

Alternates present: Dean Joseph L. Sutton for President Elvis J. Stahr
Dean Joseph R. Hartley for Dean Joseph L. Sutton
Dean Shirley H. Engle for Dean Lynne L. Merritt
Professor John B. Daughterty for Dean John R. Endwright
Professor Robert L. Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
Professor Anita Aldrich for Professor Edwin H. Cady
Professor Sears Crowell for Professor Shelby Gerking
Professor Edward L. Whalen for Professor George Wilson

Visitors: Professor John W. Ashton
Professor John F. Schrodtt

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 6, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for Ruth M. Griswold.
3. Memorial resolution for Hanne J. Hicks.
4. Secretary's business.
5. Nominating Committee report.
6. President's business.
7. Self-Study Implementation Committee report.
8. "Smoke-up" Committee report.

Dean Sutton called the December 20, 1966 meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 3:35 p.m.

With the correction of a few minor errors, the minutes of the meeting of December 6, 1966, were unanimously approved.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR RUTH MARY GRISWOLD

Professor John W. Ashton read a memorial resolution on the death of Ruth Mary Griswold (Faculty Council Document No. 11). The Council adopted the resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR HANNE J. HICKS

A memorial resolution on the death of Hanne J. Hicks (Faculty Council Document No. 12) was read by Professor John F. Schrodt, and the Council adopted this resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

SECRETARY'S BUSINESS

1. Format of Council Minutes

The Secretary reported that he and Dean Hartley, Associate Dean of Faculties, have been considering possible changes in the format of the minutes of the Council (e.g., underlining versus capitalizing motions, etc.) and would welcome any suggestions by members of the Council and the faculty.

2. Alternate University Reporters

To prepare for the possibility that Mr. Jordan would not be able to attend all of the meetings of the Council to serve as its reporter, the Secretary suggested that the Council certify Mr. Earl M. Hoff and Mr. Thomas D. White, both members of the University News Bureau, as alternate reporters. Mr. James Jordan, who was present at the meeting for the first occasion of his serving as the Council's reporter, felt that although both men would be fine as alternates, Mr. Hoff's general knowledge of University affairs would be more current than Mr. White's.

The Secretary nominated Mr. Earl Hoff as an alternate to the Council Reporter, and Mr. Thomas White as an alternate for Mr. Hoff. The nominations were unanimously accepted.

3. Student Affairs Committee Report

In compliance with the request by the Council (page 6 of the minutes of the December 6, 1966 meeting) that the Student Affairs Committee name two students to serve as official members of the

Undergraduate Residential Colleges Committee, the Students Affairs Committee, chaired by Professor Auer, selected two students. Professor Auer reported that the students were Mr. Theodore Najam and Miss Susan Whittleage .

4. Undergraduate Residential Colleges Committee

Professor Remak, chairman of the Undergraduate Residential Colleges Committee, requested that the Council formulate a more specific charge than it had heretofore made for his committee. His committee felt that it was confronted with the choice between a limited study and one that would be sweeping and thorough and it has some preference for the former alternative. It also felt that its assigned topic concerned a major revolutionary educational innovation which should neither be rushed into nor delayed for consideration.

As a basis for discussion, Professor Remak made some suggestions as to what his committee's charge might be. First, he hoped that his committee would not need to repeat the spade work already done by the Self-Study Committee in such matters as visiting other universities that have established residential colleges. Second, the committee wished to proceed on the assumption that in general, the idea of residential colleges is acceptable to the faculty and the University, even though there might be considerable difference of opinion on matters of timing and implementation. Third, the committee felt that most of its work would consist of consultation of faculty members, students, and administrators. Fourth, the committee hoped that it would not be expected to present a detailed blueprint including specific budgetary considerations of the development of residential colleges. The committee hoped the Council would be satisfied with a general blueprint and a general timetable in which case, by working basically from the Self-Study Report and the Teaching Report, it might be possible to present an intermediate report by the end of March or the beginning of April.

In essence, the charge could be to develop an intermediate report, not a detailed blueprint.

The question of considering curricular matters was raised by Dean Sutton, and Professor Remak sought the Council's sentiment on this question. Dean Carter thought the consideration of this question was absolutely essential. He did not see how it would be possible for the Committee to make recommendations relative to residential colleges unless curricular considerations were a central part of its report, particularly since one of the primary arguments for the establishment of such colleges is the possibility of making curricular innovations in a small unit. Some of the key questions will obviously involve the extent to which different parts of the faculty are attracted to programs of this sort and the extent of their participation will depend on curricular considerations.

Dean Braden suggested that Professor Remak's committee might start with a critique of what we are doing now in order to define the problems, some of which might pertain to curricular matters, that might be remedied by the establishment of residential colleges. This, Professor Saltzman felt, had already been done by the Self-Study Committee, and had led to its recommendation to establish residential colleges. He also felt that it was this committee's strong desire to hold further investigation to a minimum and to have the Council react to its proposals as soon as possible. It might then turn out that the Council will wish a more detailed consideration.

Dean Sutton commented that his assumption was that the Remak Committee was to come forward with a concrete proposal on the establishment of residential colleges and, in his judgment, it would need to make curricular considerations. He also thought that we should not limit ourselves as a faculty council or a university to the single experiment embodied in the idea of residential colleges. In his opinion, there is a great need for innovations. For example, what would happen if there were no curriculum, simply faculty and students in a teaching-learning situation without a highly structured curriculum? The Remak Committee would necessarily limit itself to the matter of residential colleges, but there should be some way of developing innovations through other approaches to the teaching-learning process. These possibilities, Professor Saltzman felt, were for future consideration. The more immediate step that needed to be taken was to solicit the reaction of the faculty and the Council to the Self-Study Committee's proposal to establish residential colleges. Dean Sutton however, was concerned that reactions to the abstract question could be quite different from those to specific curriculum proposals. Dean Carter agreed and felt that there might be immediate acceptance or rejection of the general idea of a residential college, which in its curricular aspects in the Self-Study Committee's proposals was not developed beyond a broad base of a general mix of the curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences. More specific proposals, such as a residential college system for the first two years, followed by a movement out to departments for the last two years, or a four-year residential college plan, or a plan whereby Education is merged with the normal curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences in a residential base, might bring entirely different reactions.

Dean Sutton turned the discussion to a point that Professor Remak had made earlier regarding the assumption that the idea of a residential college was acceptable to the Council. Professor Solt felt that testing this assumption by sounding out the faculty, possibly through a questionnaire, was a task the Remak Committee should immediately undertake without elaborating the proposal in great detail on matters of curriculum, cost, and timing. Dean Pinnell, however, felt that the details of a residential college would need to be spelled out in very specific detail in order to allow the faculty to react meaningfully to the proposal. He also

wondered if the Remak Committee might hold public hearings on the question before proposing legislation. Professor Saltzman beat Professor Remak to the draw and commented that he felt public hearings were not necessary. He further commented that in the Self-Study Report, ten to fifteen pages are devoted to a description of residential colleges, arguments favoring the establishment of these colleges, and specific proposals. He felt that although some of these proposals might need further elaboration, sufficient spade work had been done by the Self-Study Committee to allow the faculty to respond sensibly to the proposals. In his judgment, the first responsibility of the Remak Committee would be to inform the faculty of these proposals through the minutes of the Council and to advise the faculty to read the relevant portions of the Self-Study Report. Questions such as those raised by Dean Carter should be communicated to the Remak Committee for presentation by this committee in a discussion at the Council.

Professor Remak wished to call the attention of the members of the Council as well as the faculty at large to the relevant portions of the Self-Study Report. These portions are pp. 123-136 and 343-345 in the main Self-Study Report, and sections V-2 to V-4 and sections XXXII-7-8 in the Teaching Report. The Teaching Report should be available in January, 1967. Professor Remak commented that a section heading in his committee's report should have been "Residential Colleges" but strangely enough reads "Presidential Colleges". To this, Dean Sutton remarked that his committee had high aspirations. Professor Remak asked that the members of the Council and the faculty communicate their reactions to this material directly to the members of his committee, (Professors Appleman, Chase, Eidson, and Horowitz) and promised an intermediate report to the Council within two months.

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

1. Urban Affairs

Dean Sutton announced the appointment of three persons--Dean Byrum Carter and Professors Howard Schaller and Arthur Weimer--to constitute the Urban Affairs Drafting Committee.

2. Council meetings in January, 1967

Since the first Tuesday in January is within the Christmas Vacation period and also since the Council of Deans was scheduled to be held in the late afternoon of the fifth Tuesday, it was decided by general consent to schedule the Council meetings in January, 1967 on the second and fourth Tuesdays, i.e., January 10 and January 24.

SELF-STUDY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

Professor Saltzman's committee recommended the partitioning of the Self-Study Report into thirteen sections. One of these sections deals with the topic of undergraduate residential colleges. The other twelve recommended by the Saltzman Committee were as follows:

1. Teaching in the University
- ✓ 2. State-wide Campuses
3. Faculty Retention and Recruitment; Preserving and Enhancing the Quality of the University
4. Non-academic Student Affairs
5. Physical Plant
- ✓ 6. Library
7. Organization for Graduate Study
8. Size and Admissions Policies
9. Public Service
10. The Health Sciences at Indiana University
11. Summer Sessions
12. Cost and Finances

The Implementation Committee recommended that proposals deriving from the first six sections in the above listing be scheduled for discussion in the Council before any others, that the first six sections be discussed in the order of their listing, and that three-man committees be appointed by the President for each of the twelve sections.

Professor Saltzman moved and Professor Fay seconded the adoption of the recommendations of the Self-Study Implementation Committee.

Professor Turner asked if any consideration had been given to the possible extent of overlap between the proposed and already existing committees. Professor Saltzman responded that this matter had not been explored, but felt that any overlap would come to light, particularly after each committee publicizes the Self-Study proposals to the faculty prior to discussing them in the Council.

Dean Carter asked if it would be necessary to consider the first six sections in a particular order. He felt it should be assumed that committees will differ in their effectiveness and speed in discharging their functions. Professor Saltzman explained that the ordering pertained to the first step in each committee's assignment, that of presenting to the Council for approval or amendment, a list of proposals in the committee's assigned section for the Council to discuss at some later time. He felt that each committee could finish this assignment in two to four weeks.

Dean Sutton asked if the ordering of the first six sections should be considered inviolable. Professor Fay, a member of the Implementation Committee thought not, particularly since the report of the Sub-Committee on Teaching is a lengthy one, thus making the task of the committee assigned to this section substantially greater than those of other committees. Professor Saltzman agreed that his committee's recommendation was to be taken as a suggested order of presentation among the first six sections.

Professor Miller returned to a point raised earlier by Professor Turner and asked in what way the function of the committee assigned to the section on Teaching in the University would differ from that of the University Committee on the Improvement of Teaching. Professor Remak commented that his Self-Study Sub-Committee on Teaching only briefly touched upon a number of important matters such as Intersession, Summer Session, Postsession, correspondence study, programmed teaching, honors teaching, etc., which it felt should be further explored by the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching. Professor Saltzman commented that the three-man committee that will be assigned to the teaching section will not be a work committee in the same sense as the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching, but will function primarily as a committee to help the Faculty Council examine and deliberate the Self-Study proposals pertaining to teaching.

Professor Turner asked why the Implementation Committee could not handle the work being discussed. Professor Solt, a member of this committee, commented that the committee felt that with several hundred recommendations in the Self-Study Report, the Council would prefer to have a number of special committees rather than one committee handle the responsibility. Professor Hope remarked that the proposal was at least a device to get three times thirteen people to read the Self-Study Report.

The question was called and was unanimously accepted.

"SMOKE-UP" COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Remak, as chairman of the Committee on Teaching, reported on the history of and current recommendations for smoke-ups. In October, 1965, the Council abolished smoke-ups except for Junior Division students because so many members of the faculty were not filing mid-term unsatisfactory reports. This decision of the Council was not by a unanimous vote and the dissenters were appointed to a committee headed by Professor Solt. This committee was asked to submit a counterproposal. In a recent communication to the Committee on Teaching, the Solt Committee recommended that all faculty members be required to furnish mid-term grades as well

as final grades. The Committee on Teaching, however, has a different proposal. It accepts the principle that the faculty member is obligated to inform the student as to the status of his performance at some intermediate point in the semester, but would prefer to provide leeway in both the timing and manner of informing the student. As for timing, the committee's thinking is that the student should be informed at some time half-way to two-thirds of the way through the semester. The means used to inform the student could be a letter grade, but alternatively, depending upon the nature of the course, it could be a written critique of a paper, a written evaluation of a student's performance, or an orally communicated evaluation.

At Professor Remak's suggestion, action by the Council on these two different proposals was deferred until the next meeting to allow members of the Council to digest the reports prepared by the Solt Committee and the Committee on Teaching.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

At its meeting of November 1, 1966, the Council voted to establish a seven-man advisory committee to the Dean of Faculties with three members of the Council to be appointed to the committee by the Dean of Faculties and four members of the faculty at large to be elected by the elected members of the Council.

Dean Sutton announced the appointment to this committee of the following members of the Council: Professors Leo Fay, School of Education; Robert Turner, School of Business; and Harry Yamaguchi, College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Fuchs reported that the nominating committee had prepared a list of nominees to present to the elected members of the Council for the four other positions. He also reported that in considering nominations, the committee thought that provision should be made for representation of off-campus units of the University. The committee consulted the Office of the Dean of Faculties about this matter and found agreement that it would be desirable to include such representation but that it would not be feasible to ask these representatives to attend all meetings of the Advisory Committee. The nominating committee, therefore, wished to propose the addition of two off-campus members who might be known as adjunct members to the Advisory Committee. These members would meet with the committee on matters of concern to them or the units they represent.

Professor Fuchs moved and Professor Vitaliano seconded that there be added to the Advisory Committee for the Dean of Faculties, created by action at the Faculty Council on November 1, 1966, two adjunct members from Regional Centers and the Indianapolis professional schools, who shall be consulted from time to time or

asked to meet with the committee when matters of concern to their areas of the University arise.

Dean Sutton pointed out that the reason for not making off-campus representatives regular members of the committee was to protect them from undue travel requirements. He would be delighted to have the adjunct members attend all the meetings but felt that they should not feel required to do so.

Professor Byrnes objected to the motion in that it implied that these members would only be interested in matters that applied to regional campuses or the Indianapolis Center. Dean Sutton reiterated his desire to protect off-campus members from an undue travel and time commitment. This led to a discussion of possible amendments to Professor Fuchs' motion with Dean Sutton, Professors Byrnes, Friedman and Fuchs participating in the discussion.

Professor Fuchs then made an amended motion seconded by Professor Vitaliano. He moved that:

TWO ADDITIONAL MEMBERS SHALL BE ELECTED TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE DEAN OF FACULTIES WITH ONE MEMBER FROM THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND ONE MEMBER FROM THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS OF INDIANAPOLIS.

The motion was unanimously adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE DEAN OF FACULTIES

After the Council adjourned, the elected members convened to conduct the election of six members of the faculty, four from the Bloomington Campus and two from off-campus units, to serve on the Advisory Committee to the Dean of Faculties. The Nominating Committee had prepared a list of six full professors from the Bloomington Campus from which two were to be elected, six associate and assistant professors, two of whom were to be elected, and two nominees from off-campus units for two openings on the committee.

The elected members had no further nominations to offer and decided that for the contested elections, the two individuals with the greatest number of votes in each rank category would be considered elected.

The nominees in the full professor category were: Professors Delton C. Beier, Psychology; L. Keith Caldwell, Government; Ralph

T. Daniel, Music; William A. Madden, English; David D. Martin, Business; and Willis P. Porter, Education.

The nominees in the joint category of associate and assistant professors were: Professors Eugene A. Cordes, Chemistry; Larry L. Cummins, Business; William C. Golden, Law; Walter T.K. Nugent, History; Richard F. O'Gorman, French and Italian; and Frank J. Zeller, Zoology.

The nominees from off-campus units were Professor James E. Ashmore, Professor, Biochemistry and Pharmacology, Indianapolis Faculties; and Professor Herman Feldman, Associate Professor, Psychology, Northwest Regional Campus, Division of Regional Campuses.

The nominees elected to the Advisory Committee were:

Professors Caldwell, Madden, Nugent, O'Gorman, Ashmore, and Feldman.