

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, January 10, 1967

Ballantine 8

3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 20, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for John McMurry Hill.
3. Memorial resolution for Carl F. Franzen.
4. Space Assignment Committee report.
5. Consideration of changing the degree offered by the Graduate School of Social Service.
6. "Smoke-up" Committee report.
7. President's business.

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

January 10, 1967

Members absent, no alternate: Dean David L. Clark
Dean Emily Holmquist
Dean Glenn Irwin
Provost Kenneth E. Penrod
Professor Newell H. Long
Professor William E. Segar
Professor Robert H. Shellhamer

Alternates present: Dean Joseph L. Sutton for President Elvis J. Stahr
Dean Charles W. Hagen for Dean Joseph L. Sutton
Dean E.W. Martin for Dean W. George Pinnell
Professor Philip R. Headings for Professor Sylvia Bowman
Professor Anita Aldrich for Professor Edwin H. Cady
Professor Frederick T. Schornhorst for Professor Ralph F. Fuchs
Dean Joel A. Hunt for Professor Quentin Hope

Visitors: Professor Douglas G. Ellson
Professor Raleigh W. Holmstedt
Professor David D. Martin
Professor Walter Poesse

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 20, 1966.
2. Memorial resolution for John McMurry Hill.
3. Memorial resolution for Carl F. Franzen.
4. Space Assignment Committee report.
5. Consideration of changing the degree offered by the Graduate School of Social Service.
6. "Smoke-up" Committee report.
7. President's business.

In the absence of President Stahr who was in Indianapolis, Dean Sutton chaired the January 10, 1967 meeting of the Faculty Council and called it to order at 3:35 p.m.

The minutes of the December 20, 1966 meeting were corrected to indicate that Dean Bain was present and were approved as corrected.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR JOHN McMURRY HILL

Professor Walter Poesse read a memorial resolution on the death of John McMurry Hill (Faculty Council Document No. 13). The resolution was adopted by the Council by a moment of silent tribute.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR CARL G. F. FRANZEN

A memorial resolution on the death of Carl F. Franzen (Faculty Council Document No. 14) was read by Professor Raleigh W. Holmstedt and the Council adopted this resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

CONSIDERATION OF CHANGING THE DEGREE OFFERED BY THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

Dean Charles W. Hagen, Associate Dean of Faculties, presented a request made by the Graduate School of Social Service to obtain the Council's approval of changing the degree it offers from Master of Arts in Social Work to Master of Social Work.

Dean Hagen read a portion of a memorandum from Dean Walter B. Johnson, Acting Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service:

"The faculty of the Graduate School of Social Service has carefully considered this matter and unanimously recommends the degree awarded our graduates be Master of Social Work, M.S.W. This degree is conferred by many graduate schools of social work and is widely recognized in academic and professional circles as the professional degree. It has thus, we believe, the advantage of providing a nice distinction from the Master of Arts degree awarded by the Graduate School."

Dean Hagen stated that the request involved no curricular changes but would have the effect of shifting responsibility for the Master's Degree from the Graduate School to the recently established Graduate School of Social Service. He recommended a motion to accept the proposal.

Dean Braden moved and Dean Shull seconded that:

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE SHALL BE AUTHORIZED TO GRANT THE MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK DEGREE.

Dean Sutton pointed out that changes in degree titles ultimately require approval by the Board of Trustees, but nonetheless, it was fitting that the Council consider the matter and make its recommendations.

Professor Byrnes raised what he termed an "innocent" question --the reasons for and the virtues of the change. Dean Sutton reiterated the gist of the argument presented by Dean Johnson through Dean Hagen that most graduate schools of social work grant the M.S.W. degree, which is essentially the terminal degree and which has wider recognition in the profession than the M.A.S.W. degree. Heretofore, the Graduate School of Social Work at Indiana University has not offered the M.S.W. since it was not an independent school. Professor Byrnes asked why the change in degree could not be accommodated within the Graduate School. Dean Hagen felt that it was only logical for the Graduate School of Social Service to grant its own degree because it is now, and has been since last year, an independent school. The same power was granted to the Graduate Library School when it was created last year.

The question was called for and the motion was unanimously approved.

SPACE ASSIGNMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Earlier during this academic year, the Council elected two faculty members, Professors Douglas G. Ellson and David D. Martin, to the Space Assignment Committee to provide faculty input to the resolution of a variety of space and space innovation problems. Professors Ellson and Martin were present as guests of the Council to give a summary of the committee's activities to date.

Professor Ellson commenced his report by mentioning that the committee has been meeting every Thursday afternoon since early fall. The committee's composition, which conforms fairly closely to recommendations made in the Physical Plant section of the Self-Study Report is as follows: The Dean of Faculties Office represented by Dean Sutton or Dean Hagen; three faculty members, Professors Ellson, Martin and Dean Schaap, with Dean Schaap serving by appointment by Dean Sutton; the Business Manager's Office, Mr. Donald H. Clark or his representative; the Registrar, Mr. Don Scherer; and the Bureau of Physical Facilities Studies, Mr. Donald E. Weaver.

The committee has engaged in two different kinds of functions and activities, namely the week-by-week assignment of space on the basis of requests presented to the committee and long-term planning. The former concern has taken the major part of the committee's time to date. It has a small budget for which it is responsible, but the amount is very small and time-consuming planning has been necessary to minimize remodeling costs. As for long-term planning, the committee has not done much beyond informal discussion of how to handle the problem, but it expects to do more.

Professor Martin commented that in the weeks and months ahead, the committee will be able to engage in long-term work and therefore will need more information than it now has regarding future space needs. He thought that the cooperation of the whole faculty and of the various divisions of the University will be needed.

Dean Sutton added some observations. The schedule of weekly meetings is a departure from prior practice whereby the Space Committee met intermittently, thus causing a backlog of minor but nonetheless vexing problems. The committee did what it could with a budget of \$70,000, which is a minuscule amount when one considers the size and needs of our physical plant. The essence of what is planned, stated Dean Sutton, "God and Legislature willing, as President Stahr is wont to say," is a budget of \$200,000 which would be more realistic in terms of our needs. As for future planning, Dean Sutton looked to the committee not only to plan the rehabilitation of such buildings as the Library and the Student Building when they become available to meet the needs of instructional and other programs, but also to alert the administration to budgetary considerations to make certain that they will be included in budget requests presented to the Legislature. Dean Sutton commended the members of the Space Committee for their work and hoped that their continued efforts will mitigate some of the conflict and frustration that have characterized space operation before.

Professor Byrnes opened discussion by inquiring about the status of statistical information on instructional space utilization. Professor Ellson answered that such information is available but is not summarized in a useful way. Dean Carter asked if consideration had been given to the placement of future buildings, if and when money becomes available for such construction. Professor Martin said that a beginning had been made, that the committee had met with the Science Advisory Committee regarding the location of science departments and also intended to deal with overall campus planning. Dean Sutton commented that areas for future use have been blocked out but no firm assignments have been made. He also mentioned that the committee will have access to information being obtained by the Bureau of Institutional Research on student flow. This information will answer questions pertaining to the where, when, and why of student movement on campus.

Professor Day inquired if the design and distribution of classroom space for large as well as small classes would be considered by the committee. Professor Ellson responded that the committee is concerned with these problems and will seek more information to add to the considerable and useful amount of information already gathered and recorded in the Physical Plant Report of the Self-Study. In developing plans for classrooms, the committee feels that University-wide requirements rather than those of the department or several departments going into a particular building should be taken into account to give a broader scope to utilization planning than heretofore achieved.

Dean Sutton commented that Dean David Derge has been assigned to the Dean of Faculties Office to consider the whole area of learning resources. This will include existing classrooms and ways whereby their inadequacies can be removed. He will be working with the Space Committee, the Architect's Office, the Budget Office etc. He will be dealing with questions involved in improvements in learning resources generally, and with such specific questions as how electronic resources can best be used. In other words, stated Dean Sutton, Dean Derge exists to provide full-time concern with matters which heretofore received only intermittent attention. Dean Sutton viewed the newly created post as part of an effort to maximize concern for space as a learning device.

Professor Byrnes was "impressed, delighted, and hopeful" about this new development, but felt that the Dean of Faculties Office should concern itself only with academically related considerations and leave the mechanics and details to some other agency of the University. He wondered how other universities handled this problem. Dean Sutton replied that recommendations made by several committees were being followed in establishing the present arrangement. As for other universities, a survey was made and the information obtained suggests that this kind of activity should be located some place other than in Buildings and Grounds and that the closer it is located to the consumers of academic technology, the happier the results. Dean Sutton commented that the present organization is not immutable and can be changed if it does not work well.

Professor Byrnes asked if any university has full command of the information on academic space and has worked out reasonably satisfactory long-term plans. Dean Sutton replied that the Big Ten universities and the University of California some years ago developed a space-per-student figure which has been used as a yardstick by these and other institutions. This, however, did not take into account electronic advances and changes in the sciences requiring reordering of laboratories. The University of California and Indiana University are now in the early stages of collaboration for grant support on the development of prototypes in the design of the various kinds of classroom facilities. Dean Sutton felt that the present yardsticks are rather crude and that most planning for academic space has been less than adequate, in some

cases. And in many cases absent, commented Professor Byrnes. Dean Sutton, however, was of the opinion that there had been a good deal of planning at Indiana University but, as Professor Ellson had earlier pointed out, much of the planning has been left entirely to faculty committees. Ballantine Hall, for example, was primarily planned by a faculty committee, which did not adequately take into account the fire laws and the limited capacity provided by only three elevators. No part of these flaws was the fault of the committee, stated Dean Braden, who added that he was the chairman of that committee and served with Professor Byrnes and other distinguished members of the Council. Professor Wilson was inclined to blame the same group for planning the basketball field house.

Professor Miller asked if the committee will have outside professional architectural advice in the future on a continuing basis. Professor Martin responded that the committee at its last meeting spent some time discussing this very topic but has not yet taken action.

Dean Bain inquired as to whether the committee will concern itself with the conversion of old space or with the furnishing of guidelines and recommendations for the construction of new space or both. Dean Sutton commented that the committee has been primarily concerned with cleaning up the backlog of minor space assignment and rehabilitation problems. The hope is, however, that out of this committee will come other recommendations and the opportunity to develop somewhat more adequate long range planning activities than we have had. The University does not have a planning staff of adequate size. This aspect of the University has not been highly developed because of a reluctance, perhaps a proper one, to put money into this field when there are pressing needs for additional faculty. But whether or not the University can continue to make its choice in this way is a question the Space Committee most certainly will be considering.

Dean Bain asked if the committee will be concerned with needs, possibilities, and priorities on a broad scale and not with the general operation of planning in detail or functioning as a watchdog committee for a particular building. Dean Sutton's response was that building priorities are set by the Faculty Council and the Board of Trustees. From this committee, there will be some systematic input into the way these priorities are discussed and considered by the Council and ultimately by the Board of Trustees. The responsibility of determining physical plant priorities is mandated to the Board, but when a building is constructed for a particular department or program it should be planned for maximum general use.

Dean Bain then got down to fundamentals: opera theatre. He related that in anticipation of building an opera theatre, he has had one person for one solid year chasing down details so as to avoid making major mistakes. Some mistakes were made in designing

the annex of the Music Building. He felt it was false economy not to have some expertise to prevent mistakes. He hoped that some specific individual who would become an expert could be assigned to the details of planning a particular structure. In Dean Sutton's opinion, such a person would of necessity be an architect; the members of the committee, while supportive of this idea as a policy would scarcely have the time or the technical skills to plan an opera house. Even the great experts in New York have not been entirely successful. "They are having trouble taking one down now," remarked Professor Byrnes. To which quipped Dean Sutton, "We know where you can get a used one, Wilfred."

Professor Gerking asked Professor Day, who was chairman of the Faculty Committee on Facilities for Large Group Instruction, if the report of his committee had been sent to Dean Derge or to the Space Committee. Professor Gerking commented that the report had a number of specific suggestions for large classrooms and also recommended that planning be done on a general rather than a departmental basis. Professor Day responded that, in his opinion, it was not his privilege to distribute copies of the report since it was produced by a Presidential committee. The report has been sent to the President's Office. Dean Sutton remarked that the committee had done a fine job and had turned in an excellent report, but nobody was assigned the responsibility of following through on the report. This kind of consequence could hopefully be avoided by using the Space Committee and Dean Derge.

Professor Breneman asked if the Space Committee or some other group would follow up the Physical Plant Report of the Self-Study for implementation. Dean Sutton felt that this would depend on the Council, which approved at its last meeting, the establishment of a committee on Physical Plant along with eleven other committees covering other sections of the Self-Study Report. Professor Breneman was concerned that there would be a great deal of overlap between this committee and the Space Committee. Dean Sutton's reaction was, however, that the Space Committee will be fighting its problems on a week-by-week basis and would probably appreciate any help it could get. Also, one of the reasons for the appointment of Dean Schaap to the Space Committee was to take advantage of what he learned when he was preparing the Physical Plant Report. Dean Sutton added that, at the last meeting of the Council, Professor Turner had raised the question of committees with overlapping functions. Dean Sutton thought there would not be much overlapping if some modest definition of areas of responsibility could be delineated.

"SMOKE-UP" COMMITTEE REPORT

Professor Remak began the discussion of grading practices at mid-term by recapitulating his report at the last meeting of the Council. Last year, the Council abolished mid-term reports except for Junior Division students because it was claimed that many

of the faculty were not filing mid-term unsatisfactory reports. The "Smoke-Up" Committee, chaired by Professor Solt, recommended (Faculty Council Document No. 15) to the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching that mid-term grades for all undergraduates be required as part of the regular professional responsibility of a faculty member. The latter Committee, however, while defending the principle that the faculty has the obligation of informing undergraduate students as to their academic status at some reasonable time before the end of the semester, felt that more leeway than provided by the Solt Committee recommendation should be given the faculty member as to the manner and time of informing the student.

The present text of the section entitled "Mid-Term Reports" on page 59 of the Faculty Handbook reads as follows:

Letter grade reports shall be given at mid-term for all Junior Division students. For other students, the prevailing practice will continue of making reports on only those who are regarded by their instructors as doing work below the level of the general average (i.e., below C).

This text does not, of course, reflect the change adopted by the Faculty Council in October, 1965.

To replace the above text, the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching recommended (page 3, Faculty Council Document No. 16) the following:

Letter grade reports shall be given at mid-term for all Junior Division students. Faculty members are expected to give each undergraduate student a written evaluation of his performance as early as compatible with the nature of the course, but not later than after two-thirds of the semester or summer session have elapsed. This evidence will normally consist of a letter grade, but could also be recorded in a different manner (e.g., written critique of a paper, written evaluation of the student's total performance). In certain types of courses such as senior or honors seminars, the evaluation might be given orally.

Professor Remak moved and Professor Vitaliano seconded that:

THE RECOMMENDATION ON GRADE REPORTS AT MID-TERM MADE BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE IMPROVEMENT ON TEACHING IN ITS REPORT OF DECEMBER 9, 1966, BE ADOPTED.

Professor Pratt, a member of the "Smoke-Up" Committee stated that a major concern of his committee was that whatever routine was proposed would really be observed by all faculty members. The solution it proposed was, therefore, a simple one, that of requiring official mid-term grades. Professor Pratt asked Professor

Remak if he had any hope that the recommendation under discussion would produce better results than the previous rule. Professor Remak responded by saying that he never gives up hope on the faculty. "Bravo!" someone shouted. According to this recommendation, the Dean of Faculties would send, each semester, a reminder to the faculty of the obligation under discussion. He thought the combination of a diplomatic and sledge-hammer approach would achieve results. Several members of the Council were heard wondering out loud as to which was the sledge-hammer. But the discussion continued.

Professor Breneman thought that since the Remak Committee's recommendation required giving a written evaluation to all upper-classmen, much more work for the faculty would be involved than under the Solt Committee's recommendation. Professor Remak, however, clarified this point by reiterating that the faculty member has a choice between giving a letter grade or a more detailed accounting. He thought that normally the evaluation would be through the former. The committee did not wish to make letter grades mandatory since it felt that some courses, particularly those at junior and senior levels, do not lend themselves to a letter grade evaluation at mid-term. Dean Sutton had a query: If in a particular course, the first examination were to be given at some point after mid-term, would returning the graded examination constitute notification for a mid-term grade? Professor Remak thought it would.

Professor Byrnes was of the opinion that monitoring the recommended system would be very difficult. Dean Bain commented that the recommendation was in terms of "shall" and "expected," not "must." Professor Remak agreed, but thought that the degree of firmness of the rule would depend upon the interpretation of "expected." This could be considered quite obligatory. He further commented that his committee was concerned with the need of protecting students from professors who are too lazy to give an examination by mid-term or worry about their students' performance. He thought such faculty members constituted only a small minority, but nonetheless exist. The committee also felt that some faculty members would find their style very cramped and find it artificial in some courses to give a mid-term grade. By giving these faculty members more leeway in time and manner of evaluation, the committee felt there would be more compliance to the rule.

Dean Sutton commented that under the proposed rule, the faculty need not notify anyone but the student. Dean Bain asked if the information could be conveyed to students by such an informal means as posting a roster of students and their grades. Professor Remak agreed. Dean Bain felt that the old system was very effective in showing the University's concern for the student's record and offering an opportunity for counseling and other help. Professor Remak remarked that if any school or department

wished to add features of the old system to the proposed new routine which he regarded as a minimum obligation, the combination would be excellent.

Professor Friedman inquired if student opinion on the "Smoke-Up" system had been obtained. Professor Remak remarked that two of the members of his committee were students and that they had two basic reactions to the old system. They felt that good students did not need it since they are interested in their performance and know where they stand. They also felt that a good many professors do not bother to give sufficient progress evaluation to poor students who do not inquire about their status.

The motion was called for and the outcome was as follows:

Aye	Nay	Abstain
Dean Braden	Dean Hunt	Dean Harvey
Dean Merritt	Prof. Breneman	Prof. Yamaguchi
Dean Bain	Prof. Byrnes	
Dean Carter	Prof. Friedman	
Dean Endwright	Prof. Gerking	
Dean Higgins	Prof. Moore	
Dean Hine	Prof. Pratt	
Dean Martin	Prof. Solt	
Dean Shull		
Prof. Aldrich		
Prof. Auer		
Prof. Day		
Prof. Fay		
Prof. Headings		
Prof. Lorentzen		
Prof. Miller		
Prof. Remak		
Prof. Saltzman		
Prof. Schornhorst		
Prof. Turner		
Prof. Vitaliano		
Prof. Wilson		

The motion was carried with 22 votes for, 8 against, and two abstaining.

Professor Remak then proposed that the Council adopt his committee's second recommendation. He moved that:

THE DEAN OF FACULTIES SHALL REMIND EACH FACULTY MEMBER OF THE NEW REGULATION GOVERNING GRADE REPORTS AT MID-TERM AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME EACH SEMESTER AND EACH SUMMER.

Dean Carter seconded the motion.

A brief discussion of the means of notification developed with Professor Wilson favoring the Faculty Newsletter and Professor Breneman suggesting the addition of appropriate instructions on the pink grade sheets distributed by the Registrar's Office at mid-term. Dean Sutton commented that although the motion specified the timing of the reminder, the means was left to his discretion.

The motion was unanimously accepted.

By general consent, the effective date was set as September, 1967.

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

Dean Sutton reported that President Stahr had asked him to discuss with the Council the general situation regarding the State Budget Committee's recommendation for Indiana University's biennial budget for 1967-1969.

This year, the University submitted two budgets to the State Budget Agency. One was what is known as the traditional or cost-formula budget which is determined by figuring how much it costs on the average to educate students at freshman, sophomore, junior, senior and graduate levels. Enrollment projections for these various levels are multiplied by average costs to produce the operational budget. To this is added the requests for salary increases. Representatives of the four state universities then meet to settle questions of allocation of capital funds and special grant monies among the four state universities. By this procedure, the Medical Center of Indiana University, Purdue's School of Veterinary Medicine, and other units were developed outside of the cost-formula budget. The budgets thus developed are jointly submitted by the four state universities to their Boards and ultimately to the Budget Agency. This was done for the budget request for 1967-69.

Subsequent to that, we were directed by the State Budget Agency to submit a program budget. This was considerably different from the cost-formula budget in that it did not have any set formula for computing the cost per student. We were freed from this and allowed to develop a budget on the basis of our judgment of our program needs. The only other instruction which made any perceptible difference in the way we would have formulated the program budget was that the Budget Agency requested that a factor for optimum class size be included. This led to an increase in the faculty additions request over and above what the new student money in the cost-formula budget would have produced. It also did not tie any new program to new student money as did the cost-formula budget; the only way new program support was ever obtained was by a rise in enrollment. This appeared to be an altogether salutary opportunity for a departure from the cost-formula budget which, while it has served us very well, had problems in it. The cost-formula computation tends to lag at least a biennium behind the

rise in costs and there have been rather spectacular rises in cost in various areas such as faculty salaries, library requirements, scientific equipment, etc. And so it was that we, while not happily, but nonetheless with some enthusiasm, put together the program budget of some 4,000 pages in length.

The operations budget request for Indiana University statewide for the 1967-69 biennium came to approximately 133 million dollars for the cost-formula budget and approximately 160 million dollars for the program budget.

We then set about the task of explaining why there was a difference between the two budgets. This turned out to be a rather interesting and fruitful exercise. With respect to the biennial lag, it was found that the cost-formula budget had not produced what was needed in every year. It was found that the shortfall in the operational requests from the cost-formula budget over a six year period was nearly equal to the difference between the cost-formula and the program budgets.

After the program budget was submitted, there was a long silence. Finally the Budget Agency informed us and the public simultaneously of its budget recommendation.

Dean Sutton emphasized that this budget recommendation represents the opening salvo of what will be an exhilarating and possibly fruitful sixty days. What the Budget Agency prepared and what was recommended by the Budget Committee was a budget considerably less than the cost-formula budget and therefore, even smaller than the program budget. As someone once told him, one of his responsibilities is to tell people when to panic. In his opinion, it is much too soon to panic.

Dean Sutton then spoke off the record about recent and current work on our budget requests. He concluded his presentation with the comment that at the present time, there is no basis for concern.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Harry G. Yamaguchi, Secretary