

24 January 1967

Per
Andressohn

NOTICE OF MEETING

Faculty Council

Tuesday, February 7, 1967

Ballantine 8

3:30 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 1967.
2. Introduction of new Council members.
3. Report of the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching.
4. Nominating Committee report.
5. Report of the Committee on Curricular Policies and Educational Programs.
6. President's business.

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

February 7, 1967

Members absent, no alternate: Dean Glenn Irwin
Provost Kenneth E. Penrod
Prof. Keith Lorentzen
Prof. Ward W. Moore
Prof. William E. Segar
Prof. Robert F. Byrnes

Alternates present: Dean Joseph L. Sutton for Pres. Elvis J. Stahr
Dean David R. Derge for Dean Joseph L. Sutton
Dean William B. Christ for Dean Wilfred C. Bain
Dean Ward B. Schaap for Dean Byrum E. Carter
Dean Philip Peak for Dean David L. Clark
Dean Robert L. Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
Prof. Julius J. Smulkstys for Prof. Sylvia
Bowman
Prof. Vernon J. Shiner, Jr. for Prof. ~~Ralph F. Fuchs~~ ^{HARRY G DAY}
Prof. Willis R. Barnstone for Prof. Leo Solt
Prof. Milton Hobbs for Prof. Edward H. Buehrig
Prof. Edward G. Summers for Prof. Leo C. Fay

Visitors: Prof. Richard Turner
Prof. Schuyler Otteson
Prof. John Dowling
Mr. LeRoy E. Hull
Mr. Don Scherer

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 1967
2. Introduction of new Council members
3. Report of the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching
4. Nominating Committee report
5. Report of the Committee on Curricular Policies and Educational Programs
6. President's business

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

February 7, 1967

Members absent, no alternate: Dean Glenn Irwin
Provost Kenneth E. Penrod
Prof. Keith Lorentzen
Prof. Ward W. Moore
Prof. William E. Segar
Prof. Robert F. Byrnes

Alternates present: Dean Joseph L. Sutton for Pres. Elvis J. Stahr
Dean David R. Derge for Dean Joseph L. Sutton
Dean William B. Christ for Dean Wilfred C. Bain
Dean Ward B. Schaap for Dean Byrum E. Carter
Dean Philip Peak for Dean David L. Clark
Dean Robert L. Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
Prof. Julius J. Smulkstys for Prof. Sylvia
Bowman
Prof. Vernon J. Shiner, Jr. for Prof. Harry G.
Day
Prof. Willis R. Barnstone for Prof. Leo Solt
Prof. Milton Hobbs for Prof. Edward H. Buehrig
Prof. Edward G. Summers for Prof. Leo C. Fay

Visitors: Prof. Richard Turner
Prof. Schuyler Otteson
Prof. John Dowling
Mr. LeRoy E. Hull
Mr. Don Scherer

AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 1967
2. Introduction of new Council members
3. Report of the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching
4. Nominating Committee report
5. Report of the Committee on Curricular Policies and Educational Programs
6. President's business

Dean Sutton called the February 7, 1967 meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 3:32 p.m. President Stahr was in Indianapolis.

The minutes of the meeting of January 24, 1967 were approved for distribution after three minor corrections were made.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW COUNCIL MEMBERS

Dean Sutton introduced and welcomed to the Council two of its three new members, Professor Alfred R. Lindesmith and Professor Donald C. Manlove. Professor Edward H. Buehrig, the third newcomer, was not present.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

Professor Remak, as Chairman of the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching, offered to describe briefly some of the highlights of his committee's activities for the academic year, 1965-66. These activities are described in detail in Faculty Council Document No. 19. Professor Remak related that the main activity of the committee was the drafting of the report on "Teaching at Indiana University." He was particularly pleased to be able to inform the Council that due to the generosity of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Inc., which provided the university administration with the funds to cover the costs involved, every member of the faculty would shortly receive his own copy of the report. Professor Remak then said that he wished to pay special tribute to Professor Paul Starkey of the School of Dentistry who joined the committee after the "Teaching Report" was drafted. He asserted, "There is no division of the university that has made as systematic and as marvelously organized an effort to analyze its own teaching, and improve it, as the School of Dentistry, under the leadership of Professor Paul Starkey with the backing of Dean Maynard Hine."

Professor Remak reported that the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching recommended that the Dean or an Associate Dean of Faculties, and Mr. LeRoy Hull, Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research, be made ex-officio members of the committee. These recommendations have already been carried out; Dean Joseph R. Hartley and Mr. Hull are now members of the committee. Also, it was recommended that two students be appointed to the committee. Professor Remak informed the Council that one student has already been appointed and that next year there may be two. Further it was recommended that the Committee for the Improvement of Teaching be separated from the Committee for Teaching Awards. This recommendation, too, has already been implemented.

Professor Remak suggested that it would be desirable for the Council to comment on two procedures that the committee had developed for handling students' complaints about teaching. One

procedure was developed to deal with complaints about faculty members' violations of rules and regulations listed in the Faculty Handbook, such as the rule that no examination be given during the last week of the semester. The other procedure was developed to deal with complaints about very poor or ineffective teaching not involving violations of rules or regulations.

Professor Remak continued by indicating that the procedure for handling complaints about violations of regulations regarding final examinations is described in detail on page 2 of Faculty Council Document No. 19 in paragraphs numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4. What follows is his brief outline of that procedure. First, the membership of the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching was publicized in the Daily Student and students were advised to telephone members of the committee to communicate their complaints. If the complaints were considered by the committee member not to be trifling, the information was relayed to the chairman of the committee who then, in turn, communicated with the chairman of the department or the dean of the school in which the violation allegedly occurred. After investigating and taking appropriate action, the chairman or the dean contacted the chairman of the committee to relate to him how the matter had been handled. At its next meeting, the committee discussed the incident and its disposition with a mind to making policy recommendations to appropriate deans, or to the Faculty Council, if it were considered advisable. Professor Remak remarked that the need for speedy action dictated the adoption of the procedure which he had described.

Professor Remak continued with his presentation by relating next the procedure for handling the other kind of complaint, i.e., the complaint about "spectacularly poor teaching." He reported that "two high caliber letters from excellent students" were received by the committee complaining about the teaching of two different faculty members. An attempt was made to treat each letter as extremely confidential, to investigate the complaint as discreetly as possible, and to make reports orally, rather than in writing, whenever possible. Professor Remak reported that in each instance "a perfectly plausible explanation" of the teacher's behavior was obtained. In one case, a transitory situation seemed to account for the faculty member's poor performance. In the other case, the student had merely confirmed what most of the colleagues of the teacher concerned had known for some time. However, since the faculty member was on tenure, it was felt that little could be done to correct the situation. The student, in each case, was informed of the outcome of the investigation and appeared to be satisfied with the efforts of the committee.

Professor Remak at this point repeated his request for comments from the members of the Faculty Council regarding these two procedures which his committee had adopted. He asserted that the current chairman of the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching, Professor Richard L. Turner, who was present as a guest, would certainly welcome the comments.

Professor Remak concluded his presentation by pointing out that the only formal recommendation of his committee was:

"We recommend that the Dean of Faculties and/or the deans of the various schools remind faculty members of faculty rules regarding final examinations three or four weeks before the end of each semester. This has been done in the past but not consistently and sometimes very late."

Dean Sutton asked for questions or comments. Professor Shiner was the first to respond. He wondered whether it was proper for the University to take what appeared to be a complacent attitude toward poor teaching performance by tenured faculty. He felt that there should be some mechanism whereby such faculty members could be relieved of their teaching responsibility. Professor Shiner continued with the observation that on a very large faculty it should not be surprising to find a few very poor teachers and he felt that there should be some mechanism to rescue students from them. He suggested early retirement as a possible solution.

Professor Fuchs asked Professor Remak whether, in the committee's judgment, in the case of one of the faculty members, his performance was poor enough to justify proceedings against him. Professor Remak indicated that he did not feel such action was called for. He added that he did not think that the A.A.U.P. would consider that there was sufficient reason to recommend retiring the faculty member. When Professor Fuchs commented that there certainly comes a point where it is proper to remove a faculty member for incompetence, Professor Remak responded that, in the case in point, it was not that the faculty member was incompetent, but rather that he was "obnoxious and unfair." Professor Fuchs replied, "I think the A.A.U.P. would agree that if that were established, the removal would be proper."

Dean Shull then asked whether the individual's department chairman had been informed of the complaint and whether a record of the case had gone into the faculty member's file. Professor Remak replied in the affirmative to both questions and added that he believed that in those cases where tenured faculty are involved and where the performances are not so bad that removal is recommended, then perhaps administrative displeasure could be registered when salaries were being negotiated. Professor Shiner objected that this would not help the student.

Professor Peak asked whether it was possible for the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching to provide suggestions to help the faculty members improve their teaching. Oftentimes teachers aren't aware of their shortcomings until it is called to their attention. Professor Remak replied that he felt that Dean Peak's suggestion might be more effective with the younger faculty than with the more senior ones. He didn't think that older, tenured faculty members would take suggestions from the committee very well and

felt that they needed prodding from their departmental chairman or from the dean of their school. He added that often chairmen do not do the necessary prodding because they find it too unpleasant.

Dean Sutton suggested that it might be advisable if the complaints which come to the attention of the Committee on Improvement of Teaching were written up so that copies could be sent to the faculty member's chairman and to the dean of his school to ensure that the complaints were discussed at budget time. Dean Shull remarked that he felt that it was extremely important for the faculty member himself to be informed of the complaint, provided the necessary security precautions were taken to protect the individuals making the criticisms. He further remarked that, as Professor Shiner had already pointed out, we should be looking for ways to make early retirement possible. He held out the hope that in about 10 years or so, if the performance of the CREF side of our retirement plan continued as it had in the past, it would not cost a great deal to retire a person early.

Dean Sutton was quick to point out that at the present time it does cost the University a rather considerable amount of money for early retirement and he questioned a policy which would, in effect, reward a faculty member for poor teaching.

Professor Pratt pointed out that the issues that were being raised probably fell in the province of a Faculty Council committee (The Committee on a Faculty Conduct Committee) which he is chairing. The committee is charged with the task of looking into the advisability of having some kind of mechanism to ensure the proper observance of professional ethics. Dean Sutton agreed that issues of professional ethics were involved. He went on to describe one of several such cases that had recently come to his attention; it was concerned with the very late arrival of a faculty member to an examination. Dean Sutton expressed the belief that mailing out notices to all faculty members to remind them of the rules might be effective with some of the newer faculty members who did not yet know the rules but he was not persuaded that this shotgun approach was the appropriate one with a small group of older faculty members who know the rules but who consistently refuse to follow them. He suggested that a more direct approach might be more effective.

Dean Peak expressed his appreciation of the work of the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching in helping to publicize the fact that Indiana University is very much concerned with the problems of attaining and maintaining excellent teaching. Dean Sutton offered that the procedure developed by the Committee to publicize the membership of the committee in the Daily Student was a good one and that perhaps it should be repeated at the beginning of each semester. He hoped that Professor James Jordan might provide help in this regard.

Professor R. L. Turner, the current chairman of the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching, pointed out that students who might be reluctant to appear before his committee might not be intimidated by smaller, departmental committees. By maintaining communication with the departmental committees, Professor R. L. Turner hoped to increase his committee's contact with students.

Professor Wilson advised that the two problems being discussed should be kept separate. He felt that it was easier to deal with the first problem, rule violations, than with the second, poor teaching by tenured faculty. He also supported Professor Shiner and Dean Shull in their recommendations regarding early retirement and reminded the Council of the fact that the Self-Study Committee in its Report had addressed itself to some of the problems associated with tenure policy.

Dean Derge suggested that what is needed, over the long range, is something which the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching has recommended in its report, namely, a systematic and institutionwide evaluation system. Professor Wilson agreed. Professor Shiner objected that an evaluation system by itself would not be effective. The problem would still remain unless a mechanism for doing something about the situation were provided. Dean Sutton responded by describing two forms which early retirement could take. With one procedure, the University would contribute an amount, which could be substantial, to the faculty member's retirement fund in order to bring it up to the total that would have accrued had he continued to be employed at his current salary until he reached age 70. That procedure would provide the faculty member with "a rather generous reward." With the other procedure, the University would not add to the faculty member's retirement fund. This would be a serious financial blow to most faculty members, especially relatively young ones, who could not yet have built up a sizeable retirement fund. Whereas the former procedure seems quite sensible for a faculty member who becomes permanently incapacitated as a result of illness, it does not, on the other hand seem appropriate for a faculty member being retired early because of his inadequate performance as a teacher.

Professor Remak offered the opinion that there would be very few cases where recommendation for early retirement for inadequate teaching would be justified. He repeated that the two complaints that the committee had already received were not that the faculty members were incompetent but that their attitudes towards the students were inappropriate. He felt that salary increases and promotions in rank should be used more than they have been as a means to encourage proper attitudes with regard to teaching. He suggested that salary increases should continue to be used positively to reward good teaching. But he felt that they should be used in a negative sense, also. For example, he thought that the faculty member who publishes, but who is thought to be a poor teacher, should receive a smaller increase than the faculty member

who not only publishes, but also is considered to be a good teacher. Dean Sutton pointed out that the procedure Professor Remak was recommending was the procedure that was currently used, but he lamented the fact that the necessary information about the faculty member's teaching often was not available. Professor Hope questioned how one was to obtain reliable information about teaching performance. In reply, Professor Remak suggested that he wait for the Teaching Report.

Dean Sutton hoped that a systematic procedure could be devised for collecting information about teaching; he deplored haphazard, unsystematic collections. Dean Shull then stressed the point he made earlier regarding the necessity for providing to the faculty member a copy of any report dealing with his teaching effectiveness that is prepared for his chairman or dean. He said, "I think that it is just about as unethical for us to be making decisions about a person's teaching ability which he himself does not know exist than it is to not do it at all." He added that he felt that one of the obligations of the Teaching Committee is to see that the channel to the individual faculty member is open so he does receive every report about his teaching ability and in some cases has a chance to answer it, when it is a poorly taken report, for example. He asserted that most faculty members will correct faults as soon as they are apprised of their existence.

Professor Peak asked Professor Remak to estimate what percent of the students with complaints actually contacted his committee. He guessed that it was a very small percentage but hoped that the recommendations of his committee in that regard would improve matters considerably. He anticipated that channels would be opened not only for receiving complaints but also for receiving compliments.

Dean Sutton asked for more comments and when/^{none}was forthcoming he suggested to the committee that it would be very helpful if the unresolved problems could be discussed again in the Faculty Council, perhaps sometime after the Teaching Report was distributed.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULAR POLICIES AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Dean Sutton called on Professor Richard L. Turner, the Chairman of the Committee on Curricular Policies and Educational Programs. Professor R.L. Turner introduced the members of his committee who were present: Professor John Dowling, Professor Schuyler Otteson, and Professor Dan Miller. He also introduced Mr. LeRoy Hull and Dean Ward Schaap both of whom were consulted in the preparation of the report (Faculty Council Document No. 20).

Professor R.L. Turner started his brief presentation by reminding the Council that the matter of the length of the class period had been considered by the Council on several occasions in the past. He presented a brief history of previous action and referred the Council to Faculty Council Document No. 20 for a detailed history. He pointed out that it was the aim of the committee to find a solution which took into account three different aspects of the problem: 1) pedagogy and curriculum; 2) the daily schedule; and 3) the calendar. The proposals that the committee was recommending were: 1) to try a daily classroom schedule based on both 50- and 80-minute classes with 10-minute breaks between classes; and 2) to encourage individual departments and schools to review their course offerings with a view to reducing the number of courses, maximizing space utilization, and increasing individual study.

Dean Sutton was concerned about the fact that combining 80-minute and 50-minute class periods might increase the number of courses which students would be prevented from taking, especially when more than one department was involved, because of the increase in the overlapping of classes which the combination schedule would produce. Professor R.L. Turner stated that the existence of multiple sections for many courses would make this a minimal problem. Professor Vitaliano disagreed; he pointed out that usually there are no multiple sections of upper level courses. Mr. Hull agreed with Professor Vitaliano but pointed out that it should be possible to schedule a number of lower division courses on an 80-minute schedule without the student having scheduling problems. In reply to a question from Dean Sutton about scheduling laboratory classes, Mr. Hull admitted that difficulties would probably be encountered there. Professor R.L. Turner pointed out that an immediate movement toward the 80-minute period was not anticipated. It was hoped that if several departments believed such flexibility would be desirable, that they would be encouraged to go ahead and try and see if, indeed, it were.

Professor Hope wondered whether the committee wished to restrict the use of the 80-minute period to classes which met on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The answer was negative. Professor R.C. Turner asked whether the committee was planning on a considerable number of Saturday classes. Again the answer was negative. Professor R.C. Turner observed that if not many Saturday classes were contemplated, then most of the 80-minute classes would probably be held on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Professor Peak asked if Professor R.L. Turner had an estimate of how great a demand there would be for having 80-minute class periods. Professor R.L. Turner replied that all the committee was trying to do was introduce the notion of longer class periods. He believed that faculty members would be able to make good use of the opportunity once they had it. Professor Miller stated that he believed that there were many courses which could be taught more effectively in 80-minute class periods than in shorter periods. Many courses, especially advanced courses, are being taught that way now. Also, the use of

longer periods would enable better classroom utilization than is the case now. Regarding the criticism raised by Dean Sutton that the scheduling conflicts for a given student would be increased by introducing the longer periods, Professor Miller said that the student would be attending a smaller total number of classes and that this positive feature could, hopefully, balance out the negative one.

Professor Higgins offered the information that in the regional campuses, over a period of years, some 3-hour classes had been scheduled to meet only twice a week rather than the usual three times. This had obvious advantages for students who were commuting. He asked whether any follow-up studies had been made by the committee to compare subsequent performances of students taught in classes of different lengths. Professor R.L. Turner said that the committee had not done so. Dean Sutton then raised the general question of the relationship between length of class session and learning efficiency. Professor R.L. Turner provided the information that data collected in our post-session summer school classes seem to indicate little or no influence of class length on learning efficiency. Mr. Hull provided similar data. He reported that in a study conducted by the Junior Division shortly after the 90-minute class period was first introduced on the Bloomington campus, students who were interviewed claimed that the longer periods "did not affect their ability to learn."

Dean Pinnell suggested that if the 80-minute classes were scheduled so that they did not conflict with the most popular morning and afternoon classes, we could claim most of the advantages of the longer class periods without suffering the disadvantages. Dean Schaap agreed with Dean Pinnell. He pointed out that one of the reasons for considering long class periods was to increase the utilization of the classrooms. The 7:30 a.m. hour is poorly utilized; only about one-third of the classrooms are used. It jumps up to 80% in the next hour. Therefore, if classes could start at 8:00 a.m. and run until 9:30 a.m. and then get in the regular sequence, it is possible that one half-hour of high utilization time could be added in the morning. The same kind of change could be made in the afternoon. The last popular hour is 3:30 to 4:30 p.m., when about 60% of the classrooms are in use. At 4:30 p.m. usage drops down to 25%. If a 3:30 to 5:00 p.m. class maintained a high popularity, then, counting the morning change, a whole hour each day of high classroom utilization would be gained. Professor Schaap concluded with the thought that, for the reasons just stated, a better case could be made for introducing the longer classes at the beginning and the end of the class day, than could be made for holding them in the middle of the class day.

Professor R.L. Turner pointed out that another advantage of combining classes of different lengths was that not all the students would be on the move at the same time and pedestrian traffic jams would be somewhat attenuated.

Professor Cady asked whether the estimations of the length of time required by students to get from one classroom to another included the amount of time spent getting into and out of the buildings, as well as the time traversing the distance between the buildings. The traffic jams in some buildings during the between-class breaks would suggest that the within-building time might be substantial. Dean Schaap answered that estimates, both with and without the within-building time, had been obtained. The within-building time was approximately 4 minutes in Ballantine and about 2 minutes in Lindley and Education. Professor Vitaliano wished to know whether provisions were included for professors who consistently prevented their students from starting the race on time, at the bell. The answer was, "No." In reply to a second, more serious question from Professor Vitaliano, Dean Schaap revealed that the walking time from the Psychology Building to Lindley Hall was about 15 minutes. Dean Sutton pointed out that the committee was aware that some of the distances between classrooms would require more than 10 minutes to traverse, but had ascertained that there would be only a very small percentage of the students at the end of each class who found themselves in that kind of a predicament. He stated that it would be possible for the computer to be programed to prevent students from scheduling successive classes which were not within 10-minute walking distances. He confessed not having very much faith in how well the computer could execute that requirement.

Professor Miller related that when the committee report was written the final data were not available, but that Mr. Hull did have the data as of Monday, February 6, 1967. Mr. Hull distributed a report which was titled: TOTAL STUDENT CLASS REGISTRATIONS IN SELECTED BUILDINGS FOR EACH WEEK: TOTAL TRAFFIC FLOW TO ALL OTHER BUILDINGS AT EACH SUCCESSIVE HOUR. (Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 21)

Mr. Hull explained that the report was concerned with problems stemming from student traffic flow around the campus. It contains a summary of data for four buildings which have sometimes been called problem buildings, insofar as student traffic flow from one building to another is concerned. The total student class registration was obtained for all classes held during the first semester of the 66-67 academic year in Ballantine Hall, in the Business building, in the Geology building and in the Psychology building. Inspection of the table contained in Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 21 reveals that there were approximately 77,000 weekly registrations in Ballantine Hall. For more than 53,000 of these 77,000 registrations, about 70% of them, there was no class scheduled in the next adjacent hour. For about 9,600, 12%, the next adjacent class was in Ballantine. So a total of 82% of the class registrants in Ballantine Hall every week during the first semester did not have to face the problem of getting to a different building for the next class. Of the approximate 77,000 registrations in Ballantine, only 1700, or approximately 2% of the

total were faced with the challenge of getting to the Business building on time for the next class. Similar data are summarized for the Business building, the Geology building, and the Psychology building.

Dean Shull wished to know if there were any way to ascertain how many different classes would be disrupted by the late arrival of just 2% of the students. He added that he felt that a few students coming 3 to 5 minutes late every time a class meets could constitute a serious disruption. Also, he pointed out, it could create a hardship for the student who could never get to a particular class on time. Mr. Hull replied that the information Dean Shull requested was inherent in the data but that it had not yet been pulled out.

Dean Braden suggested that we could adjust the bells and try a 10-minute between-class break for a few weeks this semester and see how it worked. If it didn't work well, we could always go back to the 15-minute break. Professor R.L. Turner disagreed. He pointed out that it would not be a fair test for two reasons. One, the proposed computer-rejecting aspect of scheduling classes had not been employed this semester, so there might be a great many students with impossible distances to cover in 10-minutes. Two, there were no 80-minute classes scheduled so there wouldn't be any benefits of the reduced traffic flow that derived from scheduling those classes. He expressed the desire for a test of the recommendations as a complete package, not piecemeal.

Professor Vitaliano stated that if the recommendations are tried out, he hoped that the computer-rejecting aspect of the system would apply to upper level, single-section classes and protect the student who has to take classes in both the Geology building and Swain Hall.

Dean Pinnell remarked that when we reduce class length from 50 minutes to 45 minutes, we are taking a 10% reduction in instruction time for approximately 20,000 students. To do this merely to enable a small number of students who would otherwise be late, to get to some of their classes on time does not seem advisable. If the computer cannot prevent poor schedule-planning, perhaps the student can be encouraged to do so on his own. Dean Sutton repented and confessed that he really did believe the computer could do the job. He even revealed that a computer at Purdue University was already doing it.

Professor Miller supported Professor R.L. Turner's objection to piecemeal testing of the recommendations and advised Dean Braden that he also felt that to be fair, the test of the system should start at the beginning of a semester so that students would be able to set up their schedules with the knowledge that there would be only 10 minutes between classes.

Dean Braden commented that to his knowledge it is not certain at this time that Indiana University will continue to use the computer for registration. A committee is in the process of evaluating the situation. If future registration will have to be done without the computer, Dean Braden despaired of the likelihood of students being able to work out schedules, on their own, which precluded the long journeys between adjacent classes.

Dean Shull stated that it was not self evident to him that a 50-minute period was pedagogically better than a 45-minute period. Often, with 50-minute periods, students, as well as the professor, are late. Also, most of the students rush off as soon as the class is over. But with 45-minute classes it has been his observation that students are usually seated, ready to start the class on time. Also, they are less likely to go rushing off immediately after the class is over. Many are able to stay to ask questions. Dean Shull said that he felt that, in his classes in freshman chemistry, he was gaining by the 45 minute period relative to the 50. He was able to cover the same amount of material in the 45-minute classes as in the 50-minute classes.

Dean Sutton revealed that his predilection was to continue discussion of the topic at a future meeting. He felt that it would be profitable to have additional time in which to examine the report and sample faculty reactions to it.

Professor Miller hoped that all of the people who had been invited specifically for the presentation of the report would be invited back for the continuation of the discussion. Dean Sutton immediately extended to them an invitation to return. Professor Hope expressed the wish that the minutes show very clearly Dean Shull's comments, particularly his remarks about the fact that with the 45-minute class there is an opportunity for the student and professor to talk briefly after the class is over. He felt that this was a very important advantage of the 45-minute class, one that hadn't been expressed previously, and one worth emphasizing. Professor R.C. Turner observed that since approximately 70% of the students do not have classes adjacent to each other anyway, according to Mr. Hull's report, professors should be able to talk to 70% of the students even with 50-minute classes.

Professor Miller remarked that the committee was aware of Dean Shull's point when they drew up their report. From discussions they held with many of their colleagues, however, they decided that more people were against that option than were for it. The Council may see it differently, but the consensus of those people consulted by the committee was not in support of Dean Shull's view.

Dean Sutton then suggested that further discussion be postponed until the next meeting. He then read an announcement from the I.U. Federal Credit Union.

Dear Dean Sutton:

Would you please advise the members of the faculty council of the following announcement:

"The 11th Annual Meeting of the Indiana University Employees Federal Credit Union will be held on Thursday at 8:00 p.m., March 16, 1967, at the Indiana Memorial Union, State Room East."

All members of the credit union are urged to attend this important meeting. There will be an election of the Board of Directors and Credit Committee, whose terms expire this year.

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

Jerry F. Bales
Assistant Manager

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

Dean Sutton said that the matter which he was about to present could not be fully discussed in the time that remained so he planned merely to present it briefly and have it placed on the agenda as a separate item for the next meeting. On page 53 of the Faculty Handbook, which he revealed, in an aside, is rapidly being revised in the Office of the Dean of Faculties, there is a passage which should be called to the attention of the Council. He expressed the hope that at the next meeting of the Council he would be able to present a recommendation which would involve a change in the policy described in the passage. With the approval of the Council he could then bring the recommendation before the Board of Trustees. Dean Sutton then read from the Faculty Handbook.

"VACATION POLICY FOR 12 MONTHS ACADEMIC STAFF

1. All staff members on twelve months' appointments are entitled to one months' vacation with full compensation within each calendar year."

Dean Sutton skipped number 2 and then read number 3 which contained the offending passage.

"3. No compensation for vacation time shall be allowed as terminal pay at the close of service. Vacations are allowed and encouraged for the purpose of increasing the individual efficiency and usefulness rather than as a reward for past service."

Dean Sutton then briefly explained the nature of the problem. A good many academic staff members, such as librarians, for example, are on 12-month appointments. Occasionally, academic staff members, when they retire or terminate their appointments without having taken their month's leave during the preceding calendar year, erroneously think that they have earned and are therefore entitled to one month's terminal pay. This situation has understandably caused some difficulties. The change that Dean Sutton will recommend, of course, will be to help employees obtain their terminal leaves.

The non-elected members of the Council withdrew at 4:52 p.m. signifying that the meeting was adjourned. The elected members reconvened shortly thereafter and carried out the following actions:

1. Elected Professor Frederick A. Stare as a temporary replacement for Professor Douglas G. Ellson on the Space Allocation Committee for the second semester, 1966-67.

2. Elected Professor Mary E. Gaither as a temporary replacement for Professor J. Jeffery Auer for the second semester 66-67 on the Public Performances Policy Committee.

The meeting of the elected members of the Faculty Council adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Irving J. Saltzman, Secretary