

RECEIVED

JUN 1 1967

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

RE
Dartmouth
Hart

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of May 16, 1967.
2. Memorial Resolution for Hermann J Muller.
3. Report of the Elections Committee.
4. Report of the Nominations Committee and Election of (1) Secretary of the Faculty Council; (2) Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council; (3) Agenda Committee of the Faculty Council; (4) Member of the Athletics Committee.
5. President's Business.
6. Secretary's Business.
7. Report on the Stillman Alliance.
8. Report of the Calendar Committee (See Fac. Council. Doc. No. 41)
9. School of Education Request to Use + and - Designations in Reporting the Final Grades of Students in Graduate Courses in Education (See Fac. Council. Doc. No. 39)
10. Report of the Section Committee for Implementation of the University Self-Study Recommendations Pertaining to State Wide Campuses - continued discussion (See Fac. Council. Docs. Nos. 35 & 42)
11. Faculty Renew of Student Appeals Procedures (See Fac. Council. Doc. No. 40)
12. Progress Report No. 2 of the Section Committee for Implementation of the University Self-Study Recommendations Pertaining to Teaching (See Fac. Council. Doc. No. 44)
13. Meeting of the Elected Members of the Fac. Council. to elect the Chairman of the Faculty Board of Review.

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

June 6, 1967

(Not yet approved by the Faculty Council)

Members absent, no alternate: Dean William B. Harvey
Prof. Alfred R. Lindesmith
Prof. William E. Segar
Prof. Leo Solt
Prof. Robert F. Byrnes
Prof. Bernard Friedman

Alternates present: Prof. Robert L. Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
Dean Frances Orgain for Dean Emily Holm-
quist
Prof. Lawrence C. Kelly for Prof. Sylvia
Bowman
Prof. L.L. Waters for Prof. Edwin H. Cady
Prof. A.A. Fatouros for Prof. Ralph F.
Fuchs
Prof. Richard Turner for Prof. Quentin Hope
Prof. Maurice McGlasson for Prof. Donald C.
Manlove
Prof. C.L. Lundin for Prof. Henry H.H.
Remak
Prof. James D. Foust for Prof. Robert C.
Turner

Visitors present: Dean Robert H. Shaffer, Dean John W. Snyder,
Prof. Donald Gray, Prof. Robert W. Richey,
Prof. Michael Wolff, Prof. Frank J. Zeller,
Mr. James R. Jordan

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of May 16, 1967.
 2. Memorial Resolution for Hermann J. Muller.
 3. Report of the Elections Committee.
 4. Report of the Nominations Committee and Election of (1) Secretary of the Faculty Council; (2) Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council; (3) Agenda Committee of the Faculty Council; (4) Member of the Athletics Committee.
 5. President's Business.
 6. Secretary's Business.
 7. Report on the Stillman Alliance.
 8. Report of the Calendar Committee (See Fac. Counc. Doc. #41).
 9. School of Education Request to Use + and - Designations in Reporting the Final Grades of Students in Graduate Courses in Education (See Fac. Counc. Doc. #39).
- (Continued)

AGENDA (continued)

10. Report of the Section Committee for Implementation of the University Self-Study Recommendations Pertaining to State Wide Campuses - continued discussion (See Fac. Counc. Docs. Nos. 35 & 42).
11. Faculty Review of Student Appeals Procedures (See Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 40).
12. Progress Report No. 2 of the Section Committee for Implementation of the University Self-Study Recommendations Pertaining to Teaching (See Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 44).
13. Meeting of the Elected Members of the Fac. Counc. to Elect the Chairman of the Faculty Board of Review.

President Stahr called the June 6, 1967 meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 3:33 p.m.

The minutes of the May 16, 1967 meeting were approved with two minor changes.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR HERMANN J. MULLER

A memorial resolution for Hermann J. Muller (Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 49) was read by Professor Ralph E. Cleland. The Council signified its adoption of the resolution by standing for a moment in silent tribute.

REPORT OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Saltzman began by pointing out that the Election Committee which President Stahr appointed on March 7, 1967, consisted of Professor Solt, Professor Manlove and himself, with Professor Solt, the chairman. He informed the Council that when both Professor Solt and Professor Manlove learned that they had been nominated for the Council, they resigned from the Election Committee. President Stahr then elevated him to chairman and appointed Professor Pratt and Professor Vitaliano as replacements on the Committee.

Professor Saltzman then presented the report of the Election Committee. (See Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 43). The results of the election were as follows:

Secretary of the Faculty (1967-68)- Prof. Norman T. Pratt

Parliamentarian of the Faculty (1967-68)- Prof. Ralph F. Fuchs.

Elected members of the Faculty Council (terms expiring in September, 1969) from the:

Bloomington Campus

Professor Edward H. Buehrig
Professor Ira Horowitz
Professor Donald C. Manlove
Professor David D. Martin
Professor Irene D. Neu
Professor Frank G. Ryder
Professor Leo Solt
Professor Richard L. Turner
Professor Michael J. Wolff
Professor Richard D. Young

Regional Campuses

Professor Burchard R. Davidson, Jr. (Kokomo Campus)
 Professor William M. Neil (Northwest Campus)

Indianapolis Faculties

Professor James E. Carter (Medicine)
 Professor Richard W. Stander (Medicine)

Professor Saltzman pointed out that the deadline for the receipt of ballots from the Regional Campuses and from the Indianapolis Faculties had been extended a week due to a delay in the delivery of the ballots to those campuses. He concluded by indicating that a complete report of the results of the election including the ordered lists of alternates would be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty Council.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Professor Fay, speaking as the Chairman of the Nominations Committee, presented the following slate of candidates:

1. Professors Robert F. Byrnes and Richard D. Turner for Secretary of the Faculty Council.
2. Professors Ira Horowitz and Michael J. Wolff for Member of the Agenda Committee (to serve with the Secretary-Elect of the Council and with the past Secretary of the Council).
3. Professors J. Jeffery Auer and Edward H. Buehrig for Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council.

Dean Carter, as Chairman of President Stahr's Ad Hoc Committee to Nominate a Representative to the Athletics Committee, presented the following slate: Professor Robert W. Bullard and Professor Schuyler Otteson. When it was ascertained that there were no additional nominations from the floor, ballots were distributed. The results of the election were:

Professor Richard D. Turner - Secretary of the Faculty Council (1967-68)
 Professor Michael J. Wolff - Member of the Agenda Committee (1967-68)
 Professor J. Jeffery Auer - Parliamentarian of the Faculty Council (1967-68)
 Professor Schuyler Otteson - Faculty Representative to the Athletic Committee (5-year term)

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

1. President Stahr announced the nomination of Professor Edward H. Buehrig as the replacement for Professor Harry Day as Chairman of the Faculty Council Self-Study Committee. Professor Day became ineligible when he was appointed Associate Dean for Research and Advanced Studies. Dean Braden moved the confirmation of the nomination. Professor Ballinger seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

2. President Stahr reported that he, Dean Carter, Professor Solt, and Professor Appleman had not yet been successful in constituting the new Committee on Residential Colleges. He reminded the Council that the new Committee was to be made up of individuals who were favorably disposed toward the establishment of residential colleges and who would be charged with the responsibility of developing specific, detailed plans for one or more of such experimental colleges. It was hoped that the Committee would have balanced representation. President Stahr thought that it would be appropriate if people wished to volunteer to serve on the Committee or wished to suggest people who might be suitable members. He hoped to get a pool of names from which a balanced committee might be constituted. Professor Pratt suggested that the people who were involved in the Foster Quad Residential College Experiment for next fall might provide a good **source** of names. President Stahr agreed and thanked Professor Pratt for the suggestion. Dean Carter reported that breadth of representation was being sought and he indicated that the search would continue until the right people were found.

SECRETARY'S BUSINESS

1. The Secretary announced that several Self-Study Section Committee Reports had been distributed with the draft of the May 16, 1967 minutes:

- Faculty Council Document No. 44--Professor Hope's Committee's second progress report on Teaching
- Faculty Council Document No. 47--Professor Fay's Committee's report on the Physical Plant and Traffic
- Faculty Council Document No. 48--Professor Harvey's Committee's report on Size and Admission Policy

Faculty Council Document No. 45--Professor Vitaliano's Committee's report on Student Non-academic Affairs--was distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

The Secretary pointed out that only Professor Hope's second progress report on Teaching was listed on the Agenda. He said that the other reports would be scheduled for meetings next year.

2. The Secretary informed the Council that Professor Buehrig would make a statement on behalf of the Faculty Council. Professor Buehrig said that inasmuch as the Council would not meet again until the fall, this meeting would be the last meeting at which Dean Sam Braden would be in attendance. He felt sure the Council wished to take cognizance of the fact. Professor Buehrig indicated that he was very pleased "to speak on behalf of the Council for two or three reasons in particular. For one thing, it gives me the opportunity to reciprocate the 'kindness' which Sam did me only a few minutes ago." (Professor Buehrig was referring to Dean Braden's motion to confirm Professor Buehrig's appointment to the prestigious, if onerous Chairmanship of the Faculty Council Committee to conduct a self-study of the Council). Professor Buehrig stated that he and Dean Braden had been colleagues for "a good many years at this University - several decades." He said that he could testify to the outstanding contribution that Dean Braden had made to the progress of the University through his good judgment, his humor - a necessary element in good judgment - and his loyalty to the University and to his colleagues. Professor Buehrig pointed out that Illionis State University was the institution at which he himself had spent three of his undergraduate years and said that it was an institution which had served him well. He was gratified that now, in Dean Braden's presidency, it would be served well. Professor Buehrig concluded with, "Sam, you're going to like the people there and they're going to like you. On behalf of this august Council, I wish you well."

The loud and long applause which followed Professor Buehrig's comments was terminated only after Dean Braden, who was clearly pleased with and moved by the richly deserved tribute, stood up as if to speak. He said nothing but merely nodded to express his gratitude for the encomium. President Stahr suggested that such a departure from the norm for length of utterance by College Presidents, if continued, might mark Dean Braden as a "new phenomenon."

REPORT ON THE STILLMAN ALLIANCE

President Stahr reported that on Sunday, May 28, 1967, he visited Stillman College to accept their most courteous invitation to speak at their Commencement. It was his first visit there and he found it a very pleasant experience. President Stahr returned to Bloomington from Tuscaloosa with Professor Gray who had been teaching at Stillman College since March, 1967. He was pleased that Professor Gray was scheduled to relate to the Council some of the high lights of his experience. Professor Gray said that he had had a very exciting semester.

"A great deal is happening at Stillman and there is a great deal to do." Professor Gray taught only two classes of his own, but he also did a great deal of guest lecturing in other people's classes. "During one ten-day period I met 24 different classes." He said he was able to get a very clear idea of what the Stillman students were like. He enjoyed teaching his freshman class much more than his upper division class. He thought teaching Stillman College freshmen was "much like teaching freshman at Indiana University." He expressed the opinion that only 2 out of every 10 Stillman College students might be the "kind of students who wouldn't come here, although they too are the kind of students who came here ten years ago." He was impressed by the passivity of the students, but he thought that the teaching techniques which he used here at Indiana University were perfectly suitable for use at Stillman College. He indicated that he, along with Professor Zietlow, who taught at Stillman for two weeks in the Spring, would meet during the summer with those faculty members from Stillman who were scheduled to teach the first year English course there in the fall. They planned to work on a new first year program. Professor Gray said the program would be a very conventional one and expressed the view that most of the innovations in the experimental programs that had been tried in recent years had proved not necessary.

He felt that it was important to identify the very good students early in order to move them ahead rapidly. Also, he thought it was very important to give the lowest 10% of the students special assistance. Although he expected that the curriculum would be conventional, Professor Gray believed there would be a good deal of tutorial work since most of the classes were quite small. He indicated that experimentation on the size of classes and on the length and frequency of class meetings could be done easily.

Several Indiana University faculty members visited Stillman briefly and lectured to several classes during their visits. Professor Rhoades, Professor Conway and Professor Fillmore, all of the Indiana University Mathematics Department, and Professor McIntosh from the School of Education visited for two days and wrote a report about the first year mathematics program. They will all meet this summer with the faculty members who will be teaching the math courses next year at Stillman in order to work further on a first year mathematics program.

Professor Brooks of the I.U. History Department visited and gave some lectures on African Studies which the students found very stimulating.

The new head of the Social Sciences Division, Professor Gray related, is a graduate of Stillman. He earned his Ph.D. from Michigan State University in Sociology and has been teaching

at the University of Delaware. Professor Gray hoped to establish a "travelling course" in sociology next year which would have students from both Indiana University and from Stillman College and which would meet for one semester on each campus. He reported some lack of enthusiasm on the part of the Administration and Faculty at Stillman for any of his suggestions having to do with teacher training.

Professor Gray announced that President Stinson and all the Division Heads at Stillman would be visiting the Bloomington campus on June 16 and 17 and he offered to arrange opportunities to meet with them. He concluded his remarks by pointing out that the project was funded for next year under Title III of the Higher Education Act with another \$150,000. He hoped that more I.U. faculty members would volunteer to visit and teach at Stillman next year.

President Stahr thanked Professor Gray for his interesting report and then commented on the very important role Dean Braden had been playing during the last 3 years in the development of the Indiana University - Stillman College Alliance. The fact that the program had gone so well, President Stahr stated, was to a very great extent the result of the attention given to the matter by Dean Braden.

REPORT OF THE CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Professor Richey began by listing the members of his Committee: Mr. Robert Jordan, Dean Robert Sturgeon for Dean Terence Martin, Dean Philip Peak, Dean Rufus Reiberg, Mr. Don Scherer, Dean Keith Hertweck for Dean John Snyder, Dean John Porter for Dean Edgar Williams, Mr. Robert Rindfusz and Mr. Frederick Wheeler. The task of the Committee was the preparation of the calendar for 1968-69. Faculty Council Doc. No. 41 contains the proposed calendar, a list of calendar guide lines which were adopted by the Faculty Council in February, 1963, Indiana University's calendars for 1966-67 and 1967-68, and Purdue University's calendars from 1967-68 through 1972-73. Professor Richey said that as of 1968-69, the calendars of Indiana and Purdue Universities would be quite similar, making possible increased cooperation between the two Universities on such things as TV programming and scheduling.

Professor Richey listed what he called "good" and "bad" features of the proposed calendar for 1968-69. As "bad" features he mentioned: (1) The academic year will start one day earlier than the previous academic year; (2) classes will already be in session in September when several different professional groups will be holding their annual meetings; (3) the registration procedures will require four days each semester; (4) the post-

Christmas portion of the winter semester will not include two full weeks of classes. The "good" features were: (1) There will be a long Thanksgiving vacation; it will start after the last class on Tuesday, November the 26th and run till the first class on Monday, December the 2nd; (2) final exams for the 1st semester will end on a Saturday rather than on a Monday; (3) "review days" will not fall on Sundays; (4) each semester will have 75 class days, excluding Saturdays; (5) each final exam period will be seven days long, (6) the spring exam period will not overlap the Inter-session classes; (7) there will be two days for registration for the regular Summer Session.

Professor Wilson asked why Indiana University did not plan five years ahead like Purdue University. Professor Richey thought that we could. Professor Ballinger was concerned about Saturday classes during the Regular Summer Session. Professor Richey said that the Committee assumed that the 50-minute class period which was being tried out on an experimental basis this summer would be found to be satisfactory. He indicated that if a 50-minute class period were used in the summer of 1969, it would not be necessary to have any Saturday classes and the requirement of 36 class days of instruction or 1800 contact minutes of instruction would still be met. In reply to a question from President Stahr, Professor Richey noted that there would be two Saturday classes this summer, one next summer, and none in the summer of 1969.

Professor Breneman asked whether classes were scheduled on Memorial Day. The answer was, "No." Dean Shaffer informed the Council that Purdue University held classes or exams on Memorial Day and he questioned the wisdom of a holiday at that time of year. Professor Breneman reported that in past years, exams were held on Memorial Day. Professor Wilson observed that if exams were held on Memorial Day, it would be possible to start the exams a day later, thereby providing the students with two "review days." He added that he agreed with the view expressed by Dean Shaffer. President Stahr pointed out that there were already two "review days," Saturday and Sunday. Professor Wilson quickly observed that three days would be even better than two. President Stahr wondered about the benefits for the students of a break in the middle of the exam period. He also mentioned the Indianapolis 500-mile race.

Dean Bain questioned the need of a "review day." He thought it was not an "economical" use of a day. President Stahr pointed out that the pressure on the machinery of preparing for Commencement was getting almost intolerable. He wondered whether, if more time could be provided to get ready for Commencement by eliminating "review day," it might be advisable to eliminate it. Professor Richey observed that having

an extra day would be of great help to the people handling University housing assignments. President Stahr said that if the pressures continued to increase on the Publications office, for example, it might be necessary to give up the practice of printing the names of the graduates in the Program. He felt that that would be undesirable. Mr. Scherer pointed out that the recorders in the Deans' Offices have only one day to certify to the Registrar's Office what students were ready to graduate. He noted that if the "review day" were eliminated and exams were scheduled on Memorial Day, then exams could end on Saturday, May 31st, instead of Tuesday, June 3rd.

Professor Wilson moved that:

THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED CALENDAR WITH TWO CHANGES: (1) THAT THE "REVIEW DAYS" BE DROPPED, AND (2) THAT FINAL EXAMS EACH SEMESTER BE STARTED ONE DAY EARLIER.

Professor Vitaliano seconded the motion.

Professor Pratt spoke in favor of retaining the "review day." He thought that ideally a "review day" could provide a responsible student with the time to pull together the material of a course and to achieve a synthesis that might otherwise be lost. Professor Wilson thought that it would be very unlikely that a student would have his last class in a course on one day and his final exam in that course scheduled on the very next day. Professor Pratt said that he would hate to see mechanical matters sweep aside features which were instituted for an intellectual purpose. Dean Carter spoke against that "intellectual purpose." He felt that the "review day" would encourage "cramming." He doubted that it would be used in the ideal way to synthesize the material covered in a course. Professor Waters complained about what he said was a very widespread, illegal practice, namely, giving final exams during the last week of the semester before the beginning of the final exam period. Professor Pratt did not think that the high frequency of that kind of violation was justification for eliminating "review day."

Provost Penrod asked whether the Committee which prepared the calendar contained any student members. Professor Richey answered in the affirmative. (The students were Mr. Rindfusz and Mr. Wheeler.) He added that the student members were quite clearly in favor of having "review days." Dean Pinnell pointed out that the question of a "review day" had been discussed previously in the Council. The conclusion was that the faculty did not see much value to it, but that the students did. He thought that if the motion were passed, students would be alienated. He wondered whether student opinion could be sampled before voting on the motion.

Professor Breneman expressed concern for the student who had two or three exams very early in the final exam period. He thought that such students could make good use of the "review day." He cautioned against taking precipitous action to eliminate the "review day." Dean Bain thought that students knew long in advance when their exams were scheduled and could, therefore, plan to be prepared for them. He suggested that, "From the standpoint of economy of time and efficiency, 'review day' is a day that could well be used for other matters."

Professor Pratt restated his point about mechanics influencing the decision process. He felt that if the mechanics were not adequate for the situation, the mechanics should be changed, not the situation.

Mr. Foust wondered whether the time between semesters could be shortened. Both Mr. Scherer and Professor Richey thought not. The time for counseling and for registration could not be cut.

Dean Braden returned to Dean Pinnell's concern about student input. He thought that since students were involved in preparing the proposed calendar, the Council should not make a change in the calendar without concurrence from a student organization, such as, for example, the Student Senate. President Stahr asked how much longer the decision on the calendar could be delayed. Mr. Scherer said that the type had already been set for several Bulletins and that they would be printed as soon as a calendar was adopted. Mr. Scherer then provided the information that Purdue University had a "reading day" each semester.

Professor Breneman said that since the students were strongly in favor of a "review day," he thought that it would be very unwise to eliminate it, particularly for the calendar under discussion. He thought that before the next calendar was proposed, the issue of "review day" should be thoroughly discussed. Dean Pinnell agreed with Professor Breneman. He felt that since most students had already left the Campus for the summer, it would not be advisable to change the calendar now.

Professor Wilson expressed again his desire to see the University's calendars planned and adopted in five-year blocks. He thought that a good deal of time would be saved by adopting such a practice. Professor Shellhamer suggested a somewhat devious solution to the problem. He recommended the practice, used at the Medical Center, of labelling the whole block of time between the end of classes and the end of exams as the "Reading and Examination Period." Any day on which an exam was not scheduled for a particular individual was a "reading day"

for him. Fortunately many students did not have exams on the first day of this period, so they started off with a "reading day."

Professor Fatouros thought that one day was very inadequate for review purposes. But he felt that if the students requested a "review day," they should be granted that request. Dean Bain agreed with Professor Fatouros that one day was wholly inadequate as a review period. He said that at Vassar College the review period was about a month long. He added, "If you want a review period, you ought to have one, and not just make a slight bow in that direction by having one day." Dean Sutton agreed with Dean Pinnell. He thought we ought not change the calendar which students helped to prepare after the students have gone for the summer. Also, he was strongly in favor of working out a long range calendar, but at a future date.

Professor Wilson and Professor Vitaliano amended their motion. The amended motion was:

THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE REPORT OF THE CALENDAR COMMITTEE AND ADOPT THE PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR 1968-69.

The motion was passed unanimously.

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION REQUEST TO USE + AND - DESIGNATIONS IN REPORTING THE FINAL GRADES OF STUDENTS IN GRADUATE COURSES IN EDUCATION

Dean Clark moved (See Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 39) that:

THE FACULTY COUNCIL APPROVE THE REQUEST OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION TO USE + AND - DESIGNATIONS IN REPORTING THE FINAL GRADES OF STUDENTS IN GRADUATE COURSES IN EDUCATION.

Professor Vitaliano seconded the motion.

Professor Fatouros, speaking for Dean Harvey, requested some clarification. He wondered whether the change which Dean Clark was requesting had to be brought before the Council. He informed the Council that the Law School was considering a similar change in its grading practices. President Stahr thought that the grading system was well within the purview of the Council. Requiring the Council's approval before making changes in grading practices would help maintain relatively standardized procedures, which was certainly desirable. President Stahr asked whether the computer could accept + and - grades. Mr. Scherer said that it could. He added that for the past two

years, after the Faculty Council had approved the practice, the Graduate School had been using + and - grades which were recorded on the students' permanent records. President Stahr noted the precedent, and advised Professor Fatouros that the Law School might seek Faculty Council approval before adopting the practice of using + and - grades. Dean Shull informed the Faculty Council that the Graduate Council had requested recently that the Council on Advanced Studies advise the Registrar to use the + and - designations in computing Grade Point Averages. At the present time the + and - designations are not used in the computations.

Professor Waters asked why the request to use + and - designations was being made, why the School of Education and the Graduate School wished to use + and - grades. Dean Shull explained that many faculty members wished to have more than just two passing grades at the graduate level. Using + and - makes it possible to give four or five different passing grades.

Professor Fatouros asked Dean Clark whether he would consider an amendment to his motion that would include the Law School, if the Law School Faculty decided in the Fall that they wished to use + and - grades. Dean Clark preferred to keep his motion simple. President Stahr thought the Law School would have no trouble in the Fall, if it so wished, in getting consideration of its own motion. Professor Fatouros agreed.

The question was called and the motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Scherer asked when the use of + and - grades in Graduate Education would go into effect. He said that the earliest that it could go into effect was this summer. It was then agreed that the intent of the motion was for it to go into effect this summer.

REPORT OF THE SECTION COMMITTEE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNIVERSITY SELF-STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO STATE WIDE CAMPUSES.

Professor Lorentzen reminded the Council that the presentation of his initial report had been completed at the May 4, 1967 meeting of the Council (See Fac. Council Doc. No. 35). President Stahr recollected that several open questions still remained and asked about one of them. He wished to know to whom it was recommended that the referral on the bottom of page 2 of Fac. Council Doc. No. 35 be made. Professor Lorentzen, in answering, referred to item 7 of Fac. Council Doc. No. 42, which was the

Committee's Supplemental Report to Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 35. He indicated that Dean Merritt had discussed the matter with him and that it was agreed that the Council on Advanced Studies would be the appropriate agency for handling the referral. That Council would be augmented desirably by representation from the Regional Campuses.

Professor Lorentzen referred to the recommendation on page 1A of Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 35 which was concerned with Instructional Television. He reported that Professor Mielke of his Committee had studied the problem very diligently and that the Committee now wished to recommend that the Fac. Counc., rather than set up a new committee, consider the addition of Regional Campus faculty members to the already existing Indiana Instructional Television Committee. Such action would be sufficient to provide for effective Regional Campus participation in the development of State-wide TV linkage (see item 5 of Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 42). President Stahr was of the opinion that since the amount of representation (on the four-University authority) permissible under the statute that had been passed in 1967 was severely restricted (to only three members), it would be advisable to set up in some formal way broadly based Indiana University committees to advise Indiana University's three members on the Four State-School State-Wide Telecommunications Committee. He thought that one of our three members should be a person who understood the technical aspects of telecommunication. Therefore, he asked Professor Feddersen to serve on the Committee. President Stahr also requested Dean Derge to serve on the Committee because he felt that we needed some one who was interested in and who was responsible for studying the uses of telecommunication for instructional purposes. Dean Derge was a very appropriate appointment to the Committee because he was made an Associate Dean of Faculties expressly for the purpose of helping to improve instruction and develop our learning resources. And President Stahr appointed Professor J.R. Jordan to the Committee because he felt we needed a person like Professor Jordan who was familiar with all the inter-University relationships, with the relationships with the designing engineers, with the Indiana Bell Telephone Company and with the legislative committees that had dealt with the matter. Professor Jordan had been in on the planning right from the beginning and had been the sparkplug for the development of the project right up to the legislative authorization and the granting of funds to implement the project.

President Stahr reported that he consulted with Dean Irwin at the Medical Center about the Committee. Dean Irwin felt that the Committee could adequately represent the Medical Center as long as the channels of communication between the Center and the Committee were kept open. President Stahr informed the Council that he had specifically charged Professor Jordan with the responsibility of keeping all the channels of communication open

so that all sections of the University would have an opportunity to have their voices heard. He noted that none of the three members of the Committee represented the Bloomington Campus as such. The fact that their bases of operation were on the Campus here was accidental. Two members were University-wide officers, Professor Jordan and Dean Derge, and the third, Professor Fedderson, was appointed because of his broad technical knowledge of the medium, not because of his association with a Bloomington Campus Department. President Stahr felt that the Bloomington Campus should have its own committees to advise the three man committee of its interests, just as should the Medical Center and the Regional Campuses.

Dean Clark asked for information about item 7 of Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 42. He wanted to know what the Committee believed that the Council on Advanced Studies should be doing in relation to graduate studies at the Regional Campuses. He asked whether it was the development of a master plan of some sort, a description of processes to be used by departments or schools on this campus in working with Regional Campuses in the development of graduate programs. "What is it that the Council on Advanced Studies is being asked to do?", he queried. Professor Lorentzen indicated that it was the intention of the Committee that the augmented Council on Advanced Studies act as a coordinating body to set up guidelines for standardizing the development of graduate programs at the Regional Campuses. Dean Clark asked whether there was a similar proposal for undergraduate program development at the Regional Campuses. Professor Lorentzen answered in the affirmative. His Committee had recommended (page 2, item 8 of Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 35) that an advisory committee to the Dean of the Division of Regional Campuses be appointed that would serve primarily to foster the development of undergraduate proposals. Dean Clark asked why that same committee didn't also handle recommendations regarding graduate work at the Regional Campuses. Professor Lorentzen said his Committee thought it would be advisable to maintain the separation which existed on the Bloomington Campus between graduate and undergraduate programs. Dean Clark thought that "It would be extremely difficult for the Council on Advanced Studies to take up this assignment and do something with it that will be useful in providing guidance in the development of graduate programs." He thought that the recommendation for referral might be "more useful if it specified to the Council on Advanced Studies what it hoped to achieve by the referral, whether it was to develop a master plan for initiation of graduate programs at the Regional Campuses, or whether it was to develop criteria to be considered by those who were engaged in joint planning of graduate programs at the Regional Campuses."

President Stahr asked Dean Clark whether he was bothered by the fact that it was not clear where any plan of action developed by the Council on Advanced Studies would go for consideration and implementation. Dean Clark said that he was. He thought that the most useful device from the point of view of the persons who would be concerned with planning the graduate programs would be "process recommendations" rather than efforts to develop a set of guidelines or criteria, as described by Professor Lorentzen. He feared that if a set of external criteria were set up, the people on the Regional Campuses would spend most of their time trying to meet the criteria rather than directing their attention to significant interactions with the people on the Bloomington Campus with whom they should be discussing the programs. He said that he would not know what to do if he were on the Council on Advanced Studies and were faced with this assignment. President Stahr reminded Dean Clark that indeed he was already on the Council on Advanced Studies. Dean Clark said that he was "devastated."

President Stahr observed that the referral being discussed was just an initial referral and he said that he would assume that the Council on Advanced Studies in its consideration of the matter might eventually reach a point where it would wish to refer the matter to another agency. Dean Clark offered to withdraw the point and make it at a later time. Professor Lorentzen restated the fact that it was the intent of his Committee that the Council on Advanced Studies be available as a coordinating and consulting body where ideas could be exchanged.

Dean Higgins offered the view that the idea of an advisory committee for Regional Campuses was a good one and thought that there should be an advisory Committee for the now separated Extension Division, also. President Stahr agreed and suggested that Dean Higgins might prepare a proposal next Fall requesting such an advisory committee.

Professor Lorentzen moved:

THAT THE COUNCIL ACCEPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INITIAL REPORT (FAC. COUNC. DOC. NO. 35) AS AMENDED IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT (FAC. COUNC. DOC. NO. 44).

Professor Ballinger seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

FACULTY REVIEW OF STUDENT APPEALS PROCEDURE

Professor Ballinger informed the Council that he was speaking at the instigation of Professor Fuchs who could not

attend the meeting. Professor Ballinger referred to two documents. One was a communication from Professor Fuchs as Parliamentarian, to the Faculty Council, relating to review procedures in student conduct cases (Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 40). The other document, which was distributed to the Faculty Council at its last meeting, was a communication from David Cahill, Student Senator. It contained Resolution No 11 of the Student Senate (Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 40). Professor Ballinger reported that the Student Senate wished to add a step in the appeals procedure for student conduct cases. He said that the highest board of appeals at the present time was the Student Conduct Committee. Student Senate Resolution No. 11 contained a request from the Student Senate for procedures which would allow for appeals to the Faculty Council. Professor Ballinger thought that Professor Fuchs would have suggested (and he concurred) that a committee be appointed to study the matter and to report early in the fall.

Professor Ballinger moved:

THAT PRESIDENT STAHR BE REQUESTED TO APPOINT AN AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL, WITH AT LEAST ONE STUDENT MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, TO EXAMINE THE PRESENT APPEALS PROCEDURE IN STUDENT CONDUCT CASES, IN THE LIGHT OF STUDENT SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 11 (MAY 11, 1967) AND OF THE COMMUNICATION FROM THE PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE FACULTY, PROFESSOR RALPH FUCHS, DATED MAY 9, 1967 (FAC. COUNC. DOC. NO. 40); AND THAT THIS COMMITTEE BE INSTRUCTED TO REPORT TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL EARLY IN THE FALL OF 1967 ANY RECOMMENDATION WHICH IT MAY HAVE AS TO CHANGES IN THE APPEALS PROCEDURE IN STUDENT CONDUCT CASES, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUESTION OF THE DESIRABILITY OF ESTABLISHING THE FACULTY COUNCIL AS THE FINAL APPELLATE BODY IN SUCH CASES.

The motion was seconded by Dean Sutton.

Professor Pratt reported a complication. He revealed that the Student Affairs Committee had already started examining the Bill of Rights which was passed by the Student Senate and which was concerned with appeals procedures. "It advocates a complete application of 'due process' throughout the whole system," he said. It was his recollection, however, that the Bill of Rights did not include the request for the right of a final appeal of student conduct cases to the Faculty Council. Professor Ballinger thought the Student Affairs Committee would be an excellent committee to undertake the study recommended in his motion. With agreement of the seconder, the motion was amended to read:

THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE INSTEAD OF "AN AD HOC COMMITTEE"

The question was called and the motion was passed unani-
mously.

PROGRESS REPORT NO. 2 OF THE SECTION COMMITTEE FOR IMPLEMEN-
TATION OF THE UNIVERSITY SELF-STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS PER-
TAINING TO TEACHING

Professor Wolff, speaking for Professor Hope, reminded the Council that the Hope Section Committee had already presented a list of recommendations that were directed toward individual departments (See Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 34). The recommendation that he was currently presenting (see Fac. Counc. Doc. No. 44) was the prime recommendation of the Remak Subcommittee, namely, that a continuing body be appointed which would concern itself with the implementing of the recommendations in the Subcommittee Report. In consultation with Professor Richard Turner, Chairman of the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching (C.I.T.), the Hope Section Committee decided to recommend that two new committees be established to replace the two existing Committees. One of the new committees would be an Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Dean Derge and would keep the name and many of the functions of the present C.I.T. It would also take on the responsibility of enquiring into the continuing implementation of the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Teaching. The other new committee would be a Research Committee and would be composed of faculty members with special skills and interests in research on teaching and learning. It would report to the Associate Dean of Faculties. Dean Sutton wondered whether both Committees would have to be under the direction of the same Associate Dean. Professor Wolff thought that that would be desirable. He pointed out that only the Advisory Committee would have the Associate Dean as Chairman. The Research Committee would be an independent committee which would merely report to the Associate Dean. The Research Committee would be appointed by the Dean of Faculties.

Professor Richard Turner informed the Council that the C.I.T. had considered the proposal of the Hope Section Committee and had approved it. Professor Turner then moved:

THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL ACCEPT THE REPORT (FAC. COUNC.
DOC. NO. 44) AND APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS THEREIN.

The motion was passed unanimously.

The regular meeting of the Faculty Council adjourned at 5:40 p.m. The elected members of the Council remained to elect a Chairman of the Faculty Board of Review to replace Professor Dickerson, who resigned the chairmanship. Professor Christenson is the new Chairman. The Board consists of:

Professor Christenson, Chairman
Professor Dickerson,
Professor Halporn
Professor Neu, and
Professor Frye.

Respectfully submitted,

Irving J. Saltzman, Secretary