

Faculty
Council

NOTICE OF

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 19, 1967, 3:30 P.M.

Faculty Council Room, Ballantine Hall

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of June 6, 1967.
2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Edna Johnson.
3. 1967-1969 Biennial Academic Facilities Program, Bloomington Campus.
4. Appointment of the Search and Screening Committee for Regional Campus Administrator.
5. Report on North Central Association Accreditation.
6. Report on Answering Student Inquiries.
7. President's Business.
8. Report of Section Committee on Student Non-Academic Affairs (See Faculty Council Document #45, 1966-67).
9. Report of the Section Committee on Physical Plant and Traffic (See Faculty Document #47, 1966-67).

15 M. } Lib 9M
 } 1.6M Sp & hearing cl.
 } 1 1/4 M opton.
 } 1 M Law
 } 1 M acc. phy.

also Benes-Hist

RECEIVED

SEP 13 1967

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of the Faculty Council

September 19, 1967

Members absent, no alternate: Dean William B. Harvey
 Dean Harrison Shull
 Dean Emily Holmquist
 Professor Keith E. Lorenzen

Alternates present: Professor George E. Smith for Dean L. L. Merritt, Jr.
 Professor John E. Hopkins for Dean David L. Clark
 Assistant Dean Robert Bogan for Dean Maynard Hine
 Professor C. Leonard Lundin for Professor Leo Solt

Visitors present: Dean Robert Shaffer, Professor R. Bruce McQuigg,
 Professor Ralph L. Holsinger, Professor Theodore
 Bowie, Professor James D. Thompson, Mr. J. R.
 Jordan

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of June 6, 1967.
2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Lee Benms.
3. Memorial Resolution for Professor Edna Johnson.
4. 1967-1969 Biennial Academic Facilities Program, Bloomington Campus.
5. Appointment of the Search and Screening Committee for Regional Campus Administrator.
6. Report on North Central Association Accreditation.
7. Report on Answering Student Inquiries.
8. President's Business.
9. Report of Section Committee on Student Non-Academic Affairs (See Faculty Council Document #45, 1966-67).
10. Report of the Section Committee on Physical Plant and Traffic (See Faculty Council Document #47, 1966-67).

President Stahr called the September 19, 1967 meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 3:33 p.m.

The minutes of the June 6, 1967 meeting were approved with two minor changes. Two minor corrections were also made in the Faculty Council Summary for the year 1966-67. (These corrections are noted on the attached errata sheet. Please detach this sheet and put it with your June 6 minutes.)

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR F. LEE BENNS

A memorial resolution for F. Lee Benns (Faculty Council Document No. 4, 1967-1968) was read by Professor C. Leonard Lundin. The Council signified its adoption of the resolution by standing for a moment of silent tribute.

MEMORIAL RESOLUTION FOR EDNA JOHNSON

A memorial resolution for Edna Johnson (Faculty Council Document No. 3, 1967-68) was read by Professor Frank Davidson. The council signified its adoption of the resolution by standing for a moment of silent tribute.

WELCOME TO NEW FACULTY COUNCIL MEMBERS

The new Faculty Council members introduced themselves to the group. President Stahr encouraged them to take an active part in the Faculty Council discussions.

1967-1969 BIENNIAL ACADEMIC FACILITIES PROGRAM, BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS

President Stahr prefaced his remarks by stating that he wished to keep the Faculty up-to-date on the development of academic facilities on the Bloomington Campus, and on other campuses, through a series of reports. He indicated first that there were a number of small projects still in process from the program of the previous biennium, but that the projects were not of sufficient magnitude to warrant a full report of them to the Council.

In reviewing the larger projects from the past biennium, he reminded the Council that the capital appropriations for the Medical Center and those for the regional campuses are separate from those for the Bloomington Campus and that appropriations for one cannot be used for the other.

Previous Biennium

In the last biennium (1965-1967) there was a capital appropriation of just over 3.8 million dollars, and a bonding authority of just over 11.6 million, for a total of 15.5 million, of which about 9.4 million was allocated to the new library, about 1.25 million to the optometry building, and about 1.0 million for a new building on the Indianapolis campus for the School of Law, leaving 3.8 million from the 15.5 total. Of the 3.8 million, about 1.0 million was allotted to the new accelerator which will also receive an allotment from the appropriation for the current biennium, and a substantial contribution from the Federal Government. In addition, the Speech and Hearing Clinic will require about 600 thousand (the balance of the latter project, 1.2 million comes from Federal sources), the remodeling of Morrison Hall, about 325 thousand, about 200 thousand for land for the Indianapolis Law School, and then some additional funds for land purchase, of which the largest is for the former Indiana School of Religion on Union Street. Further, about 100 thousand of the funds from the last biennium will be used to recondition the old Chemistry building, while about 236 thousand will go to remodel Goodbody Hall. The latter projects will permit the University to recapture classroom space.

Current Biennium

For the current biennium, the cash appropriation for capital expenditure was slightly over 2.0 million dollars. The demand for critically needed buildings and building rehabilitation, however, goes substantially beyond this level of funding. A philosophy or strategy is therefore needed to deploy the available funds with maximum efficiency. President Stahr then said that the most effective strategy he has found is to distribute the available funds to the planning of several high priority projects, since various projects move forward with different speeds, depending in substantial part on how rapidly the State and Federal Governments move. To sink a large part of available funds into planning and partly financing one project is ineffective insofar as long, unavoidable delays in any given project may occur. For example, the President noted that any capital expenditure of 50 thousand dollars or more must be approved by the Governor, the Budget Agency and the Budget Committee, after University internal and Board approvals, each point representing a possible delay. Thus to initiate planning on more than one project and to go ahead with those projects which receive approval first is most efficient, even though the priority for the project may not be the very highest on the list.

The list of major projects for the current biennium includes the following: an addition to Jordan Hall, the Chemistry addition, a learning and instructional resources center, the Ballantine Hall rehabilitation project, principally, air conditioning, some service facilities, and the conversion of the old library into useful space. Of these projects, the plans for the rehabilitation of Ballantine Hall are being pushed along the planning and approval route most rapidly; the architects have been selected, and everything practicable is being done to have that building livable by the summer of 1969.

Additional projects encompass a good deal of classroom rehabilitation, including breaking some classrooms down to more useable size, remodeling certain facilities for the natural sciences, and some land acquisition. The President then observed that in addition to absorbing the cash appropriation for the biennium, the projects currently planned together with projects left from the last biennium would also eventually absorb the funds available for this biennium under the "new" bonding authority granted to the University by the Legislature in 1967, under a 1965 Act which authorized academic facility bonding. The limit on such bonding authority is set by the Legislature for each biennium and may not under any conditions be exceeded.

In addition to the bonding authority granted by the 1965 Legislature, the University enjoys two other bonding authorities, both granted in the late 1920's. One of these, for want of a better term, might be called the Dormitories Construction Act. The other is a bonding authority for what is loosely called Non-academic Facilities for Health, Recreation, and Culture. Under the latter authority the University has built the addition for HPER, the Auditorium, the Fine Arts Building, the Lilly Library, the Memorial Union, the Student Health Center and various athletic facilities.

Under the "Non-Academic Facilities" bonding authority, the Board of Trustees is authorized to borrow money on the current bond market and amortize the liability incurred over a number of years. Specifically, the bonds are amortized by earmarking a small portion of student fees. The latter pledge is necessary since the State cannot go into debt and the Trustees have no usable credit to back bonds other than a pledge against student fees. At the present time, of the 180 dollars which the regular, full-time in-state student pays each semester, 59 dollars goes into the various sinking funds and the balance goes into the general fund. Of the 59 dollars, 24.5 dollars goes into what might roughly be called athletic and recreational facilities, such as the Stadium, the Field house, the HPER addition, including the inside swimming pool, research computing center, etc., the outdoor track, golf course, and tennis courts. The remaining 34.5 dollars goes into paying off such things as the Fine Arts Building, the Union, the Auditorium, the Lilly Library, the Student Health Center and so on. This latter sinking fund also will stand behind the proposed Musical Arts Center. The new Assembly Hall,

however, will be carried out of the 24.5 dollar sinking fund noted earlier, since one of the major uses of the building will be for sports and recreation, including some intercollegiate competition.

President Stahr went on to say that the thinking and planning for both the Musical Arts Center and Assembly Hall goes back for many years. At least the dream of a permanent Musical Arts Center seems traceable to the building of East Hall as a temporary center, although the architectural planning for the new center became a reality only during the last biennium. Assembly Hall, on the other hand, was designed in the mid-fifties when serious development of the facilities complex on North Fee Lane was begun. The idea at that time was to move as many of the activities which do not directly involve classroom or laboratory space away from the central part of the campus toward the periphery where the heavier traffic might be more easily handled and where distances between buildings were not such a factor as on the inner campus, where space would be at a premium. Under this concept, the center of the campus would be devoted to classrooms and laboratories, with the immediately adjacent ring devoted to dormitory living space, and the peripheral ring to recreational facilities.

The President further elaborated that in a recent discussion with Chancellor Wells, he found that the Chancellor thought it was a mistake not to have gone ahead with the building of Assembly Hall at the time it was designed some 10 years ago. President Stahr believes, however, that the building was less essential then than now since in the meantime enrollment has more than doubled and promises to go still higher, thus creating a substantial strain on existing facilities. But now, with the inflationary trend in construction costs, which almost certainly will continue in the next few years, it looks very much as if the real question is whether the Hall should be begun now, or not at all. The President could think of no advantage in simply delaying construction of the building, especially in view of current economic trends and the current need for the facility. Even if construction is begun now, it would be approximately three years before the facility would be ready for use. In the interval, enrollment will, of course, continue to increase. The President continued by observing that in the planning of the mid-fifties, the Stadium, the Fieldhouse and Assembly Hall were planned as a group, and that the Fieldhouse would have been quite differently designed had Assembly Hall not also ^{been} anticipated as one of the buildings in the complex. The Fieldhouse has been used as only temporary quarters for indoor varsity sports, and does not constitute adequate quarters for events of this type or other events now staged on a repeat basis, nor for very large assemblages such as some of those anticipated in the Sesquicentennial Celebration in 1970 and thereafter.

Continuing, President Stahr said that he thought the facility in question would be used by more students, faculty and staff than any other facility on the campus except (he hoped) the new Library and perhaps the Union. Because Assembly Hall is to be a multi-purpose building, of use to a great many persons for a wide variety of activities, President Stahr felt it to be unfortunate that some persons held the belief that the building was intended to be used almost solely for varsity basketball.

In overiewing his comments, the President said that he had reported the situation with respect to building plans in such detail as he did because he felt that it is extremely important for the Faculty to maintain perspective on the University's building programs. He further observed that he has been accused of being more interested in "frills" than in education, but he saw in the construction record for the past five years little to support this accusation. He said he recognized, however, that the definition of a frill is one which each person must make for himself. Nonetheless, the record for the past five years includes (in Bloomington alone) the Student Health Center, the School of Business building, the new Library, the Chemistry addition, McNutt, Forest, Wilkie and Briscoe residence halls, a good deal of GRC, the University Schools, the Optometry building, Tulip Tree House, the Geology building, the Psychology building, remodeling in Owen Hall, the Solarium in the Union, the Administrative Services building on 17th Street, the Residence Halls Administration building, a substantial research computing facility, the varsity tennis courts, the track, and the remodeling of Lindley, Morrison and Goodbody Halls. Projects about ready to go include the retarded children's facility at University School, the Speech and Hearing Clinic, the Musical Arts Center, and finishing the remodeling in the old Chemistry building. On the regional campuses, a new teaching hospital is under construction at Indianapolis, and new buildings have been constructed at Kokomo and Ft. Wayne, and major additions at Gary and Southeastern are being undertaken, as well as a new Law School building, new Nursing School, Dental addition, Riley Hospital addition, new Regional Campus and other facilities in Indianapolis.

Returning specifically to the question of Assembly Hall, the President thought it might make sense to do one of two or three things, although he questioned the validity of each. One possibility would be to test current opinion by polling faculty and students. This proposition is not, however, as simple as it sounds since facilities involving fifty years or more of use are in question, and major elements of judgment requiring very long perspective are required. Students voting on the issue would, of course, have graduated by the time the Musical Arts Center or Assembly Hall could be constructed, and there is at least a question about how the students might vote, given a rather short perspective on the problem. Moreover, there is a further question, namely, whether the necessity for student approval at each stage of a particular project's development, along with the approval of all the other

agencies which become involved in construction, might not greatly distort the University's building programs. In any event, the President was of the opinion that if a poll is to be taken on projected construction plans, the poll should be taken very early in the planning, not in the final stages as would be the case in the matter of Assembly Hall. If the poll is taken late in planning substantial sums may have been spent for architectural fees and other planning-related expenditures. For example, in excess of 300 thousand dollars have already been paid out for bringing the plans for Assembly Hall to their current stage of development and additional obligations have been incurred on the project in more recent years.

A second possibility lies in the suggestion that that portion of the student fees earmarked for the retirement of bonds be diverted to a different use, for example, to defray current expenditures. With respect to this possibility, the President first observed that if student fees were wholly used for current expenses, many facilities which need to be built would simply not be built since there would be no way, under current legislation, to fund the construction. Further, if that portion of student fees going into the sinking funds for Non-academic Facilities for Health, Recreation and Culture were devoted wholly to academic construction, nothing would probably be gained since the Legislature votes the funds to amortize the ~~bonds~~ for academic building construction, and the diversion of student fees to this purpose could be anticipated to result merely in a corresponding reduction of academic building funds from the Legislature.

President Stahr next recognized the very appealing possibility that the student fees in question might be diverted to increase faculty salaries. This possibility, however, seems largely illusory for two reasons. First, the absolute amount of money involved in the pertinent fraction of the fees from year to year is not very great. Second, the Legislature grants funds for salary increases largely on the basis of the competitive salary position of the University among other large mid-western universities. Thus, if student fees were initially devoted to salary increases, the Legislature would subsequently make an adjustment in its level of funding for salaries, since it would fund only to degree necessary to make professorial salaries reasonably competitive. In this light, whatever proportion of student fees might be deployed for faculty salaries, in the end the faculty would enjoy no greater salary increases.

The third possibility observed by President Stahr was that of diverting a portion of student fees toward book purchases for the Library. In responding to this possibility the President noted that the budget for purchasing books had increased about 14 percent over the last biennium, and that the library staff was ordering and processing books at approximately their maximum present capacity. The possibility was nonetheless alluring, especially since the I. U.

Foundation, which contributes very substantial monies toward book purchases, was in some financial straits. The difficulties in diverting student fees toward book purchases are, however, not unlike those encountered in diverting these fees to salaries, namely, while the amount of money thus added would not be great, the Legislature could be expected, in its own level of funding, to take into account that additional student fees were being devoted to this purpose.

In closing his remarks, President Stahr pointed out that every effort has been made by the University to hold down student fees, and that the modest increase in student fees did not nearly cover the discrepancy between the budgetary request to the Legislature and the budget actually granted by it. All of the increase in fees is going into salaries, books, etc., and none into sinking funds. He then went on to indicate that in spite of the shortfall in the budget, I. U. had managed to give the second largest percentage of faculty salary increases this year among the public universities in the Big Ten, and that every effort was being made to keep other things adequately supported.

Following his remarks, the President opened the floor to questions.

Professor Shiner said that he felt the most serious problem lay in the fact that relatively little money for academic construction was available under the current budget. He wondered whether monies available under either of the bonding authority acts in the 1920's (Dormitory facilities, and Non-academic Health, Recreational and Cultural facilities) could be employed for academic purposes. President Stahr responded that it was legally impossible to divert the monies obtainable under these acts in order to increase the limits on funding authorized for academic construction.

Professor Lundin said that he was very pleased to hear what President Stahr had to say about the increase in funds for books for the Library. He wondered whether something further about the order of that increase could be said, especially in view of the fact that there were several years in which our purchases of books lagged, and that we apparently needed to make very great expenditures to recover the ground lost in those years.

President Stahr said that there were two problems in expenditures for library books. One is that many of the books needed are not readily available, even if unlimited funds were available. The second is that there seems to be a practical limit on how much can be spent per year on books, especially with staff and other limitations imposed by the present library building. He elaborated by saying that the increase in the general library accessions allocation was on the order of 100 thousand dollars for this year (Dean Sutton thought it was slightly more than that but could not remember the exact figure), and

that an additional 250 thousand was spent in matching the Lilly Endowment's gift. For the second year of the biennium, the President said that he anticipated another 100 thousand as a conservative estimate. Dean Sutton pointed out that the exact monies available would not be known until the enrollment for next year was known. The President also noted that the cost of moving the library to its new quarters would be at least another 100 thousand dollars. Commenting on the position of the I. U. library among other university libraries, using size of collections as a criterion, President Stahr said that the library holds about the same position in size among university libraries as the University holds in enrollment, namely, about twelfth. But he would like to move higher in the former scale.

Professor Lundin said that like everything else, book prices continue to increase. Hence, like the White Queen, we have to run faster and faster to stay where we are, and that the losses of previous years will be very difficult to make up. He then observed that there was some movement on campus to appeal to alumni for book funds during the Sesquicentennial year, and that this might give us a nice sum by which to make up some of the deficit. The President said that such a fund drive was being planned although it has not been publicly announced. He thought that the funds desired would be on the order of a million dollars.

Professor Wolff asked a point of clarification about the distinction between academic and non-academic facilities, pointing out that some apparently non-academic buildings such as Fine Arts actually have academic facilities in them. President Stahr acknowledged the point and said that we have in fact "cheated a bit" on some buildings such as Fine Arts and HPER. The construction of this type was done, however, under previous State administrations which employed a relatively liberal interpretation of the Acts under which those buildings were constructed.

Professor Wolff wanted to know whether Assembly Hall would have offices and other apparently academic facilities. President Stahr said that there would be 25 offices as well as some other facilities and that some instruction in physical education would be held there, but that, more to the point, the new building would open up the Fieldhouse for greater instructional activity and intramurals, for which it was originally designed. Professor Wolff wanted to know whether a case could be made that, through the use of Assembly Hall, other facilities on the inner campus might be opened up for academic use. The President thought it would be difficult to make a very big case of this kind. Assembly Hall, he said, would be more like the Auditorium than like the Fine Arts building in this regard.

Dean Shaffer said that he wanted to underscore the President's comment on intramurals. He pointed out that this institution is seriously lacking in facilities to enable students to participate in informal athletics. Intramural sports, he said, are scheduled as late as 11:30 p.m., not because the students want them at that time, but because that is the time at which the facilities are available. He felt that the construction of the new building would bring the facilities available for intramurals up to a minimum level when compared to other highly regarded institutions (Harvard, Princeton, Oxford, etc.). Dean Shaffer then went on to say that construction of the HPER addition had been of great value to the faculty, but of less value to students, and that he was very surprised that many students had apparently not seen the very great advantages to them that the new facility would provide.

President Stahr said that the bids on Assembly Hall were due on September 21, and that if they can be analyzed in time (to make sure that they meet the specifications), they would routinely be on the agenda of the Board of Trustees on Friday, September 22, for the formal act of authorizing the signing of the contract. If they are not ready for the Friday meeting, they would be expected to be ready for the October meeting of the Trustees. If the bids are within the limits of the bonding power of the University, without an increase in student fees, the President thought the Board would act on them. If they are beyond the bonding limits, the Trustees would probably delay a decision until discussions could be held with certain potential donors.

The President also said that there must have been an error in the newspaper reports which indicated that the President of the Student Body had said he would not be permitted to speak to the Board of Trustees. Prior to the time of these reports, Dean Snyder had told the President of the Student Body that he would be invited to speak to the Board if the Assembly Hall matter were on the agenda.

Professor Pratt asked whether there has been much audible static from the faculty on the matter of Assembly Hall. The President said none had come to him. He said that in general he believes the Faculty have supported the kind of buildings which enrich the campus environment and campus life.

Professor Shiner said that he thought something more might be done to encourage faculty participation in the long range planning of facilities. He said that he found the discussions appearing in the minutes of the Faculty Council helpful, but that more facts and more about the decisions really under consideration might be beneficial in relieving criticisms. President Stahr said that faculty do participate in many ways. Dean Sutton pointed out that last year the Faculty Council established faculty members on the Space Assignment Committee, and that the latter has conjoined with the Space

Committee of the Science Advisory Committee, and that they are working jointly together on overall planning. President Stahr added that he thought that the suggestion that long range planning be reviewed periodically by a body like the Faculty Council as well as by the Space Committee was indeed a valuable suggestion.

REPORT ON NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION ACCREDITATION

The President said he could report quickly on this matter and present the details later. We have been accredited for another decenium by the North Central Association.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE SEARCH AND SCREENING COMMITTEE FOR A SUCCESSOR TO DEAN BRADEN IN HIS REGIONAL CAMPUS RESPONSIBILITIES

Dean Victor M. Bogle
Dean Byrum E. Carter
Dean David L. Clark
Dean Edwin W. Crooks
Professor Leo Fay (Chairman)
Professor Herman Feldman

Professor Samuel Frumer
Professor Philip Headings
Professor Terrence Martin
Dean W. George Pinnell
Dean Joseph T. Taylor

PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

1. President Stahr announced the appointment of Professor John W. Ashton as Necrologist.
2. President Stahr is planning to give his State of the University address on Thursday, November 9, at 4 p. m.

The regular meeting of the Faculty Council adjourned at 5:20 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Turner, Secretary

RLT:jw