

Notice of Faculty Council Meetings  
Ballantine 003, 3:30 p.m.

Agenda, March 12, 1963

1. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating: University Policy on Placement Services (Recommended limit on discussion, 15 minutes)
2. Report of the Section Committee on Teaching, Faculty Council Document No. 6, 1967-68 (Recommended limit on discussion, 55 minutes) (Professor Wolff)
3. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Section I, II and III (Recommended limit on discussion, 40 minutes) (Professor Byrnes)
4. Request for Council Advice on "The University's Relation to Selective Service Policies" (Agenda Committee) (Recommended limit on discussion, 10 minutes)

Tentative Agenda, March 19, 1963

1. Approval of the Minutes of March 5, 1963
2. President's Business
3. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Buehrig Committee, Faculty Council By-laws 7-9 (Faculty Council Document No. 13) (Recommended limit on discussion, 60 minutes)
4. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Sections III, IV and V (Recommended limit on discussion, 30 minutes)
5. "The University's Relation to Selective Service Policies" (Probable limit on discussion, 20 minutes)



Minutes of the Faculty Council  
March 12, 1968  
Ballantine 008  
3:30

(This document is internal to Indiana University)

Members present: Deans Snyder and Clark; Professors Auer, Byrnes, Pratt, Saltzman, R. C. Turner, Buehrig, D. Martin, Neu, Ryder, Solt, R. L. Turner, Wolff, and Shiner.

Alternates present: Dean Harvey for President Stahr, Dean Hagan Dean Sutton, Dean Nugent for Dean Carter, Dean Hattery for Dean Higgins, Dean Martin for Dean Pinnell; Professor Olsen for Professor Lindesmith, Professor Jones for Professor Horowitz, and Professor Richey for Professor Manlove.

Absent, no alternate: Provost Penrod; Deans Merritt, Bain, Hine, Holmquist, Irwin, and Shull; Professors Fay, Long, Farmer, Friedman, Shellhamer, Davidson, Neil, Hackney, and J. E. Carter.

(Note: Because of bad weather, no members from the regional campuses or the Medical Center could attend the meeting.)

Visitors: Professors Byrd, Painter and Murray; Dean Shaffer.

AGENDA

1. Continued consideration of the Interim Report of the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating: University Policy on Placement Services (Recommended limit on discussion, 15 minutes).
2. Report of the Section Committee on Teaching, Faculty Council Document No. 6, 1967-68 (Recommended limit on discussion 55 minutes). (Professor Wolff)
3. Continued consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, Section I, II and III (Recommended limit on discussion, 40 minutes). (Professor Byrnes)
4. Request for Council Advice on "The University's Relation to Selective Service Policies" (Agenda Committee). (Recommended limit on discussion, 10 minutes.)



Dean Harvey called the March 12, 1968, meeting of the Council to order at 3:40 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of March 5 had not yet been circulated so there were no minutes to approve.

#### INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PICKETING AND DEMONSTRATING

The report of the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating was in the form of a single motion, given below in final form. In introducing the report, Professor Auer noted that the committee had made a number of suggestions about placement services in the University in its report to the Council on February 20, and that the Council had at that time requested the committee to present, at a later meeting, a formal motion covering those suggestions not acted on by the Council in the February 20 meeting.

Resolution Submitted to the Faculty Council at its meeting on March 12, 1968 by the Committee on Picketing, Demonstrations and Related Matters

The Faculty Council hereby resolves:

#### 1) THAT IT IS THE SENSE OF THE COUNCIL:

THAT PUBLICIZING EMPLOYMENT AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES AND RECRUITING FOR SUCH OPPORTUNITIES SHALL BE GOVERNED BY RULES AND REGULATIONS THAT ACCORD NO PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR ANY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OR SERVICE;

THAT ANY ORGANIZATION, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, BE PROVIDED UNIVERSITY FACILITIES FOR RECRUITMENT ONLY WHEN ONE OR MORE STUDENTS HAVE INDICATED AN INTEREST IN BEING INTERVIEWED BY THAT AGENCY;

THAT RECRUITMENT INTERVIEWS OR THE PUBLICIZING OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN PRIVATE, EXCEPT THAT CAREER INFORMATION MEETINGS, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM RECRUITMENT INTERVIEWS, MAY BE HELD IN DESIGNATED ROOMS, AND THAT REASONABLE PUBLICITY BY NOTICES PLACED ON BULLETIN BOARDS OR BY LITERATURE DEPOSITED FOR PICK-UP AT DESIGNATED LOCATIONS, MAY BE PERMITTED;

2) THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INDIANA MEMORIAL UNION, AND THE DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY PLACEMENT SERVICES ARE REQUESTED TO TAKE ANY NECESSARY STEPS TO BRING CAMPUS RECRUITING PRACTICES INTO CONFORMITY WITH THIS RESOLUTION.

Calling attention to the substance of the two parts of the motion, Professor Auer explained that the first part of the motion was intended to state Faculty Council policy on the elimination of discrimination between private and public employers giving everyone, as it were, equal opportunity; while the intent



of the second part was to implement the policy expressed in the first part. He then moved that the report be adopted (no second was needed since the report came from a Council committee).

Opening discussion, Professor Wolff asked what authority was intended by the use of the term "requested" in part 2) of the motion. Was it merely a polite way of saying "instructed"? Did the Council have the authority in a motion of this kind to instruct? Professor Auer said that while the committee had employed "requested", he thought that if it were the sense of the Council, the persons designated in the motion would respond with action. He said that if the Council felt stronger wording was required the term "directed" might be substituted. Dean Harvey observed that if it were the case that the Union was incorporated under its own Board of Directors, use of "directed" would be a bit strong while "requested" would be appropriate. Dean Shaffer confirmed that the Union was incorporated by a special statute in 1910 and was directly responsible to the Board of Trustees. Acknowledging the point, Professor Wolff wondered how the Council might nonetheless follow through and discover what steps had been taken. He said that he was particularly disturbed by what he felt was the "sore point" in the motion, namely, open military recruiting in the Union.

Professor Auer was moved to make a short speech to the point. He said that he had, as Chairman of the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating, received letters from both the Director of the Memorial Union and the President of the Union Board in the interval after the motion before the Council had been submitted to the Secretary. Both letters supported the position that open military recruiting should be continued in the Union, with the letter from the President of the Board noting that the Board had this year affirmed the policy that such recruiting should be permitted. Professor Auer said that he did not agree with this point of view, but that he felt obliged to present it.

Professor Pratt suggested that the issue might be diplomatically resolved if the request were made only to the office of the President. Dean Harvey observed, however, that since the Union is the site of the activity, it seemed appropriate to direct the request to the Union Board as well as to the President.

Professor Olsen asked Professor Auer to review the grounds on which the committee based the first part of the motion. Professor Auer said that the feeling of the committee was that all employing agencies, public or private, such as the Paducah School System, the Marine Corps, General Motors or whatever ought to stand on the same basis, and that the University ought not to provide undue visibility to one group. Each agency, he observed, should have the right to a private, dignified meeting with prospective employees.

Dean Shaffer wished to make two points; first, that he felt that the presence of the Peace Corps, VISTA and the military in



the Union was an information service. No one, he pointed out, is recruited, although information is given on where to apply. Second, in response to Professor Wolff's earlier point, he questioned whether the Council had the authority to do more than "request" in view of the fact that the placement bureaus are parts of academic departments, and that it seemed to him that the Council might be overstepping its authority if it attempted to direct an academic division concerning the handling of its own affairs. In response to a question from Professor Olsen, Dean Shaffer went on to say that other channels of information about military service, including the Military Commission Office, are open, but that because of very rapid changes in the policies of these groups concerning the alternatives available within the various services, indeed, alternatives to military service, that there was some advantage to students in having open and easily available information as provided by open tables in the Union.

Professor David Martin inquired whether there is any existing placement service which could handle military recruiting. He suggested that much of the solution to the problem might be to have such recruiting conducted in an existing office, such as the placement bureau in the Department of Government.

Dean Harvey said that it was helpful to him to make a distinction between two types of recruiting: first, placement service, in which one does work on a one to one basis and in which student interests and capabilities are taken into account; second, what one might call advertising or propagandizing, into which the high visibility recruiting in the Union seemed to fall. He further noted that the motion before the Council explicitly provided for "reasonable publicity" by means of literature and bulletin board displays, and that the intent of this provision was to meet the need for advertising. The placement activities of the military, he observed, might be conducted in the appropriate offices in downtown Bloomington or perhaps in the campus buildings housing the military science departments.

Dean Clark said that he did not find the arguments by the committee concerning the need for uniformity very convincing. He pointed out that that the military is not merely a "competing employment opportunity", that there is a draft, that graduating seniors are faced with a military obligation, and that the provision of information regarding this obligation, in view of the situation faced by students, seemed a quite reasonable practice and one that should be continued.

Dean Snyder said that quite apart from military recruitment the Undergraduate Division had for some time coordinated information about the placement services on the campus and provided career information to students, including aptitude testing, especially through the counseling office. He also noted that special work was being done with the undergraduates in certain departments, for example, Chemistry, in providing information



about career opportunities, and that expansion of this type of service in other departments was contemplated. He said that if some types of career information were to be regarded as sensitive or as verging on military recruitment or recruitment for the production of war materials, it would greatly complicate an activity which was originally designed to be purely a service to students, and one which the University gravely lacks in some areas. He continued that he was somewhat disturbed by a resolution which restricted services to students, especially in the area of information about the military, since there is increased student need and concern for this type of information, not only information about alternatives in military service, but also alternatives to it. He suggested that the Undergraduate Division was moving toward increasing the amount of such information available to students, while the discussion within the Council seemed to suggest that restrictions should be placed on this sort of activity.

Professor Shiner said that the committee had no intent to restrict the flow of information, but that it did feel that the military tables in the Union were not there simply to provide information, but to propagandize, to induce people to join the military service. Professor Byrnes said that he had passed the tables several times and that he did not feel that they were propagandizing. Professor Auer said that he felt there was nothing in the resolution which would preclude the type of activities outlined by Dean Snyder.

In response to a question concerning the nature of the recruitment for summer work done during a "Camp Fair" held on campus in the spring by the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Dean Endwright said that each year the Graduate Recreation Society asks directors of some 55 camps to come to campus and set up exhibits (this year, in the Solarium). The event is widely publicized to students, who then come to the event to talk to the camp directors about their camps. Subsequently, the students contact the directors concerning employment for the summer. Dean Endwright noted that the event is considered a service to students, and that about 500 students from the student body at large take advantage of it.

Professor Pratt said that he would like to hear more from the committee about the thinking underlying the first part of the motion. He said he saw no reason to keep military recruiters or any one else from setting up tables; and that he hoped the committee was not trying to reduce student agitation by excluding open recruiting. Professor Shiner said that the committee had two things in mind. First, that all career opportunities should be given equal access to facilities--that there should be uniform treatment. Second, that assisting students to get a job is not the main function of the University, and that this function is best carried out, in private, by a mutual agreement between the student who wants to be interviewed and the person who wishes to interview. The committee felt students should not be openly recruited in class or in moving from class to class; that the



6  
committee wished to tone down the placement activities in the University and give each person or group equal opportunity. The committee had no desire to reduce the flow of information. Professor Pratt said that he did not see how anyone could be excluded under the first point. Professor Auer said that he doubted that the case he had in mind would arise, but he thought that if American Motors were to ask for a table in the Union they would probably be turned down. Hence, the possibility of discrimination between employers, in recruiting, at least existed.

Professor Wolff joined the discussion, speaking primarily to Professor Pratt's point. He said that there seemed to be a general view that the University is a microcosm, a kind of universe of its own, and that anything that could take place, anywhere, should not be kept from taking place in the University. He continued that he felt that this was an overly relaxed view, even for a large public institution. He then read a brief quotation from an article Henry Steele Commager in the New Republic, February 28, 1968, concerning the University as an employment agency.

"The basic principle which should govern the relation of the University to recruiters is that which should govern all other activities of the academy. The university is not an employment agency; it is not an adjunct to corporations; it is not an instrument of government. Wherever feasible it should make its facilities available to legitimate educational enterprises, but it is under no obligation whatever to make its facilities available to what is not educational."

Professor Wolff said that the quotation focused on one of the "hang-ups" in the University; that he felt the University was not obligated to provide every kind of service to students, and that the burden of proof ought not always to lie on those who wish to inhibit the proliferation of services and activities.

Responding to Professor Wolff's point, Dean Clark said that the generalization provided by Professor Wolff's statements was almost self-evidently incorrect when applied to a university's professional schools. Such schools as Education, he pointed out, not only have the responsibility to prepare practitioners who relevantly fulfill the ends for which the positions they enter were created, but they also have the responsibility to alter practice in the professional field. The first responsibility, he said, might be met by a restricted definition of placement activities, but the second could not. Speaking directly to the proposed motion, he said that the committee still had said nothing which convinced him that the motion was directed to anything other than getting rid of the military information desks which appear in the Union. He suggested that the purpose



of the motion might better be discharged by the formation of a specific rule than by the formation of a general policy statement which appeared to apply only to instances involving the military.

Professor Shiner said that problems always arise with respect to specific instances, and that what such specific instances lead to is the formation of a general policy. He said that he took it that Dean Clark was not in favor of any kind of restrictions on recruiting. Dean Clark said that he took it correctly. Professor Shiner said that he believed it necessary to have a policy which made recruiting practices uniform. Dean Clark pointed out that the motion did not make clear whether there was to be a restriction of the flow of information, and that it had not been established whether the desks in the Union staffed by the military were to be regarded as recruiting or as dispensing information, although Dean Shaffer's earlier point suggested that they were there for the purpose of dispensing information.

Professor Buehrig noted that the University has an Office of Veteran's Affairs and Military Information and wondered whether this office did, or could, discharge the same functions as the desks in the Union staffed by the military. Dean Shaffer said that one of the main functions of the office in question was to provide information about the military, and that representatives of the various branches of the service would be located in this office while they were visiting the campus. He noted that the regulations and opportunities in each branch change quite rapidly and that it is quite important to have representatives or consultants with the latest information visit the campus. In some instances, he said, a particular program will be open only for 20 or 30 days, and that at the request of students the office in question will call in the consultants to provide information on the program.

Professor Auer asked Dean Shaffer whether the military persons at the desks in the Union regarded themselves as recruiters or as information officers. Dean Shaffer said that he had asked those currently on duty about this matter and that they made it very explicit that they were dispensing information. Professor Auer wondered whether students regarded the tables as being present for the purpose of recruiting or the purpose of information. Dean Shaffer said that students understand that only information may be obtained at the tables and that application to the services must be made elsewhere.

To clarify the situation which had developed at this point, Dean Harvey said that he felt the discussion had taken on an air that was far too absolutist. He suggested that there was no desire on the part of the committee to persuade the Council to adopt an exclusionist policy, to single out a legitimate enterprise, public or private, to be excluded from University channels. He said that his understanding of the intent of the committee went to the style rather than to the substance of providing information and of recruiting.



The purpose of the resolution, he observed, was to provide a general policy statement governing the style in which information was to be disseminated and the style in which placement services were to be conducted.

In additional discussion Professor Olsen inquired whether VISTA and the Peace Corps used facilities in the Union similar to those used by the military. Dean Shaffer confirmed that they did. Professor R. C. Turner asked whether the committee made any distinction at all between private enterprises and state or federal agencies. Professor Auer said the committee did not. Professor Turner thought such a distinction might be appropriate. Dean Hagan wondered whether, if the motion were passed, he would have to cease posting outside of departmental offices notices about graduate assistantships. Professor Auer said that he construed the latter as "reasonable publicity". Dean Hagan said there was an ambiguity in the motion concerning the referent of "reasonable publicity". Professor Wolff suggested that "that" be inserted before "reasonable publicity" to remove the ambiguity. Professor David Martin said that he believed the basic principle on which the University operated in placement activity is to provide a service to students, not to employers, and that he favored the motion because it equalized opportunities for employers. He then underscored the importance of providing information concerning military service to students, and suggested that the Office of Veteran's Affairs and Military Information be very active in providing information to students about the alternatives available within the services and alternatives to entering the military service. Professor E. W. Martin wished to know whether the tables staffed by the military were actually used. Dean Shaffer confirmed that they were, and that use had been particularly heavy in the last 60 days.

Professor Byrnes inquired about the expense of maintaining the rooms in the placement bureaus, and about whether rooms were available in the Union for recruiters. Professor Auer said that he had that information in his files, but that he was unable to provide exact data without reference to them. Professor Byrnes emphasized that it was important that free space be provided to recruiting agencies, for example, VISTA. Dean E. W. Martin observed that recruiting was a very expensive operation for a private employer, and that it was unlikely that such an employer would request a table in an open traffic area for general information dispensing purposes. Such activities, he noted, were much more characteristic of public agencies. He thought a distinction between public and private agencies could be viably maintained.

Professor Pratt called for the question; a split vote occurred and the Secretary took a roll call vote. Voting was as follows:

Abstain: Dean Snyder



Aye: Harvey, Hattery, Auer, Olsen, Saltzman, Buehrig,  
Jones, D. Martin, Neu, Ryder, Solt, R. L. Turner,  
Wolff, and Shiner

Nay: Hagan, Nugent, Clark, E. W. Martin, Byrnes, Pratt,  
R. C. Turner, and Richey.

The motion was approved.

Following the motion Professor Byrnes suggested that before W. W. II he had belonged to an organization called Future War Veterans, and that he thought that it would be imaginative to create an Office for Future War Veterans so that students could begin to think about the benefits they should have, and the kind of university they might attend, in future years. Dean Harvey said he thought the Council might consider approving such a motion if the members could be assured that it would not be referred to the Committee on Picketing and Demonstrating, and Related Matters.

#### REPORT OF THE SECTION COMMITTEE ON TEACHING

(See Faculty Council Document No. 6, 1967-68,  
distributed with the Minutes of February 20, 1968)

Turning the yellowed and decaying sheets of the original copy of the report, Professor Wolff noted that it had been scheduled to come before the Council for some time. During this time, he said, the Council had "changed gear" and that he now saw no particular point in spending the time of the Council reading through the report. Calling attention to the first paragraph of the report, he observed that in the first of its two previous interim reports the committee had referred some recommendations to academic departments. He said that he had not been able to discover precisely what progress had subsequently been made in taking action on these recommendations, but that he hoped a report would soon be forthcoming from the Dean of the College and the Deans of the Schools about what they have been doing. Such reports, he thought, had been prepared.

In the second interim report, the committee had recommended the creation of two standing committees: The Research Committee on Teaching and Learning, and the Committee on the Improvement of Teaching. A report on these two committees had been prepared by Dean Derge, and in the latter's absence, Dean Hagan had brought the report to the Council. Referring to the report, Dean Hagan noted that the President had appointed members to the committees, and that both committees were now active. He then read the names of the committee members and gave a brief description of the activities. He observed, however, that the report had been prepared in anticipation of a Council meeting in December and had not subsequently been brought up to date. The Secretary suggested that the report be brought up to date and issued as a Faculty Council Document so that current information would be available to the Faculty. There was general agreement that the latter should be done.



Dean Harvey then returned the floor to Professor Wolff, who continued with the presentation of the section report by underscoring certain recommendations in it to which the section committee gave strong endorsement. Beginning with the first page, the committee strongly endorsed XXX 1, concerning sabbatical leave for junior faculty members at full pay for one semester after three years of teaching (beyond the doctorate); and VI 1 concerning provisions for administrators to catch up on research activities in their fields. The committee did not strongly endorse XVIII 1, concerning "criteria for promotion", and a "model" letter of promotion, and related matters. Dean Hagan said that at one time he had attempted to draft a "model" letter and had encountered great difficulties. He questioned whether such a letter could usefully be drafted. Professor Wolff said that if XVIII 1 were to receive emphasis, the grounds should come from the Council or from faculty members who thought it important.

Turning to the second page, Professor Wolff called attention to item III 6 (under Faculty Council) which the committee thought might receive more extended deliberation from the Council. He said that the committee recognized that a one day reading period before examinations was nominal recognition of a reading period, and that consideration might be given, especially in some graduate courses, to a serious reading period, perhaps of three or four weeks duration. Continuing with the items on this page, he suggested that the Council might wish to discuss item XXII 8-9, concerning the Auditorium and Convocation Series as adjuncts to teaching, and item XXIII 2, concerning the designation of the Dean of Undergraduate Development and the Dean of the Graduate School as collecting points for all comments made on teaching. The committee, he said, felt strongly that such collecting points should be available, and that they should be identified with offices of known integrity. Dean Snyder said that the Office of the Dean for Undergraduate Development had been engaged in obtaining comments about teaching from a random sample of students. Each student in the sample is being interviewed, and background data, including his grades and test scores, are obtained as well as his opinions about the instruction he is receiving. Dean Snyder said that this practice had proved to be very enlightening and that the office would like to continue it.

Speaking in the latter context, Dean Snyder said that a problem had arisen in that some faculty members are apparently seriously defrauding students with respect to their course grades. As an old faculty member, he said he had to hear such reports from students several times before he could believe that such a thing was occurring. It did appear to be the case, however, that there were genuine instances of capricious or inefficient grading, and that students had virtually no recourse from such grading. In view of such cases, Dean Snyder said that he was moved to suggest to the Council that serious consideration be given to the creation of a committee specifically charged with hearing grievances about grading. Professor Shiner said that he felt strongly that the Council should make a recommendation on this point.



Continuing with the report, Professor Wolff said that the committee strongly endorsed item XXXIII 1-4 concerning the bookstore, and recommended that a policy committee be established. Turning to page 3, he noted that the committee was making the recommendation that some items (as listed) not be supported by the Council. With respect to additional items on this page, Professor Wolff, as expected, gave strong personal endorsement to III 5-6, concerning ad hoc courses on timely themes; the committee approved strongly of III 6-7, concerning loosening the relationship between class contact and credit hours, and of item III 2-3 on page 4, concerning the extension of integrated freshman courses. Item XXXIX 1-6, involving the creation of faculty chairs for teaching, was also strongly endorsed. Professor Wolff called the attention of the Council to the closing statement by the committee on page 5, then moved that the report be accepted. Professor Saltzman seconded the motion.

After a brief discussion, the Council agreed to go through the report one section at a time, making such amendments as thought necessary before accepting the report.

Opening discussion, Dean Hagan, representing the Office of the Dean of Faculties, said that he had no objections to those items recommended for referral to the Dean of Faculties and and Sabbatical Leave Committee (section 1). He then raised a question about XVIII 1 in section 2, indicating his difficulties with writing a "model" letter for promotion. The Council did not decide whether to leave this item in or to delete it. Referring to item VI 2, Professor Byrnes said that he felt strongly about the matter of provisions for administrators to take leave to catch up on research activities in their fields, and proposed that administrators with faculty status be given a research leave for three months every third summer. In supporting his proposal, Professor Byrnes pointed out that with the growing complexity of the problems with which administrators must cope there is less time than there was ten years ago for them to keep up with research, and to teach. Because administrators do not have time for these activities, he felt there was a very grave danger that the common ground between the faculty and the administration would be eroded and that a disastrous split between them would eventuate.

Professor Wolff observed that in the Self-Survey Report the full statement of VI 1 included the following:

"Deans and Chairman be given one semester or one summer off every third year during which they will teach and catch up on research and educational developments in their special fields."

He suggested that this sentence might be substituted for the sentence under VI 1. A short discussion concerning wording ensued, followed by a question concerning whether the intent



of the report of a section committee is to approve the substance of recommendations from the Self-Survey, or whether it is only to submit that particular recommendations are worthy of further consideration and study, and, contingent upon the recommendation of the committee, office or agency to which an item is referred, possible final approval by the Council for implementation. Professor R. C. Turner said that it was his clear understanding that a section committee can only recommend items for referral, and that approval of the substance of an item awaits later action by the Council. Professor Saltzman said that the decisions before the Council when a section committee report was presented were whether to go along with the referral recommended, whether to change the referral, whether to eliminate the item, or whether to make the item a subject for discussion and action at some future meeting. Under this interpretation, the Council would not discuss and take formal action on an item which was under immediate consideration as part of a report from a section committee.

At this point, the Secretary moved that discussion of the Report of the Section Committee on Teaching be deferred until a time to be determined by the Agenda Committee. The motion was seconded by Professor Auer.

In a brief discussion of the motion, Professor Wolff suggested that when long reports of the type under consideration were being discussed by the Council, and when members know in advance what the recommendations are, it would greatly facilitate the meeting if those proposing changes in the recommendations would send their proposed changes to the group making the report. Dean Harvey observed that the same request had been made last week in the discussion of the interim report of the Buehrig Committee. The Council agreed that such a procedure was highly desirable and gave general endorsement to it.

Dean Harvey called for the question, and the motion to defer discussion on the Report on Teaching passed unanimously. Dean Harvey, at the suggestion of the Chairman of the Agenda Committee, then moved to the final agenda item.

#### THE UNIVERSITY'S RELATION TO SELECTIVE SERVICE POLICIES

Introducing the item, the Secretary said that he had received letters from both the AAUP and from the Continuing Committee (both letters were in the names of the Council) requesting that the Council issue a public condemnation of General Lewis B. Hershey's letter of October 26, 1967 to all draft boards. This letter recommended that "illegal" anti-war demonstrators be placed at the top of the list of potential draftees. Speaking for the Agenda Committee, the Secretary said that the question before the Council was whether these letters should be made the subject of a future agenda item. Speaking for himself, the Secretary said that if the Council issued a public condemnation of the Hershey letter, but did not issue a statement concerning the recent changes in



selective service regulations concerning the drafting of graduate students, it would look as if the Council were condemning the one while tacitly approving the other, a distinctly unsatisfactory state of affairs.

Professor Wolff said that he had recently learned that the Policy Committee of the Department of French and Italian had sent a letter to the Dean of the College and to the Dean of the Graduate School concerning what it felt its obligations would be in the event that very large scale drafting of graduate students serving as T. A.'s occurred. Professor Wolff then urged that the general item "The University's Relation to Selective Service Policies" be given urgent consideration by the Council. Dean Harvey said that it was his impression that the University was working through the American Council on Education on the matter of the drafting of graduate students. Professor Shiner said that he thought a condemnation of the Hershey letter by the Council would probably have little force, especially at this late date.

Dean Harvey suggested that the item might be brought back before the Council by a group which had investigated the University's activities and position on the matter of drafting of graduate students and had studied the relevant issues in sufficient detail to present a definite report. In additional discussion, the possibility of forming a small committee and the possibility of inviting Dean Merritt, who, among the members of the administration, is most involved in the issue, were probed. Professor Byrnes said that if a committee were formed he hoped it would consider the issue in the broad context it required, namely the effect of the war on all segments of our society, and not simply in the context of the University as a "privileged institution". Dean Harvey said that to the best of his information it seemed likely that the present selective service policies would not change in the near future, suggesting that action on the item might not be quite so urgent as it seems, and that longer range consideration might be kept in mind. Considering all points of view, the Council decided that the best course of action would be to invite Dean Merritt to the Council meeting of March 19 so that full information on the University's current actions on the matter might be learned, and the Agenda Committee was thus instructed.

Dean Harvey heard the motion for adjournment, two vigorous seconds and a unanimous "aye" vote. The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Turner, Secretary