

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

Members present: President Stahr, Deans Snyder, Sutton, Carter, Harvey, Higgins, and Shull; Professors Auer, Byrnes, Fay, Long, Pratt, Saltzman, R.C. Turner, Farmer, Friedman, Shellhamer, Buehrig, Horowitz, Manlove, Martin, Neu, Ryder, Wolff, Shiner, Davidson, Neil, Hackney, and R.L. Turner.

Alternates present: Dean Orescanin for Dean Merritt, Dean Webb for Dean Bain, Professor Richey for Dean Clark, Professor Otteson for Dean Pinnell.

Members absent: Provost Penrod, Dean Hine, Dean Hölmlquist, Dean Irwin, Dean Endwright; Professor Lindesmith, Professor Solt, Professor Carter.

Visitors present: Professor Painter, Professor Byrd, Dean Schwartz.

AGENDA

1. President's Business.
2. Continued Consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries.
3. Continued Consideration of the Section Committee Report on Teaching.

Note: Election Results Attached

President Stahr called the April 30, 1968 meeting of the Council to order at 3:37 p.m. The minutes of March 19, April 2, and April 16, were approved with one correction. In the minutes of April 2, page 12, middle paragraph three, Professor Neil rather than Professor Friedman was the speaker.

#### PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

President Stahr had several items of business, discussion of which ultimately consumed the meeting. The shorter items are numbered below while the longer items are headed.

1. The President annually is required to appoint a nominating committee for a replacement for the member of the Athletics Committee whose term expires that year. This year Professor Marcus Rhoades is retiring from the committee, and the President is appointing Dean John Endwright, Professor Newell Long and Professor Ira Horowitz as the nominating committee. Dean Endwright is to call the committee together. They may elect their own chairman. They will bring in names of nominees from whom the Faculty Council will elect one.

2. The President noted that tomorrow (May 1) will be Founder's Day and urged Council members to attend. He observed that the day is devoted to the recognition of both teaching and learning, and that the University had been fortunate in receiving funds to make an increasing number of awards in recognition of outstanding teaching. He added that in his address he would talk about racial discrimination, and that he would make an important announcement about the Sesquicentennial Celebration plans of the University.

3. President Stahr next spoke briefly about the reorganization plan discussed in the Council minutes for April 16, and presented to the Board of Trustees on April 19, on which action is expected to be taken by the Trustees on May 24. He said that he is asking all academic deans to discuss with their faculties matters pertaining to the academic implications of the reorganization. He urged the Council and the Faculty to contribute their ideas about how academic matters might be most effectively organized. Vice President elect Ryan would work with the Regional Campus deans and faculties after he arrives in July. Contingent upon approval of the plan by the Trustees, a search and screening committee would be appointed to aid in the selection of a chancellor for I.U.I., but a search for a chancellor for the Bloomington campus would be delayed until we are further along in sorting out the functions to be assigned to central administration from those to be assigned to Bloomington administration.

4. Calling attention again to the concern of the University over recent changes in Selective Service policies, as discussed in the Council minutes of March 19, President Stahr said that he had just returned from a meeting of the Association of American Universities at which he had learned that a few universities were rumored to have been engaged in what was felt by some to be the ethically questionable practice of competing for graduate students by "promising" occupational deferments if they would accept teaching assistantship appointments. He said that at least one state selective service board was reported to have decided that graduate students with less than a full teaching load would be given occupational deferments. He noted that a number of other universities were upset by these promises of deferment, and further observed that the Council of Graduate Schools had recently sent a letter to General Hershey condemning the granting of occupational deferments for graduate students who teach only a few hours a week. This apparently was based on the inconsistency of universities in the past seeking to establish a special, tax free status for assistantship stipends on the grounds that they were not actually remuneration for occupational endeavor, while in the present seeking to gain occupational deferments for students on the grounds that they held graduate assistantships. These states of affairs obtaining, the AAU adopted the following resolution and directed that it be sent to General Hershey:

The AAU reaffirms its position, pending any change in the current selective service legislation, in favor of a proportionate selection of men for the draft from each eligible age group and against any discrimination by categories of academic discipline outside the health fields specified by law.

The AAU opposes action directed toward the securing of blanket occupational deferments for graduate students who also serve as part-time teaching assistants. We believe that universities should seek wherever possible to meet their teaching needs through the recruitment of teachers not eligible for the draft, and should make special efforts to attract returning veterans to their graduate student bodies. In cases where graduate students are teaching virtually full-time, and where their continued service is in the judgment of the responsible authorities of the institution essential to the fulfillment of its teaching responsibilities, it may be appropriate for the university to seek their deferment on occupational grounds.

We consider it important for all graduate students and vital in the case of teaching assistants, that if they are called for induction after registration for any academic quarter or semester, their actual induction be postponed until after the end of that term.

After reading the resolution, the President said that the Director of Federal Relations of the American Council on Education still felt, two weeks ago, that a national policy postponing the induction of teaching assistants for the academic year might yet be attained, but added that there was other evidence that there is only a remote possibility of achieving this year either that particular relief or a policy which would specify proportionate induction from the various eligible age groups.

All aspects of the current situation considered, President Stahr said that he felt that the University would be well advised to proceed on the assumption that there would be no deferments for teaching assistants unless they are teaching virtually full time. He said that did not mean they could carry no graduate courses, but that the traditional split of a few hours of teaching courses and several hours of taking regular graduate course work would not be considered grounds for deferment, even if it should be accepted by some local boards as grounds for a postponement of induction for the semester on which the student was already embarked.

5. Addressing himself to progress on the 150<sup>th</sup> Birthday Fund, (a matter separate from the Sesquicentennial Celebration,) President Stahr said that the I.U. Foundation would conduct the campaign and that the purpose of the Fund was to raise money for things for which the State could not reasonably be expected to appropriate tax funds, and that it was hoped that the fund may be "kicked off" on Commencement week-end in June and specifically at the Alumni Barbecue on the Saturday before the Commencement on Monday. He continued that one of the University's most distinguished alumni had been secured as the National Chairman of the Fund, and that full time work by a few people and semi-weekly meetings included several others had been proceeding at full pace during the past two months. Included in this work was not only the organization of the campaign, but the arduous task of locating and evaluating potential donors.

With respect to the latter point, the President observed that while the contributions of small donors were quite important, when substantial sums of money are being sought

it is of very great importance to find donors who are capable of very substantial contributions. He noted, for example, that to raise even a million dollars from donors contribution \$100 each requires a very great many donors, and that, realistically speaking, to raise funds of several million dollars requires an intense effort to find donors capable of gifts of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars. He said that while no final campaign goal had been set, the University already had commitments to raising several millions of dollars, and that, without being accused of dreaming, he thought that a goal of at least 20 million dollars might be set, some of which was already pledged. He hoped that the evaluated work might make it reasonable to set a higher basic goal, but there would probably be some flexible goals in the sense that the current thinking was that we ought to have special campaigns in each community in which the University has a campus, and these would not be restricted to alumni, but provide the opportunity for local citizens to contribute to the "extras" on their community's campus. The general alumni campaign would be directed toward some specific projects. The President noted, with respect to the latter, that most large donors prefer to give a restricted gift, i.e., one earmarked for a specific project, rather than an unrestricted gift. He added that various local campaign organizations would probably be set up for the Bloomington campus, including an organization for students, one for faculty and one for staff, as well as a community organization, and similar steps might be taken in Indianapolis and at each regional campus. The general campaign would of course be designed to reach our alumni and friends statewide and nationwide.

Returning to the matter of campaigning for funds for specific projects, the President said he had insisted that a goal be set of at least one million dollars for library books, and, depending on what the feasibility studies show, he hoped more might be added to that goal. He noted that the important matter was to actually raise the money rather than merely to have a goal, and that the opinion of professional fund raisers was that it is far better to set a goal that is exceeded than to set one against which there is a shortfall.

Addressing himself once more to the matter of identifying donors, President Stahr said that he hoped that the faculty would participate in identifying potential donors, and that each faculty member would himself be encouraged (without undue pressure) to contribute to the campaign. This could mean much, psychologically, to its overall chances of success.

A REPORT BY DEAN SNYDER ON A PROPOSAL  
FOR RESIDENCE UNIT INTERVISITATION

In opening his remarks, Dean Snyder said that an Honors floor in Foster Quad had submitted a request that his office authorize a plan for visiting privileges to the floor for members of the opposite sex. The proposal by the Honors floor suggested that the intervisitation plan be placed on a trial or experimental basis from about the first of May until the end of the semester. While Dean Snyder's office was considering this request, the President of the Student Body had come to his office with the request that the opportunity to have intervisitations on a trial basis be made available to all residence units on the campus. Dean Snyder then said that the Student Affairs Committee had had under discussion for some time intervisitation between members of the opposite sex within residence units, and that the matter seemed to be coming to a head, and therefore agreed to inform the Faculty Council of the possibility of such an experiment, but that no action would be taken on it until the Council had considered it and reacted favorably to it.

In the discussions between Dean Snyder's office, the Dean of Students Office, and the President of the Student Body and representatives of Student Government, agreement was reached that there were to be three conditions placed on the experiment. First, each separate residence unit wishing to make a trial run on intervisitation must create a plan for intervisitation which is agreeable to at least two-thirds of the students living in that residence unit. Second, residence hall units must submit their plans to Dr. Greenleaf's office for approval, while fraternities and sororities and other groups not included directly within the residence halls are to submit their plans to the Dean of Students for approval. Third, while there may be, indeed will need to be, variations within plans concerning the particular procedures for implementation, all plans must provide that no intervisitation be permitted between the hours of one a.m. and six a.m.

Commenting on the proposal, President Stahr said that all of us had heard a considerable amount about the exercise of student power in the last two or three years, frequently without equal emphasis on student responsibility, but that the present Student Government administration feels keenly that student responsibility must and can go with student power. He added that Dean Sutton had noted that students often complain about and criticize the "establishment", but that if they really are given responsibility and authority in the conduct of their affairs, they become the "establishment."

Professor Byrnes inquired whether he correctly understood that there were to be no uniform regulations other than the three noted above, hence that there could be variations in the different plans. Dean Snyder affirmed that this was the case, but made it clear that under the present concept, the Dean of Students office could reject any particular proposal. Dean Carter said that his understanding was that no large unit, such as all of Foster Quad, would submit a plan, but that floor levels or comparable units would submit plans. Dean Snyder also affirmed this point. The Secretary asked whether any serious attempt had been made to establish criteria against which the outcomes of the experiment might be appraised. Dean Snyder replied that he was not in a position at the moment to testify about the seriousness of the attempt to evaluate the outcomes, but that it had been asserted to him that a serious attempt will be made to evaluate the outcomes, and that the materials to be used in the evaluation were due shortly in his office, but had not yet arrived. President Stahr said that he hoped that Dean Snyder would make sure that the plans submitted include (as part of the evaluation) a report from the counselor in the resident unit as to his observations and evaluation. Dean Snyder said that as a general condition of the experiment, from the viewpoint of the residence hall counseling staff, a particular counselor could request that the experiment be terminated if the situation seemed to be getting out of hand. Professor Byrnes asked what Dean Snyder meant by that. Dean Snyder replied that each residence unit is to have a judicial committee to which members of the residence units are to report violations of the plan, but that if the members of the unit or the judicial committee fail to function, the resident assistants or the dorm counselors will themselves report violations. He said that he had personally communicated to the students with whom he had discussed the matter that if the controls to be exercised by students fail to function as they should and violations considered serious by the office of the Dean of Students are permitted to pass, the experiment would be closed for the particular residence unit involved.

Professor Buehrig asked whether the Student Affairs Committee had considered the matter. President Stahr said that the Student Affairs Committee was considering the workability of intervisitation on a more permanent basis, i.e. as a general policy, but was not certain whether they had considered the matter on an experimental basis. He then turned toward Dean Webb for a response, while Professor Shiner asked Dean Webb whether or not the Student Affairs Committee approved of the proposed experiment. Dean Webb informed the Council that the committee had spent many, many hours discussing the various issues surrounding intervisita-

tion, and that it did approve of the experiment. He added that the committee would make a report to the Council concerning their viewpoint on a more permanent plan for inter-visitation, as well as several other matters, in the meeting of May 21.

In response to a question concerning whether he personally favored the experiment, Dean Snyder said that in all honesty he had hoped for more limitations; for example, that he would like to be assured that room doors would be open, and he thought the hours were a little long, but that he was pleased with the insistence of the students that each plan be approved by a two-thirds majority of the students. He continued that too radical a departure from the general principles laid down would have to be "flagged down" by the Dean of Students' office, but that he was pleased with the responsibility and seriousness shown by the students, and that his major concern was not how well the students could set up and implement their plans, but the extent to which they could in fact police the conduct of their fellow students. Even though he had some reservations, he said, he thought that as long as the plans, their implementation, and the conduct of students under the plans were under the general authority of the office of the Dean of Students, he approved of the experiment.

Following Dean Snyder's responses, the Secretary proposed a motion, which appears below in the form in which it was ultimately passed by the Council.

**THE FACULTY COUNCIL EXPRESSES ITS GOOD FAITH IN THE CAPABILITY OF STUDENTS TO ACT RESPONSIBLY IN MATTERS OF INTERVISITATION; IT ALSO RECOGNIZES SOME OF THE PROBLEMS ATTENDANT TO THE WORKABILITY OF INTERVISITATION PLANS SUBMITTED BY INDIVIDUAL RESIDENCE UNITS. THE COUNCIL THEREFORE SUPPORTS AN EXPERIMENTAL PERIOD OF INTERVISITATION, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT BODY, CONTINGENT FOR EACH RESIDENCE UNIT UPON THE APPROVAL OF ITS SPECIFIC PLAN BY THE OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS.**

Professor Fay seconded the motion.

Focusing on that portion of the motion which requires the approval of each plan by the office of the Dean of Students, Professor Pratt asked whether he was correct in supposing that within the principles earlier discussed, different plans could show considerable latitude, for example, in the days of the week on which visitation might

be permitted, in the hours of the day, and so on. Dean Snyder said that there would be such variations among the particular plans, and added that one of the major problems lay in the physical arrangement of facilities in particular units. For example, the location of the lavatories and the placing of signs on which lavatories might be used during intervisitation is a problem in some residence units. Thus, the Dean of Students must take into account the "geography" of each unit in approving its plans. In addition, provision for escorts, and the workability of the plans for judicial boards are also important considerations.

Addressing the Council as a father of a student on campus, Professor Davidson said that he wanted to give his whole-hearted approval to the proposal. Professor Saltzman wondered about the adequacy of the two-thirds majority rule for the approval of the plan by the members of the unit, pointing out that a student sharing a room with a highly social roommate might find himself deprived of his right to his room. He asked whether there was a stipulation that both members of a room have to agree to the plan, as well as a two-thirds majority. Dean Snyder said that there was no such stipulation, but that one of the reasons he was concerned about the length of the visitation hours was the possible displacement of the roommate. He noted, however, that roommates now have the very problem in question since highly sociable persons may have many friends of the same sex as guests in their room, sometimes to the displeasure of the roommate. Dean Sutton suggested that working out such matters was the very point of asking for a plan from students. He continued that he did not think the Council ought to prejudge the experiment; that all that had been set were the gross parameters of the matter; that students must work out an arrangement which is satisfactory to themselves, and police and enforce this arrangement, and that he, for one, would like to see them do it.

Professor Ryder said that from the discussion he thought the experiment had been adequately thought out, and that he could support the spirit of the motion, but that earnestly he hoped that one of the subsidiary consequences of the experiment would be that some other issue would replace this one as the most burning issue before the contemporary American university student. President Stahr said that he felt confident that some other issue would emerge as soon as this one was settled. Professor Shiner inquired whether the experimental arrangement would apply to all class levels of students. Dean Snyder said that it would be difficult to work out such an application for freshmen women because their hours were more restrictive than those proposed. Professor

Wolff commented that he hoped parts of the discussion would be saved for presentation to persons designing present and future dormitories. President Stahr said that it might be reassuring to Professor Wolff to know that all architectural plans for future dormitories along traditional lines have been shelved. He added that there were a number of problems involved in the construction of new dormitories, among them not only matters of design, but also the fact that when students become 21 some of them hasten to move out of the dorms into apartments in town (which then creates problems for married students who need to find housing in apartments in town). He continued that a new dorm had not been started on campus for some three or four years now, and that he expected the rate of dormitory construction to decrease considerably, compared to the period since World War II, along with a decrease in the rate at which undergraduate enrollments in Bloomington have increased.

Professor Buehrig said that he had to confess to some bewilderment in view of the fact that he had no written proposal before him. He noted that students were to work out the plans and the rules and enforce the rules and he wondered just who these students were. Dean Snyder replied that the students in each residence unit were the ones to work out rules and the enforcement of them, subject to approval by the Dean of Students' office, and that no overall proposal had been submitted to the Council since none exists, other than the IRHA proposal, which does not cover all types of residence units. Professor Buehrig asked for specific clarification of the matter of escorts, and Dean Snyder said that the provision of escorts depended on the type of building. In buildings in which there was immediate access to the out of doors, such as GRC, no escort would be needed; on the other hand, in a large dorm, such as Foster, an escort would be needed to conduct the visitor to the proper floor and room, and to warn students of the same sex that a member of the opposite sex is approaching. He said that he presumed that the escorts would be drawn from the residence units.

Taking a different tack, Professor Long said that he would have to oppose the motion on three counts. First, he felt the Student Affairs Committee was being short-circuited when they had a permanent plan about ready. Second, he felt the Council would be placing the Dean of Students in the untenable position of having to de-legislate what the Council had legislated if he were forced to close the experiment on grounds of unworkability, without any particular set of rules to do it by. Third, he felt the hours were ridiculous, and that the Council should shorten them.

In additional discussion, Professor Pratt raised a question about the role of the residence unit counselor, to which Dean Snyder replied that the counselors did not want to police the students on matters of intervisitation, but that the students appeared to want the counselor to report violations when the policing or judiciary functions of the students did not function properly. Professor Neu said that she would like to support the motion on the grounds that the rules under which students live are archaic, and were archaic when she lived in a dorm, which, she said, was longer ago than she cared to discuss. She continued that she felt the opportunities in our society for interpersonal relations are very wide indeed, and that while she knew nothing of the incidence of pregnancy among our female students, she would be very surprised if it went up spectacularly because we permitted male visitors in girls' rooms, or vice versa.

The Council then went into a brief verbal struggle over the exact wording of the motion, followed by an amendment to the motion by Professor Long, who suggested that the hours during which intervisitation might occur be restricted to those between 11 a.m. and 11 p.m. He said that he offered the motion to protect the roommate, and that he did not think girls felt fit to be seen before 11 a.m. anyhow. While the Council was ruminating on whether girls really are fit to be seen before 11 a.m., Professor Byrnes seconded the amendment. Professor Wolff inquired whether the students in a residence unit could place such a restriction on the visitation hours if they wished. There was general agreement that they could do so. Professor Horowitz spoke against the amendment, observing that he had lived in a dormitory which had visiting hours around the clock, and that it seemed to him that the problem of couples being alone was most likely to occur in the hours of the early evening rather than after eleven o'clock, since the later hours were most typically used for parties of several persons getting together after a movie or some university function. He said that by 11 p.m. everyone was tired and ready to go to bed. (That, Professor Shiner later suggested, was exactly the problem.) Professor Horowitz added that to remove the hours between 6 a.m. and 11 a.m. was virtually meaningless, and would merely be a source of annoyance. Professor Martin inquired whether the University had rules about visitation in approved off-campus housing. President Stahr and Dean Snyder both affirmed that approved housing was under the same rules as the halls of residence, and Dean Snyder said that off-campus, approved housing units could submit plans.

There was no additional discussion. The President

There was no additional discussion, the President called for the question on the amendment, and the amendment was defeated by a wide margin. The President then called for the question on the main motion, and the motion carried, with Professor Long dissenting.

President Stahr turned next to the final item of President's Business, which concerned policy issues surrounding the strike planned by some groups for Friday last. He asked Dean Sutton to address himself to this problem.

Dean Sutton: I will just make a statement, Mr. President, and perhaps we should take it up for discussion under President's Business in the next meeting, rather than trying to discuss it at this meeting. The matter has to do with the so-called Student-Faculty strike for Peace last Friday.

Prior to that date, we were all importuned, that is, my office and the President's office, about what we would do in the event of a strike. You should note that no statement was made, except by a few unwary associate deans who were caught on the telephone, and they expressed our feeling about the policy correctly. The policy was to repose confidence in the faculty and the teaching assistants of the institution; we believe them capable of and interested in carrying out their responsibilities in educating students consigned to them pro tem in their various classes. The strike itself largely vindicated the confidence we had in the faculty and teaching assistants meeting their responsibilities. By and large people stayed in their classes and met their classes, and students showed an interest in getting an education. I know there are moral and ethical questions involved when it comes to the faculty and teaching assistants obligations to the people who have in good faith paid fees and expect to meet their classes at the regular time barring some unforeseen illness on their part or on the part of the instructor.

We have felt, and it seems traditional at this institution, that matters of this character are handled best at the departmental level. Indeed, one of the entertaining parts of my responsibility is to respond to bewildered vice presidents for academic affairs at other institutions about our teacher load. I frequently get letters from institutions asking about our teaching load, and I am always happy to respond by saying I have no idea. We know that departments have teaching responsibilities that were programmed; we know that there are faculty members capable of meeting these responsibilities, and we leave it to the departments and to the faculty members themselves to meet

their teaching obligations. This has provided us with a tremendous amount of flexibility in the assignment of individuals to teaching and research and other formal responsibilities. It has worked splendidly and I wish to see this whole philosophy continued - that we all perpetuate it.

Certain questions now arise which could endanger this wish, and I know that the President has had inquiries in his office, as I have had inquiries in mine, placed by public officials of some considerable importance, who have raised the question, "By what right does the University receive tax money to carry out certain responsibilities in teaching and research and not do so;" "by what right does it excuse people from this responsibility; and by what right does it not place sanctions against individuals who refuse for whatever reason, to carry out their responsibility?"

Now this is the kind of question that might arise in the forthcoming legislature and I daresay it will arise in unfriendly quarters. It can arise even in friendly quarters and the answer to that is first of all we have no regulations regarding faculty strikes since we've never really had a faculty strike. This was not imagined, I expect, at the time the Faculty Handbook was written, or even when it was revised. What I would like to do - and I realize that we do not now have time - I would like to get the Faculty Council, and I'm sure it's the President's wish as well, to give us some guidelines about how we are to respond, should this situation arise in the future. I say this emphasizing the fact that the so-called faculty strike of last week was not a faculty strike as far as I could make out. Most people, the overwhelming percentage of people, met their classes and it may have even quickened student attendance to some degree, in some instances. But we nonetheless need to be in a position to answer our critics and our critics are going to be more and more vocal as post time for the next legislative event draws near. We need to be sure in our own minds of what our position is.

My own predilection is that this is a matter to be handled at the departmental level or by the departmental faculty themselves. However, if people should, for reasons of their own personal commitment, absent themselves from class on the basis of their own predilection, however grave in their judgment the circumstances are, then we may be forced by external pressures to concern ourselves with matters best left to be resolved at the faculty and the departmental level. If matters such as this are not resolved at this level, and if we don't have sound answers

ready, the kind of flexibility, the kind of responsibility which has been amply developed and perpetuated at this institution stands in jeopardy - and I can't overemphasize the real jeopardy part. In many ways we and other universities get tagged for what happens at Columbia, for instance. There's a kind of reaction, and it's upset a good many people in this state who are no doubt prepared to intervene in matters best resolved at the level where they're best understood.

What I'm doing is presenting a report on this strike. The report is that our confidence was almost completely vindicated and we did not need to set up a series of threatened sanctions in order to call our faculty's attention to their responsibilities. We assumed the faculty was completely aware of its responsibilities. Nonetheless, there were instances of people absenting themselves from their classes the entire day and just to make a legalistic argument, under the law I understand you can't strike against a state institution, although garbage collectors and others have demonstrated that this is not without flaw. Still, we need this kind of guidance and I call upon this Council to give it thought. I hope we can give that thought voice at the next meeting and we can have the thoughtful counsel of the Council.

\*\*\*\*\*

Following Dean Sutton's remarks, the Council agreed to discuss the matter at the next meeting under President's Business.

Because of the lateness of the hour, the remaining items on the agenda were postponed, and the meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Turner, Secretary