

# Minutes of the Faculty Council

May 7, 1968

Ballantine 008, 3:30

Members present: President Stahr, Deans Merritt, Snyder, Carter, Clark, Higgins, Holmquist, Irwin, and Endwright; Professors Auer, Byrnes, Fay, Lindesmith, Long, Pratt, Saltzman, R.C. Turner, Framer, Buehrig, Horowitz, Martin, Neu, Ryder, Solt, R.L. Turner, Wolff, Shiner, Davidson, and Neil.

Alternates present: Dean Derge for Dean Sutton, Dean Christ for Dean Bain, Professor Richey for Professor Manlove.

Absent, no alternate: Dean Snyder, Provost Penrod, Dean Harvey, Dean Shull, Professor Friedman, Professor Shellhamer, Professor Hackney, and Professor Carter.

Visitors: Dean Shaffer, Professor Greenleaf.

## AGENDA

1. President's Business
2. Report on the Foster Quad Project (Dean Madden)
3. Continued Consideration of the Section Committee Report on Libraries, (see Faculty Council Document No. 12 (as amended), 1967-68) (Professor Byrnes)
4. Continued Consideration of the Section Committee Report on Teaching, (see Faculty Council Document No. 6, 1967-68) (Professor Wolff)
5. Secretary's Business - Advisory Statement Concerning the University Calendar - Election Results

President Stahr called the May 7, 1968 meeting of the Council to order at 3:35 p.m. The minutes of the meeting of April 30 were not yet available for approval. After noting that he had to leave the meeting at 4:00 in order to attend an important out of town meeting involving University business, and would ask Dean Carter to chair the later portions of the meeting, President Stahr turned to the first item on the agenda.

#### PRESIDENT'S BUSINESS

1. Making a brief progress report on race relations on campus, the President said that at the Deans' meeting earlier in the day, an hour and a half had been devoted to reports on and discussion of race relations and University programs, current and planned, designed to help the Negro. He observed that he had found the meeting stimulating and enlightening, and that there was a substantial volume of relevant information which the administration hoped to bring together in a report covering our current activities in this regard. He invited faculty members to contribute any special information they had on the subject, and underscored the importance of each of us knowing what others are doing in working on the problem. The target date for the report is sometime during the week of May 12.

Professor Wolff inquired whether there was some central place on campus at which information was being collected and activities coordinated. President Stahr said that under current plans Dean Snyder's office would be the central location, but that at the moment with some 80 departments in various stages of discussion and planning, the best place to find out about what a particular department is doing is probably from the department chairman.

2. As required under the new by-laws, the Council is to elect its officers at the last regular meeting in May; the President therefore appointed a nominating committee to prepare the slate. The committee is: Professor Leo Solt, Chairman, Professor David Martin, and Professor Frank Ryder. The President reminded the Council that under the new by-laws the newly elected Council members are to attend the last meeting in May to participate in the election of Council officers for next year.

(3. As indicated in the minutes of April 30, the Council was to have discussed the University's policy on the participation of faculty members in strikes involving the University; however, Dean Sutton had to be away today, and the discussion was postponed until May 21.)

## REPORT ON THE FOSTER QUAD PROJECT

Introducing the report, Dean Madden noted that it had two parts, the first part (Fac. Council Doc. No. 24) having been produced by the Jr. Division, while the second part, which contained more "hard" data, was prepared by Professor Greenleaf.\* The report by Professor Greenleaf covers the first semester of the project, while the report by the Jr. Division includes a survey made during the current semester. Dean Madden said that no general conclusion about the outcomes of the experiment could be reached from the data available at the present time, but nonetheless a decision was needed from the Council concerning whether to continue the experiment for another year, since substantial organizational work would have to get underway immediately if the decision were affirmative. He continued that the main thrust of the report was that it was desirable for the project to continue, but that it was also important that faculty direction be given to it if it were continued. The formation of an advisory board was therefore made a central recommendation in the report.

Following a brief clarification of the decisions before the Council by President Stahr, Professor Auer moved that the central recommendations of the report be approved. The motion was seconded by the Secretary. President Stahr observed that who was to appoint the board and the chairman was not clear in the recommendations. Professor Auer and the Secretary then revised the motion to include the point, producing a final motion as follows:

1. THAT THE DIRECTION OF THE FOSTER PROJECT BE ASSIGNED TO AN ADVISORY BOARD, INCLUDING AT LEAST THREE PARTICIPATING FACULTY MEMBERS, AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RESIDENCE HALLS, THE JUNIOR DIVISION, AND THE YEAR'S PARTICIPATING STUDENTS, AND THAT THE BOARD AND THE CHAIRMAN BE APPOINTED BY THE DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEVELOPMENT.
2. THAT THE PROJECT BE CONTINUED FOR ONE ADDITIONAL TRIAL YEAR IN FOSTER QUADRANGLE; AND
3. THAT THE ADVISORY BOARD CONSIDER ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTATION IN 1969-70 INVOLVING ADDITIONAL QUADRANGLES AND VARYING THE CRITERIA USED IN SELECTING STUDENTS.

\*Faculty members interested in reading the second part of the report should contact their Faculty Council representatives and borrow a copy from them.

Professor Pratt opened discussion on the motion by observing that in a project of the kind in question, curricular offerings are apt to be restrictive; he then asked Dean Madden about the curricular opportunities available to students participating in the project. Dean Madden said that participating students take a maximum of three courses within the project, leaving two courses to be taken outside. The three courses taken in the project are drawn from those which are common among Jr. Division students and have multiple sections on campus, thereby reducing logistics problems. Professor Pratt asked whether the same curricular pattern would be offered next year, or whether it might be expanded. Dean Madden said that he thought the Advisory Board might maintain the same pattern as a base, then work from that base toward an expansion of offerings, but that he could make no firm commitments on this point since the curriculum pattern would be under the Advisory Board. Professor Wolff inquired how many of the faculty currently involved in the project might be likely to continue in the experiment. Professor Greenleaf said that some faculty currently involved will continue, thus providing continuity and experience necessary to keep the program going. Dean Derge observed that a number of the instructors involved in the program were teaching associates, and wondered whether they might not move on to other assignments. Professor Greenleaf acknowledged the point, but also observed that the teaching personnel involved covered the full range of faculty, and that participation by the regulars lent a margin of stability to the program.

Professor Farmer noted that the program appears to most greatly benefit the average and below average incoming student. Observing that he was now involved in the recruiting program in Gary (see the minutes of April 16), he said he thought the program might have distinct possibilities for the disadvantaged students toward whom we are now directing greater attention. Professor Greenleaf affirmed that students standing between the 50th and 75th percentile in high school rank did tend to do better in the program than did their controls in the regular Jr. Division, but she also observed that the control group in Teter Quad was not in every detail comparable to the experimental group in Foster Quad. Pointing to an important subordinate aspect of the experiment, Professor Greenleaf said that 25 students entering on probation had been assigned a special Jr. Division advisor and two student leaders, and that a greater than expected number of the probationary students had managed to make a "C" average or better under this arrangement. Professor Farmer said that he felt that given our special efforts in recruiting, the continuation of this kind of program seemed important.

President Stahr supported this, saying that he felt that the program for the probationary students had exciting potentials, and that he hoped it might be given special thought in continuing the experiment. Examining reasons for continuing the experiment as a whole, President Stahr said that he felt there was not yet quite enough evidence to determine whether the type of program in the experiment should become the more typical way of going about undergraduate education, and that additional experience with the program might be helpful in the design of future residence halls.

Professor Martin said that there seemed to be two ways in which the experiment could be continued. One was to expand it to cover more students, the other was to keep the students who had participated in it this year in for another year. He wondered whether thought had been given to the latter point. Professor Greenleaf said that if a common pattern of sophomore courses could be identified among the participants in this year's program, these courses might be brought into the program, and this year's students continued in the experiment for an additional year. Professor Ryder said that there seemed to be many reasons for supporting a program such as the one in question, and while there might be some doubts among the faculty, the program seemed to have rather strong, although somewhat generalized, student support, that it is the type of program that many of us have hoped would work, and that these reasons seemed to be sufficient to warrant its continuation for another year.

In brief additional discussion, Professor Auer noted that faculty participating in the experiment were to be relieved of all other departmental duties, and suggested that department chairmen should be consulted before one of the members of his department was recruited for the project. There was general agreement on this point. President Stahr observed that 4:00 had arrived, and excused himself from the meeting. Dean Carter took the chair and asked for other discussion, of which there was none. He called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

CONTINUED CONSIDERATION OF THE SECTION COMMITTEE  
REPORT ON LIBRARIES  
(See Faculty Council Document No. 12, as amended)

Professor Byrnes re-introduced the report to the Council, since the last discussion of it was on March 5. He first noted that section I, items 2-5, section III, items 7-10, section IV, item 11, and section V items 12-13 were yet to be discussed and acted upon, then reviewed the background

to the report. This background was presented in detail in the Council minutes on the previous occasions then the report was discussed. In his review he emphasized the importance of approximately doubling the book fund expenditures for the decade beginning with 1964-65, reaching a recommended level of \$2,500,000 by 1974-75, so that the library might not only increase in size, but more importantly, in quality. In addition, he noted that the Council was being asked to pass resolutions in the report, hence give their collective opinions, rather than make binding policies. He then moved that:

I.2 The projected doubling of library expenditures by 1974-1975 over 1964-1965 should be regarded as minimal.

Professor Solt seconded the motion.

To clarify the intent of the motion Professor Pratt asked whether "library expenditures" was intended to mean "expenditures for books and research materials" while Professor Farmer asked whether the book fund covers expenditures for all types of information, including that available under automated library systems. He noted that in ten years books and periodicals may not be the primary means of storing information, and that under too narrow an interpretation, we might inadvertently recommend expenditures for non-functional materials. In response to Professor Pratt's question, Professor Byrnes said that "library expenditures" referred to expenditures for books and periodicals, while in response to Professor Farmer's question he observed that under section VI.14, a new unit would be created in the library to keep the library abreast on technological changes, and could work with the Library Committee to adapt book fund expenditures to changes in technology.

Dean Derge asked whether the progression of expenditures as shown year by year in the report, namely,

1.4 million	1967-68
1.6	1968-69
1.7	1969-70
1.83	1970-71
1.975	1971-72
2.125	1972-73
2.3	1973-74
2.5	1974-75

were intended as a reference in the resolution. Professor Byrnes affirmed that they were so intended, and pointed out that if a library spends an inordinate amount of money in any

one year, the effect is to drive to abnormally high levels the price of books out of print, and reprints of periodicals, thereby decreasing the effectiveness of the expenditures. He added that the target figures represented very substantial expenditures and that the committee felt it was more realistic to achieve them over a ten year period by adding one or two hundred thousand dollars each year, than to try to achieve the final figure in one step. Dean Derge noted that the actual library expenditures for 1967-68 were about \$500,000 below the figure recommended, and that a similar shortfall was in the offing for next year, and wondered whether the Council was aware that to make up the difference between the recommended figures and the actual expenditures radical re-allocations would be required in the University budget. Professor Byrnes said that in item I.3 a target figure of five million dollars library fund was recommended by the section committee for the Sesquicentennial Drive, and that if such a target were achieved, some of the money could be used to make up the deficit. In response to a question from Dean Pinnell, Professor Byrnes added that the figures recommended were both to catch up and keep up, and that that if five million dollars were spread over the ten year period, the University could catch up, but that in 1974-75, 2.5 million would be needed merely to keep up.

Dean Higgins observed that a rapid increase in expenditures for books would also increase expenditures for library staff, space and equipment, and the like, and inquired whether the committee had taken these matters into account. Professor Byrnes said that the committee had done so, and that additional expenditures would be required in these areas. Professor R.C. Turner recalled that in an earlier meeting the Council had resolved that the library should be given a "high priority" during the coming decade, and asked Professor Byrnes whether listing specific figures was really necessary at this point, especially since there were regularly established channels for budget construction. Professor Byrnes acknowledged the point, but elaborated that specific figures had been included to serve as guides in administrative budget making, everyone concerned recognizing that the expenditures in question were not binding, but only suggested. Dean Carter said that his concerns were similar to those of Dean Higgins and Professor R.C. Turner with respect to suggesting specific figures. He noted specifically that he and Dean Shull had asked (via memo) department chairmen in Arts and Sciences to suppose that a certain percentage increase in budget were to occur, then asked them how the increase should be distributed over faculty salaries, book budgets, fellowships, and so on. He said that he received few responses, and thought that perhaps department chairman did not want to

play the budgetary game that way. He observed, however, that there is only one pot of money, and that ultimately the budgetary game must be played in the way suggested, a fact which seemed to be inadequately taken into account in the report. Professor Byrnes said that in a way the comment was an argument for the proposal, insofar as department chairmen represent their own departments, and may intercede for particular faculty members for specific library requests, but that no one represented the library as a whole. Addressing himself to the same point, Professor Wolff said that the Council could not act in the same role as the departmental chairmen since it did not have the same types of information, nor was it in a good position to choose against the same criteria. The role of the Council, he suggested, was to act for the University as a whole.

In brief additional discussion, Professor Martin pointed out that the section committee was not in any sense submitting a budget but had only drawn from the Self Study Report the pertinent sections, and placed the recommendations from these sections before the Council for consideration. The issue, he suggested, was whether the Council would reject or not reject the figures used in the Self Study report to point up deficiencies in our expenditures for the library. Professor Neil said that from the viewpoint of the regional campuses, to have definite figures to serve as hard benchmarks or goals was very helpful, and that he supported the inclusion of the figures. Dean Pinnell wondered whether the figures given included monies for regional campus libraries. Professor Byrnes said that they did not. Professor Neil said that this fact notwithstanding, the regional campuses depended on the main library, and that strengthening the main library would be very helpful to the regional campuses.

To cover the various viewpoints expressed, Professor R.C. Turner offered an amendment to the motion: That the Faculty Council endorse the sense of resolution in section I, item 2. There was no second to the amendment, and the question was called for on the original motion. There was a division on the motion, with Professor R.C. Turner voting Nay and the remainder of the Council voting Aye. The motion carried. (Although the motion passed did not specifically include the explanation attached to it in section I.2, the explanation will be included in the final copy of the report as approved by the Council, since the motion is difficult to interpret without the explanation.)

Professor Byrnes next asked the Council to turn to section III, items 7-10. These items appear below, with the wording deleted or modified by the Council struck over

by the mid-bar and the new wording underlined.

7. That no new programs, fields of study, or departments be established without an appropriate increase in the book fund and in the budget for the library staff.
8. That no addition should be made to the faculty without ~~the simultaneous addition of, say, \$3,000 to~~ an appropriate increase in the permanent book fund of the library.
9. That the University in making its budget for 1969-71 and thereafter should, ~~accept, as a minimum, the book fund figures proposed by the University Study Committee,~~ in considering expenditures for the library, provide appropriate increases as the student body grows and changes in character. ~~To assist the University thereafter in reaching the required goals for library expenditure, it should add a formula providing that the funds for the library be increased by, say, \$100,000 annually for every 1,000 undergraduates over 20,000 on the Bloomington campus and by, say, \$100,000 annually for every 500 graduate students in Bloomington and in the Indianapolis professional schools over 7,000. In short, the library budget should rise automatically as the student body grows and changes in character.~~
10. That the University in its budget for 1969-1971 and thereafter should create and thereafter follow a similar formula policy for the regional campuses.

Professor Byrnes moved that these resolutions, as originally worded, be adopted, and Professor Solt, under the selective service policies employed by the Chair and the Secretary, seconded the motion.

Opening discussion on the motion, Professor Pratt suggested that the proposals presented in items 8 and 9 represented a rather totalitarian approach to budget making, and that the Council would substantially overextend its role if it were to adopt the proposals as given. He asked specifically how one could add \$100,000 to the budget in the autumn after discovering that an additional 1,000 students had arrived on campus. Professor Byrnes said that he did not mean that the budget increase had to come the same year, but might come in the subsequent year. He added that one of

the reasons the University is in trouble on library expenditures is that it has not followed this practice. Professor Buehrig aligned with Professor Pratt, saying that he did not see the interconnection between the size of student body or the size of the faculty and the size of the expenditure. He said that a university of 15,000 might have a need for the same size library as one of 25,000 except that additional copies of those books widely used in courses might be needed in the larger institution. Professor Farmer pointed out that an increase of 1,000 freshmen would be quite different from an increase of 1,000 seniors in terms of demand on the book budget, and that the proposal "locked in" a general average which might be wildly unrealistic. He continued that a similar situation seemed to apply to faculty, since some faculty need research equipment more than they need library books. Professor Shiner, following this line of reasoning, suggested that specific figures were inappropriate in item 8, and suggested the revision in that item which appears in the final motion as shown above. Professor Byrnes did not immediately agree to this amendment. He pointed out that Harvard uses the exact figure given in item 8, and has found it highly workable. There was, however, no movement in the Council to emulate Harvard. Professor Fay seconded the motion to amend.

Professor Martin opposed the amendment, pointing out that in other areas, such as space assignment, each faculty member is entitled to 144 sq. feet of office space and that this allotment seems to work out satisfactorily, even though there are variations in space needs among faculty. He suggested that certain rules of thumb were in fact quite convenient in the University since they served as reminders that if a faculty member is added, 144 sq. ft. of space, \$3,000 in book funds, or whatever will also be needed. Professor Shiner pointed out that in the wording of the motion, the terms "no addition should be made to the faculty," were used, and that this wording did not leave open the possibilities that in adding some faculty members, no addition would be necessary, while in adding others \$3,000 or more might be needed. He suggested that this wording would need to be changed if the specific figure were left in the motion. Professor Long said that floor space for faculty implied a linear addition for space, while increases in book funds did not seem to hold this implication. Dean Derge said that the amendment made sense in terms of procedures already in use. He noted, for example, that one department decided not to hire a faculty member it had originally sought because the addition of the person would have increased its book expenditures in an exotic area at the expense of the needs of the total department. He added that he felt the variation

was so wide that any specific figure would not represent it adequately.

Returning to Professor Martin's point, Dean Merritt said that while it was true that faculty members are entitled, on the average, to 144 sq. ft. of office space, the same specifications from which this rule of thumb is drawn admit wide variations in laboratory space. He continued that because of the wide variation between departments in the library needs of faculty members, it would be more appropriate to handle the matter on an individual basis, rather than attempting to get some sort of average figure which would fluctuate widely from year to year and department to department.

In brief additional discussion, Professor Farmer and Professor Byrnes established that the \$3,000 increase would go into the permanent book fund rather than into a departmental book fund, and, once added, the funds would remain from year to year, while Professor Ryder pointed out that there was the veiled possibility that if the University's growth rate slowed down, few new funds would be added to the library fund since few additional faculty would be hired. There was no additional discussion, and Dean Carter called for the question on the amendment. A division occurred, with Professors Byrnes, Saltzman, Martin, Neu, Solt, Wolff, and Neil voting Nay, and the remainder of those present voting Aye. The motion carried.

The Council next focused attention on item 9. Dean Clark immediately moved to amend the motion to the wording which appears in the final form given above. Professor Pratt seconded the motion. There was no discussion of the amendment, and Dean Carter called for the question. A division again occurred, with Dean Derge abstaining, Professors Byrnes, Saltzman, Neu, Solt, Wolff, and Neil voting Nay, and the remaining members present voting Aye. The motion carried.

Items 7-10 in section III had not yet been approved in entirety by the Council, and Dean Carter asked for further discussion. Dean Clark suggested that "formula" in item 10 be changed to "policy." This change was accepted. There was no further discussion of the items, Dean Carter called for the question, and items 7-10 were unanimously approved, as amended.

Following a brief discussion concerning which items to consider in the time remaining, the Council decided to consider section II, items 3-5, section III, item 6, and section IV item 11, but to delay action on section V, items

12 and 13 until the meeting of June 4.

The discussion of items 3-6 (given below) centered on item 3, and concerned whether the 5 million dollars mentioned in the item was in any way considered binding on the Sesquicentennial Committee. Professor Byrnes said that it was intended to express a desirable goal and was not binding, he mentioned, however, that the library seems to be overlooked in the literature sent to alumni, and that he feared it would not receive a sufficiently large proportion of the funds from the Sesquicentennial Drive. Professor Byrnes then moved that items 3-6 be approved, and Professor Solt seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, Dean Carter called for the question, and a division again occurred, with Dean Derge abstaining, Professors Pinnell and R.C. Turner voting Nay, and the remaining members present voting Aye. The motion carried, and the items approved are shown below. Dean Pinnell stated that his "Nay" vote related solely to the specific fund stated in (3) for the Sesquicentennial drive.

3. THAT A DRIVE FOR \$5,000,000 TO ENABLE THE LIBRARY TO CATCH UP WITH THE UNIVERSITY'S REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE A CENTRAL PART OF THE SESQUICENTENNIAL CAPITAL DRIVE.
  4. THAT THE PRESIDENT AND THE TRUSTEES SHOULD REQUEST THE PRESIDENT OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION TO CONSIDER ESTABLISHING AN ORGANIZATION CALLED THE FRIENDS OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY TO INCREASE UNDERSTANDING OF AND TO ATTRACT SUPPORT FOR OUR LIBRARIES AND THEIR SERVICES FROM THOSE FRIENDS OF THE UNIVERSITY WHO MIGHT BECOME ESPECIALLY INTERESTED. COMPLETION OF THE NEW BUILDING AND THE MOVE INTO IT WILL PROVIDE A PARTICULARLY APPROPRIATE TIME TO ESTABLISH SUCH AN ASSOCIATION.
  5. THAT THE UNIVERSITY THROUGH ITS UNIVERSITY RELATIONS OFFICE SHOULD LAUNCH A DETERMINED AND PROLONGED CAMPAIGN TO INFORM THE STUDENTS, PARENTS, ALUMNI, FRIENDS, AND TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE CONCERNING THE NATURE AND NEEDS OF THE LIBRARY.
- II. RESOLUTIONS FROM THE FACULTY COUNCIL TO THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT.
6. THAT THE DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEVELOPMENT, APPROPRIATE LIBRARY OFFICERS, AND THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES ON THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY COMMITTEE PARTICIPATE IN DECISIONS CONCERNING SPACE AND FACILITIES FOR LIBRARIES IN NEW RESIDENCE CENTERS.

The Council next moved to section V, item 11. Professor Byrnes moved that the item be approved; Professor Solt seconded the motion. The item is as follows:

IV. RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY COUNCIL TO THE DEAN OF FACULTIES AND THE DEAN OF ADVANCED STUDIES.

11. THAT EVERY APPLICATION FROM ANY PART OF THE UNIVERSITY TO A FOUNDATION OR GOVERNMENT AGENCY FOR SPECIAL FUNDS FOR RESEARCH OR INSTRUCTION SHOULD, WHENEVER POSSIBLE, INCLUDE A PORTION DESTINED FOR THE LIBRARY AND ACCEPTABLE TO THE LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION AND THAT A FIXED PORTION (SAY 15 PERCENT) OF THE OVERHEAD FUNDS OF ANY GRANT NOT INCLUDING FUNDS FOR THE LIBRARY BE ALLOTTED TO THE LIBRARY.

Professor Byrnes asked Dean Merritt whether he had a comment on the item. Dean Merritt said that he currently requests that every grant or contract application in which money could be requested for the library, include this request. He added that a request for funds cannot be made in certain types of grants, but in all instances a portion of the overhead from grants and contracts received by the University is earmarked for the library. There was no additional discussion, Dean Carter called for the question, and the motion passed unanimously.

SECRETARY'S BUSINESS

1. The results of the election of Faculty Council members and faculty officers were distributed to the Council.
2. A letter from Professor Plotinsky which had been forwarded to the Calendar Committee, and the response of the Calendar Committee, were distributed to the Council. with the advice that the matter would not be placed on the Agenda unless so requested by a Council member.

In additional business, Professor Wolff urged that faculty members who wished to see particular sections of the Section Committee Report on Teaching highlighted in the discussion of the report on June 4, or who wished to suggest amendments to the report, communicate with him about the matter as soon as possible.

The Council adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Turner, Secretary