

NOTICE OF
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1968, 2:30 P.M.
Faculty Council Room, Ballantine Hall

AGENDA

1. Presiding Officer's Business
2. Agenda Committee Business
3. Continued Discussion of Revision of the Faculty Constitution:
Representation of the Bloomington Faculty (see Faculty Council
Document #25, 1967-8, and Faculty Council Circular #41)(Buehrig)

8320 *mm*

*Equip. Com.
was set at
this time.
Now Dec. 12
at 2 p.m.*

Minutes of the Faculty Council
December 10, 1968
Ballantine 008
2:30 p.m.

(This document is internal to the Faculty of Indiana University)

Members Present: President Sutton; Vice-President Merritt; Deans B.E. Carter, Harvey, Pinnell, Hartley; Professors Buehrig, Davidson, Ludlow, Manlove, Neil, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Wolff, Auer, Ballinger, Breneman, Gray, Mahler, Murray, Remak, Richey, Taylor, Zeitlin, Ferdows (Southeast)

Alternates Present: Dean Chapman for Vice-President Snyder; Professor Vitaliano for Dean Yamaguchi; Dean Peak for Dean Clark; Dean Webb for Dean Bain; Professor Belisle for Dean Endwright

Absent, No Alternate: Chancellor Hine; Vice-President Ryan; Provost Penrod; Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, Farmer, Hackney, Hewitt, Turner, Frye, White, Sachs (South Bend), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Professors Philip Appleman, Jean P. Darriau, Georges Edelen, Edward E. Edwards, A.A. Fatouros, Ralph F. Fuchs, Richard C. Pugh, W.T.K. Nugent, Irving Saltzman, D.G. Sandstrom, Hans Tischler, Samuel Yellen; Messrs Charles D. Fernald, David E. Heintz

AGENDA

1. Presiding Officer's Business
2. Agenda Committee Business
3. Continued Discussion of Revision of the Faculty Constitution: Representation of the Bloomington Faculty (see Faculty Council Document #25, 1967-8, and Faculty Council Circular #41) (Buehrig)

President Sutton called the meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 2:35 p.m.

Under Presiding Officer's Business, President Sutton first called attention to the report of the Stoner Commission on Higher Education in Indiana. He said that he had nothing to add to his remarks during a press conference in the preceding week except to urge that members of the faculty read it carefully.

Under Agenda Committee business, the Secretary reminded the Council that the Minutes of the meetings of December 10 and December 17, both of which would be given to discussion of the Report of the Buehrig Committee, would be distributed together in time for the meeting of January 7. A summary of the discussion of December 10 would be prepared for distribution at the meeting of December 17.

The Council then turned to an item which, at the urgent request of the Graduate School Teaching Associate Committee, had been placed on the Agenda too late to allow distribution of the proposal the Committee wished to offer to the Council. Several members of the Committee--Professors Irving Saltzman, Richard Pugh, and Georges Edelen; and Messrs. Charles Fernald and David Heintz--were present, and Professor Pugh spoke in explanation of the Committee's proposal (Faculty Council Circular #45).

Professor Pugh described the Graduate School Teaching Associate Committee as a joint committee of the Graduate School, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Education. The Committee had been studying since mid-November the status and problems of those employees commonly called TA's, and one of its three sub-committees had been specifically concerned with the rights and privileges of TA's, including the right to purchase parking permits. The Committee had concluded that Teaching Associates should be given the privilege of purchasing blue, orange, or green permits. This conclusion, he emphasized, was only part of a much broader set of recommendations the Committee would offer later regarding the working environment of these employees. It offered this recommendation now because a request from a group of Teaching Associates and graduate assistants in the Departments of Psychology and Geology had persuaded the Committee that it was important to take immediate action on this matter.

Professor Remak, also a member of the Teaching Associate Committee, then moved: "The Faculty Council recommends that Teaching Associates be entitled to purchase blue, orange, and green parking permits; and that this recommendation be sent to the Parking Study Committee with a request that it report back to the Faculty Council quickly as to how this change of policy will affect the allocation of parking space." Professor Ludlow seconded the motion.

Professor Ballinger observed that the proposal might more appropriately be worded to make it clear that Teaching Associates be granted the same privileges with respect to parking as faculty in order to fulfill their faculty duties; so that if faculty parking privileges change, those of Teaching Associates would change along with them.

Professor Murray objected to the fact that the proposal was brought to the Council without allowing time for its members to study it. He moved, as a substitute motion, that the proposal in its entirety (that is, Faculty Council Circular #45) be referred to the Parking Committee for action at the next meeting of the Council, without any recommendation from the Council. Professor Ballinger

seconded this motion. Dean Carter agreed, saying that he would like to know about the allocations of parking space if Teaching Associates were permitted to purchase stickers of any color before he voted on the proposal. In principle, he said, he approved of the recommendation, but he would like to vote knowing the practical consequences of his vote.

Professor Taylor, speaking in support of the principle that anyone who had teaching responsibilities at the University ought to have the right to purchase parking spaces, objected to the suggestion that the principle ought to be exercised for Teaching Associates only if parking space for faculty is somehow assured. His principle was first come, first served: if he didn't get to a parking lot marked green early enough, he wouldn't find a place to park, whether he was a faculty member or not. Dean Peak also agreed to the principle of treating Teaching Associates as members of the faculty and extending to them the parking privileges now offered to the faculty. But without asking the Parking Study Committee whether or not the extension was a good idea, he would like to ask that Committee what reallocations of space this extension would require. He proposed that the Council say it believed that a Teaching Associate should have the privilege of purchasing a ticket just like any other person, not necessarily on a first come, first served basis, but on the basis of a plan that could be worked out once it was known how many spaces were required to meet an enlarged demand.

Professor Murray remarked that the discussion so far had confirmed his earlier statement that this matter needed to be studied, by a committee of the Council, if the Parking Study Committee was not an appropriate body, before it came to the floor of the Council. The Secretary replied that the practice Professor Murray advocated would mean that matters could not be referred to the Faculty Council for discussion and decisions promptly. The Agenda Committee in this matter came to the deliberate decision that the question was sufficiently straightforward to discuss in the Council subsequent to the formal closing of the Agenda on the Monday of the week prior to the meeting. It seemed to him too rigid to insist that every question be referred to a committee or be set out in a document distributed in advance.

Mr. Charles Fernald said that there was a certain immediacy to this question of parking because Teaching Associates in Psychology and Geology presently did not have an adequate place to park. Consequently it was very difficult for them to meet the classes they teach on time, or to be on time to take care of various research duties. These Teaching Associates met recently and decided that rather than take some drastic action at that time, they would wait to see if the University through the Faculty Council could act swiftly and get something done. He thought that Professor Taylor captured the essence of the whole problem. He did not think that referring the question to the Parking Committee would elicit any useful information: the Teaching Associate Committee had tried to get data about the number of cars and spaces, and found only that this data was difficult to get. The point, as he defined it, was that acting favorably on this proposal would not increase the actual number of cars involved or the number of people with permits; it would simply redistribute these numbers in a more equitable way.

President Sutton informed those on the Council who did not know what had occasioned the meeting referred to by Mr. Fernald that recently some spaces that had been marked red had been changed to another color, and therefore spaces in which numerous Teaching Associates had accustomed themselves to park suddenly could no longer be used by them. He suggested that he test the powers of the Presidency and see if it would be possible to return the spaces he had mentioned

to the status quo ante, and then ask the appropriate committee to collect data on which to have a recommendation about parking privileges for Teaching Associates.

Dean Peak questioned whether another Faculty Council study and discussion of parking would be productive or tolerable. He for one knew how he felt about Teaching Associates having the privilege of parking, and he was perfectly willing to vote on that principle, and then to leave it up to the Parking Committee to work out the details and the implementation.

Professor Ballinger returned to the larger issue of whether the Council was constantly going to be faced with, on the one hand, publishing its Agenda and making it clear what it was going to talk about, and then bringing up something which had not been on the Agenda. Like Dean Peak, he knew how he would like to vote. But there may be people who feel they lack adequate information. Further, the Council had already taken up half an hour of a session devoted primarily to a discussion of the Buehrig Report, which it would have been discussing if the Council had stuck to its practice of taking up no business, except emergency business, which was not published in the Agenda. Professor Taylor said that he rather liked the idea that the Council could quickly discuss matters in which there seemed to be some urgency. He thought that the present discussion set a good precedent that the Council was not a rigid body which had to wait for two weeks to discuss clearly urgent business.

Professor Taylor then called for the question on the motion to refer the proposal to the Parking Study Committee without recommendation. This motion was defeated.

Professor Remak then repeated and rephrased his motion: "That Teaching Associates be given the same privileges as the teaching faculty in the purchase of parking privileges." He went on to say that he agreed in principle that it was not basically a good idea to bring business to the Faculty Council on an emergency basis. But he thought that this question was so clear-cut that it did seem, except for the technicalities which were to be referred to the Parking Committee, that the Council could vote yes or no on it. The question, as he defined it, was simply whether it ought to be easier for a person with that magic Ph.D. behind his name to get to his classroom than it was for a person who has only an M.A. or a B.A. behind his name to get to a classroom to teach the same kind of class or student.

Professor Shiner returned to the issue of being forced to vote on questions that had not been set out before the meeting convened. The Council was a representative body, and he was being asked to vote on a principle which would deny parking places to faculty members he represented without giving him a chance to consult them. Dean Harvey asked if Professor Remak's motion was limited to Category 1 on the Teaching Associate Committee's proposal, or included both categories. Professor Remak replied that he would limit his motion to Category 1 (Teaching Associates), pending a recommendation by the Parking Committee of whether it was feasible to include Category 2 (graduate assistants).

In response to a query by Professor Mahler, Professor Remak restated his motion to read: "That any Teaching Associate who has a sole or substantial part of responsibility for teaching a class (Category 1) should in principle have the same privileges for the purchase of parking space as the faculty. Further, that the Parking Committee inform the Council whether it is practical that graduate assistants and others who are not exclusively or substantially responsible for a class (Category 2) also be granted the same privileges." Professor Ludlow seconded this rephrased motion.

Professor Zeitlin asked how the Council could vote on this principle without addressing the question of how it was to be implemented. The consequence of affirming this principle now was that there would be many more people fighting for the same number of parking spaces. He did not understand how the Council could affirm the principle without at the same time providing for the translation of that principle into practice. Mr. Heintz observed that even now there were fifty to seventy percent more green stickers sold than there were spaces in parking lots marked green. Professor Richey, admitting with trepidation that he was a member of the Parking Committee, confirmed Mr. Heintz's remark: there were approximately 1500 spaces available in green parking lots, for which over 4000 permits had been issued. There was also a ten percent oversale for blue as well as for orange stickers. Professor Richey went on to say that he thought it would be difficult for the Parking Committee to discriminate between requests from Teaching Associates and graduate assistants in one or the other of the two categories defined in the proposal of the Teaching Associate Committee. He urged that more information be given to the Council before it was asked to vote on the principle of parking privileges for Teaching Associates.

Dean Carter offered a substitute motion: "That the Faculty Council urge the President of the University to take action to restore the status quo ante in the parking lots formerly used by Teaching Associates in the Departments of Geology and Psychology; and that the Parking Committee be asked to inform the Council as quickly as possible of the problems that would be created, and the possibilities of reallocation, should Teaching Associates be permitted to purchase green parking decals, green and orange decals, or green, orange, and blue decals." Professor Ballinger seconded the motion. The question was then called to substitute Dean Carter's motion for Professor Remak's motion. The motion carried. The question was then called on the substitute motion offered by Dean Carter. It carried, with Professors Ludlow, Remak, Taylor, and Wolff voting nay.

President Sutton then called for the next item on the Agenda, the discussion of the Buehrig Report. Professor Buehrig began by postponing the large question of the legal basis for the governance of the University which is treated in the addendum of the Supplementary Report of his Committee. The discussion of this question would not affect actions on the specific proposals for the reorganization of the Faculty Council, and it could properly come at the end of the consideration of these specific proposals rather than at the beginning. Professor Buehrig then offered the recommendation of his Committee concerning administrative membership in the future Bloomington Council: "That the Bloomington Chancellor and other general academic officers at the Bloomington level be ex officio voting members of the Council." Professor Ryder seconded this motion.

Professor Breneman asked if, after the Faculty Council had voted on the recommendations of the Buehrig Committee, its recommendations, along with alternatives the Council might also propose, would be offered to the entire faculty for its vote. Professor Buehrig affirmed that if the Council approved alternative recommendations, they would be voted on by the entire faculty.

Professor Mahler asked for a definition of "general academic officers." Professor Buehrig answered that, unfortunately, this definition was not yet clear; there would be a Chancellor of the Bloomington campus, and presumably at least two other general academic officers, a Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs and a Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Whether there would be a third, a Vice-Chancellor for Research and Development, was not clear inasmuch as that office might be at the Presidential level. Professor Mahler asked if it would not be better so to

state, and thus make it clear that other administrative officers, such as assistant and associate deans, were not eligible to become ex officio members of the Council.

President Sutton suggested that the recommendation be worded: "That the Bloomington Chancellor and such other general academic officers at the Bloomington level as are approved by the Faculty Council be ex officio voting members of the Council." Professor Buehrig agreed to this amendment of his motion. Professor Murray wondered whether the term "academic" might not be removed, so the Council could if it wished admit the Treasurer of the University as an ex officio member, and thus enable itself to discuss broad policy matters that involve the monetary policies of the University.

Dean Harvey asked where, under the proposal as amended by President Sutton, the initiative for nominating ex officio members to the Council would lie. President Sutton said that he thought the Chancellor would nominate certain administrative officers for ex officio membership in the Faculty Council. He added that if some elected member of the Council decided that he wanted to include the Business Officer of the Bloomington campus, he could move that from the floor. He agreed, in response to a question from Professor Ballinger, that if the Business Officer was not defined as a general academic officer, the Constitution would have to be changed (presuming the proposed recommendation was approved).

Professor Wolff asked if there was provision for the balancing of administrative and elected officers built into the procedures. Professor Buehrig said there was no provision for redressing balances altered by the admission of new ex officio administrative members. Professor Breneman quoted Section 20E of the present Constitution: "Faculty Council at such times shall re-assess the balance of representation between elected members and the deans." It was agreed in an exchange between President Sutton, Dean Carter, and Professors Breneman and Ballinger that "re-assess" was an imprecise word for the useful idea that the Council could re-determine the proportions of its elected and ex officio membership.

Professor Murray observed that the point about the Council re-determining the proportions of its membership is relevant to the recommendation of the Buehrig Committee that school deans be ex officio members of the Council, but it was not relevant to the first recommendation, as amended by the President. In that recommendation the matter of redressing balances would be taken care of by the provision that the Council approve the nominations of the Chancellor for ex officio membership. If the admission of an administrative officer upset the balance, the Council could at the same time drop from membership an administrative officer then on the Council.

Dean Carter returned to the principle of the recommendation: that there be administrative members on the reorganized Faculty Council. It was his guess that practically everyone agreed that if votes were to be given to administrative members, then it was necessary to maintain the balance between elected and administrative members that was recommended in the final draft of the Committee.

Professor Yellen, speaking as a member of the Buehrig Committee, strongly supported Dean Carter's statement. He urged the Council to decide about the various principles involved in its recommendation, and to leave questions of the language in which the recommendations would finally be drafted to the Committee, when it drew up the texts which would be submitted to the faculty for its vote.

Professor Fatouros distinguished between two questions in the discussion: the general question of whether there should be administrative membership, and,

secondly, what the administrative membership would be. He noted that the Buehrig Committee very properly had put the issue into two paragraphs, so that there could be a vote as to the administrative officers with all-Campus responsibilities first, and administrative members who were school deans second. He too urged the Council to discuss the substantive question of whether there should be any administrative members, and, if so, who, and to leave the details of the language for the Committee.

Professor Neil reminded the Council that it was still an all-University as well as a Bloomington Council, and asked whether the Council named in this proposal was the future all-University Council or the future Bloomington Council. President Sutton said that it was the latter.

Professor Zeitlin returned to the issue, which he said was not whether or not there should be administrative members on the Council, but which ones, and how many. He asked for the question on the first recommendation, as amended: "That the Bloomington Chancellor and other general academic officers at the Bloomington level as are approved by the Faculty Council be ex officio voting members of the Council." The motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Buehrig then moved the second recommendation of his committee: "That the school deans on the Bloomington campus be ex officio voting members of the Council." He noted that the recommendation expressed the majority view of the Committee. There was a minority opinion that school deans should sit as ex officio members of the Council without the vote.

Professor Zeitlin said that it was here that the issue of which administrators, and how many, began to emerge. Because administrative officers are appointed, it seemed to him that their numbers ought to be kept at a minimum in an elected body. Administrators should be present, so that faculty and administration can discuss matters of common concern on common ground, but he did not think that such communication required that all administrative members have a vote. It might be possible that a large number of administrative officers would on some issues vote en bloc, and so override the will of a Council that was supposed to represent the sentiments of the faculty as a whole.

Professor Edwards reminded the Council of the Buehrig Committee's proposal that the elected membership of the Council be increased to thirty, and the number of elected members always be at least double that of administrative members. No substantive matter could, therefore, ever be carried unless a majority of elected members were for it. On the other side of the question, he continued, the Committee believed that some distribution in the Council by subject-matter was perhaps desirable, and this representation was most easily accomplished by having each school represented by its dean. Further, deans did serve with the agreement or at least the tolerance of their faculty, and some deans did, in order to preserve their position, communicate with and represent the opinions of their faculty members.

President Sutton remarked that the Committee's recommendation was a substantial change from the present regulation involving decanal membership in the Faculty Council, in that all school deans were not now represented. Professor Edwards agreed that deans of schools with fewer than thirty faculty members would be admitted to ex officio membership with a vote, while the present regulations did not admit such deans. But he also noted that there would be fewer deans on the reorganized Council because the deans from Indianapolis and the regional campuses would no longer be members. Professor Buehrig also called attention to his Committee's recommendation that the ratio of elected to ex officio administrative members be roughly three to one, whereas it was now not as much as two to one.

Professor Ballinger supported Professor Zeitlin's remarks, and advanced the recommendation of the AAUP that administrative officers who do not have all-University responsibilities stand for election to the Council, and so enlarge the proportion of the Council which is elected and representative. He said that he had yet to hear a telling argument for including as ex officio members those administrators who do not have all-University responsibilities.

Professor Wolff returned to the matter of the ratio between elected and ex officio members. It was there, he said, that the dangers of administrative membership carrying an issue against a majority of the elected membership could be guarded against.

Professor Buehrig again remarked the proposal of his Committee that the reorganized Council number thirty elected members. Assuming that, counting the Chancellor, perhaps two Vice-Chancellors, and the eight deans of the existing schools, there would be eleven administrative officers, the ratio of elected to ex officio members was about three to one. Professor Wolff proposed that this ratio be specified in the revised Constitution.

Professor Manlove said that the recommendation the Council had already approved, that it would decide whether to add to its members those administrative officers nominated by the Chancellor for ex officio membership, was one safeguard against a dilution of its representative character. He said that a further safeguard might be to limit ex officio membership to deans of schools whose faculties number more than thirty, but he thought that if, without such a provision administrative membership became disproportionate, it could be changed, as the composition of the Council was now being changed.

Professor Taylor said that the assumption that there was only one faculty attitude on the Council, and only one administrative attitude, was a delusion. Even if the ratio were three to one, it was likely that a group of administrators which stayed together on a vote would carry it against an elected membership which in the nature of things was more diverse and likely to divide. Certainly in the presently constituted Council, six or seven faculty votes joined to a relatively solid administrative vote had carried three or four crucial issues.

Professor Edwards replied that if there were thirty elected members, and, say, twelve administrative members, it would then require twenty-eight votes (of forty-two) to carry a substantive matter which requires a two-thirds vote (Section 22C of the Faculty Handbook). Even if all twelve ex officio members voted one way, they would have to have sixteen of the thirty elected members to carry the issue, which means that a solid administrative section could not carry anything unless they had a majority of elected members with them. Professor Edwards proposed that the language which set out how the Council was to readjust its balances could assure that administrative members could not prevail against a majority of elected members if the language specified that the number of elected members should always be more than double that of administrative members.

Dean Webb, also replying to Professor Taylor, said that there were issues on which administrative members of the Council diverged. Further, he argued that deans of schools did have academic as well as administrative roles, and the Dean of the School of Music--he could not speak for any other school--did represent on the Council the purposes of the school and the needs and perhaps the wishes of the faculty of the school.

Professor Breneman, after strongly endorsing the idea of an explicitly stated ratio of three to one, said that to admit to ex officio membership the deans of all schools on the Bloomington campus would assure some representation for schools that customarily were not represented by elected members on the Council. Professor Buehrig asked if Professor Breneman would then abandon the present rule, requiring that a school number at least thirty faculty members before its dean became an ex officio member of the Council. Professor Breneman said that he thought the rule ought to remain; he was calling attention to the fact that even under this rule, some schools which rarely elected a member of their faculties to the Council were represented by a dean.

Dean Harvey, arguing from a stated bias in favor of faculty democracy in the governance of the University, set out his opinion that administrative membership ought to be substantially reduced or almost totally eliminated on the Council. Administrators are faculty members, and can stand for election. The question then was the justification for ex officio membership in their character as deans. There was some special justification for the membership of several University officers. The argument that school deans were to be ex officio members simply because they represent sub-communities within this University was not persuasive because the schools did not, in his opinion, represent the real communities within the University. Further, he had not tended to think of himself as representing the School of Law on the Council, even if it were a real sub-community of the University. Secondly, he could think of very few contributions deans had made to the deliberations of the Council which he could attribute peculiarly to their experiences as deans of schools. He would not argue if someone moved to reduce substantially the number of ex officio members from the decanal ranks, but his own preference would be to eliminate them entirely and let them stand, if faculty members wanted, for election to membership in the Council.

After Professors Yellen and Buehrig had suggested that the second recommendation of the Committee could be changed to specify that only the deans of certain schools be admitted to ex officio membership on the Council, Professor Mahler said that he thought the Council was ready to vote on the matter of whether school deans should be represented on the Council at all. If the Council should determine in the negative, no further discussion was necessary. If the Council should vote in favor of the representation of school deans, it could then turn to such questions as safeguards, numbers, expansions, contractions, and the like.

Professor Auer, in response to a request from Professor Buehrig that he suggest a procedure for the vote Professor Mahler suggested, and to questions about whether, under the revised constitution, assistant and associate deans would be eligible for election to the Council, first reminded the Council that the Buehrig Committee was not proposing a totally new constitution, but amendments to the present Constitution. Therefore unless the section which now prevented assistant deans, associate deans, and other members of deans' immediate staffs from being elected was specifically amended, it stood.

Professor Auer then proposed a procedure for voting on the Buehrig Committee's recommendations on administrative membership. He suggested that the Council first vote on the second recommendation, that the deans of the existing schools on the Bloomington campus be named ex officio voting members of the Council. Should that recommendation be approved, the Council could consider other questions: how to add deans of newly created schools, what ratio should be maintained between elected and ex officio membership, and how to maintain the ratio.

Professor Breneman suggested that the discussion might be expedited if the Council became a Committee of the Whole. He moved that the Council so constitute itself; Professor Buehrig seconded the motion, observing that as a Committee of the Whole the Council could discuss and vote on each of the closely related questions set out by Professor Auer without the vote fixing the final decision on the entire matter of administrative membership. Professor Auer, replying to a request for clarification of this parliamentary maneuver, agreed with Professor Buehrig. As a Committee of the Whole it was appropriate for the Council to formulate a resolution to bring back to the parent body, which was the Faculty Council. The only final action taken was to recommend a motion to the Council. The question was called for, and the motion was passed unanimously.

Reconvened as a Committee of the Whole, the Council agreed to take a roll-call vote on the motion: "That the deans of the existing schools on the Bloomington campus be ex officio voting members of the Council." A roll-call vote was taken, and the motion carried fourteen votes to nine. There were eight abstentions. (As Parliamentarian, Professor Auer ruled that a roll-call vote taken in the Committee of the Whole did not become part of the permanent record of the Faculty Council.)

The next question raised was how the deans of newly created schools on the Bloomington campus would be added to the Bloomington Council. Professor Auer suggested two procedures: one which would automatically place the dean of a new school among the ex officio membership of the Council, and another which would require that the Council approve the membership of the dean of each new school. President Sutton remarked that it would be well also to raise the question here of the explicitly stated ratio of elected to ex officio members, and he suggested the addition of language which would specify that each time a new dean was added to the ex officio membership, the Council would be enlarged by three additional elected members. Professor Auer then moved the addition to the second proposition offered by the Buehrig Committee the sentence, "The deans of schools which may be established on the Bloomington campus in the future will be added to ex officio membership only after approval by the Council." Dean Hartley moved the addition of another sentence: "The ratio of elected members to ex officio members will not be less than three elected members for every ex officio administrative member." This latter addition was regarded as a separate motion, seconded by Professor Ryder, and passed unanimously.

The Council, still convened as a Committee of the Whole, then discussed the procedure by which the deans of newly established schools would be admitted to ex officio membership. Professor Gray spoke in support of the automatic admission of the deans of new schools; so long as the ratio of elected to administrative members is fixed, the Council would then enlarge as the University grew. Dean Peak objected to a procedure by which the Council would so relinquish control over which and how many administrative officers came into the ex officio membership of the Council. Professor Mahler also objected, remarking that the creation of new schools and the genuine growth of the University were not necessarily synonymous. A motion was then framed which added to the second proposition of the Buehrig Committee report the sentence, "The deans of schools which may be established on the Bloomington campus in the future will be added to the ex officio administrative membership only after approval by the Council." Professor Remak brought this motion, and Professor Ballinger seconded it. It was passed with two nay votes.

Professor Neu raised the question of whether assistant and associate deans ought to be eligible for election. Dean Harvey said that the disposition of the

Council to admit deans to ex officio membership implicitly denied them the possibility of standing for election. But the argument that associate and assistant deans were so identified with their deans that they too should be denied the right to stand for election did seem to him to be more dubious. President Sutton agreed, but he referred to the argument made by Professor Remak that assistant and associate deans were more likely than faculty members without administrative responsibilities to be elected simply because more people knew them. That was the reason for the present rule that they could not stand for election.

The Council then voted unanimously to rise as a Committee of the Whole to report the resolution it had framed. The resolution was divided into two parts, the first given the number of the second recommendation under the heading "Administrative Membership" in the Buehrig report: "2. That the existing school deans on the Bloomington campus be ex officio voting members of the Council, and that the subsequent addition of any further ex officio member is dependent on Faculty Council approval."

Professor Buehrig offered this motion, Professor Auer seconded it, and it was approved, fifteen votes to eight, with three abstentions.

Aye

Auer
Webb for Bain
Breneman
Buehrig
B.E. Carter
Clark
Belisle for Endwright
Hartley
Ludlow
Manlove
Merritt
Remak
Richey
Ryder
Shiner

Nay

Ballinger
Gray
Harvey
Mahler
Murray
Neu
Wolff
Zeitlin

Abstain

Clark
Pinnell
Chapman for Snyder

Professor Buehrig offered the second part of the resolution, which was numbered the third proposition of the Buehrig report: "3. The ratio of elected members to ex officio members will not be less than three elected members for every ex officio administrative member." The motion was seconded by Professor Auer, and passed unanimously, with one abstention (Professor Davidson).

The Council then took up what it numbered Proposition 4 of the Report of the Buehrig Committee, concerning "Elected Membership". Professor Buehrig moved, "That the Council consist of thirty representatives of the faculty, fifteen to be elected each year: except that in the academic year 1969-70 the members of the existing Council elected from Bloomington in the Spring of 1968 be designated members of the Bloomington Council. Accordingly, the latter in its first year would have a total elected membership of twenty-five." Professor Breneman and Dean Carter inquired whether there is a way to avoid reducing the ratio of elected to administrative members to something like two and one-half to one in 1969-70. Professor Fatouros suggested that twenty new members be elected in the Spring of 1969, five of them for one-year terms.

Professor Ballinger asked if Teaching Associates were to be counted among the thirty elected members of the faculty, should the Council decide to include them in its membership. Professor Edwards said that they were not so to be counted, that "thirty representatives of the faculty" meant people holding faculty rank of instructor or above.

Professor Remak, who said that he intended to move the inclusion of Teaching Associates when that motion was appropriate, also said that he intended that Teaching Associates not be counted among the faculty membership of the Council, but be added to the Council's membership as a distinct category.

Dean Carter suggested that because the Council had fixed a ratio of elected to administrative members and allowed for the addition of ex officio members, the proposition ought to state that "at least thirty representatives of the faculty" are to be members of the Council, to allow for an increase in that number. Professor Wolff returned to the question of the number of elected members on the Council in 1969-70, and suggested that in the Spring of 1969 twenty new members be elected; the five members who stand lowest in the poll be elected for one-year terms, and the fifteen other new members for two-year terms.

Dean Carter's suggestion that the proposition specify that at least thirty representatives of the faculty be elected to the Council, and Professor Wolff's suggestion that twenty members be elected in the Spring of 1968, five for one-year terms and fifteen for two-year terms, were adopted by the Council with the understanding that the Buehrig Committee would work out language to incorporate these suggestions. The motion was then put to a question, and passed unanimously.

President Sutton then called for item 4 (b). Professor Buehrig read the item, "That a minimum of three junior faculty be included annually among those elected." Two points were clarified: first, that the term "junior faculty" was to be understood to refer to instructors and assistant professors (about one-third of the total faculty); second, that the provision meant that at any given time, there would be a minimum of six junior faculty on the Council (three each year for a two-year term).

President Sutton then called for the question on item 4 (b) as discussed, and it was passed unanimously.

Item 4 (c) was then called for. Professor Buehrig read the item, "That each elector (each faculty member) may make a total of five nominations and that the thirty faculty members receiving the highest number of nominating votes be placed on the final ballot."

Professor Edwards remarked that the six junior faculty nominations with the highest vote would be placed on the ballot, regardless of their overall ranking.

Professor Tischler now read the preamble to a proposal which he had distributed (this comprises Faculty Council Circular #47).

Professor Tischler explained that he hoped someone from the Council would introduce his proposal as a substitute motion for the first clause of item 4 (c). He argued that the current proposal did not help those faculty members who felt disenfranchised because they were acquainted with only a few of their colleagues. On the other hand, people did know each other in closely related departments; therefore, under his proposal, they could vote more knowledgably.

Professor Mahler sympathized with some of Professor Tischler's arguments. He noted that the question of constituencies had been frequently raised and Council members were familiar with it. The desirable aspect of the proposal was that it would assure greater acquaintance between voters and candidates. But the principle of constituencies was artificial and, if allowed, would lead to a false fragmentation of University concerns. He did not see himself as a representative of his department but as a representative of the faculty.

Professor Ballinger then elicited from Professor Edwards that the Committee's reason for limited nominations, and indeed limited votes, had to do with the matter raised by Professor Tischler, namely, minimizing nominations and votes for people not known or known only by previous service on the Council or elsewhere. Professor Ballinger and Professor Buehrig then discussed the relation of this limitation both to slates and to what Professor Buehrig called better distribution of Council membership through the University community.

Professor Shiner thought the current item and item 4 (d) would properly diminish the influence of organized minorities.

Professor Buehrig mentioned other methods of handling the voting; for example, by allowing each elector to use his 5 votes as he saw fit, giving them all to one candidate if he chose, or by following the complicated system of proportional representation.

President Sutton, with a word about taking up business where it had been left off and about reflecting on Professor Tischler's proposal, adjourned the Council meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Wolff, Secretary
Donald Gray, Associate Secretary