

NOTICE OF  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1968, 2:30 P.M.  
Faculty Council Room, Ballantine 008

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of December 3, 1968
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business (Including a Report on Future Agenda)
4. 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)
5. The Appointment of So-called "Super Ranks (see Faculty Council Circular #44)

Enclosed:

Minutes of the Meeting of December 3, 1968  
Faculty Council Circulars #42 Memorial Resolution on the Death of Professor  
William Riley Parker  
#43 Memorial Resolution on the Death of Professor  
Marshal H. Wrubel  
#44 Memorandum from AAUP on "Super-ranks"  
#45 Recommendations from the Graduate School TA  
Committee for change in faculty and staff  
parking privileges  
#46 Draft Statement on University Policy: Request  
for Comment



Minutes of the Faculty Council

December 17, 1968

Ballantine 008

2:30 p.m.

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

Members Present: Vice-President Ryan; Provost Penrod; Deans Yamaguchi, Clark, Pinnell, Bain, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, Davidson, Farmer, Hackney, Hewitt, Ludlow, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Turner, Wolff, Auer, Ballinger, Breneman, Frye, Murray, Remak, Richey, Zeitlin, Sachs (South Bend)

Alternates Present: Vice-President Hartley for President Sutton; Dean Hagen for Vice-President Hartley; Dean Chapman for Vice-President Snyder; Dean Bogan for Chancellor Hine; Professor Nugent for Dean B.E. Carter; Professor Fuchs for Dean Harvey; Professor Fatouros for Professor Gray; Professor Cordes for Professor Mahler; Professor Joyner for Professor Taylor

Absent, No Alternates: Vice-President Merritt; Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, Manlove, Neil, White, Ferdows (Southeast), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Professors Philip Appleman, Edward E. Edwards, Richard Pugh, Hans Tischler, Samuel Yellen; Messrs Charles D. Fernald, David E. Heintz, Earl Hoff

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of December 3, 1968
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business (Including a Report on Future Agenda)
4. 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)
5. The Appointment of So-called "Super Ranks" (see Faculty Council Circular #44)



Vice-President Hartley, presiding on behalf of President Sutton who was in Indianapolis at a meeting with the Governor, called the meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 2:35 p.m.

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting of December 3, 1968, were approved with one addition, called to the attention of the Council by the Secretary, to be made between paragraphs 3 and 4 of page 12 of the Minutes: "Professor Ludlow wondered to what extent the English Department had information about how well the objectives of English L101 were achieved during the normal year. Any judgment as to the desirability of English L101 during the short sessions depended in part upon knowing what happened during the regular academic year."

Under Presiding Officer's Business, Vice-President Hartley wished to assure the Council and the faculty in general that despite some recent confusion about the state of our legislative request to the General Assembly, the University's concern was not that a reduction of the budget below current levels was being proposed, but that we were not likely to receive the level of increase in support from the State that we had requested. The Budget Agency was recommending the smallest increase in State appropriation that he could recall since 1960, but he was confident that from now on we would be moving upward and that the next two years held great promise for us. If we should receive only a very modest increase in appropriations, we obviously would face some basic decisions having to do with tuition and enrollment. We all undoubtedly had a very difficult task in working with the Legislature during the next two or three months. The aid of many faculty members had been enlisted through the Sesquicentennial Speakers Bureau; students had organized themselves to work with the Legislature through the Student Legislative Coordinating Committee which seemed to be highly effective. He thought that the State Legislature, with all its trials and tribulations, had treated Indiana University remarkably well, else we would not now be a great University. Somehow they would see their way through the current difficulties. At any rate, our first priority would be the preservation of faculty salaries as it had been for the last four years.

Professor Buehrig noted that newspaper reports stated clearly that the appropriations for Regional Campuses would be larger in the next biennium than in the past. Was there specific information about the operating appropriation for the Bloomington campus?

Vice-President Hartley understood that the recommendation for Bloomington for next year would constitute an increase of just over 1 million dollars, with rather more than that for 1970-71. Last year our increase in State funds for Bloomington had been 3 million. The current total operating budget for Bloomington was about 53 million dollars, including the income from fees and other sources as well as State appropriations. The State appropriation for last year had been slightly over 40 million dollars, so that the increase might be only about 2%. It should be remembered that this was part of a balanced budget within the existing tax structure, and it was clear that one of the key issues that faced the Legislature was tax policy.

Professor Murray asked whether consideration was being given as to who would eventually make a decision, if one had to be made, between raising tuition and reducing enrollment. He thought the Faculty Council should be involved.

Vice-President Hartley thought such a decision should and would be discussed in the Faculty Council since it concerned the entire University community.



He then turned to the Stoner Commission Report which the Faculty Council would also presumably discuss at some time. The recommendations of the Stoner Commission raised serious questions for the University to do with budgetary procedures and with academic and curricular flexibility. The recommendation for giving autonomy to the regional campuses as well as Mayor Lugar's proposal for a University of Indianapolis should also be of grave concern to the Faculty Council. Vice-President Hartley said that a university was greater than the sum of its parts and the decision to divide Indiana University into several parts should be weighed very carefully.

Professor Shiner thought the decision to turn the only medical school in the State over to the citizens of Indianapolis would not be very popular in the rest of the State.

Vice-President Hartley then informed the Council that President Sutton had taken action regarding the parking lot discussed in the meeting of December 10. The lot behind Geology had, following the recommendation of the Council, been restored to its original "red" status.

Professor Murray then noted that President Sutton had intended, as Presiding Officer's Business to this meeting, to make some comments about recent decisions of his with regard to appointments, the creation of positions, and the degree to which the Council or the faculty in general had been associated with these decisions. He proposed that the Council hear from Professor Philip Appleman, president of the local chapter of the AAUP.

Vice-President Hartley then invited Professor Appleman to speak.

Professor Appleman remarked that he had not intended to mention this issue, but since President Sutton could not be present, he was willing at least to raise the matter so that faculty interest in it would be part of the Council's records at the earliest possible moment. There were three issues which President Sutton and he had discussed briefly. The first was the creation of a new Vice-Presidency and the degree to which there was or ought to have been faculty participation in that major decision. (He was not talking of the appointment of Dean Derge to this position since that was the sort of appointment which might well be taken by the faculty to be President Sutton's personal prerogative.) The second was the extent to which there was adequate faculty participation in the appointment of the Dean of Faculties. Though there had been some faculty participation, there had not been a Search Committee, and he thought President Sutton would talk about that. The third question involved reorganization: what happened to the Dean of Faculties position after the University was reorganized and there was a Bloomington Chancellor? Professor Appleman reiterated that he was mentioning these matters only for the record and that President Sutton had indicated that he would discuss them as soon as he could.

Professor Shiner wished to second Professor Appleman's remarks, and to make one additional point to the effect that, when faculty opinion was solicited, the faculty members for a search and screening committee for any high University office be selected by the Faculty Council.

Under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary noted items for future Council meetings in addition to those raised under Presiding Officer's Business. For convenience, they are listed here.



Appointment of so-called "Super Ranks"  
 AAASA proposal to combat "institutional racism"  
 Recruiters and the question of debate  
 A further resolution to open Council meetings.  
 Report of the Committee on the Daily Student and Other Campus Media  
 Reports of the Standing Educational Policies Committee of the  
 Council on matters to do with Summer Sessions and with Public  
 Service  
 Reports of the Section Committee on Teaching and of the Committee  
 on Improvement of Teaching  
 Report from the Dean on the work of the College of Arts and  
 Sciences Committee on Educational Policies

The Secretary noted that by late January or February, the Faculty Council might find itself discussing education. He then informed the Presiding Officer that Professor Remak had asked for the floor as a matter of personal privilege.

Professor Remak reported that the Agenda Committee had a very interesting meeting with some Black student leaders. He wished now to take a completely personal initiative. He was sure it must be a matter of concern for everyone and a kind of badge of shame that we were all wearing as faculty members or as citizens of the State that in seven or eight years the number of Black students at this University had increased by only three or four. In the spirit of the season and the hope of arousing a widespread sense of commitment he wished respectfully to suggest that each member of the Faculty Council pledge \$100 preferably payable before the end of the year and give it either to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Fund of the IU Foundation or the Educational Opportunities Foundation of which Professor Sara Berry in Economics was Treasurer. What was needed was a dramatic gesture on the part of those elected by the faculty to raise dollars and cents to enable Black students who otherwise would not attend Indiana University or, worse, would not attend any college, and to support those who were already here and needed help to come through. He hoped the press would report this proposal and that we would, by this action, urge other faculty members to do likewise both for the sake of the money and for the impact in terms of moral commitment which such an effort would make on the campus.

Professor Ballinger was strongly in favor of Professor Remak's proposal. He wondered whether such a contribution would offer the same kind of tax benefits as would accrue from \$100 given to the Library as recently indicated by a circular to the faculty.

Professor Ballinger's question began a general discussion which was not formally resolved at the time about the State tax credit provision for gifts to an Indiana institution of higher education. (See Faculty Council Circular #47.)

After that discussion, Professor Farmer wished to record that in his view it would take more than money to solve this very difficult problem. We should continue to explore the more subtle reasons why Black students did not come to Indiana University.

The Presiding Officer then turned to continued discussion of the Buehrig Report and the Secretary distributed a record of the discussion to date and some proposals from Professor Hans Tischler. The Secretary noted that there was a motion on the floor, namely: "That each elector may make a total of five nominations and that the 30 faculty members receiving the highest number of nominating votes be placed on the final ballot."



Professor Neu, without committing herself, then moved as a substitute motion the first of Professor Tischler's proposals, "That a number of constituencies of approximately the same size be established for each election, this number to correspond to the number of faculty members to be elected." Professor Ludlow seconded this motion.

Professor Tischler began a defense of his proposal by opposing the argument that it would divide the campus community into small interest groups. He thought most of those who so argued were from the College of Arts and Sciences and had been on the campus for many years and therefore knew many of their colleagues. He believed the unity they felt was quite unrealistic. Most of the faculty knew very few colleagues outside of their departmental professional group. The mere fact that we were too large to act as a faculty but needed a representative council proved that this campus had outgrown the stage of at-large elections. It was better to recognize the principle of constituencies and thus give all or part of the community a feeling of belonging, than to pretend that there was still some unity and thereby give the majority of the faculty the feeling of being left out.

There were many problems to do with salaries, scholarships and fellowships, teaching and research associates, grading, student-faculty relationships, that could not be resolved to the satisfaction of members of many divisions of the University unless there were representatives on the Council for those divisions other than the deans or other ex officio members.

At Professor Buehrig's request Professor Samuel Yellen from the Committee was recognized. He thanked the committees of the AAUP and the Continuing Committee and other groups and individuals for the time and thought they had given to these problems. He particularly wished to thank Professor Tischler to whose suggestions the Committee had given a great deal of thought. The Committee, however, had disagreed with Professor Tischler both on the matter of feasibility and on the matter of principle. It had, through Professor Tischler, been made especially aware that faculty members were hampered by their limited knowledge of their colleagues and also that some Council members were elected over and over again simply because they were known. The Committee had hoped that it had dealt with the first problem by the suggestion that nominations be limited to five (which would also help to ensure specific schools and divisions some representation). The second problem should be taken care of by the proposal that limited both consecutive terms of service on the Council and the total numbers of terms a faculty member might serve.

Professor Wolff raised the question of how far faculty members felt identified with their departments when it came to a vote in faculty government. Although there might be an argument for making some provision for departmental constituency representation, he did not see how we could decide to give as great a stress as Professor Tischler proposed.

Professor Shiner agreed with Professor Wolff but, because he felt uncertain about the current Council's representativeness in this matter, he wished to raise the general procedural question of whether alternatives could be presented to the faculty when the time came to vote on the constitutional amendments.

Professor Buehrig thought alternatives could be presented but only in those cases where a matter of principle was involved. In this particular case, his Committee's view was that lack of feasibility made the alternative unrepresentable.



Professor Tischler argued for the feasibility of his proposal. He thought the principle of adjustment of members in the Council arrived at in the discussion of ex officio membership was easily applied to the determination of constituencies.

Professor Edwards argued against the validity of departmental or divisional representation on the grounds that each faculty member, at different times on different issues, belongs to many varying groups.

Professor Murray raised the difficulty of combining the Council's decision ensuring representation of junior faculty with any decision to use constituencies.

Professor Fatouros questioned the artificiality not of the principle of constituencies, but of the grouping into constituencies of smaller units superficially related but in fact strangers to each other. He also believed that giving constituencies constitutional standing would encourage divisive identifications along unreal lines.

Vice-President Hartley then called for the question on Professor Neu's substitute motion on behalf of Professor Tischler's proposal.

The motion was unanimously defeated and discussion returned to the motion: "That each elector may make a total of five nominations and that the 30 faculty members receiving the highest number of nominating votes be placed on the final ballot."

Professor Edwards reminded the Council that the item would be rewritten to include the provision that a minimum of six junior faculty would appear on the final ballot, in order to allow for the election of three junior faculty and for two nominees for each place in the Council.

The question was then called for and the motion passed unanimously.

The next item moved was "That each elector may vote for a total of five nominees."

Several points were clarified, namely, that the provision for actual election of the nominees receiving more votes had been included in an earlier item, that final wording would ensure that forty rather than thirty nominees were on the ballot for the transitional year of 1969-70, and that no voter would be obliged to vote for any junior faculty.

The question on this item was called for and the motion passed unanimously.

Professor Buehrig then read the next item, "That no elected faculty member serve more than two consecutive terms and that thereafter he be ineligible for re-election for a period of two years." (He also introduced the item, "That no faculty member serve more than a total of four terms on the Bloomington Council," but, at the suggestion of Professor Auer, discussion on this latter point was delayed.)

In answer to a question from Professor Hewitt, Professor Buehrig said that the point of the limitation was to assist in breaking the pattern of familiar faces in the Council and to relieve such individuals of the burden of repetitive terms on the Council.



Professor Wolff preferred to the proposal the procedure of reminding faculty members that they had the right to signify that they did not wish to be nominated. He thought the limitation in nominations would in any event help to break the pattern of familiar faces. Moreover he did not like to deprive faculty members of their right to nominate and vote for whoever was willing to serve.

The question was then called for and the motion carried with only Professor Wolff dissenting.

Discussion then turned to the recommendation "That no faculty member serve more than a total of four terms on the Bloomington Council." It was first established that there had been Council members who had in fact served more than four terms.

Professor Murray thought that facts about prior service included with the information distributed about nominees for the Council would permit those who objected to people serving too frequently not to vote for such people.

Professor Ryder was worried about losing the service late in his career of a distinguished member of the Council who had, so to speak, used up his terms of service earlier. It seemed needlessly hampering so to deprive ourselves.

Professor Buehrig clarified for Professor Auer that the Committee's intention was to start counting terms with the new not the old Council.

Professor Remak thought that there were enough able people in the University so that we could well afford the limitation, but he was perturbed by two problems. First, there would be increased clumsiness in listing those not eligible for nomination. Second, especially, if we turned down this motion, there was the problem of the wasted nomination, where someone chose not to run after he had been nominated. He thought that, in any event, the names of those not eligible or not willing to run should be circulated to the faculty in advance of the nomination ballots.

Professor Turner then proposed a substitute motion to give formal effect to Professor Remak's suggestion. The motion was seconded by Professor Murray.

Professor Edwards, on behalf of the Committee, objected to the substitute motion. He thought an improper effect would be to force people to say publicly that they were running or were willing to serve. Moreover, now that one could only make five nominations, it was not difficult to check personally whether one's choices wished to run.

It was made clear that the current procedure ensured that, whatever happened to the nominations, no one wasted a vote. Professor Neu, a member of the last Elections Committee, said that very few people had indicated that they did not want to be nominated, and of these only one had in fact been nominated. Professor Buehrig noted that whereas a faculty member would have no hesitation in speaking privately to a committee about not running for the Council, it might seem to him presumptuous to announce it publicly.

Professor Wolff wished to emphasize Professor Edwards' point. If we adopted these changes, there was going to be a change in the way in which the elections were conducted. The fact that there would be only five nominees in question made the burden upon the individual faculty member of checking that he was not wasting his nomination sufficiently slight that it could well be his responsibility.



Professor Fatouros then raised for consideration a compromise between the motion and the substitute motion which would increase the period of ineligibility between terms without putting an absolute limit to the number of terms.

The question on the substitute motion was called and it was defeated unanimously.

The question was then called for on the motion to limit service in the Bloomington Council to four terms. A roll-call vote defeated the motion 28 to 4 with one abstention.

Aye

Nay

Abstain

Breneman  
Ludlow  
Neu  
Remak

Auer  
Ballinger  
Bain  
Buehrig  
Nugent for B.E. Carter  
Clark  
Endwright  
Farmer  
Frye  
Fatouros for Gray  
Hackney  
Hagen for Hartley  
Fuchs for Harvey  
Hewitt  
Bogan for Hine  
Cordes for Mahler  
Murray  
Penrod  
Pinnell  
Richey  
Ryan  
Ryder  
Shiner  
Chapman for Snyder  
Joyner for Taylor  
Turner  
Wolff  
Yamaguchi

Davidson

The Council now turned to the matter of special observer status for teaching associates and teaching assistants. The Committee's recommendation was "That observer status, with the privilege of placing items on the agenda and of entering discussion on any agenda item, be accorded to three persons to be designated annually by whatever organization of teaching associates and/or assistants may be forthcoming, subject to the proviso that the standing Committee on Faculty Affairs inform the Council each year, to the latter's satisfaction, as to the representative character of the organization in question." Professor Buehrig noted that this recommendation did not require constitutional amendment.

Professor Remak then distributed a proposal (Faculty Council Circular #49) for an alternative procedure and made a substitute motion recommending that teaching associates and teaching assistants be given voting representation on the Faculty



Council, not exceeding three representatives and that the Buehrig Committee be requested to bring in specific suggestions for implementing this recommendation. Professor Fatouros seconded the motion.

Professor Remak acknowledged the difficulty of defining this particular group; therefore he was unwilling to push a specific proposal. He and, he gathered, the teaching associate members of the Teaching Associate Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School would rather have a carefully worked-out plan than take part in the election of Spring 1969. However, on the matter of principle, on the matter of competence to serve, and on the matter of the propriety of giving teaching associates voting status, he disagreed with the Buehrig Committee.

Professor Murray again raised the problem of presenting alternatives to the faculty at the time of the vote on the constitutional amendments. He thought this matter too important for the Council to decide once and for all. The faculty should be allowed to express itself on the matter of voting status for teaching associate representatives. Professor Breneman strongly endorsed this view.

Professor Edwards thought that the Council could only present amendments for acceptance or rejection. He reminded Council members that any 25 faculty members could call for a general faculty meeting at which alternatives could be raised. He defended the Committee's unwillingness to give the vote to teaching associate representatives on the grounds that there was no clear definition of a teaching associate, and that conditions of selection and employment varied so widely through the campus. Some members of the Committee thought that, whatever bad treatment the teaching associates had undergone, representation on the Council would not solve their problems. He hoped the Vice-President and Dean of Faculties would mark this as an important matter. (Vice-President Hartley assured him he would, but he felt it should be a concern of the whole faculty.)

In answer to a question from Professor Ryder, Professor Remak said that the intention of his motion was that teaching associate membership in the Council would be quite independent of the 3 to 1 ratio proposed for elected and ex officio members. He thought some of his colleagues overestimated the difficulty of defining teaching associates and assistants of various types. Nor was it a matter of using the Council to redress the grievances of teaching associates; it was rather a matter of justice and of taking the opportunity for constructive collaboration. He hoped a decision could be made on the grounds of principle.

Professor Murray returned to the question of laying alternative proposals before the faculty. He was not satisfied that the machinery of a general meeting of the faculty was adequate to the situation. He thought some procedure for presenting alternatives directly ought to be possible. Professor Auer, as Parliamentarian, saw no reason why two forms of a particular amendment should not be presented to the faculty and Professor Murray pronounced himself satisfied with that opinion.

In answer to a question from Professor Breneman, Professor Remak stated that he intended to include in his motion all those teaching associates or assistants who had a substantial role in the class either by being responsible for grades or by actually teaching. All he was asking was a vote on the principle. He was willing to leave to a Committee specific recommendations for implementing the principle.



Professor Cordes declared himself in favor of Professor Remak's motion on the grounds that he saw no particular discontinuity between teaching associates and instructors, and the Council had already guaranteed the presence of junior faculty (i.e., instructors and assistant professors) on the Council.

Professor Auer then remarked that on the matter of definition he preferred the wording used by the Teaching Associates Committee in its memorandum to the Council about parking. He thought the words, "teachers below the rank of lecturers who have responsibility for teaching and assigning grades for at least a portion of a course and who have, in an instructional role, direct contact with students," were both appropriate in themselves and brought out the strongest aspects of Professor Remak's arguments.

Once again, the question of offering alternatives to the faculty arose and Professor Auer noted that there was a third course, namely, maintaining the current situation in which teaching associates had no formal connection with the Council. He thought that, in part because we were talking in one case of a constitutional amendment and in another of a change in the By-Laws, it was perhaps best to refer the whole matter to a committee which would prepare for us a statement with choices which we could then refer to the faculty in a separate referendum.

A question was raised as to the time that might be involved in this procedure and it was agreed that constitutional amendments should go to the faculty no later than February 15, 1969. This meant, Professor Buehrig thought, that it was most unlikely that there would be time for a committee to formulate an amendment along the lines of the Remak proposal. One problem was the absence of any representative teaching associate organization.

Professor Remak thought that, although it would be all right to work with an organization if we were talking about observers, only a proper election would do if we were talking about voting members. Moreover, because it would make more sense to hold an election for teaching associates in the fall, there need be no rush to get this particular matter into the package of constitutional amendments for February 15.

Professor Cordes then proposed first a vote on the recommendation of the Buehrig Committee and second a decision to form a committee to develop a constitutional amendment. Professor Remak agreed to withdraw his substitute motion reserving the right to re-introduce it after the vote on the motion.

The question was then called for on the motion to give teaching associates observer status on the new Bloomington Faculty Council, and it passed unanimously.

Professor Remak, stating that he still wished to sound the Council's opinion on the principle of voting representation for teaching associates, moved that "The Faculty Council recommends that teaching associates and teaching assistants be given voting representation on the Faculty Council, not exceeding three representatives." Professors Auer and Cordes suggested that Professor Remak add to his motion that a committee be established to consider a constitutional proposal allowing for voting representation of teaching associates on the Council, and that this proposal then be submitted to the entire faculty for a vote.

Professor Wolff said that the Council had now brought itself to a division about whether or not to establish a committee to present a constitutional amendment, and not to a division on the matter of whether or not teaching associates



should have a vote on the Council. He thought the Council ought to vote on this matter of principle. Professor Remak said that he accepted the altered motion because he interpreted it now to mean that the Faculty Council was interested in voting representation for teaching associates and teaching assistants, but wished to withhold its final opinion until a more precise plan had been submitted.

At the invitation of Vice-President Hartley, Mr. Heintz (a graduate student in Fine Arts) offered his opinion that unless representatives of teaching associates had a vote on the Council, they were not likely to be sufficiently interested to engage themselves in the business of the Council. Not only were teaching associates themselves very busy teaching and earning their degrees, but they could not be expected to participate earnestly in the Council if it did not take them seriously enough to recognize them as being, in effect, junior faculty members who have something substantive to say about and to contribute to decisions that will be made about faculty interests.

Professor Fuchs asked that the motion before the Council state more precisely whether the issue would necessarily go to the entire faculty after a committee had reported on it. Professor Buehrig said that in his view, the committee would report to the Council, which would then decide whether or not to send it on to the faculty for a special referendum. The present vote, in his opinion, was to establish a committee, and not to decide on the substantive matter of voting representation for teaching associates. Vice-President Hartley agreed, saying that there was no point to establishing a committee to study the matter if the Council was going to make a decision about it now. Professor Auer offered, as a means of divining the meaning of a vote on this motion, the formula that anyone who favored voting status on the Council for teaching associates should vote to establish the committee, while those who were unalterably opposed under any circumstances to voting rights for teaching associates should vote against the motion. Professor Ryder said that he thought the latter part of Professor Auer's statement too restrictive: he at the moment was opposed to voting representation for teaching associates, but he could imagine that the committee might devise a scheme which would change his mind, and therefore he was ready to vote for the establishment of the committee.

The motion that a committee be established to study the matter of voting representation on the Faculty Council for teaching associates, and that the committee report to the Council before the end of the spring semester was then put to a vote and passed unanimously. Vice-President Hartley said that he would ask President Sutton to name such a committee (in consultation with the Agenda Committee), which, if it did not include any members of the Buehrig Committee (Professor Buehrig urged that the members of his Committee be exempted), would consult with them in framing its own recommendations.

Discussion moved to the Buehrig Committee recommendation "That the Faculty Council appoint a standing Committee on Student Affairs. It would be available to any student or student group wishing to apprise the Council of any matter deemed to be of a nature requiring the Council's attention. The Student Senate, through an appropriate committee of its own, would be invited to meet periodically with the Committee on Student Affairs to identify matters of overlapping concern and to determine the appropriate method of dealing with each such instance. Further, that matters relating to student life in residential quarters be understood to be within the province of the Student Senate subject only to the ultimate authority of the Board of Trustees." Professor Buehrig reminded the Council that this recommendation did not require a constitutional amendment and therefore did not have to meet the February 15 deadline.



Professor Fuchs thought that the last sentence of the recommendation should be submitted separately since it raised issues totally different from those involved earlier. He was not at all sure that there was no proper faculty concern in the matter of student life in residential quarters; nor was he sure that it was sound policy to throw so much responsibility to the Board of Trustees. It was agreed then to omit the last sentence from the current discussion.

In answer to a question from Professor Ryder, Professor Buehrig said he thought the committee should be a Faculty Council Committee consisting exclusively of faculty members although not exclusively elected members of the Council. However, he thought that before we voted on this matter, we ought to have the views of the President and Vice-President of the Student Body, although he would judge that this proposal would be wholly agreeable to them.

Professor Fatouros asked about the difference between this proposal and the proposal of the AAUP Committee and the Continuing Committee. All he saw was increase in flexibility. There would still be a conference committee in the sense that Faculty Council and Student Senate committees would try to resolve problems of conflict between the two bodies before they became disputes. Professor Buehrig agreed that that was a correct understanding.

Professor Ballinger then raised the problem of what sort of authority this joint body would have to settle jurisdictional and other disputes. Professor Buehrig doubted that it would have any. Professors Edwards and Ballinger discussed this matter of authority further, though not to Professor Ballinger's satisfaction.

Vice-President Hartley returned to Professor Buehrig's point that further discussion of this matter should await the presence of student leaders. Professor Fatouros hoped that at that time some more precise wording about the function of Council and Senate committees would be offered.

Before the adjournment, Professor Shiner reminded the Council of the unfinished business of understanding the authority of the Council itself; Professor Murray recalled the problem of presenting alternatives to the faculty; and Vice-President Hartley called for formal commendation of the Buehrig Committee.

Vice-President Hartley adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted  
Michael Wolff, Secretary

After the Council's discussion of the Buehrig Report is completed, a summary of the substantive proposed changes in the Faculty Constitution and in the By-Laws arising from that discussion will be printed as a Faculty Council Circular