

NOTICE OF
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1969, 2:30 P.M.
Faculty Council Room, Ballantine 008

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of February 18, 1969
2. Memorial Resolution on the Death of Dr. Robert Louis Stumpner (Professor Jack Daugherty)
3. Presiding Officer's Business
4. Agenda Committee Business
5. Report on Afro-American Affairs (Faculty Council Circular #67)
6. Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W. J. Siffin) (Faculty Council Circular #66)
7. Report of Committee for Research on Learning and Teaching (Professor Keith Mielke) (Faculty Council Circular #65)
8. Report of the University Library Committee on Regional Campus Libraries (Shiner) (Faculty Council Circular #63)
9. Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings (Professor Philip Appleman) (Faculty Council Circular #64)

Enclosed:

Minutes of the Meeting of February 18, 1969

Faculty Council Circulars #61 Memorial Resolution on the Death of Professor James I. Toy (Dean W. R. Kendall)
#62 Memorial Resolution on the Death of Professor Hedwig Leser (Professor Frank Banta)
#63 Recommendations from University Library Committee for Regional Campus Libraries
#64 Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings
#65 Progress Report from the Committee for Research on Learning and Teaching
#66 Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media
#67 Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Consolidation of Afro-American Programs

ALSO ENCLOSED: NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY FACULTY (FROM PROFESSOR RICHARD L. TURNER, SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY)

Minutes of the Faculty Council

March 4, 1969

Ballantine Hall 008

2:30 p.m.

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

Members Present: President Sutton (for first part of meeting); Vice-Presidents Hartley, Snyder, Merritt; Provost Penrod; Deans B.E. Carter, Harvey, Yamaguchi, Clark, Bain, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, Davidson, Farmer, Hackney, Lorentzen, Martin, Neu, Shiner, Wolff, Auer, Ballinger, Frye, Gray, Mahler, Murray, Remak, Taylor, R.L. Turner, R.C. Turner, Zeitlin, Ferdows (Southeast)

Alternates Present: Vice-President Hartley for President Sutton; Dean Charles W. Hagen for Vice-President Hartley; Dean Robert W. Hattery for Vice-President Ryan; Professor Robert L. Bogan for Chancellor Hine; Dean E.G. Williams for Dean Pinnell; Professor Harlan Hoffa for Professor Manlove; Professor Albrecht Holschuh for Professor Ryder; Professor Frank N. Young for Professor Breneman; Professor Philip R. Headings for Professor Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Absent, No Alternate: Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, Solt, White, Sachs (South Bend)

Official Visitors: Deans John B. Joyner, Richard D. Young; Professors Philip Appleman, Boyd Berry, Jack Daugherty, Richard G. Gray, Ralph L. Holsinger; Messrs David Cahill, Paul Helmke, Robert L. Johnson, Ted Najam, Cliff Travis

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of February 18, 1969
2. Memorial Resolution on the Death of Dr. Robert Louis Stumpner (Professor Jack Daugherty)
3. Presiding Officer's Business
4. Agenda Committee Business
5. Report on Afro-American Affairs (Faculty Council Circular #67)
6. Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W.J. Siffin) Faculty Council Circular #66)
7. Report of Committee for Research on Learning and Teaching (Professor Keith Mielke) (Faculty Council Circular #65)
8. Report of the University Library Committee on Regional Campus Libraries (Shiner) (Faculty Council Circular #63)
9. Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings (Professor Philip Appleman) (Faculty Council Circular #64)

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

Minutes of the meeting of February 18, 1969 were approved unanimously.

Professor Jack Daugherty presented a Memorial Resolution for Dr. Robert Louis Stumpner prepared by Professors George F. Cousins (Chairman), John B. Daugherty, and A.T. Slater-Hammel. (This will be distributed with these Minutes as Faculty Council Circular #68.)

Under Presiding Officer's Business President Sutton had two items. First he wished to say something about the Report (to be considered today) of the Afro-American Affairs Committee, appointed by him at the request of the Council. He had read the Report carefully and had been through it with nearly all the members of the Committee. It was an extremely good report, and he did not see anything infeasible in it. Should the Council adopt this report, he thought it imperative that implementation begin as soon as possible. The Report itself pointed towards a program very similar to existing inter-departmental programs in such areas as Asian Studies, African Studies, Statistics, Bio-chemistry, and so on, although it was somewhat more complex and involved an Institute of Afro-American Studies within the College of Arts and Sciences calling for special action by the College. His concern was that implementation follow rapidly enough to make it clear that the University and the Council were acting in good faith. He had already suggested to the Committee that one of the ways to begin implementation of the Report was to follow those procedures used in the development of other area programs. One of these procedures was not to offer a degree but an area of concentration. He suggested that until such time as the permanent positions recommended in the Report could be filled, that an inter-school Afro-American Studies Committee be established, consisting, perhaps of some members of the present Committee along with others directly involved in courses relevant to Afro-American Studies. This new committee could begin at once by taking an inventory of courses now being offered and by surveying areas in which courses were not offered. Such an inventory would be extremely valuable for effective recruitment. The new committee could also get the program underway by constructing a curriculum for Afro-American Studies out of existing offerings. Such a curriculum should not be confined to the College of Arts and Sciences but should involve other schools where appropriate. It might be that we would not be able to implement this Report as fully as we would like. The fate of the University budget, in particular that for the Bloomington campus, was quite uncertain. Whatever the decisions of the State Legislature, this was an important enough program for us to implement it to the best of our ability even if that meant a certain sacrifice on the part of existing programs and departments. He felt very strongly about this plan; he was deeply touched by the responsibility and sincerity of the Committee; the plan reflected highly on the Committee, and, indeed, on the University. His recommendation to the Faculty Council was that it give favorable consideration to the Report. He did wish to enter the caveat that there could well be problems about its implementation as a result of budget stringencies. Nevertheless, despite these possible stringencies, ways had to be worked out to implement the recommendations of the Report as fully as possible.

The other item the President discussed was the Board of Trustees action relating to The Spectator. This matter had not been discussed by the Board in the light of any direct legislative pressure because the legislature had not,

at the time of the meeting, taken up the question of underground newspapers on university campuses. The Board had discussed a wide range of possibilities for action on the matter of underground publications on campus. For instance, it had rejected the possible policy of banning the sale of The Spectator in the Bookstore and in the Union Building. There had, however, been considerable discussion among Board Members as to the criminal liability of the University and the Trustees in case the University was actually selling a publication in violation of any State statutes. Mr. Travis, the University Counsel, had been directed by the Board to inquire of the State's Attorney General's office whether or not The Spectator had been in violation of any State statute. The Board was worried that if there had been any violation of a State statute, somebody in the University organization, members of the Board, employees in the Bookstore, or the President, might be in criminal jeopardy. In any case, there had been no recommendation to ban The Spectator from the campus. His judgment was that such a move would be infeasible, if not unwise. The question of advertising, however, had arisen and the Board had decided that, since in its judgment it had found The Spectator in questionable taste, it did not wish to indicate its support of The Spectator and it had directed the officers of the University to cease forthwith all official advertising in The Spectator. The Board of Trustees had jurisdiction over the expenditure of general fund monies for any purpose whatsoever and it had been acting not as the result of the legislative hearing but on its own cognizance and as a result of its own concern about jeopardizing any University official who might be held responsible for vending items which were in violation of State or local statutes. He would be very happy, after the Attorney General's judgment had been reported to the Board, to report further to the Faculty Council on the Board's decisions. The President asked for questions and then gave Professor Philip Appleman the floor in order that he might read the following statement from the AAUP Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee of the American Association of University Professors requests that the Trustees' prohibition of advertising in The Spectator be re-examined.

Without endorsing either the opinions or the rhetoric of The Spectator, we nevertheless believe that the paper has a right to exist, to be treated essentially like other organs of news and opinion, and, as a student-operated enterprise, to be sold at prescribed locations on campus. Part of its function, like that of the Daily Student, is to serve as a bulletin board for its readers, carrying paid and unpaid announcements of University events. To limit this function by forbidding paid advertisements may be the University's legal right, and may be something less than outright censorship; but it nevertheless carries with it the aura of censorship. To take selective, discriminatory action against one newspaper tends to discredit the University's professed commitment to the principles of a free press.

As a simple matter of tactics, there is also reason to fear that the Trustees' order was imprudent. It is highly doubtful that it will serve to placate the more intemperate critics of the University; and it is already clear that it has alienated some of the faculty and an influential part of the student body.

The Executive Committee of the AAUP therefore urges President Sutton to use his good offices to persuade the Trustees to rescind the order banning advertisements in The Spectator.

At the suggestion of Dean Harvey, the President called on Mr. Travis to tell the Council about the questions put to the State's Attorney General's office. Mr. Travis said that in general terms the questions had been: with regard to the February 18 issue of The Spectator, in the opinion of the Attorney General, had that issue been in violation of any Indiana law? What reasons lay behind the Attorney General's opinions? The same two questions had been asked in regard to the publication as a whole. Further questions had followed as to where the legal liability for publication, for vending, or for possession of the newspaper lay in the event that the opinion was that there had been a violation.

President Sutton noted that there was no question to the State's Attorney General's office asking whether the University had the power to ban The Spectator.

Professor Taylor was worried about the University developing a precedent when it made judgments as to which newspapers were undesirable to certain elements of the University community. He thought one could question the desirability of, for example, the Indianapolis Star for certain elements in the University. He thought we ought to be consistent, either advertising in all papers read by the University community or in none.

President Sutton agreed that non-legal questions were raised but observed that it clearly lay within the legal power of the Board of Trustees to make this decision.

Professor Shiner then asked to what extent did the fact of University advertising appearing in various other publications indicate that the University was in agreement with the policies of those publications? If we did not want to advertise in one newspaper because we disapproved of something they were doing, then the converse would be indicated that when we did advertise it meant that we did approve.

President Sutton noted that the situation might well change when we got the opinions of the State's Attorney General's office and that, in any event, he would present the AAUP's Resolution to the Board of Trustees. In answer to a question from Professor Murray, he said that although he could not speak for what went on in the minds of the Board, he assumed that the members had been troubled by the presence of four-letter words and other matters which they found in questionable taste.

Mr. David Cahill, Business Manager of The Spectator, was recognized and described attempts that had been made to cancel advertising without acknowledging that this was being done because of the Trustees' action. He noted that the Student Senate had been extremely upset and that the resolution then passed was printed as a paid advertisement in today's Spectator. The resolution stated that if the Trustees did not retract their order "appropriate action will be forthcoming." The status of the Union Board, which received hardly any general fund money but had received a directive to cease advertising, raised a more serious problem. In any event, The Spectator had printed one Union Board advertisement free and had in all lost about \$30. He wished to make a brief report to the Council about the financial condition of The Spectator. It was a non-profit Indiana corporation and had a net worth of approximately \$1300. The action of the Trustees would not fatally damage the paper. The advertising in today's issue was almost up to the all-time record partly because of supporting advertisements put in by churches and other groups. The Trustees could, if they

wished, rescind their action, but they would not do that, at least until the legislature adjourned. There was also the possibility of legal challenge to the action on the grounds that a state agency might not discriminate against any vendor without cause.

There being no further comments on this matter, President Sutton reminded the Council that he thought the Afro-American Studies program was feasible, responsible, and necessary. He then yielded the Chair to Vice-President Hartley.

Under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary noted that the Council was behind in its appointment of a Faculty Board of Review and nominations for that Board would be forthcoming at the next meeting. He reported also the name of the Chairman of one of the sub-committees appointed by the University Structure and Educational Policy Standing Committee in accordance with Council action at the last meeting. This sub-committee had to deal with the question of the reading period before final examinations, a question passed to the Council by the Section Committee for Implementation of the Self-study Recommendations on Teaching. The Chairman of that sub-committee was Professor H. James Jensen of the English Department.

Vice-President Hartley then brought up the next item on the Agenda: the Report on Afro-American Affairs (Faculty Council Circular #67).

Professor Wolff moved THAT THE COUNCIL ENDORSE AND ADOPT THE REPORT, and Professor Ballinger seconded the motion.

Chancellor Snyder wished to report that representatives of the four State institutions had met yesterday in Indianapolis and had given their attention to several items dealing with the problems of the disadvantaged in general and of Blacks in particular. The general outcome of that discussion had been two-fold. First, a kind of loose consortium of the four State institutions should be formed to deal with such problems and to work out ways in which some of these problems could be addressed on a state-wide basis. It had been suggested, for example, that a consortium approach would be much more likely to realize federal funding than would an approach from a single institution. Such support, of course, would be very useful for Operation Catch-Up. Secondly, the consortium had agreed to pursue specifically two immediate projects: one was the adoption of something like Operation Catch-Up by all the State institutions' campuses so that a state-wide proposal could be presented, and the other was the development as soon as possible of a Tele-Communications introductory course on Black America, to act as a kind of selling device to arouse general interest among the State's college students in the problems of the Black American and of Afro-American Studies as a discipline. He wished also to report that Operation Catch-Up had reached its final stages as a proposal for a ten-year program, that is, for bringing 200 students to campus each year over a ten-year period and working with those students until they graduate. It had a \$15,000,000 price tag. He had one comment on the topic of the Vice-Chancellor or chief administrative officer for Afro-American Affairs, and that was to urge that no action be taken confining that officer's attention to the problems of Black students. We had other disadvantaged students and his concern was that such a person have wider administrative responsibilities and consequently greater access to the resources of the institution. Finally, if in the course of the many projects dealing with disadvantaged students, we adopted a remedial program, or a stretch-out of the freshman year, we would need University-wide acceptance of a couple of basic propositions, to the effect

that credit could be given for remedial work, and that credit-point deficiencies could be held in abeyance or otherwise dealt with so that a two-year stretch-out was arithmetically feasible for students who only gradually worked up to a "C" level of performance. A related problem of which the Council should be aware was the problem of working with draft boards so that students who had an under-load did not become subject to the draft.

Professor Ballinger asked about the communication from Professor Fuchs which raised a substantial question with respect to the role of the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices. (That memorandum is attached as Faculty Council Circular #69.) He was on a committee in the School of Education not too different in character but much smaller in scope, and the problem of a committee being both prosecutor and judge had already arisen. He did not think the question was decided in the recommendations of the report. Dean Richard Young said that the Committee's recommendation that the President first set up and clearly define the jurisdiction of this committee would avoid the kind of problem that Professor Fuchs had drawn to our attention. It should be noted that the Committee had specifically recommended not that this committee be a part of the consolidation of the Afro-American Affairs Program but rather that it continue to be a Presidential committee.

Professor Remak then proposed that, instead of picking up at random various parts of the Report, the Council proceed through it, section by section.

Vice-President Hartley accepted this suggestion and turned to the recommendations on page 2 dealing with the Chief Administrator. As there were no questions or comments, he then moved to those recommendations dealing with the Institute of Afro-American Studies on pages 5 and 6.

Professor Murray commented that we need to be clear about how we operated when the decision as to a faculty member's appointment or rehiring was in different hands from those responsible for funding the position. At the University of Chicago recently, as he understood it, there had been a division of responsibility with regard to a faculty member where the Human Development Program which provided the funds had endorsed the person, but the Sociology Department which had the power of decision had been opposed to rehiring her. One needed to look very carefully at any arrangement in which responsibility was divided.

Vice-President Hartley followed this comment by asking whether or not faculty had been appointed in area programs without any departmental affiliation.

Dean Carter thought they had not, although there had been talk about it in the past. He could think of only one clear instance of an appointment which was to no department, and that was the job of Director of the Division of Biological Sciences who was a professor of Biological Science, rather than of Zoology or Microbiology or Botany or Anatomy & Physiology.

Vice-President Hartley noted the Self-Study Committee had had a rather lengthy discussion on this matter because they were concerned about faculty who find themselves in a sort of limbo with no department assuming responsibility for their careers.

Dean Carter acknowledged there was always a risk when faculty members held joint appointments. A situation could arise, indeed had arisen, in which one department had recommended promotion and the other department had not only opposed

that promotion, but had recommended dropping the man. There were, however, general committees of the College (and, he assumed, of other schools) responsible for breaking such deadlocks. As for appointments solely in Afro-American Studies, he was not really worried by this despite its involving something of a precedent. There should be a way of accommodating a particular person who was excellent for a program but not quite appropriate for any department.

Professor Farmer thought that, in general, the way people got promoted in the University now was by having proper credentials and by being within a department that recommended them strongly. In view of the proposal recommending some appointments without regard to college degree, it might be as well to start thinking ahead about different kinds of criteria for professional competence that would be available at promotion time.

Vice-President Hartley noted that the promotions criteria at present said nothing about the number or type of academic degrees that the faculty member had to have earned.

Professor Farmer agreed that nothing was said, but such things counted nevertheless. He was disturbed at the thought of a competent person without a college degree being trapped because of our conventions.

Dean Carter pointed out that we now had faculty without college degrees, and that our promotions process did recognize special kinds of professional competence that made up for the absence of a degree.

Dean Harvey agreed with Professor Farmer that because our criteria for promotion and tenure had tended to be directed towards the more traditional academic career, we ought now to try to differentiate some criteria appropriate to less traditional careers. But simple justice required that anyone being considered for an appointment know before he committed himself to the institution what the relevant criteria in his case would be. The Council should make a matter of record its view that this difficulty should be worked out with great care in order to protect the legitimate interests of anyone who might be considered for appointment in this program.

Mr. Robert Johnson, student member of the Committee, thought that a meaningful discussion required the recognition that this document and the program were precedent-setting ventures. The discussion would be weaker than it need be, if we could not get beyond the sort of structural point we were now engaged with. He wished to emphasize that the expectation and hope of the Committee was that this would be one of the most rigorous departments or institutes on the campus. If that was to be so, the people brought into the program would be sufficiently accredited. We were not going to bring in people with minimal skills and abilities.

Professor Buehrig then asked how close the Afro-American program came to being a department. Were there to be courses offered under its auspices?

Dean Young replied that course offerings in the program of Afro-American Studies and within the College were now possible, and that courses need not be located in any particular department.

Dean Carter noted that this was not unique, that West European Studies, American Studies, and Victorian Studies all had their own courses.

Vice-President Hartley mentioned that he liked the concept of a program here because a department within the College of Arts and Sciences might become almost exclusively an Arts and Sciences affair. He hoped that all the professional schools would develop curricular elements with the program providing the framework.

Professor Taylor wished to amplify Mr. Johnson's remarks. The Committee had been working on a program which would be innovative and imaginative, which would help to make those new definitions now necessary to the reshaping of American education. In a sense, the program involved a rethinking of the total mission of the University. For example, there might be people (Professor Taylor cited Lerone Bennett, an historian) who, despite their being outstanding people from a Black perspective, might not get an appointment in a department of this University because they only held a Bachelor's degree. Such people would have a definite place in an Afro-American program. As far as he could tell, the programs coming out of such institutions as Harvard, Yale, and Stanford, were not anywhere near the program being discussed here. We had before us potentially the finest Afro-American Studies program in the country.

In reply to Dean Harvey's raising again his worry that the criteria for promotion and tenure for those brought in by the program be clearly understood by all concerned, Dean Young pointed out that Appendix I of the Report suggested lines of administrative responsibility including lines for budget and for tenure and promotion. It was from the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences that people in the academic program would hold their appointment and to him that they would look for promotion and tenure. He wished also to point out that there was a lot of confusion among younger faculty members not in this program as to the guidelines on promotion and tenure. If the Council wished to consider the Afro-American program in this light, they might well consider all programs.

Vice-President Hartley noted that the chart showed that the academic program of the Institute showed only an uncertain relationship to schools other than Arts and Sciences. He hoped that it would be possible for faculty members to be appointed in the professional schools while participating in this program.

Professor Farmer said that his previous remarks had not had anything to do with any notions about second-ratedness. He had in mind someone he would very much like to have on the faculty of the School of Business, a black, a third-grade drop-out, a multi-millionaire, and a man who he thought could teach us a great deal. The point about criteria was terribly important, not so much for now, but for the next three or four years when this program gets into high gear. Professor Farmer then asked about the relation of research in the professional schools to this program. Dean Young replied that the intent of the proposal was to encourage research to be done under the auspices of the Institute if so desired, but there would be no pressure in this encouragement. The idea was that the more people you had together working on problems of mutual interest the more they could stimulate one another.

Vice-President Hartley then directed the Council's attention to page 7 of the Report and the recommendations on Special Programming.

Professor Remak said he was entirely in favor of these recommendations but he did have a question. Since the Special Programming mentioned was specifically attached to the program for Afro-American Studies and was also devised to help

students who had disadvantaged backgrounds, and since it is obvious that Black students are not the only students who are disadvantaged, were two special programs being established, one for disadvantaged Black students and another one for disadvantaged students in general? Mr. Robert Johnson thought not. The Committee was suggesting innovations in the programs that already existed. No exclusion of other disadvantaged students was intended. Dean Young wished to add that the Council should remember that we were discussing the consolidating of current Afro-American programs and not dealing with all possible programs for disadvantaged students of whatever origins.

Professor Shiner acknowledged that he thought that taking in people who were not qualified for college work and remedying their deficiencies within the University was not the solution for the problem. The problem had been created in the high schools. What we might do was probably a drop in the bucket given the number of students who were deprived in high school. He was not so optimistic about how successfully we could identify the qualified people to take them through the University with a remedial program.

Dean Clark disagreed with the idea that the problem was created in the high school and could not or would not be solved in the university. The problem was created not in the high school but by the society, and any element of the educational institution, whether it was the high school or the university, had a perfectly legitimate role in solving the problem. The degree of success was related to a lot of variables including the amount of effort that the educational institution was willing to invest, but the evidence from higher educational institutions, as well as from secondary and elementary schools who had really tried to mount effective educational programs directed at disadvantaged groups was that, for the most part, they were eminently successful. He thought that the view of the higher educational institution as one relevant agency that could undertake a part in remedying this societal problem was the one that ought to prevail and not the view that we should skip over this generation and start with the pre-schoolers and remedy that social disfunction responsible for their being disadvantaged students at the college level.

Professor Martin wished to second that point that Dean Clark had made. Much as he would like to see the University maintain high standards, that idea could become a way of excusing ourselves from our responsibilities. We could not now go back in history ten generations and start working on the problem when it started. We had to start working on it where we were. Our professional accreditation processes were three-quarters ways of limiting entry to the profession and improving our share of the national income. A large part of the business of raising standards was a process of maintaining or improving our own status relative to the disadvantaged. He was very enthusiastic about the program as set forth here, and he wished to make one more point about it, namely, even if we did not succeed in educating all the students we brought in, the attempt to do so would have a tremendous impact on the students with whom they would associate. This was not a matter of "us" and "them", and our doing something for them; it was just as much a matter of their doing something for us. We certainly should not ignore the advantage of this program from the standpoint of its educational value for white people.

Professor Shiner remarked that he too was in favor of the program and he was not ready to write off any generation but he thought it had to be matched by efforts up and down the line.

Dean Carter commented that the University was filled with people of good intentions who would volunteer for remedial work on an overload basis, but he guessed that most of the faculty were not competent to do it. The faculty already tended to grouse about the competence of the students it now dealt with. We had to face the fact that we might well have to add to our staff people who were better at handling the remedial aspects of the program than he himself or most of his colleagues were likely to be.

Dean Young noted that the Committee had been concerned about this matter. He thought that nobody knew confidentially how to answer the question about remedial teaching and we really could not find out until we tried it. Professor Taylor said that one thing the Institute ought to do was some research in the area of this very problem. It was another example of how this program could begin to take a position of national leadership. To his knowledge, there had not been a systematic program anywhere which had attempted to look at the whole range of educational and social problems associated with the social problem of catching up.

Professor Zeitlin noted that we often overlooked the tremendous resource which we had in our students, both black and white. We ought to explore systematically the opportunities for putting the students in positions where they could also be educators.

Dean Harvey wished to relate what Professor Taylor had said to Professor Shiner's point. He hoped that, as the University developed a competence for remedial work in this area, it would at the same time be able to influence the educational system at lower levels.

Professor Farmer wished to emphasize the disservice done by the kind of patronizing attitude Professor Martin had referred to. We could learn an enormous amount from so-called deprived people. We could well accept this project not in terms of what we were going to do or of what our resources were but in terms of what we were going to learn from the people who would be here as a result of this project.

Professor Wolff then asked if the inter-institutional program mentioned by Chancellor Snyder would not have in it opportunities for articulation with the rest of the educational system which could become an important aspect of it.

Dean Clark felt that it was a mistake, and a patronizing one at that, to think that we were about to move in and help the misguided elementary and secondary schools in dealing with education to the disadvantaged. The fact of the matter was that although the elementary and secondary schools had failed, just as we had, in that area, most of the efforts from which we could learn had been conducted in elementary and secondary schools. We had a great deal to learn from the elementary and secondary schools especially in regard to the very difficult problem of continued attention on the part of a large bureaucracy to this question. We needed to draw on their expertise to help us.

Professor Holschuh wished to return to the earlier recommendation and to ask whether the powers of the chief officer should not be broader than responsibility to the Afro-American Institute and similar programs. Perhaps he should be in charge of all programs and related efforts for all disadvantaged students and for all the students from the minority groups.

Mr. Robert Johnson replied that the chief administrator's duties went beyond those towards disadvantaged students. He would be responsible for a very wide range of activities of which the disadvantaged student program was only a part. He was going to have his hands full as it was.

Vice-President Hartley then suggested that the Council move on then to the bottom of page 8, about inter-institutional cooperation, to which he wished to speak. The C.I.C. had had two conferences this last fall and winter with respect to education of the underprivileged and they were waiting committee reports. He thought there were some real possibilities for constructive and fruitful joint efforts here but that the chances for state-wide coordination and cooperation were probably even more promising.

He turned then to pages 9 and 10 and the recommendations dealing with the Office of Afro-American Affairs. There being no comment here, the Council moved on to discuss the next Section: Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices and the Recommendations on page 12.

Professor Remak wholeheartedly endorsed these recommendations of this Committee but he wondered whether the Committee ought not to change its name to the Committee on Equal Opportunities. The use of the words "discriminatory practices" for the activities of this committee had been perfectly justified when it was established and discriminatory practices clearly had not entirely stopped. Nevertheless the first phase of this particular matter, where discrimination was particularly obvious and visible, was almost over. We would risk complacency if we thought that, because these discriminatory practices were for the most part over, that the job was done. The Committee had now become far more constructive. It was, for instance, now trying to help fraternities and sororities overcome something much harder to get at than overt discriminatory practice, namely, cultural bias in the selection of members. The name of the Committee was needlessly negative. A more positive name was likely to get a more positive response. The work of the Committee ought now to be widened and made more educational because its responsibilities would now tend to be educational rather than punitive. He was also a bit bothered by the sentence: "The purpose of the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices is to eliminate all vestiges of racial, religious, ethnic or national discrimination, both overt and covert, at Indiana University," especially insofar as it suggested an effort to exercise some kind of thought control over individual opinions which might not be quite what we had hoped they would be. He was surely in favor of what he took the sentence to mean but he wished to avoid our even appearing to fall into any kind of vigilantism. We should desire as much pluralism as was compatible with the decency and humaneness of a university. He was also concerned about the story told in the third paragraph about the establishment of the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices. It was certainly true that some members of the Committee originally appointed by the President did not meet with the approval of a number of Black students. But he thought the phrasing involved an unwarranted reflection on the particular members of that Committee. He did not want to waste any time on new wording but he wished to offer his comments and to hope that those responsible for implementation would read it.

Vice-President Hartley asked if there was any further comment on this section, or on Professor Fuchs's memorandum.

Professor Gray suggested that, because the Council was only endorsing a recommendation that the President give an explicit charge to this committee and

a set of defensible procedures, a copy of this memorandum go with the report. Vice-President Hartley asked for and received approval from Professors Wolff and Ballinger to include transmission of the letter in their motion.

Mr. Travis was worried that Professor Fuchs's concern would inhibit the Committee from working with dispatch and expediency. To have each occasion wrapped up in procedural niceties with a prosecutor and a defense attorney and a committee sitting in judgment would make a very difficult job impossible. This Committee had been extremely conscious that its main role was to advise the President and give its opinion concerning what should be done to solve a problem the existence of which had been established to the satisfaction of the Committee. It had been in large respect a mediating agency and not some kind of repressive instrument or kangaroo court.

Dean Harvey did not believe that the Fuchs memorandum impugned the motivation of the existing committee. It raised a problem of much more general concern which he thought should be dealt with. Professor Fuchs had raised two questions that needed separating. One was whether or not this Committee which was directed toward discriminatory practices with racial overtones was really adequate to the needs of the University. Dean Harvey found himself increasingly concerned with the other question, that, though we had developed all kinds of safeguards within the University for faculty input, we had done very little in the development of safeguards for students. We might therefore do well to consider what was appropriate due process for the consideration of student grievances that might not have anything to do with racial discrimination. And while he did not make any proposal at this time, he thought that that aspect of Professor Fuchs's recommendation should be kept in mind.

Professor Taylor could appreciate Dean Harvey's point concerning the need for a University-wide position with respect to student complaints. He wished to warn against thinking that all the problems could be solved with one instrument. Both as regards the Joint Committee as it now stood and the proposed Vice Chancellor for Afro-American Affairs, he did not want to see the effectiveness of this program diluted. On the other hand, he had no objection and would in fact encourage the adoption of appropriate instruments to deal with other problems.

Dean Joyner then returned to the 3rd paragraph on page 11 to which Professor Remak had referred. The Committee had prepared a substitute for that paragraph as follows:

The Committee's history has been extremely hectic. A Committee was appointed by President Stahr, the members of which served for one month. During that month the Committee, of which Benjamin Peery was the chairman, strove to develop strategies for making the Committee most effective for the needs of this University. The Committee, indeed, had a number of cases brought before it for investigation.

There seemed to be a dearth of communication to the University community about the activity of the Committee. The leadership of the Afro-Afro-American Student Association, as a result, was of the opinion that the Committee was not meeting its charge, that of rooting out all vestiges of unlawful discrimination on this campus.

A petition was presented to President Stahr in Wittenburg Auditorium by the Afro-Afro-American Student Association in mid-spring 1968, to disband the Committee. After much discussion between President Stahr and

many of the more than 400 persons in attendance, it was agreed that the Committee would be disbanded and a new Committee would be appointed from a list of names submitted by the Afro-Afro-American Student Association.

The act by President Stahr of disbanding the committee in no way reflected on the character of the individual committee members. President Stahr was grateful for the service that the Committee had rendered and for the individual commitment of each Committee member. However, since it was obvious that a large segment of the black student body was unwilling to work with the Committee, he deemed it necessary to appoint a new Committee.

Vice-President Hartley asked for and received the agreement of Professors Wolff and Ballinger to accept the substitute paragraph in the Report.

Dean Harvey had a brief comment to make to the effect that the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices might perhaps be responsible to the Chancellor of the Bloomington campus rather than to the President. He remained troubled by the lack of a proper tribunal to consider either student complaints or other complaints that rested ultimately on allegations of faculty misconduct.

Professor Wolff suggested that the matters raised by the Fuchs memorandum insofar as they involved faculty ethics be referred to the Faculty Affairs Standing Committee; and insofar as they involved student complaints that it be referred, with Dean Harvey's comments, to the Student Affairs Standing Committee. The suggestion was approved by consent along with a one-month interval for reporting back to the Council.

Vice-President Hartley then directed the Council to the section entitled Sensitivity Training Program, and the recommendations on page 14 of the Report.

Professor Farmer reported that some of his constituents in the Behavioral Science area in the Business School were a little concerned on this point. They objected to sensitivity training as such, but their more important worry had to do with awareness of alternatives and alertness to the need for experimentation with this technique. Dean Young assured him the Committee had an implicit understanding of these options for development.

Professor Wolff referring to the last sentence of 2a on page 14, noted that the so-called Eschbach or Communications Committee had been considering at one time a proposal for establishing a University ombudsman. He wished to know if the Committee's proposal was compatible with the Eschbach Committee's thinking. Dean Joyner, a member of both Committees, said that the Eschbach Committee had considered the possibility of the Center being used as a locale for an ombudsman.

Professor Buehrig then asked for some background information about the Center for Human Relations. When, for instance, had it been established? Dean Joyner noted that the Center being established as of February 1, was now one month and three days old. It had been an outgrowth of long-range planning, particularly by Chancellor Snyder, in consultation with a number of other officials. It currently had a Director, a secretary, and a graduate assistant. Professor Buehrig asked about its mission. Dean Joyner said that one of its initial goals was to define its own role within the University. It seemed clear that one way of looking at the difficulties of the University was in terms of a series of breakdowns in

human relations. No one was quite sure what "breakdown" meant or, indeed, what "human relations" meant, but if these definitions could be fully investigated we could thereby develop an agency that would surely speak to critical needs within the University.

Professor Shiner asked for and Vice-President Hartley recommended that the Director of the Center report back to the Council sometime later in the spring with some indication of the development of the Center's mission.

Chancellor Snyder said it had become increasingly apparent that the University had to provide some kind of lubrication to apply to those places where friction was most likely. The field of human relations was a complicated one but we certainly seemed to have the problems that the Center was designed to alleviate. It was true that the Center had been developed without its precise activities being specified in advance. But we could see the problems quite clearly and several centers existed around the country which were obviously doing valuable work. After Dean Joyner had had a chance to visit these centers, after the Eschbach Committee had delivered its report, and after there had been sufficient time to study the whole situation, then some final recommendations about the staffing and role of the Center would be presented to the Council.

Dean Young emphasized that the Committee was making recommendations only for that element of the Center relating to black-white relationships. It was not trying in any way to detail what the Center did or should do except in that area.

Vice-President Hartley speculated that what was troubling the Council was that a new Center had been established without full discussion in Council.

Professor Taylor thought the Center for Human Relations would examine those attitudes which underlay our social problems. Its program would enlighten people on various aspects of interpersonal relations including black-white relations and it would deal with particular problems as they arose. The Center would not deal exclusively with black-white problems and for this reason the Committee had recommended that it not be under the Vice-Chancellor for Afro-American Affairs but rather the President, directly.

Professor Wolff asked whether, as concrete instances of the role of the Center, we might not expect to find it cooperating with the Committee on Research on Teaching and Learning or the Psychological Clinic. Dean Joyner agreed that this would be so.

Professor Shiner then asked about the relationship between the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices and the Center for Human Relations. Dean Joyner thought one concern that the Center would have would be with the basic attitudes involved in discriminatory practice, while the Joint Committee would be concerned with the practice itself. Professor Taylor gave as an example a complaint being filed by a black student about treatment he claimed to have received from a member of the Safety Department. The Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices would study and investigate that particular charge and perhaps make some recommendations. The Center for Human Relations might, on the other hand, consider offering members of the Safety Department and other faculty and staff a course in human relations.

Vice-President Hartley suggested moving on to the final recommendations of the Report, which were statements about urgency and priority.

In reply to his request for discussion, Professor David Baker read the following statement from the Black faculty and staff of the University:

We urge the Faculty Council to adopt, in their spirit and in their broad programmatic outlines, the proposals of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Consolidation of Afro-American Programs.

In the University's continuing examination of its aims and methods, we consider that two imperatives must be given new prominence: the need to educate in a setting that recognizes the multi-cultural character of our society, and the need to make the University's great resources more accessible to the black community.

We read the Committee's proposals as realistic and imaginative contributions to these urgent ends.

Vice-President Hartley then brought up the question of implementation and suggested that the Council leave that problem in the first instance to the President to whom the recommendations had been made. He went on to thank the Committee for its creative and significant proposals. If Indiana University succeeded in implementing even a portion of this program, it might well be one of the most important things accomplished in the decade of the 1970's. He was reminded of the famous speech of President William Lowe Bryan at his inauguration in 1903. It had been a time when the role of the public universities had not been clearly defined. President Bryan had said, "What the people need and demand is that their children shall have a chance--as good a chance as any other children in the world--to make the most of themselves, to rise in any and every occupation, including those occupations which require the most thorough training. What the people want is open paths from every corner of the State through the schools to the highest and best things which men can achieve. To make such paths, to make them open to the poorest and make them lead to the highest, is the mission of democracy." It seemed to him that if we could successfully implement the recommendations of this Committee we would have opened the last of the pathways that concerned William Lowe Bryan.

Vice-President Hartley then announced the next item on the Agenda: The Report of the Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media. Because it was so close to adjournment he doubted if any formal action could be taken but he asked Professor W. J. Siffin to summarize the findings of the Committee.

Professor Siffin thought the shortest way to summarize the findings would be to say that the Committee had found the proposals of the Journalism Department for modifying the past relationship between the Department and the Daily Student most attractive and generally recommended that those proposals be viewed favorably by the Faculty Council, and that the Council forward this approval as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for their action in clarifying and defining the position of the Daily Student in the University.

Professor Wolff suggested that Professor Siffin identify those areas in the Report that appeared controversial or about which there was disagreement, so that although the Council would not be able to discuss them now, it could be aware of them for discussion at a subsequent meeting.

Professor Siffin said that the aspect that called for most attention was perhaps the structural position of the Daily Student in relation to the University. One position sanctioned by the AAUP was that student newspapers should be structurally and financially autonomous. However, the report recommended not structural and financial autonomy but only a substantial increase in the degree of autonomy. A second point had to do with a recommendation that a publications board be established as a supervisory body mediating between the University and the Daily Student. This board was to have three component elements: three representatives of the faculty including one to be designated by the Faculty Council, three students to be selected by the President of the Student Body from a slate prepared by the Daily Student staff, and three professional journalists selected from the Journalism Alumni Association. Some students had felt that it might be wise to expand the scope of the student membership on that Board. The third main point was the establishment of a professional full-time publisher who would serve as advisor to the Daily Student in lieu of faculty from the Journalism Department. The object of this recommendation was to provide the kind of provisional guidance and assistance that was probably essential in the production and operation of a substantial newspaper, while at the same time eliminating the restraints under which students had been graded and given course credit for their work on the Student. Fourthly, students would not work on the Daily Student for class credit within the Journalism Department and there would be a sharp separation between academic activities and participation in the Daily Student.

Vice-President Hartley then called on Professor Richard Gray, Chairman of the Journalism Department.

Professor Gray said there did seem to be a great deal of agreement between the Siffin Committee and the Department on the proposals. The change in the Daily Student was closely tied to curriculum, because the academic side of the Department would be strengthened by having less focus on the Daily Student. A great body of new knowledge had developed in the last 20 years which they were really not taking cognizance of in their academic program. They were not able to give proper attention to a great body of research in law, history, philosophy, ethics, and so forth, because too much attention was given to the technical aspect of training people for roles on the Daily Student. He also thought that there had to be some sort of resolution of the present role of the Daily Student since it was not well defined and we were sitting on top of a potentially explosive issue.

Professor Ralph Holsinger was then recognized. He wished to point out that the Department of Journalism had been put in the position of operating almost with one hand a newspaper as large as or larger than most of the commercial daily newspapers in the state of Indiana. Its budget was \$250,000 a year. Now an operation of that magnitude, serving an essential communications function in a community as volatile as a university needed to have very clear guidelines. Moreover, we had to face the fact that it was no longer a laboratory but rather a professional means of internal communication for the University.

Mr. David Cahill thought the report was a progressive step but it still maintained "big people" control over a student newspaper. The Board of Publications had the power to remove editors for a variety of very vague reasons. This was extremely dangerous especially when five out of the nine members were Journalism faculty or ex-Journalism people. A student newspaper should be controlled by students and action against editors should be taken only after prior determination of judicial guilt.

Professor Boyd Berry wanted to raise the possibility of the University getting altogether out of the business of student publication. All student publications had a built-in problem, that they were not really professional. They were not operating (as any other newspaper business would) to make money and they always involved the curious relationships of the editor to the legal owners of the paper. He suggested that the AAUP's statement be reconsidered.

Professor Taylor thought it might be instructive for the Council to have persons from the general student community present for the discussion the next time, and that the Council seek out such visitors.

The question then arose as to whether the report had been or should be discussed in Student Senate, especially in the light of the ruling that matters coming before the Board of Trustees affecting student affairs must be acted upon and recommendations made both by the Student Senate and the Faculty Council. It was agreed, after some discussion, that the Student Senate should be sent a copy of the report, so that whatever procedures it decided to engage in could be completed in time for the March meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Professor Shiner then asked whether there was not a related problem with respect to radio and television. The charge to the Committee had talked about "mass media" and the other mass media had not been considered in the report. Professor Siffin replied that there were probably some problems to be looked into in the area of radio and television but the prime concern had been with the Daily Student and its position within the University. Moreover there were so many transitions and changes going on in that area that the Committee's attention had been given to the Daily Student.

Vice-President Hartley adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Wolff, Secretary