

NOTICE OF

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1969, 2:30 P.M.

Faculty Council Room, Ballantine 008

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 4, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
4. Report from Nominations Committee (Ryder)
5. Continued Discussion of Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W.J. Siffin) (Faculty Council Circular #66)
6. Report of Committee for Research on Learning and Teaching (Professor Keith Mielke) (Faculty Council Circular #65)
7. Report of the University Committee for the Improvement of Teaching (Professor George Smerk) (Faculty Council Circular #70)
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)
10. Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh) (Faculty Council Circular #71)

Enclosed:

Minutes of the Meeting of March 4, 1969

Faculty Council Circulars #68 Memorial Resolution on the Death of Dr. Robert Louis Stumpner (Professor Jack Daugherty)

#69 Memorandum from Dr. Ralph Fuchs Regarding Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Consolidation of Afro-American Programs

#70 Report of the University Committee for the Improvement of Teaching (Professor George Smerk)

#71 Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh)

RECEIVED

MAR 13 1969

Minutes of the Faculty Council
March 18, 1969
Ballantine Hall 008
2:30 p.m.

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

Members Present: Vice-Presidents Snyder, Ryan; Provost Penrod; Deans B.E. Carter, Yamaguchi, Clark, Pinnell, Bain, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, J.E. Carter, Davidson, Farmer, Hackney, Lorentzen, Manlove, Martin, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Solt, Wolff, Auer, Breneman, Frye, Gray, Murray, Remak, R.L. Turner, R. C. Turner, Zeitlin, Ferdows (Southeast)

Alternates Present: Vice-President Hartley for President Sutton; Professor Fatouros for Dean Harvey; Professor Jenkins for Professor Mahler

Absent, No Alternate: Vice-Presidents Hartley, Merritt; Chancellor Hine; Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors Ballinger, Taylor, White, Sachs (South Bend), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Professors Boyd M. Berry, Richard G. Gray, Ralph H. Holsinger, M.E. Lawlis, William J. Siffin; Miss Betty Ketchen; Messrs David Cahill, Paul Helmke, Ric Manning, Ed Moss (News Bureau), Ted Najam, Michael Richmond, Rod Smith

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 4, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
4. Report from Nominations Committee (Ryder)
5. Continued Discussion of Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W.J. Siffin) (Faculty Council Circular #66)
6. Report of Committee for Research on Learning and Teaching (Professor Keith Mielke) (Faculty Council Circular #65)
7. Report of the University Committee for the Improvement of Teaching (Professor George Smerk) (Faculty Council Circular #70)
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)
10. Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh) (Faculty Council Circular #71)

Vice-President Hartley, taking the chair for President Sutton, called the meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 2:37 p.m.

The Minutes of the Meeting of March 4, 1969 were approved with the following corrections from the Secretary. First, on page 15 of those Minutes, between the first and second paragraphs, an important matter had been omitted. The formal vote on the motion "That the Council endorse and adopt the Report on Afro-American Affairs" had been called for at this point and had passed unanimously. Second, in writing up the discussion as to whether and how the Council should involve the Student Senate in the matter of the Report of the Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media the Secretary had chosen to omit much of the argument. Professor Ballinger wished to have recorded his statement that there was a significant difference between consulting with students and giving them a share in the making of relevant decisions.

On the Minutes of February 18, 1969, at the bottom of page 4, the President was reported as saying that the Sabbatical Leaves Committee had recommended to the Dean of Faculties sabbatical leaves for junior faculty members. This recommendation had, in fact, not emerged from the Sabbatical Leaves Committee but from the Committee on Academic Development.

Under Presiding Officer's Business, Vice-President Hartley noted that President Sutton would probably want to speak at some length to the Council about the past session of the Indiana General Assembly. He noted that the total legislative appropriation for operations of Indiana University had fallen far below expectations. Of the three units of the system, Indianapolis, he thought, fared relatively better than either the Regional Campuses or Bloomington. Some appeared to think that the Regional Campuses had come off remarkably well, but he disagreed. The University had been very anxious to develop four-year baccalaureate programs at campuses across the state, which meant improvement in the libraries and academic equipment, and especially in the number of qualified full-time faculty members. Quality baccalaureate programs required full-time faculty, so though there would be some additional funds the situation in the Regional Campuses would be tight in comparison with what the University ought to be doing. As for Bloomington, for the first time in decades operating funds for the coming year would be actually less in absolute terms than for the current year. He did not think this would be disastrous, though there was no doubt that we faced a major fee increase. If we were not to take restrictive financial action that would result in a perceptible reduction in academic quality, we had to try to find some optimum position relating our obligation to maintain academic excellence and the desire to minimize increases in tuition. With the request for capital funds very sharply reduced, he saw little chance of overcoming the severe space shortages throughout the system. Nevertheless, we should remember that this was only a single session of the Assembly. The University was 149 years old and he was confident we could work through our problems.

Under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary noted the possibility of an extra meeting on the 29th of April. The Agenda Committee, he said, had taken action, subject to approval from the Council, on the following matter: since Minutes were still formally restricted, though Council meetings were now open, the Agenda Committee had felt it was acting appropriately in arranging to have Minutes sent to the offices of the Staff Council and the new Graduate Student Council. He noted that the report from the Halls of Residence on the matter raised by the Section Committee on Teaching dealing with the first and last day of classes in relation to recess was being referred directly to the Student Affairs Committee. He then asked that Professor Buehrig be recognized.

Professor Buehrig had a resolution to offer as an aftermath of the second session of the General Meeting of the Faculty. He thought there were colleagues in Indianapolis who were alarmed by what was proposed, on an interim basis, for the all-University Faculty Council. By way of emphasizing that the proposed Article 21 was purely interim, he suggested that the Council adopt the following resolution: "THE FACULTY COUNCIL VIEWS THE FORMATION OF AN ALL-UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL TO BE AN URGENT MATTER. IT ANTICIPATES THAT STEPS TO THIS END WILL BE TAKEN IMMEDIATELY UPON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL, A FACULTY COUNCIL FOR IU-PU-I, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT BY THE REGIONAL FACULTIES OF REPRESENTATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH A METHOD OF THEIR CHOICE." The resolution was intended to show that, as soon as these Councils were established, the important question of an All-University Council would immediately be taken up. He moved and Professor Wolff seconded the adoption of the resolution.

Professor Remak noted some people had been compelled to vote against the motion because the proposed proportions had been too lopsided. He wished to undercut any impression that Bloomington was trying to shut out the other campuses.

Professor Buehrig also noted that some members of the faculty, particularly in the Regional Campuses, saw the all-University Faculty Council as being more properly constructed on the principle of a federation than on the basis of a ratio.

Vice-President Hartley emphasized how important it was that the all-University Council be organized permanently after the faculties at Indianapolis and on the regional campuses had organized their own councils. The burden of representing IUI in a discussion like that at the General Meeting should not rest on the shoulders of one or two faculty members, but rather on a duly constituted body representing the whole faculty.

The question was called for on the resolution and it was passed unanimously.

Vice-President Hartley then called on Professor Ryder for a report from the Nominations Committee.

Professor Ryder noted that only elected members of the Council vote on the Faculty Board of Review for which the Nominations Committee had prepared a ballot. The ballots were distributed and Vice-President Hartley announced that they would be collected during a tape break.

Professor Remak, meanwhile, raised the dilemma of assistant or associate professors being promoted after they had been chosen to represent their rank. This problem applied both to the Faculty Board of Review and to the proposed provision that assistant professors be guaranteed places on the new Faculty Council. Professor Ryder replied that we had, surely, no alternative but to assume their continuing legitimacy.

Vice-President Hartley then called for Item 5: Continued Discussion of Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media. Professor Buehrig, in order to get the topic before the Council, moved that the Council adopt the Recommendations to the Board of Trustees set out on pages 3 and 4 of Faculty Council Circular #66. Professor Robert C. Turner seconded the motion.

Vice-President Hartley then recognized Professor William Siffin, the Chairman of the Committee.

Professor Siffin first offered to the Council a minority report drafted by the two student members of the committee, Miss Betty Ketchen and Mr. Michael Richmond (Faculty Council Circular #73). He then acknowledged that there had been problems

over student participation in the Committee's operations. Two students had participated in the Committee's early work. During this year, the two original student members had withdrawn. One had been replaced by Miss Ketchen. Through a bizarre set of circumstances, he had failed to reach Miss Ketchen until after the report had been drafted. He was sorry about the circumstances that had conspired against her presence. However, he assured the Council that neither he nor the Committee had sought deliberately to exclude students and their opinions. He wished now to explain the rationale behind the recommendations. First, the Committee had found no evidence of intense and widespread demand that the Indiana Daily Student be made fully independent. Second, if "independence" meant "student control," that was not necessarily independence, nor was it necessarily consistent with the fact that the Student was essentially a community paper, with more than one constituent group. Third, the Committee had found no great fault with the Student. The limitations and problems that did exist did not constitute compelling cause for any radical change in its position. However, there were serious internal problems in the Student's relationship to the Department of Journalism, which had undoubtedly affected the paper's quality. Most importantly, the Committee initially defined its problem as follows: how could it achieve and assure in practice over time the fullest possible implementation of the principles of the "Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students." This statement, prepared by a Joint Drafting Committee representing the American Association of University Professors, the U.S. National Student Association, the Association of American Colleges, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, and approved by the U.S. National Student Association and the Council of AAUP, had been discussed at length by both the student and faculty members of the Committee. The majority of the Committee thought that its proposal did, in a practical fashion, sustain and advance those principles. The Committee recognized that its proposals could hardly satisfy everyone, yet the majority had agreed upon an arrangement that had the practical prospect of assuring the continued and improved existence of a good campus newspaper, which would serve the University community without being subject to domination by any one of the University's several constituencies, while offering greater opportunities for unrestrained student participation than in the past.

He finally noted that the report was controversial. Some people, he understood, felt that too radical a change in the relation between the University and the Student was being proposed. Other people thought that the Committee had rubber-stamped the Department of Journalism's proposal. There was little difference between the proposals, but this was because the majority of the Committee independently thought that the plan was a good one. Of the two essential disagreements involving the Report, one was basic: a totally independent press versus a press that was in some some way "buffered." The majority had recommended the latter. The minority had called for the former. There was no objective basis for choosing. One could say, simply, "independent is good, dependent is bad," and let it go at that. Or one could wrestle with a thoroughly complicated question and end up with a judgment.

The second disagreement had to do with the composition of the proposed Publications Board and especially with the share of student membership.

The Report recommended changing the relationship between the Department of Journalism and the Student by the creation of a Publications Board with faculty, student, and alumni representation, which would be responsible for the selection and removal of an editor. It recommended eliminating the relationship under which Student workers get academic credit for their work. The structural position of the Student as a unit of the University was not changed. What did change was the relationship of the Student to the Department of Journalism and in some ways to the University at large.

Vice-President Hartley then recognized Miss Betty Ketchen, a student member of the Committee. She wished first to note that the Report almost totally ignored its charge to study campus communications media other than the Student. She personally was particularly eager to see some discussion of the situation of the Arbutus whose Sesquicentennial edition could play a significant role in the celebrations. She thought that the Report did not do justice to the recommendations of the Self-Study Committee and of the implementing Section Committee. She wished to quote the relevant Self-Study recommendation:

"The Committee recommends the creation of a supervisory board for student publications composed both of faculty and students; responsibility for the Daily Student would be shifted to this board from the Journalism Department."

The Section Committee had recommended implementation and had suggested that the Faculty Council appoint a committee to investigate:

- "a. the financial and legal implications of such a move.
- b. the possible effects on the Department of Journalism in changing its relationship to The Daily Student, which now serves as a laboratory for Journalism majors.
- c. the feasibility of extending the Self-Study Committee's recommendation to include operation of the campus radio and television facilities in conjunction with the Daily Student as important media for communication on and off campus.
- d. the possibility of free distribution of The Daily Student on campus as a means of enhancing its status as a communications agent."

It was further recommended that, if possible, a (Miss Ketchen's emphasis) member of the Department of Journalism be placed on the committee appointed by the Faculty Council. Item (c) above suggested that "publications" should be given the widest possible interpretation as regards the Supervisory Board.

She had already voiced her disappointment that the Report had said nothing about the new television station, or about WIUS, or other forms of campus media. Mr. Michael Richmond, the other student member, and herself had in the Minority Report argued that the purpose of the Self-Study recommendation and its approval by the Section Committee had been defeated by the Report's proposal that the Trustees continue to vest general responsibility for the Student in the Department of Journalism. The qualification about editorial autonomy was in turn defeated by the two-thirds non-student membership of the proposed Publications Board.

Miss Ketchen then introduced two amendments to the Minority Report which appear in Faculty Council Circular #73 at the end of the Report.

Vice-President Hartley then recognized Mr. Richmond who referred to the Minority Report. On the first point, he thought that not enough had been done to separate the Student from the Department of Journalism, which would still be in a position to influence the newspaper and its editorial policy. On the next point, that a professional publisher had no place on a student newspaper, it was felt that if this were to be truly a student or community newspaper, then a major aspect of University policy should be to allow students to assume the responsible positions on it. The third point criticized the proposed Publications Board. The second recommendation proposed an editorial board as a substitute. The objectionable feature of the current recommendation was the presence of a majority of non-students on the board. Faculty should not be excluded, but the principles of a student newspaper required that it should be controlled by students. The other points either spoke for themselves or

had already been covered. In general, one returned to the principle that a student newspaper should be an independent corporation. The Report had acknowledged this, but it had also assumed that such independence was not practical. However, the Report nowhere explained why such an arrangement was impractical nor did it cite any investigative studies. But there were American universities in which student papers were independent, financially solvent, and free from any problems concerning libel.

Mr. David Cahill was then recognized. His main fear, he said, was that the Report proposed an institutionalized means for removing a student editor without a fight. He thought this was incompatible with the Joint Statement, which would clearly prefer that the student press behaved properly but did not recommend that impropriety be grounds for removing an editor. Mr. Cahill then introduced two quotations. The first one was from Successful Publishing on the Campus by James Cummins, written with the assistance of the U.S. Student Press Association which represented about 250 college papers not of the "underground" variety:

"In a typical year, according to one national survey, no fewer than twenty student editors (among 285 respondents) were suspended from school for alleged journalistic felonies. Eight editors' publications were suspended indefinitely. Twenty-two editors saw distribution of one or more offending issues stopped by the administration. 25 editors were removed from office. 5 faculty advisors were relieved of their advisory positions. And an unspecified number of editors were summoned to administrative carpets for quiet chats about alleged journalistic misdemeanors. By these figures, one editor in four might expect a major crisis to befall him in any given year, and rare is the student who emerges from a year's editorship unscorched by the hot breath of authority.

On a few campuses, the newspaper is independent from the university, so that the university has neither the legal authority nor the financial control to limit operations. Interestingly, most of these papers report a profit and tend to have less frequent clashes with the administration."

The second quotation was from an article, "Plain Talk on College Newspaper Freedom," by Roger Ebert, former president, U.S. Student Press Association and one-time editor of the Daily Illini, one of the independent student dailies. The article was taken from Herman Estrin & Arthur M. Sanderson, Freedom and Censorship of the College Press.

"There is no such creature as a Constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press which applies to editors. The Constitution, instead, defends the rights of publishers. And if a campus newspaper is legally published (or subsidized) by its institution, then the freedoms belong to the administration, and the student editor does not have any inherent rights.

Being the publisher of a campus newspaper does not consist entirely in the enjoyment of Constitutional freedom, however. The publisher is legally responsible for everything that is printed in his paper, and a university can be sued if its student journalists libel someone. As a result, there is a great deal of talk about responsibility of the student press. At the minimum, this means staying within the guidelines of newspaper law. At the worst, it may mean protecting the good name of the institution. In almost every case, it means censorship or supervision of some sort.

We live in an age of fairly enlightened university administration, and most colleges do not like to be in the position of censoring their student paper. It creates an unfavorable public image, and it breeds discontent in the student body. In addition, censorship plays upon the consciences of college presidents, who like to be thought of as open-minded and liberal toward student opinion. In place of a formal censor, then, a college newspaper is likely to possess an adviser, sponsor, consultant, faculty liaison, or senior copy editor. Whatever the title, however, the role is likely to be the same when a student press controversy boils over, and the adviser will caution the editors to show restraint in the best interest of the school or (still worse) of themselves and their newspaper.

Having said this, however, let me point out that there is no reason, really, why a university should publish its student newspaper. If I were a college president, I would not want the headaches attached to legal responsibility for the contents of a newspaper; I would consider it wiser to separate the newspaper from the school and let the editors have their freedom (and a taste of the responsibility, too).

It is not a coincidence, I am convinced, that many of America's greatest college newspapers are published by corporations which are financially separate from their universities. The list included the Harvard Crimson, Michigan Daily, Cornell Daily Sun, the Daily Texan, the Daily Illini, the Rutgers Daily Targum, and several others.

It is not enough, however, to create an independent publishing corporation in order to provide the campus with a free student newspaper. The corporation must be able to support itself. And newspaper economics make it very difficult for a student paper to meet its expenses out of advertising revenue, which is usually limited, and subscription fees (which, remember, cannot be collected through a compulsory student activity fund but must be solicited independently)." (Mr. Cahill noted that Indiana was in the fortunate position of having one of the few University-controlled newspapers which did sell and solicit subscriptions and subsisted on that and on advertising.) "How, then, can the paper pay its bills?

There are two fairly workable solutions. The first is to unite the student newspaper and the student yearbook in the same corporation. Yearbooks are usually profit-makers which can be used to make up the newspaper's deficit. Another solution, which is being considered with interest by a few schools, is to assist the newspaper through a no-strings-attached grant from a non-profit educational foundation attached to the university.

From both the Constitutional and the practical point of view, it is impossible to have a truly free student paper unless a separate publishing corporation is established to free the university from legal responsibility.

When a proposal such as this is made for a free campus newspaper, two questions are usually asked: what about libel? and, what do you do about long-term management?

I can speak only for the Daily Illini, but I believe our experience is fairly typical. The Illini has been independent since 1911. During that period of mostly daily publication, we have been sued for libel only four times. All of the suits were settled out of court. The company carries libel insurance as a routine precaution.

The Illini Publishing Co. employs a full-time professional company manager, who acts as publisher of the newspaper and oversees the yearbook operation and the job printing done in our shop. He is responsible for keeping the enterprise financially sound. He does not exercise any power of censorship, and indeed does not see the paper until it appears every morning. The affairs of the company are decided by a Board of Directors made up of four University faculty members and four students, who choose their own replacements."

Vice-President Hartley then called on Ted Najam, President of the Student Body. Mr. Najam hoped that the genuinely good recommendations made by the Department of Journalism with regard to the Student and to revision in curriculum would not be forgotten in the concentration on a few crucial issues. He had concurred in the presentation of the Minority Report and had had it printed by Student Government not because he supported it in every respect but because he felt there was need for a minority report. He wished to refer to the last meeting of the Student Senate. Subsequent to the March 4 meeting of the Faculty Council, he had had printed and circulated among the Senators copies of the Committee Report and Vice-President Helmke had appointed a committee of the Student Senate to review the Report and present a resolution to the Senate. This resolution had been presented on March 13 and had passed with 21 ayes, 14 abstentions and 7 noes. Mr. Najam was tempted to veto this resolution and probably would for the following reasons. In the first place, the number of abstentions was unusual and indicated that many Senators had not felt adequately informed. The overall figures meant that half of the Senators present had not been able to support the Report. Secondly, there were some substantive reasons for casting a veto. One reason was the composition of the Publications Board. He found the inclusion of alumni or those chosen through the auspices or under the direction of the Alumni Association on the Publications Board of a student newspaper very disturbing. He thought rather that there should be a greater percentage of students on the Board. Another reason was in the last sentence of the Committee Report which indicated that an editor might be relieved or temporarily suspended prior to a hearing. He thought an editor was innocent until proven guilty and that he should continue with his responsibilities until he was proven to have been derelict in his responsibilities. He was pleased with a great deal that the Department of Journalism had presented. But he was worried by the way in which the Committee Report mirrored the sentiments of the Department. If the Student was to become a truly campus-wide newspaper, we needed the involvement of many components within the University.

Professor Farmer asked whether the kind of thing the Minority Report suggested was legally possible. As he understood it, the Trustees were responsible for all assets of the University. There was an authority/responsibility question here which could not be ignored. He was not referring to the option of having no official paper at all and letting the Student run as a private corporation, because that had not been proposed. What was proposed seemed to be a University-sponsored operation or at least one that would use University facilities without those control features which seemed legally necessary.

Vice-President Hartley recognized Professor Boyd Berry, faculty advisor to the Ballantonian. Professor Berry said he had been persuaded by the Joint Statement, by his year as a faculty advisor, and finally by the Report that university control of student publications presented such difficult problems that the option Professor Farmer referred to of having the paper run as a completely private corporation should be seriously considered. The two very timely questions of journalistic professionalism and of censorship in themselves gave enough evidence of the overwhelming complexity resulting from continued university involvement. It would be simpler for the University simply to withdraw all financial connection with student publications. The

choice lay between the artificial situation of parental control of the newspaper and the neutral situation in which those students who want to publish things did all the publishing.

Vice-President Hartley then noted the presence of Mr. Rod Smith, editor of the Daily Student, Mr. Ric Manning, also of the editorial staff, and of Professor Richard Gray, Chairman of the Department of Journalism.

Professor Ryder was interested in the idea of a totally independent student press and asked what the Harvard Crimson and other papers cited did as far as subsidy was concerned. As he read the Minority Report it was not a proposal for an entirely independent journal but one which claimed also the advantages and immunities of dependence, both in the use of physical plant and in the call for a subsidy in perpetuity.

Vice-President Hartley wished to clarify an issue raised by Professor Farmer. The Board of Trustees of Indiana University was quite clearly responsible in every sense to the state of Indiana for the use of its property and its resources, and would be so in some way in respect to a student newspaper that used either physical facilities or funds of the University.

Miss Ketchen cited the case of the Purdue Exponent in which it had been recommended that the Board of Trustees sell the physical facilities of the printing plant for a token sum to a non-profit corporation made up of a board of nine members, three faculty, three students, and three Exponent staff members, the other students on the board to be appointed by Student Senate. The committee at Purdue had recommended no ownership or control by the Purdue administration or the Board of Trustees.

Professor Richard Gray said that the case in question had never been brought to court to his knowledge. However, decisions had been given on this matter and in every case these were to the effect that those who in any way owned a newspaper were liable as were those who were in any kind of editorial or business control. The faculty members on the board of control of the Exponent would therefore legally be held responsible for libel.

Miss Ketchen thought this would not be so if they were neither voting nor paid members of the board.

Professor Martin commented that he had had a very deep interest in this question since he had first read the Self-Study Committee's recommendations for change in the existing arrangement. He agreed with Mr. Najam that much of the Report was very good and should not be lost in the process of focusing attention on a few controversial issues. On the other hand, he thought the proposal needed some changes. He wished to suggest several changes and offer them in the form of amendments to the motion. His suggestions were designed to accomplish the following results. The first was intended to establish the idea that such a complex problem needed to be re-examined from time to time in the light of experience. The second and third suggestions were intended to follow two of the suggestions of the Minority Report, namely, that there was no place for a non-student publisher, and that if one member of the Board was appointed by the Chairman of the Department of Journalism from his faculty that person could serve the critical and advisory function set forth by the Committee without being called publisher or being given the authority that word implied and, lastly, that, in view of our inability to make a really autonomous paper, the University accepts its responsibility and have those three members whom the Committee would have had selected by the Journalism Alumni Association now be picked by the

Faculty Council. He therefore moved to amend the motion by striking, on page 3, paragraph 3 under point 2 of the Committee Report (Faculty Council Circular #66), the words "Now, therefore" and replacing them with the words "AS A FIRST STEP TOWARD THESE ENDS, AND WITH THE INTENTION OF RE-EXAMINING THESE ARRANGEMENTS IN THE LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE."

Professor Ryder seconded this amendment.

Professor Murray wondered if some mention of time might not be worked into the statement, but Professor Martin thought it unnecessary because the Council could always initiate a change by sending another resolution to the Board.

Vice-President Hartley then called for the question and the amendment passed unanimously. He then asked Professor Martin for his next amendment.

Professor Martin then moved to amend the motion further by deleting, in point 2 in the fourth line, the words "the publisher--save that if said publisher is not a member of the faculty, another," and by inserting the word "one" and inserting after the words "Journalism Department Faculty" the word "who," so that the sentence read "This Board shall consist of the Chairman of the Department of Journalism; one member of the Journalism Department Faculty who shall be appointed by the Chairman," striking the word "also".

Professor Ryder also seconded this amendment.

Professor Richard Gray said that he was opposed to this amendment because the students connected with the paper objected very strongly to members of the Journalism faculty who were doing classroom teaching serving in advisory capacity, and because that faculty was notoriously overworked without prospect of relief.

Professor Siffin wished to try to offset an unfortunate implication of the word "publisher." The Committee had used the term in part because it was a broader term than "faculty member" and therefore would make it possible for this person to be on the staff and payroll of the University without having to be eligible for faculty status. The range of qualifications called for were those possessed by a professional journalist who would be an advisor to the students on the paper who were learning their journalistic trade, but he would be separated from any classroom functions within the Department of Journalism. To insist on the advisor being an academic member of the Department of Journalism would reduce the amount of separation or autonomy which the Report was aiming for.

Professor Martin was worried that a professional person picked for that purpose could become the effective editor of the student paper. If we built in a non-academic, non-faculty staff person, hired young and continuing in the job, in a decade or so he would be the Indiana Daily Student. He thought it would be better to delete that function completely than risk such a possibility.

Professor Fatouros raised what seemed to him an awkward ambiguity in the role of the publisher, and asked what the actual qualifications of that person were and to what extent he would be part of the faculty.

Professor Richard Gray said that the description had been purposely left ambiguous because this could be a very difficult person to find. He would have to have the right rapport with students as well as the technical knowledge. It should not be required that he be in a regular faculty role in case he was not able to go

up through the academic ranks. So it was left either way. If he happened to have the qualifications for a regular faculty career, then he could be on the regular faculty; if not, then he could be a staff member within the Department. As to his role, he would act as an advisor and as a much needed continuing technical consultant who would mark up the paper after publication and who would write a weekly review of the previous week's publications pointing out matters of error in make-up or editorial judgment or syntax. He could play a very important teaching role without having any classroom responsibilities nor giving any grades.

In answer to a question from Professor Neu, Professor Gray said that there would be a business manager in addition to the publisher and that the business manager would report to the publisher. The finances of the Student were very complicated insofar as, unlike most campus newspapers, it was not distributed free. He wished also to disagree with some of Mr. Cahill's citations. For example, neither the Daily Texan nor the Michigan newspaper was in any way autonomous. The Yale and Harvard newspapers were autonomous but Yale and Harvard were very particular kinds of institutions. For example, they had a different kind of advertising from that in the Student, especially institutional advertisings from many big corporations. The advertising in the Student was from small businessmen in Bloomington who saw the Student as a legitimate advertising means that sold shoes or sweaters or pizza. The very organizations that Mr. Cahill had relied upon had published a study which said that "The financial structure and independence of the newspaper is dependent upon the individual circumstances in a given university community."

Professor Breneman thought some of the difficulties might be bypassed if the Publications Board were reconstituted and given the responsibility of selecting not only the editor but the publisher. He also thought a board consisting of the Chairman of the Department of Journalism, three student members, and three members of the faculty elected by the Faculty Council would be workable with input from the Department Chairman and yet with relative independence of the Department.

In answer to a question from Professor Murray, Professor Siffin said that the Chairman of the Department of Journalism was responsible for the choice of the publisher, and Professor Gray noted that all staff was chosen by student-faculty screening committees and by regular interview procedures.

Professor Martin then withdrew his amendment with the support of his seconder and moved instead that point 2 be amended to read "There is hereby created a Publications Board to select the editor and publisher of the Indiana Daily Student and to advise the editor and the Department of Journalism. This Board shall consist of the Chairman of the Department of Journalism; three faculty members from outside the Department of Journalism to be selected by the Faculty Council; and three students to be chosen by the Student Senate. Said Board shall elect its own chairman."

Professor Ryder seconded this amendment.

Professor Murray asked why the phrase "and the Department of Journalism" was needed and also whether it would not be desirable to retain the sentence "from among a list of nominees submitted by the editor of the Indiana Daily Student" to give a little clearer idea of where the students might come from. He had a further worry in the first resolution prepared for the Trustees, namely, that the general responsibility for the publication be changed to read that the Board rather than the Department be the agency in which the general responsibility of the publication would be vested.

Professor R.C. Turner asked for some discussion from the Committee of the reasons for including practicing journalists on the Board.

Professor Siffin said that one of the assumptions of the Report was that journalism had certain professional standards and norms, and that this professionalism was part of the source of responsibility of those engaged in the practice of journalism. It was thought that the presence of professional journalists on the Board might further those professional values.

Professor Ralph Holsinger, giving examples from other professions and skills, wished to echo Professor Siffin's point that journalism was a discipline, with a considerable body of professional knowledge. Part of the responsibility for the low esteem in which journalism was held by some today was that many publishers had assumed that anyone who could write could work for a newspaper. Fortunately, publishers today were beginning to see that the crisis of our time was a product of a breakdown in communications. If journalism was an increasingly important discipline then there was something to be said for having some professional journalists on a Board that was to decide whether or not an editor had violated the canons of good journalism. He wished to make one further point. The Student was not "just a student newspaper." It had approximately 9,000 circulation and served a community of about 30,000 students, faculty, administrators, and staff. The purpose of both the Committee and the Department of Journalism was to aim for a newspaper that would adequately serve all the elements of this University community with a high degree of professionalism.

In answer to a question from Miss Ketchen, Professor Richard Gray noted that there were 12 full-time employees of the Student, one with 20 years tenure, whose presence gave rise to a much more complex issue than perhaps appeared on the surface. The business manager in particular had been building circulation from advertising and the operating deficits on the Student had dropped from \$35,000 five years ago to a current surplus of \$6,000. He thought this was evidence for a continuing business manager. The Student was a large business organization and needed professional guidance on the business side. He wished also to say that three professional journalists need not be appointed by the Journalism Alumni group--there were a number of different ways this could be done. He noted more than 1,000 issues of the Student were daily mailed outside Monroe County and that only 59% of the paid circulation went to students. Historically, the most infamous periods of censorship in this country had been at times when journalism had been especially partisan. Such partisanship had aroused repressive opposition and he would hate to see the day when a governing board was allowed to become a partisan body.

Professor Remak then put before the Council, for the record, the board favored by the Student Senate: "The Board shall be composed of 9 members only; the Chairman of the Department of Journalism; one non-Journalism Department faculty member elected by the Faculty Council; publisher; 3 professional journalists; and 3 students." He also noted that the resolution said: "The Board may meet on the petition of any 3 members; a positive vote of 7 is needed to suspend the editor; the Senate prefers the student Board members be elected according to the procedures suggested in the Department of Journalism's Report, that is to say, 2 selected by the Indiana Daily Student staff and 1 selected by the Senate." He was prepared to move that the suspension of the editor should require a 2/3 majority. He was personally very much concerned about the question of accuracy. The Student had a monopoly on campus, in that every other student newspaper or magazine was basically an opinion newspaper. Accuracy was extraordinarily important in these explosive times. One issue of the Student recently had had three retractions about the way somebody had been reported. For this reason he thought professional help and criticism was very seriously needed.

Professor Buehrig was impressed with the arguments for the inclusion of practicing journalists and he could think of no better way of selecting those individuals than through the Alumni Association of the Department. He would vote against the amendment.

Dean Carter was also concerned about accuracy. Many student newspapers did not report the news. They had a series of editorials with nice headlines. He wished however to make the point that alumni membership of the Board, however it was chosen, might well provide useful protection for the editors against external criticism.

Professor M.E. Lawlis replied that the Committee had considered that very point and endorsed Dean Carter's position.

Vice-President Hartley then called for the vote of Professor Martin's amendment. A roll call vote was taken and the amendment was lost with 6 ayes, 16 noes, and 5 abstentions.

<u>Aye</u>	<u>Nay</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Fatouros for Harvey	Auer	Frye
Martin	Bain	Remak
Murray	Beuhrig	Ryder
Neu	B.E. Carter	Wolff
Shiner	Clark	Zeitlin
Solt	Endwright	
	Farmer	
	Lorentzen	
	Jenkins for Mahler	
	Manlove	
	Penrod	
	Ryan	
	Snyder	
	R.L. Turner	
	R.C. Turner	
	Yamaguchi	

Professor R.C. Turner then moved that, because the Minority Report had been submitted after the Committee's Report had been prepared and because a good many new ideas had been brought forward THE MOTION BE POSTPONED AND THAT THE COUNCIL ASK THE COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER SOME OF THESE SUGGESTIONS AND COME BACK AT THE NEXT MEETING WITH CHANGES THAT MIGHT BE MADE IN ITS ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

Professor Fatouros seconded this motion.

Professor Ryder wished to note that his abstention on Professor Martin's amendment was the result of his interest in the case for having professional journalists on the Board.

Vice-President Hartley called for the question and the motion passed unanimously.

Professor R.L. Turner noted that the Agenda Committee could perhaps order the agenda items so that the waiting time of people visiting the Council to present reports could be minimized.

Vice-President Hartley added that the Council should also consider some kind of limitation on either the number of visitors who speak or on the length of their comments. Otherwise, he was afraid the Council would never be able to reach decisions on some highly significant issues which he hoped would not be indefinitely postponed.

Professor Ryder then referred to the ballot for the Faculty Board of Review and moved THAT THE FULL PROFESSOR RECEIVING THE LARGEST NUMBER OF VOTES BE DESIGNATED AS CHAIRMAN.

Professor Manlove seconded this motion and it passed unanimously.

The membership of the newly elected Faculty Board of Review was announced and is as follows:

Professor David Maxwell, Chairman (Business Economics & Public Policy)
 Professor Daniel Miller (Physics)
 Associate Professor Gene Groff (Production Management)
 Associate Professor Sherwin Mizell (Anatomy & Physiology)
 Assistant Professor Marian Swayze (Education)

Vice-President Hartley then adjourned the meeting of the Council at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
 Michael Wolff, Secretary