

NOTICE OF
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETINGS

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1969, AND TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1969, 2:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of April 8, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
- *4. Continued Discussion of Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W.J. Siffin) (Faculty Council Circulars #66, #73 and #76)
5. Continued Discussion of Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh) (Faculty Council Circular #71)
6. Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey) (Faculty Council Circular #77)
- **7. Report of the Committee on Fraternities and Sororities (Remak)
8. Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings (Professor Philip Appleman) (Faculty Council Circular #64)
9. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Junior Division (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item A)
10. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Academic Calendar (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item B)
- **11. Report of the Foster Project Advisory Committee (Professor Jack Balcer)

Enclosed:

Minutes of the Meeting of April 8, 1969

Faculty Council Circulars #75 Memorial Resolution for Professor John F. Schrodtt, Jr.
(Professor Ingrid Strom)

#76 A Further Report of the Faculty Council Committee on
Campus Communications Media (Siffin)

#77 Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey)

#78 Student Senate Resolution Concerning the Siffin
Committee Report on Campus Media

#79 Proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences
Relating to the Junior Division and the Academic
Calendar (B.E. Carter)

* The Final Report of the Committee on the Daily Student is not available in time for general distribution but will be sent to Council members in time for the meeting of April 22. Interested faculty should request copies of this report from Mrs. Richardson, Ballantine 542 (337-9533). All this material will subsequently be distributed as a Faculty Council Circular.

** It is expected that reports from these Committees will be distributed to the faculty in time for the April 29 meeting.

Minutes of the Faculty Council

April 22, 1969

Ballantine Hall 008

2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice-President Snyder; Provost Penrod; Deans B.E. Carter, Harvey, Yamaguchi, Bain, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, Davidson, Farmer, Hackney, Lorentzen, Manlove, Martin, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Solt, Wolff, Auer, Ballinger, Breneman, Frye, Gray, Mahler, Murray, Remak, R.C. Turner, Sachs (South Bend)

Alternates Present: Vice-President Hartley for President Sutton; Dean Hagen for Vice-President Hartley; Dean Day for Vice-President Merritt; Dean Hattery for Vice-President Ryan; Dean Bogan for Chancellor Hine; Dean Peak for Dean Clark; Dean Williams for Dean Pinnell; Dean Joyner for Professor Taylor; Professor Pugh for Professor R.L. Turner

Absent, No Alternate: Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, White, Zeitlin, Ferdows (Southeast), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Professors Theodore Bowie, Georges Edelen, Ralph H. Holsinger, Merritt E. Lawlis, Elinor Ostrom, Irving J. Saltzman, William J. Siffin; Messrs David Cahill, Charles D. Fernald, Fred A. Hardy, Earl Hoff (News Bureau), Lawrence D. Klein, Curt Zimansky

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of April 8, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
4. Continued Discussion of Report of Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media (Professor W.J. Siffin) (Faculty Council Circulars #66, #73, and #76)
5. Continued Discussion of Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh) (Faculty Council Circular #71)
6. Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey) (Faculty Council Circular #77)
7. Report of the Committee on Fraternities and Sororities (Remak)
8. Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings (Professor Philip Appelman) (Faculty Council Circular #64)
9. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Junior Division (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item A)
10. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Academic Calendar (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item B)
11. Report of the Foster Project Advisory Committee (Professor Jack Balcer)

The meeting of the Faculty Council was called to order at 2:38 p.m. by Vice-President Hartley, who presided because of the illness of President Sutton.

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 8, 1969, were approved unanimously.

Under Presiding Officer's Business, Vice-President Hartley mentioned President Sutton's visit to Washington to encourage Congress to restore some of the funds that had been cut from federal sponsorship of student aid and his participation in the Annual National Meeting of the American Association of Universities at Williamsburg, Virginia. President Sutton had reported that the mood of the latter meeting had been most discouraging. Vice-President Hartley alluded to this because he thought that Indiana University had stood out among leading universities as one where the working relationships within the faculties, the student body, the scholar-administrators, and the Board of Trustees had been excellent. He was sure he was tempting the gods by talking that way but he wished to indicate his personal appreciation for the maintenance of the tradition. Indiana was an open university where all could reason and seek truth together. He was proud of the University and of the student body and he fully expected that we would move through the rest of the semester reasoning together calmly and quietly as a house of intellect and a community of scholars should. These were trying times and our objective must be to see that higher education emerged in the 1970's as a strengthened institution and not as a weakened one.

The following business took place later in the meeting but is best presented here.

Vice-President Hartley then noted that the Council had worked long and arduously to recommend to the Faculty some amendments to the Faculty Constitution. Professor R.L. Turner, Secretary of the Faculty, now had the result of the balloting on those amendments.

Professor Buehrig was called on and reported the votes. On the proposed new Sections 20 and 21, the vote in favor had been 439 and against 268. On the ballot which concerned revision in the existing Constitution insofar as it seemed to require that changes in the By-laws be referred to the whole faculty, the vote had been 331 for and the vote against 350, so that proposed amendment had failed to be adopted.

Vice-President Hartley remarked that the major work of the Council had borne fruit and that the full report was being distributed and could be further discussed. He wished to remind the Council that the Indianapolis faculty had been concerned about its small representation on the proposed interim University Council and that we were all committed to push the development of the permanent Council. The Indianapolis faculty committee was moving very rapidly towards formulation of a constitution for its own Council. Once that step had been taken, then we could move towards the organization of the permanent all-University Council.

Under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary noted that the Committee on the Safety Division chaired by Dean Harvey had raised the question of the release for distribution outside the University of reports made to the Council. That committee had consulted other institutions and some of them had expressed an interest in seeing their report. Dean Harvey had referred this matter to the Agenda Committee.

After a short discussion, the Council agreed that a report should be released no earlier than the first presentation of it to the Council and that it would depend upon the Council's wishes at that time as to whether the report would be released while it was still under discussion.

The Secretary then reported that the Agenda Committee recognized that there was a good deal of interest in the subject of grading and that this subject must be brought before the Council. It did not see how this could properly be done before the fall. Nevertheless it proposed shortly to distribute a package of relevant documents and to ask the Council at the meeting subsequent to the distribution of those documents to consider a referral to a Standing Committee, or to some sub-committee of a Standing Committee, with a view to the topic being on the Agenda next fall. The distribution of the package would be both to give that committee something to work with and to alert the faculty and the University to the subject and to some of the things that were being said about it. It would give people the summer to brood over the subject. All this was, of course, intended to be without prejudice to the rights of next year's Agenda Committee.

Professor Wolff then left the Council for another meeting and Professor Gray took over the Secretary's chair.

Vice-President Hartley then called for Item 4 on the Agenda: Continued Discussion of the Report of the Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media, and asked Professor Auer to open the discussion.

Professor Auer said that, as the person who had made the motion to recommit at the previous Council meeting, he thought that the Committee had done admirably what it had been asked to do. He moved the adoption of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4) with its three points (a), (b), and (c). Professor Buehrig seconded the motion. (The reference is to Faculty Council Circular #80, Final Report of the Committee to Review the Daily Student and Other Mass Media).

Professor Siffin was called on and referred to this Report, pointing out that its recommendations were substantially compatible with the resolution adopted by the Student Senate although there were some incidental variations that were discussed and explained in the final sections of the Report itself.

Professor Ballinger thought that the Committee had not done what several members of the Council had wanted it to do, namely, give the rationale for what it proposed, particularly in the light of other possibilities. Nevertheless, taking the proposal as it was, he did wish for some clarification in respect to the addendum called "The Code of Ethics of the United States Student Press Association." If this Code were to be adopted as normative and binding upon one segment of the operation of the University, it would seem difficult to deny its operation where relevant in another segment of that operation. Moreover, the Code was more than a code of ethics. The first four paragraphs did not deal with the rights of the student press against infringement by others. There was no indication of what sanctions might be applied against those in the University who might violate any of those four items under the heading "Freedom." There might also be some question as to what "student press" meant. If it were a general term, then it would include all publications produced by students, or student organizations, including the Spectator. In that case the 3rd paragraph was most interesting where it referred, among other things, to "financial sanctions." Under the heading "Responsibility" there were some problems of phrasings that needed clarification. The paragraph referring to "respect for the privacy and right of the individual" seemed unnecessarily vague, and he would have very little idea if he were sitting on the proposed publications board as to what that meant for the removal or the retention of an editor. Again the statement referring to the responsibility to maintain the "highest standards of accuracy," etc., might well be interpreted to be the norm upon which the judgment of the publications board

would be based in considering replacing an editor "upon finding that he has violated the code of ethics." The language here surely needed to be tightened because a violation of the "highest standards of accuracy" was very easy to commit. The Code of Ethics at least talked about "flagrant and consistent violation" and he thought that the words "flagrantly and consistently" should be added to the Committee's proposal on this point. He was worried generally about the absence of distinctions in the Code between admonitions which pointed to an ideal which it was hoped would be achieved and a disciplinary rule upon which something as serious as a discharge of an editor could be based. His final comment was to ask whether the publications board had any function other than the consideration of the discharging of an editor.

Professor Siffin noted that the only official functions of the publications board were the hiring and the discharging (under certain conditions) of an editor. What these conditions raised were very serious and difficult problems, because it was probably impossible to arrive at a full set of specifications that would serve as an automatic guide to judicial action. He wished only to point out that his Committee, ranging in membership from a tax lawyer to the editor of the Spectator, had found it possible to accept this Code of Ethics. As far as the application of this Code to any other publication was concerned, that was outside what he took to be his Committee's current obligations.

Professor Murray wished to support Professor Ballinger in his implicit suggestion that the principles set forth in this Code under the heading "Freedom" be adopted by the University or by the Department of Journalism as appropriate to their side of the relationship of the student newspaper to the University.

Dean Carter wished to speak here as a Dean addressing an important and significant issue involving an academic program. He understood Professor Murray and Professor Ballinger's point about the general principles involved, but he wished the Council to find its way to a decision about the Student. For years the Department of Journalism had had the responsibility of running the Student. It had been a back breaking obligation. There was before the Council a proposal which most members would agree was better than the present arrangement and which provided for review within a relatively short period. In its discussion, the Council ought to think of the morale of the members of the Department of Journalism who for the first time had an opportunity to break away from what had been put on their shoulders in large part through our neglect. The Department had gone through a substantial curriculum revision. If this was to take effect the issue of the Student must be resolved. If general principles about student rights with respect to all publications were to be the topic at this time, the Council risked jeopardizing what he was confident was an improvement in the educational opportunities available to students who decided to major in the Department of Journalism. There would be further opportunities to discuss that topic, but we were meanwhile damaging an academic program, and the longer the Council delayed, the more likely it would be to put the Department in an impossible position for next fall. He was especially disturbed about the situation because he had been most impressed with what had been done in curriculum revision and in particular in making a Department of Journalism that would be at home within a College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Shiner thought that, in fact, adoption of this Report would not imply adoption of this Code of Ethics for general purposes. There would be only the very restricted reference in Recommendation (3). He suggested, however, that that Recommendation could be improved and he moved to AMEND THAT RECOMMENDATION ON PAGE 1 OF THE REPORT, THE SECOND LINE FROM THE BOTTOM, BY INSERTING "FLAGRANTLY" BEFORE "VIOLATED THE CODE OF ETHICS." Professor Ballinger seconded this motion.

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

Professor Murray then moved, as an amendment to Recommendation (2) on page 1 the proposal of Messrs. Cahill and Richmond that the professional journalists be non-voting members. He did not wish to support it either way, but he did want it to get consideration.

Mr. Cahill noted that this amendment would also require the lowering of the five-man vote needed to remove an editor. He believed that control in such an important matter should be vested in a lay body rather than one containing experts. He noted that Mr. Richmond and himself had decided to go along with the Report in the hope that the publications board would be only interim. He also wished to enter into the record the Statement of the Board of Trustees at Purdue about the Exponent. (This statement is attached as Faculty Council Circular #83, along with a statement from the Student Advisory Board of the Department of Journalism, also submitted to the Council but not read.)

Professor Auer thought it would be very unbecoming of the Council as faculty members to take a stand against experts.

Professor Lawlis noted the assumption that the publications board would act in good faith. He thought this assumption should extend to the three professional members and that they should have some power on the board in exchange for their involvement.

The motion was voted on and lost, all present voting nay except for Professor Martin who voted aye, and Professors Frye, Mahler, and Murray who abstained.

Professor Ballinger then referred to Recommendation (4) (b) and moved as an amendment THAT THE WORDS "SHALL BE PRIVILEGED" IN THE THIRD LINE OF THAT SECTION BE CHANGED TO "HAVE A RIGHT TO APPEAR IN OPEN HEARING." This motion was seconded by Professor Remak.

Vice-President Hartley called for the vote on the motion and it was passed unanimously.

In answer to a question from Professor Murray, Professor Siffin said that it was the intent of the Committee that the publisher be appointed as any faculty or another professional member of the University staff would be.

Vice-President Hartley called for the vote on the original motion, TO ADOPT THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED. The motion was passed unanimously.

Dean Harvey noted that the original mandate to the Committee had been that it deal also with media other than the Student. He asked for some clarification of the status of that part of the mandate.

After a short discussion, the Council accepted Dean Harvey's suggestion that the Agenda Committee review the original establishing resolution, see what part of the original mandate was still pending, and report to the Council.

Vice-President Hartley then called for Item 5 on the Agenda, Continued Discussion of Report of the Graduate School TA Committee, and asked Professor Pugh to open the discussion.

Professor Pugh asked Professor Remak, as a member both of the Committee and the Council, to offer an amendment to Proposal A of the Report (Faculty Council Circular #71, page 3).

Professor Remak said that the effect of the proposed amendment was to leave the first two sentences as they were and to offer a substitute for the third sentence. The new paragraph would read: "That there be a change in nomenclature. A graduate student who has responsibility for teaching and assigning grades for at least a portion of a course and who has, in an instructional role, direct contact with the students should be called an Associate Instructor. THE PREVIOUS PAYROLL TITLES OF TEACHING ASSOCIATE AND TEACHING ASSISTANT WILL BE ELIMINATED." He wished to refer to the discussion at the last Council meeting. In the first place, the Committee was well aware that significant changes of the sort proposed were not going to dispose of all questions very smoothly. He wished to remind the Council that the Committee was asking for a standing committee to iron out problems. He hoped therefore that the Council would not insist on 100% assurance that everything had been worked out before giving its consent to what the Committee considered a basic act of justice. As to the point that making the Associate Instructorship so attractive that graduate students would want to stay in the role indefinitely, the Committee recognized that there was no obligation of any kind on the part of any department to prolong the awarding of its Associate Instructorships to its departmental assistants. The department had now and under this proposal would continue to have complete jurisdiction. Again, as to the effect that a move to upgrade teaching associates might have on other graduate fellows and other graduate students who were not teaching, the Committee was conscious of that possible effect and was willing, despite this, to give special attention to the teaching associate in his crucial and delicate classroom function. As for the difficulty with some of the provisions of the proposal insofar as an Associate Instructor would lose privileges when he reverted to the status of a regular graduate student, such privileges as those connected with library reserve or desk copies, were lost naturally with the change of job. Some others, for example, medical insurance, might well be retained. Perhaps the University should move in the direction of giving better medical insurance to all graduate students. In any event, that was not a major problem. Another point was that, although this proposal, in essence, gave the TA's the supposed freedom of faculty members to do what they wanted in the classroom, there was keen awareness in the Committee that nothing should weaken the power and the responsibility of a department to criticize, supervise, and help a TA in his teaching. A last point had to do with the worry of at least one Council member that the Associate Instructor as a graduate student might be loaded down with too many committee responsibilities. It would be important for departments not to forget that the Associate Instructor was also a graduate student and for the Associate Instructor himself to assume and claim whatever responsibilities, committee memberships and so on, related to his teaching. He believed very strongly that, though the University had done a very good job, by and large, of preparing graduate students in their disciplines, it had done a bad job, or no job at all, in preparing them to be faculty members. These students had very little idea of what it meant to be a member of a college, or a school, or a department; and of how a school or department worked. We should welcome Associate Instructors getting first-hand experience of how a university functioned.

Vice-President Hartley reminded the Council that the original motion before it was Professor Remak's motion to adopt Proposal A, the one Professor Remak was now proposing to amend.

Professor Ryder asked if the Committee had thought about making some distinction between Teaching Associate and Associate Instructor, proposing that after a certain point a graduate student attain a position which warranted his being made a part-time member of the faculty. As chairman, he felt that it would be really very strange for him to write to new B.A.'s congratulating them on becoming part-time members of the faculty. He realized that the assigning of that point, say, at the M.A. or at the time of passing the doctoral qualifying examinations would pose very difficult questions from department to department and school to school.

Mr. Lawrence Klein, Teaching Associate in the School of Education and a member of the Committee, was recognized. He thought that Professor Ryder's concern was misplaced. The teaching associates were not thinking about their image. They were concerned rather with the privileges and rights that should accompany the job. He thought the Council ought to focus its attention on these rights.

Professor Ryder replied that, for him, the image had been only a sort of a metaphor for his concern for the substance which was that, if the Council was going to give the prerequisites of part-time faculty status without at the same time recognizing the full responsibilities of faculty status, it would be approaching too close to sentimentality. Because he could not see asking graduate students in his department to take on that full responsibility in course preparation and committee assignments, he was asking for something short of full faculty status for the TA in his first or second year. He was not 100% against the proposal, but he was against it on balance. He spoke for himself and he believed for the TA's in his department when he said that such privileges as parking, medical insurance, office space if possible, bookstore privileges, and support for attendance at one professional meeting a year, were a great deal more important than any universal application of part-time faculty status. If he was not convinced otherwise by further discussion, he planned to offer a motion to the effect that, without prejudice to the remainder of the report, the TA Committee be asked to study and report back on the feasibility of a distinction in grade between Teaching Associate and Associate Instructor, the latter rank to be attained at some more advanced level.

Professor Irving Saltzman of the Committee said that what Professor Ryder was suggesting was that the beginning Associate Instructor be required to earn the rights and privileges of a teacher after he got his appointment as a teacher. The Committee disagreed with that and thought that the Associate Instructor was entitled to those rights with his appointment. Recognition of experience was present in the Report in terms of increased salary.

Professor Farmer was bothered by this report's originating from and applying primarily to the College of Arts and Sciences. Input from the School of Business had been largely statistical with very little discussion or expression of opinion. He was uncertain about supporting the Report insofar as it would be applied to schools outside the College. His own TA's were very much in favor of the benefits. However, he did not himself know how this proposal worked in relation to the School of Business or some of the other professional schools. He thought there should be further investigation of the question as it related to the professional schools.

Vice-President Hartley said that it had been brought to his attention that this Committee appeared to be a committee of the College of Arts and Sciences with thirteen members from the College and three from the School of Education, and that it was not an official committee of the Faculty Council, and that it did not represent the total spectrum of the University in Bloomington or on the other

campuses. However, when Dean Carter proposed this Committee, he had had his (Vice-President Hartley's) encouragement and Vice-President Hartley had thought that there would be merit in having the Report made to the Council.

Dean Carter had also heard complaints on procedure. This Committee had been created in the fall of 1968 after Dean Yamaguchi and he had told a meeting of the Council of Deans of their intent to appoint a committee to look into questions of rights, prerequisites, responsibilities, and status of TA's. They had invited representatives of other schools to join in the creation of that committee. The only school which had responded had been the School of Education. He may well have been negligent in not getting in touch with the other Deans when it had appeared that the dimensions of the recommendations were such that it had become important that members of their staffs participate. He accepted that responsibility. The Report had come to the Council, however, because, if the School of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences had proposed the adoption of the Report or had even proceeded independently with those portions with which they could proceed, then the professional schools would have been under great pressure and it would have been very difficult for them to have faced up to the situation. Therefore it seemed that the Council was the only appropriate body that could deal with something that could have repercussions over the entire system.

Professor Farmer then made the general suggestion that, in cases like this one, when widely significant action was proposed, schools that might be affected at least have a chance to make modifications in the proposals.

Professor Remak reminded the Council that there was nothing in the Proposal that would restrict any school. Since it simply said any school which appointed a graduate student as a teacher with specified responsibilities would be designating him an Associate Instructor, the basic decision still rested with the schools. He wished to support Professor Saltzman's remarks about the complications of promotions within the Teaching Associate system. We should not think too much about how the regular faculty member was going to appear next to an irregular, or associate, faculty member nor how a Fellow was going to appear next to a TA. As Professor Wolff had said at the last meeting, we had to see the situation from the point of view of the classroom. A semi-permanent fact of life was that 4,000 undergraduates were enrolled in a course taught by a teaching associate, over 3,000 were taught by two, 1,500 by three, and almost 500 by four or more. The University had to acknowledge that it was using these people as instructors. If anything, "Associate Instructor" was a little too modest, because in most cases they were the instructors to the students. They did and ought to get help from the full-time faculty, but they went to the classrooms, they taught the texts, they gave the tests and graded them. To the student it made absolutely no difference whether or not they had B.A.s, M.A.s, or Ph.D.s.

Professor Murray referred, as an example, to a first-year graduate student assigned in a laboratory to assist in laboratory instruction. Perhaps a laboratory quiz would be given and he perhaps would be required to give certain grades on that quiz--altogether a very limited instructional involvement; he might also be assigned to grade certain questions in an examination, say, one or two out of ten, during the semester; he would then be a teacher assigning part of a grade in a course. Nevertheless, he did not appear to Professor Murray to be the sort of person who would be appropriately placed in the category of Associate Instructor. He wished to know if this title was going automatically to designate someone on the basis of some fairly clearly defined rule or was the department to make the determination in each case, and, if that were so, was a departmental chairman within his rights, if he simply did not so appoint someone who in someone else's opinion might well qualify.

Professor Ostrom replied. One of the reasons, she said, for proposing the single title of Associate Instructor was that multiple titles had not been used in any consistent way. There was such wide disparity in current practices, even with gradations in title, that the Committee decided to conceptualize the teaching student within one category to include the whole range from the student who had a responsibility for assigning only a portion of a grade and teaching only a portion of a class, to the student who was teaching a class to the extent of establishing his own syllabus, preparing his own book orders, assigning the final grades without sharing any responsibility except perhaps with a faculty member to whom young faculty were assigned for some sort of supervision. Of course, departmental action had to follow. A department had to have a fair degree of freedom over this sort of legislation. One of the reasons that the Committee had then proposed under "D" that "a permanent University-wide Associate-Instructor Committee be established by the Faculty Council" was to enable problems of interpretation to be resolved.

Professor Ryder said that he had a specific gradation in mind. For example, in his department, he would be delighted to have teaching M.A.'s become Associate Instructors, thereby avoiding promotional hassles. The issue here might well be the dilution of the concept of faculty. To accept the proposal would salve our consciences, but he was not sure what else it would do. He was not even positive that every student invited was going to want to come to an institution where the concept of faculty was held in rather flexible esteem. Therefore, despite the pending amendment and without prejudice to the remainder of the Report, he wished to make a motion to recommit Proposal A to the Teaching Associate Committee for a report on the feasibility of a distinction in grade between Teaching Associate and Associate Instructor, the latter rank to be granted at a more advanced level. The motion was seconded by Professor R.C. Turner.

Professor Buehrig thought that the problem raised by Professor Murray might be resolved and the cause of Professor Ryder's unease be avoided if the second sentence were to be changed to eliminate the qualification that was now contained in that sentence "for at least a portion of a course." If the definition of an Associate Instructor were to be one who had full responsibility for teaching and assigning grades in a course, we would avoid the anomaly of a first-year graduate student having the title of Associate Instructor because there would not be first-year graduate students with full responsibility for a course, including final grades.

Dean Carter commented that that was, unfortunately, not true.

Professor Ryder thought that trying to reword the proposal to avoid recommitting it might deprive us of the benefit of the judgment of the TA Committee which might want to look at the situation in the light of various departmental or divisional contexts.

Professor Pugh wished to say in regard to the motion to recommit, that the nomenclature problem had been thoroughly discussed in Committee, including the implication that first-year graduate students would have the rank of Associate Instructor. No terminology, allowing for gradations in rank, could be found that made sense for all departments. Therefore, the Committee had concluded that only one title could be used. Its focus had been classroom responsibility.

Professor Murray asked how the Committee would consider the laboratory assistant he had described. Professor Pugh thought he would be an Associate Instructor under the current proposal.

Dean Bain noted that the School of Music was deeply involved in using the services of graduate assistants. He thought that part of the difficulty might well reside in a confusing use of academic titles. Might not reference to an associate teacher make clear that we were not talking about another conventional faculty rank? The School of Music needed gradations of rank within its graduate assistants and he therefore supported Professor Ryder's proposals.

Professor Mahler was impressed by Professor Remak's plea for justice for graduate students who were teachers and now had the responsibilities of teachers without having their privileges. But he thought there was an implied absence of justice for a group of advanced students, particularly in the science departments, who were no longer teaching because they were good enough to be supported by outside fellowships, or research assistantships.

Professor Pugh said that the Committee had been charged to examine the teaching function of TA's and it focused on that function in the hope of improving things in the classroom. It was quite conceivable that other groups ought to have some of the same rights and privileges.

Professor Mahler said that some of these non-TA's had teaching functions in the laboratory but were not being paid by the University.

Professor Pugh replied that as long as they had direct contact with students, they would meet the proposed definition.

Professor R.C. Turner suggested that, in the absence of input from some parts of the University and on substantive grounds, a wider motion to recommit might be in order. He would like to see the entire Report recommitted to an all-University committee.

Dean Peak thought it was becoming clear that the issue was not status but fringe benefits. Perhaps a gradated series of fringe benefits could be developed, designed to correspond to the different sort of work called for from various sorts of graduate students.

Professor Ryder noted that those who felt as he did that the other provisions of the Report should be adopted but that, at the same time, the rank of TA should not be totally eliminated, could vote for recommitting Proposal A.

Professor Murray argued against this because he thought the rest of the Proposals were bound up in Proposal A and because either a different committee or the current Committee broadened to include the rest of the University should receive the recommitment.

Professor Shiner then moved, as an amendment, that the entire Report be committed to the Council's Standing Committee on Faculty Affairs.

Professor Farmer seconded this motion.

Professor Buehrig thought it a disadvantage that this committee would have to begin from scratch.

Professor Martin wished to argue against the motion to recommit. He thought the Committee was by and large adequately representative. He had not heard any reason why the Proposal was unworkable in the School of Business. But two objections of a

substantive sort had been raised. One had to do with diluting the status of the faculty. But in Section B the Report clearly offered Associate Instructors second-class status: they outnumbered the faculty and yet they would elect only three members to the Council; they would not vote on the faculty representatives to the Council; they would be a separate electoral group with token representation. The second had to do with who should get privileges. The only really serious objection that had been raised, in his opinion, was that on behalf of the student in the sciences who was in a sense a more honored student. Such a situation simply required separate action somewhere by someone after the adoption of this proposal. It would not be very difficult to extend parking privileges and Council representation to this very small group of highly esteemed graduate students. He was in favor of adopting the whole Proposal as it stood.

Mr. Curt Zimansky, a TA in English not connected with the Committee, was recognized. He said he was surprised to see the Council disputing the work of the Committee in Proposal A. He thought any graduate student facing a class, assigning part or all of a grade, did not really care about his title; he felt rather in a community with other graduate students doing the same thing. Mr. Zimansky felt that a graduate student running a laboratory session was doing as much work as he was in his class. Distinctions were being forced on people who were not interested in distinctions. The result would serve to fragment them and to fragment their interests and, if there was any effect, it would be in the direction of lowering morale.

Vice-President Hartley then called for a vote on the motion to amend Professor Ryder's motion to recommit Proposal A to the Committee. The amendment would recommit the whole Report to the Standing Committee on Faculty Affairs. The motion was defeated: 12 ayes, 19 nays, and 2 abstentions.

Vice-President Hartley noted that the question now before the Council was the motion to recommit Proposal A to the present Committee and that without prejudice to the remainder of the Report, the TA Committee be asked to study and report on the feasibility of a distinction in grade between TA's and Associate Instructor, the latter rank to be granted at a more advanced level. The question was called for and the motion was defeated: 13 ayes, 17 nays, and 2 abstentions.

Vice-President Hartley said that the question now before the Council was Professor Remak's amendment to strike the last sentence of Proposal A and substitute "THE PREVIOUS PAYROLL TITLES OF TEACHING ASSOCIATE AND TEACHING ASSISTANT WILL BE ELIMINATED."

Professor Remak, speaking primarily for himself rather than the Committee, was willing to see the proposed change in status not become operative until September 1970. There were questions that needed to be ironed out by a University-wide committee.

After some discussion about the form of this Committee and its relation to the Committee mentioned in Proposal D, Professor Remak took the Parliamentarian's suggestion and accepted, with the agreement of his seconder, an addition to the amendment adding the following words to the first sentence: "That there be a change in nomenclature EFFECTIVE BY SEPTEMBER 1970."

The question was called for and the amendment passed unanimously.

Vice-President Hartley said that the Council was back with the original motion, that was the adoption of amended Proposal A.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed with 17 ayes, 12 nays, and 3 abstentions.

Aye

Auer
Ballinger
Buehrig
B.E. Carter
Frye
Gray
Hackney
Bogan for Hine
Lorentzen
Mahler
Martin
Murray
Neu
Remak
Pugh for R.L. Turner
Wolff
Yamaguchi

Nay

Bain
Breneman
Peak for Clark
Endwright
Hagen for Hartley
Manlove
Day for Merritt
Penrod
Williams for Pinnell
Ryder
Shiner
R.C. Turner

Abstain

Farmer
Hattery for Ryan
Snyder

The amended Proposal A reads as follows: THAT THERE BE A CHANGE IN NOMENCLATURE EFFECTIVE BY SEPTEMBER 1970. A GRADUATE STUDENT WHO HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR TEACHING AND ASSIGNING GRADES FOR AT LEAST A PORTION OF A COURSE AND WHO HAS, IN AN INSTRUCTIONAL ROLE, DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE STUDENTS SHOULD BE CALLED AN ASSOCIATE INSTRUCTOR. THE PREVIOUS PAYROLL TITLES OF TEACHING ASSOCIATE AND TEACHING ASSISTANT WILL BE ELIMINATED.

As for the rest of the Report, Professor Remak thought that the Committee would return next week with a somewhat modified Proposal D.

Vice-President Hartley, speaking as Dean of Faculties, hoped that the Committee could return with a proposal that would have the support of the entire institution.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The Council remained for a time in closed session. One action taken can be reported, namely, that the Standing Committee on Educational Policies and University Structure would, in consultation with the President and the Acting Chancellor for the Bloomington Campus, propose candidates for a Search Committee for a Vice-Chancellor for Afro American Affairs.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Wolff, Secretary