

(Partial)
Minutes of the Faculty Council
April 29, 1969
Ballantine Hall 008
2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice-President Snyder; Deans Harvey, Yamaguchi, Clark, Pinnell, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, Farmer, Hackney, Lorentzen, Manlove, Martin, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Solt, Wolff, Auer, Breneman, Frye, Gray, Murray, Remak, Taylor, R.C. Turner, Zeitlin, Sachs (South Bend)

Alternates Present: Vice-President Hartley for President Sutton; Dean Hagen for Vice-President Hartley; Dean Curtis for Vice-President Merritt; Dean Hattery for Vice-President Ryan; Dean Bogan for Chancellor Hine; Dean Young for Dean B.E. Carter; Dean Christ for Dean Bain; Professor Haffley for Professor Davidson; Professor Ringer for Professor Solt (after 4:30 p.m.); Professor Cordes for Professor Mahler; Professor Johnston for Professor Taylor (after 4:30 p.m.)

Absent, No Alternate: Provost Penrod; Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, Ballinger, R.L. Turner, White, Ferdows (Southeast), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Vice-President David R. Derge; Messrs. David Cahill, Paul Helmke, Mark Oring

AGENDA

1. Presiding Officer's Business
2. Agenda Committee Business
3. Continued Discussion of Report of Graduate School TA Committee (Professor Richard Pugh) (Faculty Council Circular #71)
4. Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey) (Faculty Council Circular #77)
5. Report of the Committee on Fraternities and Sororities (Remak)
6. Statement from AAUP on Addressographed Campus Mailings (Professor Philip Appleman) (Faculty Council Circular #64)
7. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Junior Division (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item A)
8. Proposal from the College of Arts and Sciences Relating to the Academic Calendar (B.E. Carter) (Faculty Council Circular #79, item B)
9. Report of the Foster Project Advisory Committee (Professor Jack Balcer) (Faculty Council Circular #81)

The meeting of the Faculty Council was called to order at 2:40 p.m. by Vice-President Hartley presiding for President Sutton who was in the hospital.

Since the Minutes of the Meeting of April 8, 1969, had already been approved by the Council at its meeting of April 22, and the Minutes of the April 22 meeting had not yet been distributed, the first item of business was Presiding Officer's Business. After a report that President Sutton was recovering satisfactorily from his operation, Vice-President Hartley suggested that further Presiding Officer's Business be deferred until the arrival of Acting Chancellor Snyder.

Under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary said that under the procedure adopted at the Meeting of April 8, he had to report THAT THE PROGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING (FACULTY COUNCIL CIRCULAR #70) AND THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH OF TEACHING AND LEARNING (FACULTY COUNCIL CIRCULAR #65) WERE TAKEN AS APPROVED. However, there had been some communication about the Report of the Library Committee on Regional Campuses Library Policy (Faculty Council Circular #63) and that Report would have to come before the Council in due course.

The Secretary also reported that he had received two appeals of Student Conduct Committee decisions, and, in a series of telephone calls, he had decided that these appeals should not be dismissed summarily but rather referred to the Standing Committee on Student Affairs for a report to the Council today. He asked the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Zacharias, for his comment.

Professor Zacharias said the problem was a sort of preview of issues dealt with in the proposed Student Conduct Code which would be coming from his Committee to the Council as soon as it could get on the Agenda. The Student Affairs Committee had met and discussed very briefly the nature of the two cases referred to it. One of them involved several fundamental issues that were going to be raised by the new Code: the legal existence of certain University regulations and conflict between such regulations and the law of the land. The second case involved certain basic issues to do with the kinds of records kept in the Halls of Residence and their use in the proceedings. Both of these cases had gone to the Student Conduct Committee and they had rendered decisions. As matters now stood, according to the Faculty Council action of December 19, 1967: "The Student Conduct Committee decision shall be final, and only the penalty can be reduced by action of the Dean of Students." In the prepared new Code, however, there was going to be the opportunity for students to appeal the decision of the Student Conduct Committee to the Faculty Council. Indeed, even according to present procedures, the students already, and the majority of their Committee, felt there was a right to appeal to the Council. The Committee therefore made the following immediate suggestions: either reaffirm the previous decision that Student Conduct Committee decisions are final and wait for the new Code to be presented, or (and this was the Committee's preference) assume for the time being that these cases could be appealed and let a committee, presumably the Student Affairs Committee, decide whether these cases themselves needed to be reviewed and then receive a further recommendation from that Committee. There was some urgency to one case which had been in litigation since January.

The Secretary suggested that the Council accept the Report of the Student Affairs Committee and thereby formally acknowledge that the case was under appeal. That was the recommendation of the Agenda Committee, which could be reversed by Council objection, but which would stand if there were no objection.

Dean Harvey inquired of the Secretary, by reference to what legislative background he had proceeded to assume that the case was still in an appeal process when the developed routes of appeal had been exhausted?

The Secretary replied that that was the question that the Agenda Committee had referred to the Student Affairs Committee. He had felt that the development of the standing committee procedure and the imminence of a report on the Student Conduct Code required the Agenda Committee at least to keep these cases alive until the Student Affairs Committee could report to the Council. The Agenda Committee did not feel that it could take the responsibility for dismissing the cases without bringing them to the Council through the best channel.

Dean Harvey confessed that he found this procedure disturbing. He did not think the Council was an appropriate tribunal to hear disciplinary cases. For a group of the Council's size to try to participate in a judicatory process was close to the impossible. Presumably it had been in recognition of that near-impossibility that the resolution in December 1967 had been passed. This was now a Committee whose function was essentially legislative and had in preparation a revised Student Code. He questioned the propriety of using that Committee in a judicial capacity. He did find the issues raised by Professor Zacharias very troublesome. He did not want to be taken as having formed any opinion on the individual merits of these cases, but there was something to be said for orderly processes and particularly for orderly processes of judication.

Vice-President Hartley asked Dean Harvey if he had anything to suggest, or any alternative. Dean Harvey noted that, in its deliberations a year or so ago, the Council had granted to the Office of the Dean of Students a substantial discretion to mitigate penalty. If such discretion were called for in view of possible impending change in the legislation and procedures, (and it did seem that we needed these) then the situation would be better met by an administrative decision to suspend penalty. Such a decision would keep the situation intact so that, if need be, retroactivity could later apply.

Professor Buehrig then moved THAT THE COUNCIL REAFFIRM ITS ACTION OF DECEMBER 1967 TO THE EFFECT THAT THE DECISION OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE SHOULD BE FINAL EXCEPT THAT THE DEAN OF STUDENTS MIGHT REDUCE ANY PENALTY ASSESSED. Professor Auer seconded the motion.

In answer to a question from Professor Ryder, Professor Zacharias said the recommendation from the Student Affairs Committee which stated that students should have a right to appeal to the Faculty Council did not mean that the Council would actually become a court. The Committee did however feel that the Council should establish a judiciary committee. Because the Council was a legislative body it should also have a judicial branch otherwise a student had no clearcut way of challenging the legality of a rule. The Student Conduct Committee could not decide whether a law being used against a student was unfair or illegal.

Professor Ryder thought this recommendation could well come into effect in the future, but he did not see how it could now be applied to the past.

Professor Zacharias thought that the Council was going to get cases one way or the other and the proposed procedure seemed to the Committee a more orderly way of dealing with the problem.

Mr. Mark Oring asked to give a student viewpoint. The students had always felt that, because the Dean of Students' Office prosecuted the student before the Student Conduct Committee, it was not sensible to leave that Office as the next appellate level over the Student Conduct Committee. Because the Faculty Council was responsible for that rule, the students were bringing their appeal before it.

Dean Harvey said that he found that argument persuasive within certain limits, but if one must have a law analogy, the analogy to executive clemency by the Office of the Dean of Students was far more appropriate than an analogy to appellate review. He would not contest the argument that a second-stage appellate review was needed. He did doubt that the Council was an appropriate judicial body. Moreover, if the problem was how to determine the validity of the rule, then it was surely anomalous to turn to the legislative body which had laid it down in the first place. If there was a need, it would be a need for something in the nature of an independent judiciary. But in the interest of orderly procedure and until matters could be examined in a general way, he was troubled by the idea of remitting decisions in individual cases to specialized ad hoc courts. He would much prefer to see whatever considerations had been raised of fairness to these particular students dealt with simply by a suspension of penalty by the Office of the Dean of Students until the general matters could be tackled.

Mr. David Cahill said that the cases involved rules laid down neither by the Faculty Council nor by the Trustees but by the Dean of Students' Office itself. That office was not a clement office. The students would be satisfied if the Council would in fact order a suspension of penalties, but unless it did, there would be no suspension of penalties.

Vice-President Hartley called for the question. The motion carried with all members voting aye except for Professor Wolff who voted nay.

This point is as far as the Secretary has been able to proceed with the preparation of the Minutes. The rest of the discussion dealt with the recent fee increase. Minutes of that part of the meeting will be distributed in due course. The six motions passed by the Council and not recorded here were distributed with the Notice of the Special Meeting of the Faculty on Monday, May 5.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Wolff, Secretary

Because Acting Chancellor Snyder had arrived during the discussion of the preceding matter, the Secretary suggested that the two motions the Agenda Committee had wanted to bring forward be held back until Acting Chancellor Snyder and Vice-President Hartley had said what they had to say about the student requests concerning the fee increases.

Vice-President Hartley began by recalling that last Thursday the Student Senate had requested that the Administration stop working on the budget, and that members of the Administration responsible for the budget meet to discuss it with a committee of students. Vice-President Hartley said that it was not practical to stop working on the budget if it was to be presented to the Board of Trustees at the meeting of May 24 and if faculty members were to receive letters in June notifying them of next year's salary. A meeting had been arranged on April 27, attended by seven students chosen by Mr. Helmke, the Student Body President, some of the Vice-Presidents and academic deans, and Professor David Martin, an elected member of the Faculty Council and an officer of the AAUP. Vice-President Hartley emphasized that the salaries of individual faculty members had not been discussed at this meeting. The discussion concerned budget allocations which were already described in public documents. Vice-President Hartley concluded his remarks about this meeting by saying that he thought it had been a useful discussion, and by thanking the students who had taken time to participate in it.

Acting Chancellor Snyder then commented on the task that had been assigned him, a response to suggestions from the student committee for cuts in the budget. He said that he was concerned that cutting the budget would confirm the notion that there was "fat" in the budget, and would also mortgage the future by deferring costs (such as maintenance or interest on bonds) or sacrificing necessary programs. Chancellor Snyder said that he thought that there were perhaps places in the budget that might be cut, but these cuts would have to be made very carefully and after some judicious balancing of alternatives and consequences. We might as well recognize, he went on, that one reason for the failure of the State to appropriate more money was a readiness to question whether excellence in higher education was worth it, whether we really needed the world's best music school or the exotic languages we taught. We faced, he said, the possibility that the State had repudiated the idea of Indiana University as a major institution among the great institutions of this country, that the State very possibly thought that its interests would be better served by four large undergraduate institutions and not so much by academic excellence in those graduate programs and research to which we had devoted so much of our time. In his view, it was not possible to separate clear excellence in research and graduate institutions from excellence in undergraduate education. That was the case the University must make to the State in the next two years, while we operated on what Dean Hartley had called a "maintenance budget" which would not injure important programs. It was for that reason that he did not think it prudent in the current year of the biennium to make drastic cuts. He said that he hoped that students and members of the faculty would participate in these decisions about whether and where to cut the budget, and that the faculty-student budget committee Dean Hartley had suggested at Monday's Assembly would in the future be established in departments and schools. Chancellor Snyder concluded by remarking that it was one of the aims in making the budget and determining the amount of the fee increase to put as much money as possible

into financial aid for students. In effect, this increase in financial aid created a kind of graduated fee scale, which was one of the proposals put forward at the Monday Assembly. He said that he would try in other ways to mitigate the effects of the fee increase and to respond to the proposals and suggestions of the students, not because he was responding to demands or coercion, but because he and other members of the administration and faculty wanted to keep the University as open to students as they could, and to keep its academic programs sound and, if possible, to change and improve them.

The Secretary of the Council then remarked that classes had been cancelled for Monday's Assembly after the members of the Council had been polled on this matter by telephone. He then brought forward a proposal offered by the members of the Agenda Committee:

"The Agenda Committee of the Faculty Council commends the remarks of Vice-President Hartley yesterday suggesting the establishing of faculty-student committees to help determine priorities in the University's budget. It also calls attention to the section on "Budgeting" in the "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" of the American Association of University Professors (1966), which has been adopted by the AAUP as a matter of national policy and is supported by the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges:

The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short and long range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short and long range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions. (page 7)

The Agenda Committee therefore moves adoption of the following:

1. THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE COMMITTEE SHALL SUBMIT A PROPOSAL TO THE COUNCIL SPECIFYING THE PROCEDURES NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT THE PARTICIPATION OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES IN BUDGET MATTERS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE QUESTION OF PARTICIPATION OF STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES IN THE BUDGETING PROCESS.
2. THE EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE COMMITTEE SHALL CONSULT WITH THE ADMINISTRATION WITH RESPECT TO THE CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE BUDGET."

The Secretary, for the Agenda Committee, moved and seconded item 1 in this proposal.

Professor Farmer, as Chairman of the Committee which was asked by the proposal to specify procedures for creating budget study committees, asked how soon the Council expected such a report. Professor Wolff replied that the members of the Agenda Committee recognized that only an interim report could be expected by the end of this semester, and a more complete report would have to await the coming academic year. The question was called for, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Secretary then moved item 2 of the proposal, which Dean Harvey seconded.

Professor Murray asked whether it was wise to ask the Educational Policies and University Structure Committee to take on this task too. Professors Wolff and Farmer reminded him that chairmen of Faculty Council committees could appoint sub-committees, an authority Professor Farmer proposed to use freely. The question was called for, and the motion passed unanimously.

The Secretary then brought forward another proposal offered by the Agenda Committee:

"The failure of the legislature to provide adequate support for Indiana University and for the State Scholarship Commission has created great potential hardship for students qualified to enter or continue their studies at Indiana University. The Agenda Committee therefore moves the adoption of the following motions:

1. The Faculty Council urges the faculty to respond to this critical and inequitable situation by pledging to contribute during the next academic year to a loan and scholarship fund to be disbursed to needy and deserving students judged unable to enter or continue at Indiana University in view of the fee increases.
2. The Faculty Council hereby establishes the Faculty Loan and Scholarship Fund.
3. The Agenda Committee shall report to the Council at its next meeting specific proposals for the administration of the Fund."

Professor Zeitlin said that he failed to see the appropriateness of this particular motion at this time. He thought it offered an inauthentic way of responding to a crisis. Any faculty member could at any time contribute to a scholarship fund. Unless something more was done now, unless this proposal was one among several, it offered not even a worthwhile symbolic gesture. He said that he was impressed with Chancellor Snyder's observation that the present stringency might reflect a decision by the State not to support some of the functions for which the University was nationally known. If that was the case, then clearly people in the University were going to have to put their heads together and figure out other ways of supporting the kinds of functions they thought a university ought to perform. That would take time, and he thought we had a right to ask the Legislature to reconvene and to reconsider some of these questions, because the present stringencies were really jeopardizing, not only the quality of education, but perhaps education itself at this level. He meant to say, Professor Zeitlin concluded, that we should be prepared to say that unless there was some reconsideration of the budget and a very serious consideration of the problems that we were now confronting, we would not operate the University. He did not mean to present an ultimatum, but he did not see why the faculty should contribute to scholarships and the administration cut back important functions and programs as ways of meeting a crisis whose source was in the decision of the Legislature not to support the University adequately.

Mr. Mark Oring, a visitor to the Faculty Council, agreed with Professor Zeitlin, saying that it was politically naive and set dangerous precedents to meet the present situation by raising fees, cutting programs, and supporting scholarships through faculty donations. He said that he thought Chancellor Snyder was correct: the Legislature had decided against quality. As long as someone was teaching down there, as long as teaching certificates were coming out of the School of Education, as long as professional people were being trained and could pass the State exams, as long as there were people to fill the business posts in the State of Indiana, the

Legislature was perfectly willing to let things go along at a level that was not qualitatively what we in the academic community would like it to be. But, he said, he did not think that the Legislature would tolerate the universities not operating at all. So he suggested that the University simply refuse to open in September unless it had funds adequate to maintain the kind of educational institution its students, faculty, and Administration thought it ought to be. For the alternative, Mr. Oring argued, was to accept a two-year budget which would permanently retard and damage the growth and quality of the University. He hoped that the administrations of all the state universities could agree at least to press the Governor to call a special session to appropriate more funds. Otherwise, he said, if the budget was cut this time, and student fees raised, the next legislature would conclude that it could do it again, and the University would again be faced with the necessity of cutting into its quality. Mr. Oring concluded by suggesting that the Faculty Council request a general faculty meeting to consider, among other matters, such a tactic as he proposed.

Professor Ryder said that he opposed Mr. Oring's proposal because it denied the possibility that good faith in normal human efforts might possibly be able to resolve a critical situation, and because it offered instead the notion that salvation lay only on the other side of some sort of Armageddon, the speeding of which was the job of policy. He supported the proposal for a faculty scholarship fund. It offered a traditional way to meet a critical situation, and it was a means which was encouraged by the state tax laws regarding contributions to educational institutions. It was also a gesture which, unlike that Mr. Oring counseled, might help rather than hurt our case with the Legislature.

Professor Johnston, also a visitor to the Faculty Council, said that one of the reasons for supporting the proposal for a faculty contribution to a scholarship fund was to support the students in their admirable concern for the educational and academic aspects of the University over its frills. But he thought the arguments against this proposed resolution were stronger, because it seemed to him that the proposal accepted the Legislature's failures, and suggested to the faculty that it should pay yet again for these failures. Our disagreement, he said, was not with each other, granted in one sense it was too late not to fall back before its decisions. Our responsibility was to show in the interests of the University that the decisions were wrong, that they were based on partial information and prejudice, and that their consequences would ultimately damage the quality of their lives and of the lives of their children.

Professor Taylor, a member of the Agenda Committee which had prepared the resolution, said that he thought that it addressed only a very small aspect of the total problem. He would feel more comfortable in voting on this resolution in the context of a broader Faculty Council program which spoke to the current problem. He suggested that the Council go on record in recognition of and in support of the students for their responsible behavior thus far, and even in support of some of their suggestions of how the budget might be cut. To offer to do nothing but to chip in part of our salaries, Professor Taylor concluded, was simply to put a band-aid on a large wound.

Mr. Paul Helmke, the President of the Student Body, agreed that the proposal for a faculty scholarship fund was worthy but inadequate to the issues of how the money the University now had was going to be spent, and how to get more money. He said that it was important that a faculty committee consult with the administration about the current budget, as the earlier proposal passed by the Council provided. He did not think that the suggestions of the student committee which had gone over

the budget Sunday threatened the real academic interests and quality of the University. He thought that it would be possible to explain these cuts to the Legislature and citizens of the State as protecting quality by doing away with functions which once were considered important but were no longer so considered. But, he continued, the other issue remained: how to get more money. Students were not of one mind about tactics like that suggested by Mr. Oring. But Mr. Helmke thought that at the moment the opinion of the faculty was crucial, because most people want to know how the faculty would respond to a legislative decision that affects the institution in which they worked and taught.

Professor Fatouros said that while he agreed that the faculty scholarship fund was a small gesture, it was the only gesture the members of the Faculty Council could make without knowing more than they now did about the possibility of budget cuts and the consequences of such tactics as those suggested by Mr. Oring. He went on to say that if one of the urgencies in completing the budget without reconsidering the fee increase was the need to notify faculty members in June of their next year's salaries, that urgency could be alleviated by sending out the letters later. He was pleased, Professor Fatouros said, that Chancellor Snyder and Dean Hartley were not responding on a rigid principle that these matters could not be discussed. He regretted that such discussions of the allocations of the budget with faculty and students had not happened before.

Professor Ryder observed that the first resolution passed by the Council did provide a way for its members later on to give to these matters the kind of deliberate consideration Professor Fatouros wanted.

Dean Harvey said that he regretted that the present motion was the vehicle for discussing a very wide range and profoundly significant range of questions. He thought that the only reason for creating a special scholarship fund--since faculty members already had opportunities to contribute to scholarship funds--would be if the fund had some special symbolic value. The symbolism in this gesture he thought to be vacuous. On the other hand, tactics like that suggested by Mr. Oring, although accurately reflecting the size and urgency of the issue, seemed to him to be too simple. He was more and more unsure that many of the high expectation programs of advanced study in this University which support and serve a national market were in full measure appropriately a charge upon the taxpayer of Indiana. He thought that the University ought to participate in a national study of the appropriate means for financing higher education and national universities. A confrontation with the Legislature now would not produce solutions to the questions that such a study would address. He preferred, he said, that the Faculty Council say that the faculty needed and must have a voice not only in setting priorities within the range of budgetary resources that the State Legislature made available to us, but in rethinking the total range of questions as to how higher education in this country ought to be financed.

Professor Martin said that it seemed to him that radical changes in public policy had been made, and the University was now in the process of trying to adjust to them. The two essential policies at issue, he said, were that the State should maintain one or two really first-class, excellent universities, and that these universities should be open to all qualified high school students, "qualified" being defined in a non-exclusive way. Indiana University, in his opinion, had probably come closer to achieving that combined goal than any university in the country: he could not think of a university that was both as good as this one and as open as this one to interested, serious, determined students. Now if the Legislature had really decided that the University should prefer the second of these goals to the first, this decision was a very serious matter. The faculty by and large, if it

had to choose whether to sacrifice the goal of excellence or the goal of openness, would sacrifice openness to choose excellence. The students, on the other hand, particularly the undergraduate students, probably did not want to sacrifice openness, particularly when that meant excluding them next year, or their younger brothers and sisters. His own choice, Professor Martin said, lay where the students' choice probably lay. But the decision looked as if it had been made without the participation of the faculty and students of the University. What did we do now? If the budget could be cut, the faculty could with some study and information act intelligently to help cut it. If the budget could not be cut significantly, we could sacrifice openness by taxing undergraduate students, and thus preserve excellence. That was what the Board of Trustees and the Administration and the faculty, by its acquiescence, had done up to now in this crisis. The students had not acquiesced so lightly. The alternative was simply to raise the question seriously, not as a tactic, but quite seriously: did the Legislature know that it had adopted a new policy which required that the University either deteriorate in its quality, or cease to be as open as it had been? If the Legislature forced the choice because it erroneously thought there was fat in the budget, then the Legislature ought to be told that it had made a mistake. Now, how did we go about doing this? The matter was too serious to use a tactic which risks the University in a maneuver just to get the Legislature to convene. Dean Harvey had suggested that we give up on the legislature and that we get to work seeking alternative sources of funds. The possibilities in the Federal Congress at this session were not very good for a short-run solution from that source, but perhaps within a few years we could develop a national system of systematically financing higher education in the United States on a federal level. It would certainly be appropriate for the Faculty Council of this University in this moment of crisis to initiate a formal plan of action in conjunction with other universities and federal agencies to look into that question, possibly with a Presidential commission that would study the problem and report and get action from the Congress. But we should also begin to talk to members of the State government, to ask them if their action was in the service of a policy, and if they had really faced up to the choice their action proposed: did they want the University to deteriorate, or did they want exclusiveness--and let them face their constituencies with their decision. Professor Martin then proposed a substitute motion: that the Faculty Council ask the Agenda Committee to formulate some plan for initiating communication with other universities in similar plight to ours with a view to exploring possibilities for encouraging new federal programs for financial support for those state universities that are truly national in character; and, secondly, that the Faculty Council ask the Agenda Committee to formulate a plan for initiating communication with leaders of the Legislature and the Governor to discuss the policy question that we are presenting.

Professor Murray seconded this motion.

Professor Remak asked how these large plans for reconsideration and action in one or two years would meet the immediate problems faced by students who because of the fee increase could not continue their studies in the University.

Dr. Donovan Allen, of the Office of Financial Aids, said that the 1.3 million dollars proposed in the budget for scholarships will not meet the total need of the students who would be subjected to the fee raise. The total need was well in excess of $4\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars. But, Dr. Allen went on, when loans and employment programs were added to this 1.3 million dollars of gift aid, his opinion was that the students would find their additional funds through loan programs and through employment programs. The 1.3 million, he remarked, was for undergraduates. There was an additional 1.3 million for graduate students, who would also have to supplement gift aid with loans and employment. The problem, he concluded, was difficult but not unsurmountable. Students would have to work more and borrow more to continue their educations, but the University was trying to assist by giving additional gift aid.

Professor Shiner asked if those administrators who were closely working with legislators during the legislative session knew whether the legislators had known that the University would have to raise the fees as much as they had been raised, and whether in effect the legislators were in this way directing the University to become more exclusive.

Vice-President Hartley replied that in his opinion most legislators did not know with any precision how large a fee increase would be required. Some perhaps suspected or thought or believed that there might be "fat" in the budget.

Professor R.C. Turner remarked that of course there was "fat" as defined by someone's value system, and, by using his own set of value judgments, everyone in the room, and in the legislature, would convince himself that some programs or expenses are unnecessary.

Professor Ringer enlarged Professor Turner's point about the values defined in a budget, observing that the present difficulty was not simply a disagreement about how much money the University needed, but about the directions in which it ought to go. One of the reasons for remonstrating to the state government was to protect and advance our sense of what was valuable, and to change a set of values which perhaps wanted the University to be both less excellent and more exclusive. Further, Professor Ringer went on, we needed to work out a system--perhaps of scholarship aid and graduated fees--which would assure that the costs of education were allocated equitably. Finally, he said, there were many mechanisms to work out disagreements apart from the political mechanism. To organize to press an interest, to lobby, to bargain: such means did not bring us to what Professor Ryder called Armageddon. When you wanted to educate people, to change their minds, you did not do it by being as nice as you could be and taking a half a step back after every forward step. The community of the University must seriously and with intent begin to provide counter-arguments and counter-pressure. For that reason, he concluded, he would also suggest a call to a general faculty meeting at which the faculty could begin to express and organize its responses to the decisions of the Legislature.

Professor Farmer pointed out two issues in the discussion so far: the short-term question which was here and now, this week; and a more important long-run issue, which was how we financed higher education in general over the next two or three decades. The difficulty, he said, was that in the short-term we could say that the Legislature did not really mean it, and we had better inform them so they would provide more money. On the other hand, if the Legislature really did mean to change the character and direction of the University, we had better begin to look for other ways to finance the kind of university we wanted. We did not really know the intentions of the Legislature. But even though Professor Martin's proposal did nothing in the short run, Professor Farmer concluded, it was a useful beginning in the likely event that the Legislature would continue to decide that state support for the universities would not be enough to assure the maintenance of an excellent national university.

Professor Fatouros returned to the short run, remarking that the question in the short run was what kind of crisis budgeting, if any, was possible which would permit a decrease in the new fee schedule or an increase in the amount of money available for scholarships. Professor Ryder said that while he too regarded Professor Martin's proposal as unexceptionable, he too would like to return to the short-term possibility of creating a faculty scholarship fund to assist students caught in the present squeeze.

After a discussion in which it was established that Professor Martin's motion was an amendment to the original proposal of the Agenda Committee that a faculty scholarship fund be created, Professor Buehrig said that he had been heartened by the discussion, which he thought displayed loyalty to the University and concern for its future as an excellent institution of higher education. He said that he was in favor of both parts of the motion, because by contributing to the scholarship fund the faculty could show its loyalty to the institution, and by beginning the enterprise Professor Martin suggested, it could take an affirmative action to ensure the future of the University in its present character.

In response to a query from Professor Johnston, Professor Martin said that he did not regard the proposal he had added to the proposal of the Agenda Committee as necessarily suggesting an action which would not begin or be effective pretty quickly. He said that he had assumed the Agenda Committee could set up some immediate means to start talking to members of the past legislature, and other appropriate people in the state and federal governments and in other universities. Professor Wolff said that he too had taken Professor Martin's proposal as requiring prompt implementation.

Vice-President Derge said that he was in favor of Professor Martin's proposal because although we talk about "the legislature," that body is not monolithic. There were some people in the Legislature who were concerned about the size of Indiana University. There were other legislators who were not concerned about size; there were others who were concerned about the faster growth of the regional campuses to give opportunities locally. There were some who were concerned with strengthening Ball State and Indiana State as alternative institutions for undergraduate education. Rather than assuming that the whole body of legislators somehow or other was entirely hostile to the University throughout the session, Vice-President Derge said, it was important to remember that there were people very friendly to the University. He said that Professor Martin's proposal would enable people in the University to talk to each of the many different legislators with some precision so that each might go into the next sixty-one day session with a surer sense of what the University was and needed.

Mr. Oring reminded the Council that the amended motion before it still, in his opinion, did not meet the immediate difficulties of a 68% increase in fees. He repeated his belief that only a special session of the Legislature could meet those difficulties by appropriating more money so that the fee increase could be rescinded or reduced, and that some direct and immediate tactic was required which would persuade the Governor to convene a special session.

Professor Martin then read his amendment to the original motion of the Agenda Committee: The Faculty Council ask the Agenda Committee to formulate some plan for initiating communication with other universities in a similar plight to ours, with a view to exploring possibilities for financial support for those universities that are truly national in character; (2) to formulate a plan for initiating communication with leaders of the legislature and the Governor to discuss the policy questions presented by the low appropriation and the fee increase. The motion was passed, twenty-nine members voting in favor, two against, and two abstaining.

The Secretary then repeated the entire motion, now consisting of the three parts of the original Agenda Committee proposal, and the two added by Professor Martin.

1. The Faculty Council urges the faculty to respond to this critical and inequitable situation by pledging to contribute during the next academic year to a loan and scholarship fund to be disbursed to needy and deserving students judged unable to enter or continue at Indiana University in view of the fee increases.

2. The Faculty Council hereby establishes the Faculty Loan and Scholarship Fund.
3. The Agenda Committee shall report to the Council at its next meeting specific proposals for the administration of the Fund.
4. The Faculty ask the Agenda Committee to formulate some plan for initiating communication with other universities in a similar plight to ours, with a view to exploring possibilities for financial support for those universities that are truly national in character.
5. The Faculty Council ask the Agenda Committee to formulate a plan for initiating communication with leaders of the legislature and the Governor to discuss the policy questions presented by the low appropriation and the fee increases.

This motion was approved, with one negative vote (Professor Ringer) and one abstention (Professor Zeitlin).

Professor Johnston said that because he was voting for Professor Taylor, he would like to explain that he voted for the entire motion, even though he disapproved of the creation of the scholarship fund as an inadequate gesture. His vote, he said, testified to his having been gallantly outmaneuvered by Professor Martin, and not to his having been persuaded that the first three parts of the motion were an apt response to the immediate consequences of the fee increase.

Vice-President Hartley, referring especially to the last two points of the motion just passed, urged the members of the Agenda Committee to solicit the advice and opinions of people on the regional campuses and on the Indianapolis campus. Dean Derge suggested that the motion just passed be presented to a meeting of CIC representatives in May.

Professor Fritz Ringer (alternate for Professor Solt) moved THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL INSTRUCT ITS AGENDA COMMITTEE TO REQUEST THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY TO CALL A GENERAL MEETING OF THE FACULTY. THE PURPOSE OF THE MEETING WOULD BE TWOFOLD: FIRST, TO ADD WEIGHT TO WHATEVER COMMUNICATION WITH LEGISLATORS AND STATE OFFICIALS THERE MIGHT BE ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY BY COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL BY THE ADMINISTRATION; AND, SECOND, TO GIVE THE FACULTY AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ITS OPINION ON THE SUBSTANCE OF THE MOTIONS PREVIOUSLY PASSED.

Professors Breneman and Buehrig both questioned whether a general faculty meeting, without the information which would come in when the several committees of the Faculty Council reported, would be efficient and prudent. Professor Cordes agreed that a general faculty meeting might be ineffective now. But, he said, Mr. Oring had raised the question of where the faculty stood on these issues, about which a large number of students were intensely concerned. He thought it would be useful that such a meeting be convened so that the faculty could make its opinion known. Professor Remak also questioned the effectiveness of a general faculty meeting, but also agreed that it would be appropriate that the faculty have a chance to express itself on these urgent issues. The motion to convene a meeting of the faculty was then approved, twenty-four in favor to nine against, with one abstention.

Aye

Auer
 Christ for Bain
 Young for B.E. Carter
 Clark
 Haffley for Davidson
 Frye
 Gray
 Hackney
 Hagen for Hartley
 Harvey
 Bogan for Hine
 Cordes for Mahler
 Martin
 Murray
 Neu
 Remak
 Hattery for Ryan
 Shiner
 Snyder
 Ringer for Solt
 Johnston for Taylor
 Wolff
 Yamaguchi
 Zeitlin

Nay

Breneman
 Buehrig
 Endwright
 Farmer
 Manlove
 Curtis for Merritt
 Pinnell
 Ryder
 R.C. Turner

Abstain

Lorentzen

Vice-President Hartley had earlier reminded the Council that two weeks ago, President Sutton had received a standing ovation after an address to the Hoosier State Press Association in which he called the fee increase a "surtax on opportunity" and deplored its effects on students from poor families. Professor Auer then read part of a news story in which, in reply to a question about whether campus controversies were inflamed by outsiders, President Sutton had said, "It might be the case on campuses like Berkeley near large cities but not at I.U." Sutton had then been asked if student radicals were inspired from abroad. "If you mean by Communists, Sutton said, then, no." Professor Auer said that he thought it important to read this quotation because many students had resented being labeled as "outside agitators," and had also complained that no one in the University had defended them by denying this accusation. President Sutton, Professor Auer concluded, had publicly stated that the students were not communists, and were not outsiders.

Vice-President Hartley closed the meeting by recalling that a week ago he had thanked the students and the faculty for the community of interest they had displayed throughout the year. Without community, Dean Hartley said, we were not a university.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
 Donald Gray, Acting Secretary