

NOTE: Tuesday, May 27, 1969, 10:00 a.m.: The Agenda Committee cannot foresee what further Council meetings there will be beyond the one this afternoon. The Agenda below, however, includes items which in the Committee's opinion need attention this academic year. The most likely time for an extra meeting is Tuesday, June 3.

NOTICE OF

POSSIBLE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1969, 2:30 p.m.

Faculty Council Room, Ballantine 008

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 20, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
4. Continued Discussion of the Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey) (Faculty Council Circular #77)
5. Report of the Student Affairs Committee--"Student Conduct Code" (Professor Elmus R. Wicker) (Faculty Council Circular #92)
6. Report of the Foster Project Advisory Committee (Professor Jack Balcer) (Faculty Council Circular #81)
7. Report on the Status of Librarians (Shiner) (Faculty Council Circular #86)

All other items that have appeared on recent Agendas have either been referred to committee or postponed until 1969-70.

Enclosed:

Minutes of the Meeting of May 20, 1969

Faculty Council Circulars #96 Response to the "Four Demands"--Document
Referred to on Page 17 of Faculty Council
Minutes of May 20, 1969

#97 Memorandum from Professor Henry Remak on
Teach-ins

Minutes of the Faculty Council

June 3, 1969

Ballantine Hall 008

2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Vice-Presidents Hartley, Ryan; Provost Penrod; Deans B.E. Carter, Clark, Pinnell, Endwright; Professors Buehrig, Farmer, Hackney, Neu, Ryder, Shiner, Wolff, Auer, Breneman, Gray, Mahler, Murray, Remak, R.C. Turner

Alternates Present: Acting-President David R. Derge for President Sutton; Dean William A. Madden for Vice-President Snyder; Dean Robert W. Hattery for Vice-President Ryan; Professor A. A. Fatouros for Dean Harvey; Dean Joel Hunt for Dean Yamaguchi; Dean Charles Webb for Dean Bain; Professor James Weigand for Professor Martin

Absent, No Alternate: Vice-President Merritt; Chancellor Hine; Deans Irwin, Holmquist; Professors J.E. Carter, Davidson, Lorentzen, Martin, Solt, Ballinger, Frye, Taylor, R.L. Turner, White, Zeitlin, Ferdows (Southeast), Sachs (South Bend), Sunderman (Fort Wayne)

Official Visitors: Dean Bernard Fry; Professors Cecil K. Byrd, J. Gus Liebenow, Dan W. Miller, Conrad G. Mueller, Ann F. Painter; Mrs. Kerry Allen; Miss Lois Heiser; Messrs. John A. Conley, Ed Moss (News Bureau), Thomas J. Michalak

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of Meeting of May 20, 1969
2. Presiding Officer's Business
3. Agenda Committee Business
4. Continued Discussion of the Report of the Committee on the Safety Division (Harvey) (Faculty Council Circular #77)
5. Report of the Foster Project Advisory Committee (Dean William A. Madden) (Faculty Council Circular #81)
6. Report on the Status of Librarians (Shiner) (Faculty Council Circular #86)

The meeting of the Faculty Council was called to order at 2:40 p.m. by Acting President Derge presiding for President Sutton who was still convalescing from an operation.

Minutes of the Meeting of May 20, 1969, were approved unanimously.

There being no Presiding Officer's Business, under Agenda Committee Business, the Secretary noted that Professor Gray, the holdover member of the Agenda Committee and the member charged with liaison with the Student Affairs Committee, would work with members of last year's, and perhaps next year's, Student Affairs Committee and with people in the Dean of Students' Office about what to present to the Council early next fall on the subject of a Student Conduct Code. One suggestion from Professor Albrecht Holschuh, a member of the Committee, was to present to the Council at its first or second meeting a statement of principles based on the AAUP/NSA statement. Then the 1969-70 Student Affairs Committee could work out whatever specific provisions were thought desirable. Anybody with suggestions on this subject should send them to Professor Gray.

The Secretary asked that Professor Farmer be called on to report on the work of his Budget Sub-Committee. Professor Farmer mentioned that the work as a whole had been written up and reports were available through the Secretary of the Council's office. The basic approach had been to search for budget-cutting rather than revenue-raising ideas and to this end he had appointed 28 sub-sub-committees, each charged with the task of checking a quasi-academic activity which generated revenue. Not all the reports were in yet but it was already possible to say that an additional \$500,000 could be raised by increasing fees, largely through the Registrar's Office and from various forms of parking changes mainly in stickers. Other items included faculty lockers, outdoor swimming pool, campus bus service, and some ID card charges connected with the Library and the Music School. He reminded the Council that his Committee had no authority to change anything; it would be sending a report to the Administration recommending the changes. They were all charges on things that people cared about and it was quite possible that some of them would be unacceptable for political reasons. It was also suggested that these be temporary 2-year items clearly labeled as such; that these funds be put in a separate scholarship account; that about \$100,000 be committed to such direct grant programs as the Black students program and Upward Bound. Professor Irving Grossack of the School of Business was discussing an arrangement with the Indiana Banking Association whereby the money raised might be used as guarantee money with various banks for about 10 times the amount in student loans. It was entirely possible that \$400,000 could be maneuvered into roughly 4 million dollars in student loans along with the \$100,000 in direct grants. Some outstanding reports such as concessions, Student Union, athletics, dormitory pricing, looked quite lucrative but were too complex for quick conclusions. Professor Farmer noted that the \$500,000 would accumulate through the year and one of the strategies the Committee had in mind, given that there was apparently enough scholarship aid for the first semester, was to try to start accumulating cash in the fall to prepare for pressure in the second semester. The estimate was, however, based on a September starting date.

Acting President Derge asked how these surcharges on services were divided as to faculty and students.

Professor Farmer said his Committee had avoided student charges with one possible exception in the Registrar's Office. Of course, in the area of parking

students with cars would be directly affected, but that was unlikely to be a poverty-stricken block of students. All these would be optional charges. If people didn't wish to pay the price, they wouldn't have to.

Acting President Derge was worried about approving surcharges for the faculty by administrative fiat and without consultation with the Council.

The Parliamentarian suggested that the Faculty Council could call special meetings during the Summer by a simple majority vote. However, if it were to be done, it would have to be done at this meeting.

Acting President Derge asked if it would be appropriate for the Council to authorize the President to call the Council if, in his judgment, some of these recommendations call for consultation.

The Parliamentarian said a special meeting or meetings of the Council with the specific dates to be determined by the Presiding Officer or by the Agenda Committee could be authorized without fixing the exact dates.

Vice-President Hartley said that whatever recommendation the Committee had in regard to parking ought to be seen by the Parking Committee.

Professor Farmer said he would send copies of the Report to all administrators and to the Council and he presumed they would use them appropriately.

Professor Gray moved that THE COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO CALL A SPECIAL MEETING OF THIS YEAR'S FACULTY COUNCIL DURING THE SUMMER IF IN HIS JUDGMENT AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE PROFESSOR FARMER'S REPORT REQUIRED FACULTY COUNCIL ACTION. Professor Remak seconded this motion.

Professor Wolff thought there might well be other potential emergency situations, where the possibility of a formal Faculty Council meeting might be valuable.

After some discussion, Professor Murray moved, as an amendment to the motion, THAT THE PRESIDENT MAY STIPULATE THAT OTHER TOPICS WHICH IN HIS JUDGMENT MIGHT REQUIRE FACULTY COUNCIL ACTION BEFORE THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR BE INCLUDED ON THE AGENDA. Professor Remak seconded the motion.

The question was called for and the motion on the amendment passed unanimously. The question was then called for on the motion itself and this was also passed unanimously.

Acting President Derge then asked the Council to continue its discussion of the Report on the Safety Division.

Professor Fatouros moved adoption of recommendations 6 and 7. Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

Professor Remak had some qualms about recommendation 6 as it was worded. He reminded the Council that there were many sorts of dossiers. Faculty members, departmental chairmen, Deans of the Schools, the Dean of Students, the central Administration, and placement bureaus all could well have dossiers on students. It was surely unrealistic to expect each of these to check with the responsible University officer before any information from a student's file be released.

Moreover, what was "political" information? In these times, almost any information could be made to be political. His worry was reinforced by page 9 of the Report, the first paragraph, which said, "The Committee vigorously condemns any overt or covert surveillance of students to determine their political views or activities. The Committee is deeply convinced that it is improper for any University agency to maintain a political dossier on a student." Surely any citizen of this country was completely free to make any notes whatsoever on any subject. Matters of this sort simply had to be left to the wisdom and judgment of particular faculty members if their freedom and that of the administration were not to be severely handicapped.

Professor Fatouros thought a distinction had to be made between the freedom of an individual to act for himself and the policy of an institution acting as such. The recommendation did not comment on the freedom of any faculty member to keep any notes that he wanted on the political activities of his colleagues or his students. On the other hand, the Council helped to determine the policy of the University and that was the proper subject of discussion. What the Council was being asked to do was to suggest how the University should behave. There was no contradiction between the freedom of faculty members to do anything with respect to finding out about the political activities of others and deciding what limit might be proper for the University administration.

Professor Shiner thought that the wording, "a student's file," was perhaps too general and that something to the effect of "a student's official file" might be better.

Professor Miller stressed that the key to the recommendation was that some specified University officer should take the responsibility for evaluating and for approving or disapproving the present procedures for releasing information from student files.

Dean Pinnell thought the proposal was unenforceable. As a dean, he could not guarantee the integrity of a student folder in the Placement Service, for example, where it was of necessity accessible to members of the faculty and to other interested individuals. It would be very awkward, to say the least, to have to get a release from a University administrator before one could tell a recruiting company the age of a student.

Professor Miller said that the Committee's concern was that all current procedures should be thought through critically and that, once it was decided what a proper procedure was, then the necessary authorization for placement bureaus and so forth could be given.

In answer to a question from Acting President Derge, Professor Mueller said the Committee was not attempting to restrict the activity of any particular individual. He repeated that there was a distinction between an official action of the University as an institution and the action (even if official) of an individual.

Dean Carter said that his assumption had been that the Committee was at this point interested in recorded information having to do with the political activities of students. Much of what had been discussed did not seem to have any bearing on this. He was confused, however, over the statement in recommendation 6 that political dossiers were not to be maintained, whereas in recommendation 7 appropriate guidelines to control the gathering and disseminating of information relating to students' political activities were mentioned.

Professor Miller acknowledged that "prevent" might be a better word than "control." The important point of recommendation 7 was that the subject should "be given priority attention by the proposed Policy Committee."

Professor Shiner proposed new wording for recommendation 6 to the effect that "responsibility for releasing any information from a student's official file be assigned to a responsible University officer." The Committee accepted the rewording.

Dean Hunt was unclear about what a "political dossier" was.

Professor Mahler then moved an amendment to reword the first part of recommendation 6 to read "That no dossier concerning political activity of any individual student be maintained." Dean Hunt seconded the motion.

Professor Farmer asked how these proposals, if passed, were going to be policed. If some administrator decided to maintain political dossiers, and was discovered to be doing so, what was to be done? Professor Mahler suggested the administrator ran the same risk he would run if he refused to follow policy laid down by the University and the Board of Trustees in any area. Professor Farmer thought the Council should not lose sight of the problem of enforcement machinery. Professor Mahler noted that the specific ruling that no such files be kept by the Safety Division would be enforceable.

Acting President Derge asked the Committee's attitude towards official University records on organizations that happened to be political organizations and the practice of the Dean of Students' Office of maintaining historical files and compiling records in order to gather background for administrative decision-making.

Professor Miller thought the first question was beyond the Committee's concern insofar as the records were themselves not political; the second question was outside its area of interest provided the records of individual students were not involved.

Acting President Derge reread recommendation 6 with the proposed amendment: "THAT NO DOSSIER CONCERNING THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF ANY INDIVIDUAL STUDENT BE MAINTAINED AND THAT RESPONSIBILITY FOR RELEASING ANY INFORMATION FROM A STUDENT'S OFFICIAL FILE BE ASSIGNED TO A RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY OFFICER." The question was called for on the motion to amend and it was passed unanimously.

Professor R.C. Turner asked about the delegation of the responsibility mentioned in the recommendation. Did the Committee have in mind a single official who would then delegate responsibility or would the initial responsibility be, for example, with departmental chairmen?

Professor Fatouros said that what was intended here was reference to some principle of accountability, namely, that whoever was in fact responsible would both know of his responsibility and have that responsibility known to whomever it concerned.

Dean Pinnell remarked, with reference to Professor R.C. Turner's question, that administrators cannot avoid accountability even though specific responsibilities had been delegated away.

In answer to a question from Vice-President Hartley, Professor Mueller said that he thought there was a distinction between a University officer carrying political information for his own knowledge and his compiling a formal record that could be filed away under the student's name and which outlined that student's political activities. What the Council was being asked was, should the knowledge University officers had of a student's political activity be allowed to become part of the official University files or not?

On the question raised by Dean Carter about information being kept, even about individual students, in files devoted not to particular students but to political organizations, Professor Miller announced that the proposed policy committee would have to consider that problem.

Professor Fatouros referred the Council to page 9 in the body of the Report: "The Committee believes that the full development of acceptable guidelines to control the activity of the University police officers and other personnel in connection with the gathering and dissemination of information on student political activities and appropriate publicity regarding these guidelines should be a matter of priority attention by the policy committee recommended in Part V of this report." It would be well to recall that the more specific decisions of the proposed policy committee would not take away from administrators the responsibility for making marginal decisions.

Acting President Derge asked about the scope of the proposed policy committee, and Professor Miller announced that it was an advisory committee to the University officer to whom the Security Division would be directly responsible, namely, the Chancellor. The Dean of Students was named as a member of that committee and presumably anyone could ask it for advice.

Dean Pinnell here proposed that the Council dispose of recommendation 6, before continuing its discussion of recommendation 7. The Council consented. The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 6 as amended and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Buehrig proposed and the Committee accepted that the word "governing" be substituted for the words "to control" in recommendation 7.

In answer to points made by Professors Murray and Remak, Professor Mueller said that the Committee had called the proposed policy committee a "Policy Committee on the Security Division" partly for historical reasons but that its role should transcend the role of the Security Division itself. It was for that reason that the committee was made advisory to the Chancellor and not to some subordinate officer. The committee could also presumably initiate action.

Professor Miller noted that this recommendation was very restricted. It simply said that certain matters "be given priority attention" by the policy committee and that guidelines on these matters ought to be formulated properly and carefully and well publicized. The conclusions of the committee would not be binding. It was an advisory committee. Only the Chancellor could give authority to its findings.

Dean Hunt was worried that what was proposed as a policy committee on the Security Division had somehow mushroomed into one concerned with the whole University.

Professor Miller replied that the committee had been designed with the mission of determining procedures and guidelines for the Security Division, and that was all that was being recommended. Other questions being raised in Council went further and might very well be incorporated within the Committee's charge at a later time, but he agreed with Dean Hunt that that was beyond the Report's responsibility.

Professor Remak asked whether the University did not need a little guidance and sharing of information in a wider context than that within which the proposed committee would work.

Acting President Derge thought that the Chancellor might wish to expand and enrich the membership of the committee so that it could deal with all-University matters.

Professor R.C. Turner suggested that rather than the responsibilities being delegated to a policy committee advisory to the Chancellor, they be given directly to the Chancellor.

Dean Carter noted that the Committee and the Council were discussing an area where it was almost impossible to set precise boundaries. He supported Professor R.C. Turner's suggestion because the Council's concerns clearly go beyond the Security Division, and a policy committee proposed for the Security Division might well not be an appropriate body.

Professor Miller concurred that, although the Committee's charge had been narrow, it had been impossible to ignore matters that went beyond it. These recommendations therefore were intended originally both to be true to the narrow charge and to point towards problems of broader interest and concern.

Professor R.C. Turner now moved to substitute the words "the Chancellor of the Bloomington campus" for the words "proposed Policy Committee on The Security Division." Professor Gray seconded the amendment.

The question on the amendment was called for and it was passed unanimously. The question was then called for on the motion to adopt the amended recommendation 7: "THAT THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROPRIATE GUIDELINES GOVERNING THE GATHERING AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON STUDENT POLITICAL ACTIVITIES AND APPROPRIATE PUBLICITY ON THESE GUIDELINES BE GIVEN PRIORITY ATTENTION BY THE CHANCELLOR OF THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS." It was passed unanimously.

Professor Wolff now moved the adoption of recommendation 8: "THAT IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS RELEVANT TO ALL FUNCTIONS OF THE SECURITY DIVISION BE DEVELOPED. MOST IMPORTANT AMONG THESE WOULD BE TRAINING IN HUMAN RELATIONS TO SENSITIZE OFFICERS TO THE CHARACTERISTICS AND VALUES OF A COMPLEX, CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITY." Professor Mahler seconded the motion.

Dean Pinnell thought the last sentence was, in a sense, gratuitous and provocative and asked whether it was a necessary part of the recommendation.

Professor Mueller said that it was included as a matter of emphasis. There were certain somewhat broader phases of training to which the Committee wanted to call special attention.

Dean Pinnell remarked that he had no objection to the substance of the recommendation. He was only concerned not to undermine the Security Division's receptivity to it.

Acting President Derge asked whether the Committee had made any estimate of the cost of such a training program.

Professor Mueller said it had not. Its conviction had been that this kind of program could be implemented on the campus with the help of the Department of Police Administration, of members of the School of Law, of several Departments in the social sciences who were interested in the problem.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 8 and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendations 9, 10, and 11. Dean Hunt seconded the motion.

In a short discussion, it was agreed that some minor modification of wording was needed in recommendation 9 and the Committee accepted the following revised version: "THAT THE SECURITY DIVISION BE STAFFED BY A CORE OF PERMANENT, PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED PERSONNEL AND A GROUP OF OFFICERS WHO COMBINE PART-TIME SERVICE IN THE DIVISION WITH PARTICIPATION AS STUDENTS IN A DEGREE PROGRAM IN AN ACADEMIC UNIT OF THE UNIVERSITY."

The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendations 9, 10: "THAT NEW TECHNICAL GRADES BE DEVELOPED TO REFLECT VARIOUS LEVELS OF COMPETENCE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF SECURITY DIVISION PERSONNEL," and 11: "THAT THE CRITERIA OF APPOINTMENT REQUIRING A PERIOD OF RESIDENCE IN INDIANA AND IN MONROE COUNTY BE ELIMINATED," and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 12 and Professor Murray seconded the motion.

At the suggestion of Acting President Derge, the Committee changed the word "man" to the word "person".

Vice-President Hartley asked about the logic of requiring that this person be eligible for faculty appointment. Did that wording mean that he or she must be appointed to the faculty or simply that he or she might be appointed to the faculty?

Professor Mueller said that the Committee did not intend this as a requirement. It was trying to describe the qualifications of the kind of individual that it had in mind.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt amended recommendation 12: "THAT THE UNIVERSITY IN APPOINTING THE NEXT DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITY DIVISION SEEK A PERSON WITH A SIGNIFICANT EXPERIENCE IN POLICE WORK AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS WHICH WOULD MAKE HIM ELIGIBLE FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY," and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 13: "THAT THE UNIVERSITY RECOGNIZE AS JUSTIFICATION FOR ANY WEAPONS USED BY SECURITY DIVISION PERSONNEL ONLY THEIR NECESSITY FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF FUNCTIONS ASSIGNED TO THE DIVISION." Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

Dean Webb asked what the current justification for the use of weapons was. Professor Mueller said the best that the Committee could determine was that it was tradition.

In answer to a question from Dean Hunt, Professor Fatouros said functional necessity in performance of duties was the only justification recognized.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 13 and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Wolff moved the adoption of recommendation 14: "THAT SUCH FUNCTIONS AND THE WEAPONS THEY REQUIRE BE KEPT UNDER CONTINUING SCRUTINY BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF RESTRICTING THE DISPLAY OF WEAPONS TO THE MINIMUM CONSISTENT WITH UNIMPAIRED FUNCTION OF THE OFFICERS." Professor Mahler seconded the motion.

Dean Madden asked whether the Committee intended any weight to be attached to the word "display." Was the public visibility of the weapon what was involved here? Professor Mueller said that, though the Committee had not discussed the possibility of a weapon being hidden on the person, it had discussed the question of a weapon being in the patrol car. The question of display was an abrasive issue and constituted a negative side of the question of function.

Vice-President Hartley asked about the arbitration issue and about the views of the Staff Council and the Union. Professor Miller noted that the Committee had discussed the matter with the representatives of Local 832, with the Personnel Division, and with Captain Spannuth.

Mr. John Conley said that he understood that though Captain Spannuth had some hesitancy, he had felt that there were other things in the Report sufficiently beneficial to his people and that these recommendations would not pose unsurmountable problems.

Professor Fatouros remarked that this recommendation was in accord with the arbitration award. All the award did insist on was that any decision on this subject come after proper study. The Committee contended that its work and the Council's discussion constituted proper study.

In answer to a question from Dean Webb, Professor Mueller felt that Captain Spannuth did not officially object to the recommendation. Objections, however, might take the form that the carrying of weapons was an essential symbol of trust and faith in police officers, and that denial of weapons implied lack of trust.

Professor Miller added that a general set of recommendations including upgrading and increased educational opportunity and presumably higher salary ratings would ensure a more favorable reception of this recommendation than if it were put forward by itself.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 14 and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 15: "THAT NO PRESENT NEED BE RECOGNIZED FOR SIDE ARMS ON SECURITY DIVISION PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN ROUTINE DAYLIGHT PATROL." Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

Professor Fatouros noted that the word "routine" had been included to take into account a situation where a special patrol might be needed, for example, one transporting sums of money during the daylight hours.

Professor Mueller added that it would be conceivable that the policy committee would extend this restriction. This particular recommendation was thought to be important enough to implement before the policy committee got around to deliberating the general question.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 15 and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 16 and Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

Professor Breneman said that this was a very broad and sweeping statement. He was in agreement with the general principle, but there had been student demonstrations at which people had been shot. Did this recommendation mean that even when there was shooting no sidearms were to be worn by police. Perhaps the words "except under extreme provocation" should be added.

Mr. Conley agreed that, if there were any shooting, a police officer would be expected to defend himself. What the Committee had in mind was a more routine situation where the presence of armed policemen at a demonstration magnified the possibility of a gun going off. The fact on the campus now was that the Safety Division did not carry armed weapons to demonstrations. They had not been armed at the Dow incident. Weapons were unloaded before such an event. The Committee was saying that police should have no side arms at a demonstration. It was being recognized by some police agencies that side arms and clubs in a non-violent demonstration had a tendency to turn that demonstration into a violent one. It was this that the Committee was addressing itself to.

Professor R.C. Turner asked whether there was any value in saying "that no side arms be worn in the policing of any non-violent student demonstration."

Professor Fatouros thought that if by "violent" was meant the presence of guns among the students, then the Council was no longer talking about a student demonstration, but about an armed attack on the campus. By present regulations, the Safety Division disarmed itself before entering into the policing of any demonstrations because it recognized that that was the proper police technique for dealing with demonstrations. All kinds of qualifications that could be inserted could cover the middle ground between an ordinary demonstration and an armed attack but he was afraid that this would immediately deprive the rule of its strength in asserting that the police should rely on their own skill in handling student demonstrations rather than on the presence of weapons.

Acting President Derge reminded the Council that not only firearms but other weapons had been used across the country such as rocks, bottles, sticks, and bricks, so there were tactical questions that had to be determined on the spot by the people involved.

Professor Fatouros pointed out that recommendation 17 provided for the development of detailed guidelines which would presumably include such situations. Nevertheless, the Committee had asked for this specific recommendation, though it recognized that the proposed policy committee might want to qualify it and perhaps bring the matter again before the Council.

Professor Mueller added that the Committee felt that some statement should be made and the problem recognized now, with recommendation 17 allowing for the question to be reviewed. With respect to the police the difference between having side arms without ammunition and having no side arms at all was not very great, but it was a powerful distinction in terms of the appearance created.

Professor Farmer said, and Professor Fatouros agreed, that if demonstrators showed up with some form of deadly weapon, it became a different kind of situation from that described in this recommendation as a student demonstration.

Dean Clark agreed that there was utility in saying something on this topic now. He thought that what was needed, however, was a policy statement to the effect that the presence of side arms tended to increase the possibility of

violence in a demonstration and should therefore be discouraged. Such a statement would explain clearly that the University did not intend to have side arms worn at the policing of student demonstrations and that the policy committee was responsible for specifying this.

Professor R.C. Turner thought recommendation 16 too categorical. A policy committee might well conclude that there could be no qualification of it.

Professor Miller said that, what with the testimony at the Committee's hearings, the information received from other universities, the arbitrator who wrote "It seems clear that the use of firearms in handling student protest demonstration is probably unnecessary, inflammatory, and potentially dangerous," and the Safety Division itself with its policy of not having loaded sidearms, this was intended to be a fairly unequivocal statement. The real problem involved how policemen should behave even in a crowded area if there was unexpected shooting: should they be getting the bystanders out of the way before taking retaliatory action or should they immediately start shooting?

Dean Clark that the point Professor Mueller had outlined would be well handled by a strong policy statement.

Professor Wolff proposed a slightly altered version of wording used by the arbitrator on page 21 of the Report: "That the use of fire arms in handling student protest demonstrations is unnecessary, inflammatory, and potentially dangerous."

Dean Clark then moved as a substitute motion "THAT THE WEARING AND USE OF FIRE ARMS IN HANDLING STUDENT PROTEST DEMONSTRATIONS IS UNNECESSARY, INFLAMMATORY, AND POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS." Professor R.C. Turner seconded the substitute motion.

Professor Shiner did not approve or understand what he thought was an implication of the amendment, namely, that a policy could be violated but a rule must be obeyed, so that the recommendation should be in the form of a policy.

Dean Clark said that his motive for putting it the way he had was to avoid the otherwise inevitable debate about remote exceptions to a rule. He had no objection to the rule, but others appeared to have. But, if everybody in the room was in agreement in regard to a policy, everyone would vote for it; and it would have the same effect and force as a rule. The proposed policy committee would translate the policy into operational rules.

The question was called for and the motion to substitute was passed with 17 ayes, 7 nays, and 2 abstentions.

Professor Mahler moved to amend the substitute motion by including the language of the original recommendation: "And that, therefore, no side arms be worn in the policing of any student demonstration." Professor Murray seconded this motion.

The question was called for on this amendment and the motion failed with 10 ayes and 16 nays. The question was then called for on the adoption of the substitute motion and it was passed with 2 abstentions.

Professor Breneman hoped that the Minutes would clearly show that the definition for "student demonstration" as given by members of the Committee was a narrower one than that often used. Acting President Derge also hoped that the Minutes would show that the policy committee was urged by the Council to consider this in drawing guidelines.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 17 and Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

Professor Gray asked the Committee to accept the addition of the words "on the display and use of weapons." The Committee accepted the addition of these words, the question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 17: "THAT THE POLICY COMMITTEE GIVE PRIORITY ATTENTION TO THE MATTER OF DEVELOPING DETAILED GUIDELINES ON THE DISPLAY AND USE OF WEAPONS BY OFFICERS OF THE SECURITY DIVISION AND THAT ALL OFFICERS BE FULLY INSTRUCTED ON SUCH GUIDELINES." It was passed unanimously.

Professor Fatouros moved the adoption of recommendation 18: "THAT A POLICY COMMITTEE ON THE SECURITY DIVISION, ADVISORY TO THE CHANCELLOR, BE CONSTITUTED WITH THE FOLLOWING MEMBERSHIP: (A) 4 MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY ELECTED BY THE FACULTY COUNCIL; (B) 4 STUDENTS ELECTED BY THE STUDENT SENATE; (C) THE DEAN OF STUDENTS; (D) ONE MEMBER SELECTED BY THE STAFF COUNCIL; (E) ONE MEMBER SELECTED BY LOCAL 832 OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO; (F) THE DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITY DIVISION." Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

After some discussion it was agreed that the chairman should be a faculty member elected by the Faculty Council through the usual procedures of the Nominations Committee. It was decided to leave the exact wording of that provision to the Style Committee. After further discussion it was agreed that the motion should stand without any stipulation as to length of term and that that would be decided at a later date. The question was called for on the motion to adopt recommendation 18 and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Auer then moved that the Council stay in session for 30 more minutes. Professor Mahler seconded this motion. The question was called for and the motion was passed unanimously.

Acting President Derge then called on Dean Madden to present the Foster Project Advisory Committee Report (Faculty Council Circular #81). Dean Madden recalled that the Foster Project had begun two years ago as an experiment in one of the dormitories in establishing closer contact between the residence halls and the academic experience. It was not exactly a residential college because many of the students actually took their classwork in regular classrooms. Only a minority of the courses were actually taught within Foster Project. The theory was that by being together in the same classes (even outside the dormitory) the students would experience greater involvement and both this year's and last year's report substantiated that. He wished to summarize briefly the advantages mentioned in the Report before the Council: greater effectiveness in teaching and educational experimentation; more student-faculty dialogue; improved academic peer-learning relationships; marked increase in Library use and facilities; more student-organized seminars and study groups; and a strong indication of a greater survival rate of freshmen at Foster than elsewhere. The research involved was very unsophisticated but everyone especially the students--some faculty members had some reservations--agreed that the experiment was valuable. Grade averages did not seem to be affected a great deal, though there was evidence of slight improvement. There was considerable evidence that freshmen in the Project became adjusted, established friendships, and got moving much earlier than those outside it. In short, the Report did not present overwhelming evidence for continuation but there was general consensus that it ought to be continued, and that someone be given official responsibility for it. He therefore moved ADOPTION OF THE REPORT and, in particular, of

the following recommendations of the Advisory Committee: THAT THE FOSTER PROJECT BE CONTINUED; AND THAT THE ACTING CHANCELLOR OF THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS APPOINT A FULL-TIME DIRECTOR TO THE PROJECT WHO WOULD TEACH HALF-TIME IN THE PROJECT, AND WHO WOULD BE AIDED BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, THIS DIRECTOR BE IN CHARGE OF THE PROJECT AND ITS PROGRAM, TO COORDINATE THE COURSES AND NON-CURRICULAR PROGRAM, AND TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT IN A SYSTEMATIC MANNER. Professor Wolff seconded the motion.

As to the budgetary implications of this motion, Dean Madden said that Chancellor Wells' Task Force examining the residence halls was most interested in the Project's continuing and had assured him that financial aid would be available if need be.

Professor Farmer who had participated in the Project was bothered by the lack of evaluation. He thought approval of another year of experimentation should be contingent on some sort of guarantee that there would be precise and valid measures of the effect of the Project.

Professor Shiner urged that the evaluation not be confined to the matter of grades.

Professor Neu asked how many students were included in the Project and how much it cost.

Dean Madden said that there were about between 250 and 300 students involved and the costs were minimal.

Professor Shiner noted that, in his observation, the Foster students had a lot more spirit than other students and he thought that significant. Professor Farmer said that that was the kind of statement that made him nervous and which called for criteria and precise comparisons.

The question was called for on the motion to adopt the Foster Project Advisory Committee Report and the two recommendations and it was passed unanimously.

Acting President Derge then called for the next item on the Agenda: Report on the Status of Librarians (Faculty Council Circular #86). Professor Shiner reminded the Council that the Library Committee had two specific recommendations, the first, in the nature of a recommendation to the Board of Trustees: THAT PROFESSIONAL LIBRARIANS BE ACCORDED FULL FACULTY STATUS; AND, THAT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE BE ESTABLISHED TO FORMULATE PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING FACULTY RANK OF LIBRARIANS AND TO REVISE WHERE NECESSARY THE LANGUAGE OF THE FACULTY HANDBOOK TO REFLECT THE PROPOSED CHANGE." The Committee stressed that the proposed change would give library staff a choice as to whether they wanted to take faculty status or remain under their present conditions of employment. There were about one hundred librarians almost all with master's degrees which was the terminal degree for beginning in the library profession, some not only in Library Science but in subject-matter areas. Thirteen librarians had Ph.D's. They commanded, on the average, two languages each. They have published 235 articles, 144 reviews, and 39 books. The Committee thought that the storage and procurement of information was a very important research tool and that there was an important research dimension to what the librarians did. It thought that there was also an important teaching dimension to what they did, not currently realized to the extent that it should be. If librarians had faculty status and took on the regular obligations of faculty for promotion, this teaching role would be greatly expanded.

Moreover, with the College moving toward an independent study program, the role of librarians would be very important. At the moment, librarians were in a kind of halfway house: they were under the Dean of Faculties, they had TIAA benefits and parking privileges, and they were included in the faculty mailing list, but they did not have sabbatical leaves or academic tenure, and they did not participate as faculty members in University government. Currently, some six of the librarians in the upper administrative levels had faculty status, and eight or ten, mainly branch librarians, had part-time faculty status. The immediate cost of the change would be quite small and would relate to the sabbatical leave program. Eventually salaries might go up but presumably the University was competing in a national market anyhow and rates had to be competitive. If librarians were given a direct role in the teaching and research functions of the University they would contribute much more importantly to these goals than was now possible. If the change were not approved, there would be some demoralization and the University would have a harder time attracting and retaining the better people.

In answer to a question from Acting President Derge, Professor Byrd, University Librarian, said that a faculty librarian would not be attached to any presently existing academic department.

Vice-President Hartley said there had been a long-standing policy that faculty have rank in some degree-granting program. He thought that, if librarians were to have faculty rank, they ought to have it in some academic program where they were involved in teaching, research, and service. Otherwise, the criteria for promotion might not apply to many of them.

Acting President Derge asked Dean Fry of the Graduate School of Library Science if there had been proposals to make all librarians members of his faculty. Dean Fry replied that this would not be practical. The teaching, research, and service functions of librarians were to be performed for the University community as a whole, and as the trend developed and as developments in the library profession itself moved towards more effective assistance and bibliographic work, information retrieval and storage, and so on, it would, he thought, be found suitable to offer faculty status within the University library system itself.

Professor Shiner noted that the criteria for promotion and tenure listed in the Faculty Handbook would require little if any editing or changing in order to be applicable to the librarians. He wished, while he had the floor to repair an error in the Report and to add to it the names of the following additional Library Committee members: Dean Carter, Professors Robert Bareikis and Henry Mahler, and students, Charles Lawrence, Gerald Thrasher, and Diane Zimmer.

Dean Carter referred to the system that had been adopted at the University of Illinois where there was no assignment to departments. Recently at the University of Illinois, he had been impressed by evidence of the greater extent to which librarians were used for instructional purposes by departments.

Professor Farmer gathered that there would be no objection to joint appointments, where the qualifications existed. Professor Shiner said some already existed but that no departmental affiliation was being required.

In answer to a question from Professor Neu, Professor Shiner noted that the rank would apply to the person and not the position.

Vice-President Hartley hoped that departments would do their best to involve librarians in their academic programs. Otherwise, this proposal would be putting librarians on a career track where they might have real difficulty in achieving advancement.

Professor R.C. Turner asked if every full-time employee of the Library were eligible. Professor Shiner said that there was a distinction between the professional librarians and the clerical help. The normal requirements for appointment at the lowest level, an instructorship type of appointment, would be the Master of Library Science and in most cases some experience. From there, requirements for promotion would be the same as they were for other faculty members.

Professor Byrd noted that librarians had always been given released time for teaching.

Professor Neu asked about support for this proposal among librarians themselves.

Mr. Thomas J. Michalak of the Library said that there had been a number of meetings to which all the librarians had been invited and a committee elected by the librarians had studied the problem and made recommendations to the Library Committee. Without question, the proposal had the support of the majority of the librarians.

Dean Carter reminded the Council that there was no intent in this recommendation to coerce presently employed professional librarians into acceptance of faculty rank.

Professor Byrd, speaking for the library administration, said he would however have preferred that all qualified librarians took faculty status.

Dean Pinnell was somewhat disturbed at the implications of having a faculty member who was a professor but who did not profess. He believed that there must be some better way to take them into the body of the faculty.

Professor Byrd said that the Library Administration felt that there were no logical reasons why professional librarians should not be given faculty status, only excuses and old rules. The Library Administration was in favor of the change for two reasons: one, that it would get better performance from its staff, and the other that it would be in a better position to recruit librarians as vacancies occurred.

Professor Buehrig raised the possibility of faculty status without ranks. Professor Shiner said that if the Council wanted librarians to be faculty and to act like faculty, they should be given the same titles as the rest of the faculty.

Professor Wolff moved the adoption of the Report and the two recommendations and Professor Fatouros seconded the motion.

Professor Remak said that nobody appreciated better than he the tremendous professional support that the faculty received from its colleagues in the Library. But he objected in principle to such a significant step of adding one hundred new additional members to the faculty so hurriedly. He therefore wished to make a subsidiary motion to postpone consideration until the first meeting in the fall. Professor R.C. Turner seconded the motion. The question was called for on the subsidiary motion and it failed with 16 nays and 10 ayes.

The question was then called for on the motion to adopt the Report and the two recommendations and the motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Remak then asked to speak as a matter of personal privilege. He felt it would be very unfortunate if the Council ended its year without paying

tribute to Acting Chancellor Snyder. He wished to propose as a motion that: THE FACULTY COUNCIL EXPRESSES ITS DEEP APPRECIATION TO ACTING CHANCELLOR JOHN SNYDER FOR THE INTEGRITY AND DEDICATION OF HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THIS UNIVERSITY AND WISHES HIM GODSPEED IN HIS NEW POSITION. Professor Auer seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Professor Remak wished also to say something about the Secretary of the Council, Professor Michael Wolff. He thought one of the reasons, in spite of the fashion of the Council to deprecate its own work, why the Council had nothing to be ashamed of this year was the dedicated and effective work of the Secretary which nobody not on the Agenda Committee could really appreciate. He thought the Council had proved that this particular kind of representative democracy was still the most effective and reliable way of getting work done efficiently and usefully. A great deal of the credit for this must go to the current Secretary. It was not only the incredible amount of time that the job had taken; he wished to speak particularly and with great appreciation of the tremendous intelligence and integrity the Secretary had shown in this job. It was no secret that Professor Wolff had his own ideas and preferences and that these had not always been the ones that, as Secretary of the Council, he had had to promote. Therefore, on behalf of the Agenda Committee and members of the Council itself, he wished to express profound gratitude to him and to his secretary, Mrs. Alice Richardson, who had also been a wonderful worker.

Acting President Derge adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

The Secretary cannot let the year go by without issuing his own thanks to Mr. Don Scales, who tapes the meetings of the Council with such imperturbability and efficiency; to Mr. Frank Buick, who oversees the distribution of these Minutes with all deliberate speed; and to Mrs. Richardson whose reliability, accuracy, and diligence have made the work possible and whom he bequeaths to his successor, Professor Willbern, as he would throw a life-belt to a man in danger of drowning. His colleagues on the Agenda Committee, Donald Gray, Henry Remak, and Orlando Taylor, it would be presumptuous to praise. Each, in his own way, has rendered the University signal service during a difficult year.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Wolff, Secretary