

Minutes of the Faculty Council

September 15, 1969

Ballantine Hall 008

4:00 p.m.

Members Present: President Sutton; Chancellor Carter; Deans Harvey, Shull, Pinnell, Bain, Endwright, Fry; Professors Auer, Breneman, Carter, Case, Gray, Johnston, Lynch, Murray, Newton, Osterburg, Otteson, Panschar, Pratter, Stolnitz, Thomas, Berkley, L. Brown, Daniel, Daugherty, Farmer, Holland, Long, Ludlow, Ludwig, Maxwell, Richey, Shiner, Wennerstrom, Willbern; Messrs. Helmke, Hardy, Eherenman

Alternates Present: Dean Walter Nugent for Dean of Arts & Sciences; Professor Robert Hennon for Professor Davidson; Professor Vernon H. Smith for Professor Pilder; Professor Paul Strohm for Professor Renak

Absent, No Alternate: Dean Clark; Professors Frye, Hackney, Molson, Singer, Sunderman, Turner, A. Brown; Mr. Scott

Official Visitors: Vice-Presidents J. R. Hartley, D. R. Derge, Lynne L. Merritt, John Ryan; Dean Harry Yamaguchi

AGENDA

President Sutton will report to the Faculty Council on two matters: the present state of the reorganization of the University's administrative structure; and progress towards the organization of a University Council.

President Sutton called the Special Meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 4:00 p.m.

The President apologized for requesting the special meeting at 4:00 o'clock, and hoped that it need not extend past 5:00 o'clock. He wished to answer questions as well as present the results of the reorganization of the University. During the administration of President Stahr, the Faculty Council approved in principle the reorganization of the University. Substantially, what it approved was that the University would be divided into three autonomous units. The three autonomous units were Bloomington, Indianapolis (now Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis), and the remaining five regional campuses of Gary, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Kokomo and Jeffersonville. Several charts had been presented to the Council showing what the central administration would look like. There has been no substantial change in the plan that both the Board of Trustees and this Council approved. But the President said he wanted an opportunity to report directly to the Faculty Council and through the Faculty Council to the Faculty about this reorganization and what it means.

A document (Faculty Council Circular #4, attached to these Minutes) was distributed which showed, first, the organization on a chart (although the President indicated little confidence in charts) and, second, job descriptions for each of the central administrators and Chancellors. These were done partly for our own edification but partly because the Board of Trustees had never seen a job description of anybody before and they were curious as to what people's responsibilities really were. These were not easy to get; everybody cooperated very well but the first job descriptions from the central administrators sounded like what they had been doing. They were then set the task of writing a statement of what they weren't going to do anymore. That was an interesting exercise; after they had written down what they weren't going to do anymore then they wrote down again what they were going to do now, and this is the origin of this paper.

The Chancellors will be responsible to the Office of the President (and to the Board of Trustees, therefore) for the operation of their own campuses. This is all spelled out in rather considerable detail, although at the end of each job description there is a sentence that says, "And such other duties as the President may assign", because in such a complex apparatus there is bound to be something that was overlooked. By assigning major responsibility to the geographic chancellors, many of the things that were formerly done in the central administration will no longer be done there. For example, before the reorganization it was the responsibility of the Dean of the Faculties to make out all of the budgets for all of the campuses and go over all of the salaries for all of the faculty personnel on all the campuses, to approve all of the requested changes and developments in programs, go over all of the promotions for all of the faculty for all of the campuses, and incidentally try to do a little planning for the future. It just got to be obvious that this was no longer an effective way to administer the University. So those responsibilities, and specifically the control of academic personnel and staff (the responsibilities the Dean of Faculties had), including promotions, raises, and the general and line item budget responsibilities, devolve upon the Chancellor and his staff.

The Office of President includes those people who are actually in the office and all the other Vice Presidents. The responsibility of the Office of the President now includes, as far as local operations are concerned, only a post hoc review. We will find out what the Chancellors did in any given year, but we will

not go over every document, every piece of paper, every personnel appointment, and otherwise muddy the waters for the local Chancellor. This will not be perhaps a relief to the Bloomington campus, which has always had more ready access to the central administration than the other campuses. But oftentimes things were held up unconscionably on the regional campuses and in Indianapolis simply because of the assignment of responsibilities for operations to central administrative officers. They will now no longer have to go through that exercise.

The central administrative group, the Office of the President, will have the responsibility for long-range planning and development of the University, financially, in terms of physical plant, general budget preparation, presentations to the Legislature, et cetera, et cetera. All of these duties are set down and described in appropriate places in the document which has been distributed.

You will notice that one vice-presidency vanished. There is now one less vice-president than there used to be; that is the Vice-President for Undergraduate Development. That is not because we are not interested any longer in undergraduate development. But many of the responsibilities that had been assigned to that office had been assigned to it over a period of years without their necessarily having any relationship to one another. This was oftentimes referred to as "clothes-line administration". If you didn't know where to hang it, you hung it in Undergraduate Development; so such diverse matters as the Junior Division, the Student Health Service, the Registrar's Office, and other things were under him. Many of these duties, of course, now go to the geographic chancellor. That is, the Chancellor of the Bloomington Campus will have the responsibility for the operation of the Health Center, will have the responsibility for the Junior Division insofar as it is applicable to his campus, and so on. Two parts of that office remain in some form or another in the Central Administration: The Vice-President and Dean for Academic Affairs (that is Dean Hartley, who was formerly Dean of Faculties) will retain the overall responsibility for the stimulation and development and improvement of undergraduate programs on a system-wide basis. This will also include the development of what are generally styled "learning resources", which involve classrooms, audio visual, the use of the state-wide television network, and so on. The other part of what was in the now-disappeared vice-president's office that remains in the central administration is the Office of Registrar. There had been a kind of separation of the information-developing services of the University under various persons. For example, the Bureau of Institutional Research reported to the Dean of Faculties, the Registrar reported to the Vice-President for Undergraduate Development, and Data Systems and Services reported to the Vice-President and Treasurer. Oftentimes they were doing the same thing over again without keeping one another informed, and they weren't effectively providing information to the planners because of this division. So these three, Data Systems and Services, the Registrar's Office, and the Bureau of Institutional Research, now report to the President's Office and provide, hopefully, system-wide service for Indiana University.

It will obviously be a question in your minds as to how all of these--five Vice-Presidents, three Chancellors and the President--are going to keep adequate communication with one another. The answer to that is that the Central Committee, the so-called Administrative Committee, of the University has been reorganized. Now, the Administrative Committee, in case you have never had the pleasure of attending one of its meetings, consisted of just about everybody you could think of who might someday have something come up that he was interested in; it consisted of a whole room full of people. The meetings went on and one, and of course if

someone was on the committee they felt they had to make a contribution whether they had one to make or not. It was too cumbersome an instrument. This has now been reorganized so that the Central Administrative Committee of the University will consist of the President, the Vice-Presidents, and the geographic chancellors. The actual on-campus regional campus Chancellors are not yet included, for they all fall under the Vice-President and Chancellor of the Regional Campuses as of this time and the foreseeable future. It is also planned that if it is appropriate for persons not in this group to come, for whatever reason, to Administrative Committee, they will be invited. But it will streamline the operation, and it should save a good bit of administrative time, for there were people who came week after week and sat from 2:30 to 6:30 while their work piled up and they didn't have anything to do in the meeting except occasionally to doze or make wry and cynical observations about having better things to do with their time. Hopefully, we have corrected that.

That in general is what has happened in the reorganization. In general, it is what had been previously approved by the Faculty Council and by the Board of Trustees. The President then offered to answer any questions that were not answered either by the general descriptive statement or by the documents.

Professor Farmer noted that the Vice-President and Chancellor of the Regional Campuses is shown as reporting to the President and the three Chancellors also report to the President and, yet, reading the job descriptions, it sounds as if they report to him. Is this structured correctly? Is he staff advisor to the President? The President replied that this post was the most complex appointment and only an Irishman could handle it. Actually, at least for the time being, given the fact that the Regional Campuses are developing now toward full programs but have not yet developed to that point, plus the obvious importance to the University system as a whole, in terms of the kind of support they do or do not generate depending on how they execute their missions in the various heavily populated regions of the State, it was felt that they should report to the central administration through a Vice-President who has the responsibility for all five campuses. We do not have a budget for Gary, a budget for South Bend, a budget for Kokomo; we just have a Regional Campus budget, and that money has to be allocated on the basis of priorities that are developed, or opportunities seen, in the Regional Campuses and we hope that the Legislature will not for some time sub-divide that budget. If someone gets a good, unique program idea in Gary, say, we want to be able to help that flourish and develop right away and we don't want to be bound by having money tied up on some other campus unspent. The five Regional Campus Chancellors report to the Vice-President and Chancellor for Regional Campuses. The "Chancellor Regional Campuses" on the chart, refers to the Vice-President and Chancellor of Regional Campuses. It was observed that, therefore, one man presently occupies two boxes on the chart.

The President then said that he did not for one minute think that we have, by the legerdemain of a chart and job descriptions, settled the question of reorganization. His best estimate was that it will be three years before the shake-down cruise is over on this. The reorganization does not mean, for example, that any faculty member or any administrator from any campus, is excluded from talking to the President, any more than they ever were. It just means that daily operational responsibilities will be the responsibility of the geographic chancellor. And this is already, in the short time that we have had it operating, proving to be effective. The central administrators are finding that they are having more time to give to system-wide problems than they used to have and, hopefully, this additional time will be fruitfully used.

Mr. Helmke said he was still unsure about how a problem like budget making would work. You say the Chancellors are responsible for budget, but Academic Affairs and Treasurer are also responsible for budgets. Do they each operate independently, or do they come up with the same budget for the whole system?

The President replied that the Chancellors of the various geographic units will put together, along with deans and departmental chairmen, their requests for the next biennium. These will come into the central administration and there, after discussion with the various Chancellors through the medium of the Administrative Committee, we will decide what the central budget request will be. This will raise all the questions of program priority and so on that have always been raised, but it will mean that once these decisions have been made, the Legislature has enacted the budget, and the budget monies have been assigned to the geographic divisions, expenditures will not need to be cleared through a single administrative office. The only review will be a review after the fact. This change is less obvious to the Bloomington campus faculty member or student than it is to regional campus people, who for years have had to clear things with Bloomington that they knew more about than Bloomington did and this naturally annoyed them. They were tied, for example, to programs that were established in Bloomington when they knew that they needed different kinds of programs. If the course wasn't in the catalogue, it didn't exist as far as the Regional Campuses were concerned. The kind of Psychology, for example, that we're very proud of and that has developed on the Bloomington campus was not thought to be suitable by the psychologists in Gary who wanted a different kind of program in Psychology with more emphasis on Social Psychology, Industrial Psychology, and Clinical Psychology. There is no reason why they can't go ahead and have that kind of Psychology program and, indeed, under this reorganization they can.

Professor Willbern asked if it was meant that decisions with regard to expanded programs at the regional campuses now can be made on those particular campuses. If they want to offer master's degrees, for example, no one in Bloomington has any control over that? The President replied that the Vice-President and Chancellor for Regional Campuses would have such control and "he's got to explain it to me".

Professor Willbern asked, for a person graduating at Gary, from whom the degree was granted, Indiana University or Indiana University-Northwest? Vice-President Ryan replied that, for those who earned a degree in 1969, it was voted by the faculty of Indiana University and awarded by the Trustees. Whatever we do under this reorganization scheme, it will still be true that the same Trustees award the degree. Nothing on the degree indicates whether it comes from Bloomington or from Northwest. Professor Willbern suggested that this might mean that in the future he will get a degree from the University as a whole but only a portion of the University would have control over what it consists of. Vice-President Ryan said that, while the reorganization had not yet arrived at that point, it certainly is consistent with it that a future step would be to have the degree at Gary voted by the Gary faculty that taught the courses and developed the curriculum and knows the student.

Chancellor Carter added that he thought that at present none of the institutions on the regional campuses are accredited to confer degrees directly. The President and Vice-President Ryan said that this was true through the 1969 class, but that all the regional campuses are accredited by the North Central Association, beginning now, for undergraduate work on their own, but that this does not apply

to graduate programs. The only accreditation that exists for the Master's degree in Business, for example, is through the Graduate School of Business in Bloomington. Vice-President Ryan said that yet to be wrestled with is the role of a university-wide group, Faculty Council or otherwise, in reviewing individual campus proposals for degrees.

The President said that it therefore becomes a matter of some urgency that we get forward as rapidly as possible with the reorganization of the system-wide Faculty Council. It should be broadly representative of the three units. In Indianapolis, IUPUI has its own faculty organization that deals with faculty matters of that unit. Similar steps are going forward on the regional campuses and certain steps have been taken in Bloomington through the Buehrig Committee to develop such a Faculty Council uniquely concerned with Bloomington matters. There needs to be a system-wide Faculty Council to whom questions of this sort can be introduced, discussed, and decided upon, or decided against.

The Secretary said that the amended Constitution for the Faculty Council specifically provides for both a Bloomington Council and an All-University Council. We must work out the procedure for handling the two this year. The Bloomington Council is composed of members elected from Bloomington only, plus certain administrative officials from the Bloomington campus. All of those people are members of the All-University Council also. And, in addition, the President is a member of the All-University Council, and there are some other elected members from the regional campuses. Professor Farmer asked what needed to be done in this regard. Is there further machinery that has to be set up? The Secretary replied that immediate action was not necessary, but that there was a good deal of dissatisfaction with the way in which the All-University Council was set up. It was approved with a firm understanding that it would be reviewed and revised as quickly as possible during this year. Vice-President Hartley said that it was clear that there is need for a constitutional revision. When the Constitution was amended last spring, the objections were, of course, that there were only 3 Indianapolis representatives and roughly 40 Bloomington representatives and the ratio of the faculty numbers is about 2½ to 1, and there are similar problems with the regional campuses.

Before further discussion of constitutional revision, the President mentioned another item which he wished to commend to the Faculty Council for its expeditious consideration. This is the question of a code of ethical and professional conduct for the faculty itself. This has been talked about for a long time but no systematic job has been done. He said he had recommended to the Secretary of the Faculty Council that the Agenda Committee consider putting together a committee to study this problem and to make recommendations to the Faculty Council for its consideration. It is the responsibility of the faculty to determine and to oversee questions of professional and ethical conduct on the part of the faculty; it is not the administration's responsibility to do this and, indeed, this would be ineffective. Professor Breneman said that apparently the President felt that the statement on ethics in the Faculty Handbook is not adequate and should be revised. The President agreed. The Faculty Council could decide, he supposed, that the statement in the Faculty Handbook is adequate. But, on the other hand, he had a feeling that a number of contingencies are not covered there. The students are concerned, for example, about classroom relationships and teaching responsibilities, which clearly are matters of ethical and professional conduct on the part of the faculty.

The Secretary then distributed some proposals by the Agenda Committee with regard to committee structure and Council procedure with a request that they be considered at the next Council meeting.

Dean Harvey wished to raise a general point. He recalled that on a number of occasions last year, when we were considering the structure of the Council, the point was made that we were essentially legislating for the Bloomington Council, which for an interim transition period was performing a dual role. The point was emphasized that at some later time, particularly early this academic year, attention would be given to the devising of what was really to be a new institution. There may be some danger of having our processes in some measure distorted by introducing the birth of this new institution too intimately into this Council. We are talking about revision of a constitution. It might be better to think, not in terms of constitutional revision, but of the creation of a constitution for a new all-university body. The processes that we now have for this body are not necessarily the appropriate processes for bringing a new all-university constitution into operation for a new Faculty Council for the entire university.

Professor Pratter felt that the single most important issue with regard to the All-University Council was not a matter of membership or representation, but rather the division of function.

Dean Harvey moved that the Committee on Educational Policies and University Structure be asked to prepare for consideration of the Council a proposal for the creation of an appropriate body to draft the constitution of an all-university council. This motion was seconded by Professor Farmer.

Professor Carter asked about the composition of the committee, indicating that this would be a concern of the constituents in Indianapolis whom he represented. The Secretary and Professor Breneman, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, reminded the Council that committee memberships had not yet been determined, but that the Nominating Committee was working on a slate of nominees. The President felt certain that there would be opportunity for the Indianapolis campus people as well as the regional campus people to have an input of consequence, because the whole purpose of the review is to correct the problem that they were worried about. Professor Carter informed the Council that a Faculty Council has been formed and is now meeting in Indianapolis.

Professor Pratter anticipated some difficulties in creating an all-university constitution. The existing Council, at least in some people's minds, is not a representative body. It now begins to create an all-university Council. The built-in non-representative aspects of it may affect its act; the important thing is to undo that basic prejudice. It will depend upon the good sense and the good will of the committee that comes back with the recommendation. Chancellor Carter wondered if this matter might not be deferred until the next meeting of the Council, since the committee has not been formed and cannot function in between anyway. In the interim it might be advisable if we could hear from representatives at Indianapolis or the regional campuses about some of their conceptions as to how to go about the business, although they may not be meeting in the interim. In view of this suggestion, Dean Harvey, with the consent of the second, withdrew his motion at this meeting.

The President made an announcement which he said he was very unhappy to make, informing the Council of the untimely death of Professor Stanley Ballinger, who had been a member of this body and a member of this University for some time. There will be a memorial service for him Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. in Whittenberger Auditorium which will be of special interest to members of the Council.

The Secretary had an announcement with regard to membership on the Council. There are six vacancies among the elected members of the Council. The alternates who, under the Constitution, fill those vacancies, have been notified. From the persons elected for the term 1968-70 there are the following vacancies: Stanley Ballinger; Henry Mahler; Orlando Taylor; Robert Turner; and Irving Zeitlin. The outgoing Secretary, the present Secretary, and the Parliamentarian had some exercises of judgment to make in arranging for alternates which should be reported to the Council. The first alternate on the list for that particular term was Charles Hewitt. Hewitt is now Dean of the Junior Division. The Faculty Council Constitution disqualifies Associate and Assistant Deans from membership on the Council by election, but it says nothing about Deans. We interpreted the Constitution to include Deans as well so we jumped over Dean Hewitt in the list of alternates. We also, in going down the list of alternates, came to names of several people who have now been elected for terms on their own; we jumped them as well. It could be argued that these people could be promoted to the vacancies and then their alternates chosen, but that seemed too complicated. The alternates notified and included on the new roster are Roger Newton, Schuyler Otteson, Owen Thomas, George Stolnitz, and William Lynch. Of the group of faculty members elected for 1969-71, Frank Ryder is not here and his alternate is Arlen Brown. In each case, of course, the alternate serves so long as the person who has been elected to that position is not available. If he should return or give up his administrative position, during the term for which he has been elected, he resumes the Council post.

President Sutton adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted
York Willbern, Secretary