

NOTICE OF

All Univ.

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1969, 2:30 P.M.

Faculty Council Room, Ballantine Hall

AGENDA

1. Approval of May 27, May 29, June 3, 1969 Minutes.
2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Dotaline E. Allen (Professor Helen Weber).
3. Memorial Resolution for Professor Cecilia Hendricks (Professor Frank Davidson).
4. Presiding Officer's Business.
5. Agenda Committee Business (not to exceed 30 minutes).
 - a. Procedure and Committee Structure
 - b. Election of Committees
6. Student Conduct Code (Gray) (not to exceed 15 minutes).
7. Progress Report on Afro-American Affairs (Dean Richard Young) (not to exceed 45 minutes).
8. Student Financial Aid and Budgetary Resources to Supplement It (Mr. Edson W. Sample and Farmer).

Pending (not necessarily in order of priority):

Fraternalities and Sororities
Campus mailings
Status of graduate assistants
Role and composition of search and screening committees
Grades and grading policy
Summer sessions
University public service
Distribution of authority in the University Junior Division
Calendar
Tenure in Athletic Department
Appointments to special professorships
Academic priorities
Space utilization
Improvement of teaching
Admissions policy
Faculty ethics

Enclosures:

Faculty Council Circular #1 Faculty Council Membership List
#2 Faculty Council Constitution
#3 Progress Report on Afro-American Affairs
Student Conduct Code (Bloomington faculty only;
other faculty to receive copies later)

Minutes of the University Faculty Council
 September 23, 1969
 Ballantine Hall 008
 2:30 p.m.

Members Present: President Sutton; Chancellor Carter; Deans Shull, Harvey, Yamaguchi, Clark, Endwright, Fry; Professors Auer, Breneman, Carter, Davidson, Frye, Gray, Hackney, Johnston, Lynch, Molson, Newton, Osterburg, Otteson, Panschar, Pilder, Pratter, Remak, Stolz, Stolz, Sunderman, Thomas, Berkley, A. Brown, L. Brown, Daniel, Daugherty, Farmer, Holland, Long, Ludlow, Ludwig, Maxwell, Richey, Shiner, Wennerstrom, Willbern

Alternates Present: Dean Harvey Bunke for Dean Pinnell; Professor A. A. Fatouros for Professor Murray

Absent, No Alternate: Dean Bain; Professors Case, Singer, Turner; Messrs. Helmke, Scott, Hardy, Eherenman

Official Visitors: Vice-Chancellor R. C. Turner; Dean Charles Hagen; Dean Richard Young; Mr. Robert Johnson; Mr. Edson W. Sample

AGENDA

1. Approval of May 27, May 29, June 3, 1969 Minutes.
2. Memorial Resolution for Professor Dotaline E. Allen (Professor Helen Weber).
3. Memorial Resolution for Professor Cecilia Hendricks (Professor Frank Davidson).
4. Presiding Officer's Business.
5. Agenda Committee Business (not to exceed 30 minutes).
 - a. Procedure and Committee Structure
 - b. Election of Committees
6. Student Conduct Code (Gray) (not to exceed 15 minutes).
7. Progress Report on Afro-American Affairs (Dean Richard Young) (not to exceed 45 minutes).
8. Student Financial Aid and Budgetary Resources to Supplement It (Mr. Edwon W. Sample and Farmer).

President Sutton called the meeting of the Faculty Council to order at 2:30 p.m.

Minutes of the meetings of May 27, May 29, and June 3, 1969 were approved unanimously.

Associate Dean Edith Green presented a Memorial Resolution for Professor Dotaline E. Allen prepared by Dean Frances Orgain and Professor Helen J. Weber, Chairman (Faculty Council Circular #5-70).

Emeritus Professor Frank Davidson presented a Memorial Resolution for Professor Cecilia H. Hendricks prepared by Professors Samuel Yellen, Russell Noyes, and Frank Davidson (Faculty Council Circular #6-70).

Since there was no Presiding Officer's Business, President Sutton then called on the Secretary to present Agenda Committee Business.

The Secretary said that the Constitution adopted by the Faculty of the University last spring provided for two Faculty Councils; one is the All-University Council of which this is an official meeting; the other is the Bloomington Council. They are juridically separate bodies. There will be a great deal of difficulty working out what ought to be done by each of them, but in the short run at least there must be some arrangement as to which is meeting when. The proposal of the Agenda Committee is that, for the time being and until we know better how these things work, they alternate with each other. On behalf of the Agenda Committee, he moved THAT THE BLOOMINGTON COUNCIL NORMALLY MEET ON THE FIRST (AND FIFTH, IF THERE IS ONE) TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH AND THE ALL-UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON THE THIRD TUESDAY: PROVIDED THAT THE AGENDA COMMITTEE MAY SHIFT SUCH MEETING WITH APPROPRIATE NOTICE TO THE MEMBERSHIP AND THE FACULTY. The President recalled that there was an expectation that the All-University Council will soon be restructured, so this is merely an interim arrangement. The motion was seconded by Professor Auer. The question was called for and the motion passed unanimously.

The Secretary then called attention to a proposed structure of committees related to the Faculty Council (Faculty Council Circular #7-70). The first page of the document, which includes Basic Committees, the Faculty Board of Review, and University Committees for which the Council chooses members, involves no change in the existing arrangements; it is an attempt merely to summarize what these committees are and what the relationship is to the Faculty Council. The second page, which relates to standing committees which are more peculiarly those of the Council, does involve some changes, though not major ones. It is suggested that the Committee on Educational Policies and University Structure be divided into two committees. In the past, that Committee has been overloaded with business. It is suggested that the Committee on Regional Campus Affairs be abolished. It didn't do anything last year, and each of the regional campuses now has its own faculty structures. And, third, it is suggested that there be created a standing committee on Afro-American Affairs. This is a new committee but, since there are now a good many activities in this area, the Agenda Committee suggests that the Council should have a committee to keep informed and to report to the Council from time to time. With regard to the Council standing committees, there is an attempt to divide committees in some measure with regard to all-university and Bloomington concerns. It is suggested that each committee have at least 6 members elected from the faculty at large; at least 4 should be from the Bloomington campus and at least 2 from other campuses. In some cases there should be a larger representation from Bloomington, or from outside of Bloomington. When matters relate only to Bloomington, the portion of the committee that is from Bloomington would constitute the committee; if

matters are felt to relate to other portions of the University as well as Bloomington, then the whole committee would be involved. This again is an initial attempt to try to operate this dual structure. He then moved THAT THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF COMMITTEES RELATED TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL BE APPROVED. The motion was seconded by Professor Berkley.

Professor Long asked the purpose of a Style Committee. The President replied that the Council had earlier decided that it would pass substantive concepts and then let a committee on style sit down and work out the language.

Professor Thomas asked if all of the committees would be reconsidered in the new constitutional revision. For example, one basic committee is elected by the Council and two are appointed by the President. This is something that, for example, might be changed in the constitutional revision. The President said that none of the present arrangements would be binding on the All-University Council if, and when, we get a new one.

Professor Pratter asked why it was necessary to approve the list on the first page, since they did not change. The Secretary agreed to change the motion to TO APPROVE PAGE 2 OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF COMMITTEES. (The seconder agreed). The question was called for and the motion passed unanimously.

The Secretary then moved TO DELETE FROM THE BYLAWS ANY REFERENCE TO SPECIFIC STANDING COMMITTEES. Since the bylaws constitutionally need to be approved by the whole faculty, this would make it easier to change committee arrangements. The motion was seconded by Dean Harvey. The motion also passed unanimously.

The Secretary then moved that the problem of revision of the Faculty Constitution, be referred to the Committee on University Structure. He felt that a constitutional convention of some type was needed; the Council must initiate the action and set up the structure by which it is undertaken. Professor Auer seconded the motion.

Dean Harvey suggested that, rather than having this a reference to the Committee on University Structure, the Committee on University Structure should be asked to carry out the appropriate consultations with relevant people in the University and then bring back to the Council a proposal which the Council itself would then consider for the creation of the agency to re-write the Constitution. It seemed to him important on something as basic as this, that the Council have the opportunity to consider and commit the basic constituent act rather than simply to make it on the basis of a broad reference to one of its own committees. The Secretary had no objection to this; it adds one extra step, but in view of the importance of the subject, it might be appropriate. The President thought this extra step wise because it gives us a chance to consult with Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis and the regional campuses somewhat more effectively and make sure we get a better balance in that constitutional committee. Professor Davidson agreed with Dean Harvey's remarks about the desirability of the Committee on University Structure simply making a proposal to the Faculty Council because, unfortunately, the faculty at the regional campuses do not regard this Council as representative of the regional campuses.

Professor Arlen Brown then asked that the motion, as modified with the consent of the mover and seconder, be repeated.

The President stated the motion: THAT THE COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY STRUCTURE BE DIRECTED BY THE FACULTY COUNCIL TO PROPOSE A GROUP OF FACULTY MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES, THE INDIANAPOLIS CAMPUS, AND THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS, TO BEGIN IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSTITUTION, THE STRUCTURE AND RESPONSIBILITIES, ET CETERA, OF THE ALL-UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND FACULTY COUNCIL. The question was called for and the motion was passed unanimously as amended.

The Secretary then said that the Bylaws provide that if the President cannot be present at a meeting of the All-University Council he shall designate someone else to preside in his place. The Chancellor presides at the Bloomington Council meeting but nothing is said about a substitute for him in that regard. To permit him also to designate a substitute to preside in his place, the Secretary moved THAT THE WORDS "OR CHANCELLOR" BE INSERTED AFTER THE WORD PRESIDENT IN THE SECOND SENTENCE OF PARAGRAPH 10 OF THE BYLAWS. Professor Auer seconded the motion. The question was called for and the motion passed unanimously.

The Secretary then moved THAT THE REVISED BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL BE SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY FOR APPROVAL. Professor Farmer seconded the motion. Professor Fatouros recalled that the proposal to have the Faculty Council approve its own bylaws without having to refer to the Faculty was defeated last year in the constitutional amendments proposed. The question was called for and the motion was passed unanimously.

The President called for Agenda Item 5b., Election of Committees. The Secretary said that normally the Nominating Committee is not supposed to propose a slate of committee memberships until the second regular meeting, which would be in October, but in view of the fact that student affairs and the matter of university structure, which was just discussed, appeared to be fairly urgent, the Agenda Committee asked if the Nominating Committee would prepare a slate of nominees for those committees earlier.

The Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Professor Breneman, reported initially that, as a member of the Educational Policies and University Structure Committee, he had been asked to arrange for a sub-committee to study the university division proposal which was in the College of Arts and Sciences recommendation in the spring. The following people have been asked and have agreed to serve on this Committee on the University Division Proposal: Professor Newell Long, Music; Professor James Patterson, Business; Professor George Cousins, HPER; Professor James Weigand, Education; Professor Eugene Cordes, Chemistry; and Professor Theodore Torrey, Zoology.

He then, for the Committee which also included Professors Holland and Ludlow, nominated for the Student Affairs Committee: John B. Daugherty, HPER; Kenneth Johnston, English; Harry Pratter, Law; Henry H. H. Remak, Germanic Languages; Paul Strohm, English; Mary Wennerstrom, Music. He moved that the nominees be approved. Professor Auer seconded this motion. The Secretary said there are, in addition, 6 student members who are chosen through different channels. The question was called for on the nominees to the Student Affairs Committee and the motion to approve was passed unanimously.

Professor Breneman then moved that the Committee on Educational Policies be composed of Richard Farmer, Business (Chairman); Dean Berkley, Education; William R. Breneman, Zoology; James Jensen, English; Roger Newton, Physics; Robert Richey, Education. Professor Thomas seconded this motion. President Sutton then asked for nominations from the floor and there were none.

Professor Frye called attention to the fact that the list did not include two non-Bloomington members, which was required by the committee provisions previously adopted. The Secretary felt that the point was a valid one, which could be satisfied by the addition of at least two people from outside Bloomington. Professor Fatouros felt that, since there were six from Bloomington, it might be more appropriate to have three from the other campuses. Professor Breneman offered to withdraw his motion and revise the list. Professor Farmer suggested an alternative; that these nominees be approved and the Nominating Committee be asked to add 2 or 3 names for the next meeting. Professor Breneman then amended his motion to provide that the present slate be accepted and the Nominating Committee be instructed to bring back an additional slate of 3 names.

The question was called for on the motion to accept the Nominations Committee's recommendations for membership on the Educational Policies Committee with the understanding that the Nominations Committee would come before the Council at its next meeting with additional names of persons from regional and Indianapolis campuses; it was passed unanimously. The President suggested that the Committee try to determine what the precise numerical relationship should be.

Professor Breneman then nominated for membership on the Committee on University Structure: Philip Appleman, English; Robert Frye, Philosophy (Indianapolis); William M. Neil, History (Northwest campus); Vernon J. Shiner, Chemistry; George Wilson, Economics; James Wood, Sociology. The nominations were accepted unanimously.

The President suggested that, if it is the intent of the Nominations Committee that these committees shall elect their own chairman, the first person in alphabetical order be designated to convene the first committee meeting. This was accepted by the Council without objection.

Professor Breneman then suggested that Professor Sylvia Bowman of Fort Wayne, and Professor James Carter, from Indianapolis, be added to the Nominations Committee. After it was pointed out that the size of the Nominations Committee was fixed by the Constitution at three, it was agreed that the Nominations Committee would consult with these two people and take their judgments into consideration.

President Sutton then called for Agenda Item No. 6, Student Conduct Code, and asked Professor Gray to present the subject. Professor Gray said that the last time the Faculty Council saw the Student Conduct Code it was in the form of a report from last year's Student Affairs Committee which was given to the Council Memorial Day evening and was not accepted by the Council. Three points emerged from that discussion: one was that the membership of the Council present that evening was split exactly in half over the question of whether a student conduct code should be particular and, to use the word that was used that night, "legalistic", or whether it should be largely a statement of principle. Furthermore, everybody apparently had some particular dissatisfaction with the Code that was presented. And then, third, everybody was concerned that no statement of regulations and procedures for a student had been published. The Council that evening asked that the Agenda Committee get together with the remnants of the Student Affairs Committee and the Dean of Students, to see if a revised Student Conduct Code and a comprehensive statement of those regulations and procedures which were then in force could be prepared before fall.

The Board of Trustees at their first meeting in June approved a set of procedures. At the Board meeting late in July, Dean Rogers proposed some amendments to the Board action of June, Mr. Helmke proposed some amendments, and Dean Carter proposed some amendments. Professor Gray said he could only say at that time, that the

Faculty Council was still interested, however oddly we had shown our interest that Memorial Day. The Board asked Chancellor (by then) Carter to get together an ad hoc committee which would incorporate what it had done in June with the proposed amendments brought to it by several parties and that that committee report to the Board in time for a code to be made ready for distribution. The committee that Chancellor Carter convened consisted of Ralph Fuchs, Emeritus Professor in the School of Law; Cliff Travis, University Counsel; Chancellor Carter; Dean Rogers; a student (Paul Helmke was there for some of it and then was replaced by Barry Phillips); and Professor Gray. That committee gave a report to the Board which resulted in the Student Conduct Code that has now been approved and has been distributed to the students during registration and distributed with the Agenda of this meeting.

Professor Gray then moved that this Code be referred to the Student Affairs Committee and that the Student Affairs Committee be requested to report in the month of October to the Faculty Council about whether it wants to enlarge the Code by adding, say, a Student Bill of Rights; whether it wants to endorse it as it stands; whether it wants to suggest revisions for it or parts of it. The intent of the motion is to postpone debate for a month, say, or for at least two meetings, until the Student Affairs Committee reports back what it recommends about the Code. Professor Thomas wondered if it would be possible to get a very quick report back within a week's time. There are a number of things planned across the country for October 15, and it might be wise at least to discuss certain portions of the Student Conduct Code before October 15. Professor Gray did not think the motion precludes that. The President suggested that the Chairman of the Agenda Committee check with Student Body officials about the selection of student members.

Professor Frye said it was his understanding that the Student Conduct Code, when it was approved by the Board of Trustees, became binding on all students of Indiana University, not just the students of this campus. Nonetheless, the faculty and administration and students who have consulted with the Board upon the structure of that code, did not draw upon the advice of other campuses. That is in the past and cannot be changed, but if there is now once again an opportunity for this Conduct Code to be reviewed by the Student Affairs Committee, then it is all the more important that that committee be fully representative. Chancellor Carter said that Vice-President Ryan and Chancellor Hine, or their representatives, also sat in on the sessions of the drafting committee, but it is quite true that no students from either Indianapolis or any of the regional campuses did. There is no overall student organization that cuts across the university at all, even as much as this Council cuts across it for the faculty. Professor Willbern suggested that the all-University complications might be avoided in the short run by asking the new Student Affairs Committee to report to the Council their reactions to the Code only insofar as it applies to the Bloomington campus.

The question was called for on the motion: THAT THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE AS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES BE REFERRED TO THE STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE AND THEY BE ASKED TO REPORT TO THE FACULTY COUNCIL WITHIN THE NEXT MONTH THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO ENLARGEMENT, ENDORSEMENT, OR REVISION OF THE CODE AS IT PERTAINS TO THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS. This motion passed unanimously.

The President said he would get in touch with the other components of the University as to their reactions. He made it clear that, pending the acceptance by the Board of Trustees of any recommendations for changes, the rules and regulations in the Code are in full effect.

The President then noted that Section 2.5 of the Code, referring to appellate jurisdiction, states that "The Review Board shall be composed of the Chief Justice

of the Student Supreme Court (or, where there is none, by a student appointed by the appropriate president of the student body), a faculty member appointed by the Faculty Council (or, where there is none, by a like faculty body designated by the President), and an administrative officer appointed by the President. The administrative member shall serve as chairman." This means that the Faculty Council needs to elect a member of the Bloomington Review Board and the other component bodies must have similar elections. He asked if the Nominating Committee had nominations. In reply to a question from Professor Breneman, he said that he thought it desirable that there be alternates, also. Professor Breneman, for the Nominating Committee, had three nominees and proposed that the Council vote on the three nominees, the one receiving the highest votes becoming the member of the Review Board and the other two becoming alternate members. The nominees were Professor Boshkoff, Law; Professor Panschar, Business; and Professor Patterson, History.

A ballot vote was taken and Professor Boshkoff, Law, was elected to the Review Board with Professors Panschar and Patterson, alternates.

The President called for Item 7 on the Agenda, Progress Report on Afro-American Affairs. Dean Richard Young said that, while people involved in the various Afro-American activities had been extensively consulted, the report had been prepared by himself and Mr. Robert L. Johnson, research associate, and it had not been endorsed by any committee or any of the sub-groups involved. Secondly, he strongly emphasized the fact that while black students may be the focus of attention, the Afro-American Studies Program is for all students at I.U., white, black, red, or any other color. This report deals with the Bloomington campus; it does not include material from the regional campuses. There are programs going on in Indianapolis and in Gary, although they are not reviewed in the report.

Dean Young felt that the chief change, since last spring, is new leadership. A new leadership group has emerged from the black students group; they seem to be cooperative; they are enthusiastic for the program; and they appear to have optimism. The faculty that have been involved in the program, from the Institute, and from the Joint Committee on Discriminatory Practices, are also eager to get started this fall. The Institute's 1969-70 committee has been appointed and will meet for the first time this Friday. The Committee on Discriminatory Practices will be appointed by Chancellor Carter in the near future. Most of what has been going on in the summer could be termed "holding our own". Nothing new has been introduced. There was at least one notable success. Despite some problems, Group '69 had so far met with very considerable success, a real tribute to the Junior Division people who worked very hard, and also to about 50 faculty members and their wives, and people in the community who contributed greatly.

The President wished to second what Dean Young had said about Group '69. The troubles were all of a most modest order. The people in the Junior Division and a good many black and white faculty members worked very hard. The community pitched in in a most remarkable way. He could not recall community participation in any project equal to the community participation in this one. Members of the Legislature had expressed a very strong interest in this program, and indicated their desire to keep in touch with it.

Professor Farmer said that he understood that Professor Peery is on leave; and that he was Chairman of the Search Committee for a Vice-Chancellor for Afro-American Affairs. He asked if a new Chairman had been appointed for that Committee. Chancellor Carter replied that Professor Peery is on leave, and that the Committee would need to be reconstituted. This Committee had done quite a bit of work during the spring and summer. One possible candidate had been brought in during the summer, another is lined up and an early visit is hoped for.

Professor Thomas noted that enrollment in courses last spring was rather high and courses were enthusiastically received by white students. Circumstances have obviously changed slightly since then. He asked if there were any figures yet on enrollments this fall. Dean Young replied that there are no courses listed in the Institute this year, but the courses in traditional departments are again there. The Black Literature course closed up the first day and gave trouble because even the English majors who wanted to take it couldn't get in it. The Sociology courses all closed and the special K300 course on the Black Community as an Internal Colony was closed at 45.

Professor Farmer asked if it were planned to have the operation Group '69 repeated each year, with the same number of students. Dean Young replied in the affirmative, and that Dean Boyd and his staff are already preparing to begin the interview process for next summer's group while they continue to counsel with this group. Professor Farmer asked about difficulties in recruitment. Dean Young replied that Dean Boyd has a most interesting way of recruiting. He uses not just the schools but also ministers, social agencies, and other sources where a very different kind of student is located. There is no problem in getting 200.

Since there were no other questions, President Sutton thanked Dean Young and Mr. Johnson for their presentation and turned to Item 8 on the Agenda, Student Financial Aid and Budgetary Resources to Supplement It, calling on Mr. Edson Sample and Professor Farmer to present the report.

Mr. Sample said that he intended briefly to go over the history and organization of the Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid and then to make a few remarks about the practices used in administering the financial aid program, with some attention to the impact of the fee increase. The office was organized in 1951, bringing together into one office several functions which were operated through various departments on the campus. Until the Board meeting in July, it reported to the Dean of Students; it now reports to Vice-President Merritt. There is a staff of 11 professional people, 13 clerical, 4 graduate assistants and around 20 to 25 part-time students on the Work-Study payroll. The program is administered under a University Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aid which is a faculty-administrative-student committee appointed annually by the President of the University. There are regional campus people represented, and the President of the Student Body makes nominations for the two student members. The Office handles regional campus financial aid. This year there is to be an effort to de-centralize the decision-making authority with regard to the regional campuses and to retain in the Bloomington operation only those things which are necessary for fiscal control and for the various reports which must be made to the federal government and others. The Office works very closely with the I.U. Foundation, the Business Office, and with others who have provided the funds. Indiana University now operates one of the largest programs of student financial aid in the country. Mr. Sample distributed some brochures and said he intended to mail one of the comprehensive brochures (117 pages) to each faculty member this fall, so that more of the faculty will become familiar with the office and will refer students who have financial aid problems to it.

There are essentially two types of financial aid programs. There is a scholarship program, with some awards with monetary stipends that are not based on need. High scholastic attainment is recognized, ordinarily with a small stipend of \$100, where the student does not have to submit a parents' confidential financial statement. For all other aid, with the exception of some prizes which are offered through departments, the parents must submit a parents' confidential statement to the office. That statement is analyzed and a "need" figure is determined. Financial aid sufficient to meet that figure is provided. We subscribe to a College Scholarship Service, along with about 900 other institutions. The college budget figure,

for example, for in-state students here is \$2100 for 9 months; from that is deducted a contribution from the parents, some summer earnings expectations that the applicant would be expected to save from summer employment; and the student's assets will be tapped at 20% of everything under \$2,000. Anything over \$2,000 is included in the parental contribution. The parental contribution, the summer earnings, and the student assets are added; that is deducted from the college budget; the result is the "need" figure.

This summer, between the end of the school year and an extended deadline, something over 12,000 applications were processed; of these, over 10,000 received aid. Those figures will be considerably larger when the annual report is made at the end of the fiscal year. The others didn't receive aid because, first, they didn't apply for anything other than a scholarship and they did not meet the scholarship criteria or, second, the analysis of the financial information which was submitted indicated that they had sufficient resources to come to the University without help from the University. The award letters were sent out this summer two weeks earlier than ever before, under some prodding from the President. Award letters were also sent out prior to the opening of school even to students who applied after the deadline. This had never been done before, but these students were advised that aid would be available to them this year even though the funds themselves would not be available by registration; that they could come on to school and sometime in the month of October payments would be made to them. These students will be permitted to delay payment of their fees until the paper work can be processed. With few exceptions, all students who submitted applications received some type of announcement prior to the opening of school.

Despite some Federal funding cut-backs, it is estimated that this fiscal year something over 12 million dollars of financial aid will be administered through the Office. This does not include teaching assistantships, or the fee-remissions given to the teaching assistants or graduate assistants; it does not include the regular student employment program through which students get jobs outside the work-study program or off-campus; it does not include employment of spouses or things of this type. The break-down on this is estimated to be about 4 million dollars in direct gift aid in the form of scholarships and grants, 7 million dollars in loans, and 1 million dollars in earnings under the Work-Study Program where the referrals are made through the Aid Office. This represents a greater reliance on loans than heretofore. Since the National Defense Program was passed in 1958, the acceptance of borrowing is much more prevalent now. Guaranteed bank loans were included this year for the first time; students go to the banks and obtain a guaranteed loan. In cases where students were unable to get the loan, money is loaned to them through the University, on the same terms as the bank would have loaned.

Mr. Sample said the students have been very cooperative. There is a tremendous backlog of work in the record section but the students have been very understanding of the situation. There is a new Financial Aid Review Office which was authorized at the July Board meeting. This is an office to which students may appeal decisions of the Financial Aid Office. It will investigate and see if the student has a legitimate concern about his financial aid and then attempt to work it out. This Review Committee is composed of three faculty or administrators and three students.

Mr. Sample said he was pleased to report, as he had reported to President Sutton earlier, that with regard to the statement that was made last spring about students not failing to return because of lack of finances, he believed that the University had met this commitment and had met it well. To his knowledge, every student who applied to the office had received financial aid of sufficient quantity

to enable him to come. There may be some problems in that what a student says he needs may be a little different than what the Office thinks he needs. This may be an area where the Financial Aid Review Office will have activity.

The biggest shortage of funds, he said, is in the gift aid area, the scholarship and grant area. He would like to increase the gift aid portion of the financial aid package and reduce the loan or the work part. If the Faculty Council wishes to establish any type of fund that they want to contribute to, the Aid Office will administer it in any fashion designated. About five hundred thousand dollars a year are handled for outside organizations where they specify the recipient and the terms and conditions of the award.

Before questions began, the President wished to make two observations. First, a part of the Sesquicentennial Fund Drive is directed toward increasing scholarships and gift grants to students. The other observation is that he thought the Scholarship Office had done a tremendous job in view of the general national shortage of loan money. The banks of the State of Indiana are still working toward increasing the availability of loan money.

Professor Gray reminded the group that last spring the Faculty Council voted a Faculty Scholarship Fund. The Agenda Committee was supposed to try and find out from the Financial Aids Office the precise needs and to devise ways in which the faculty could contribute to meet those needs. It looked as if, from what Mr. Sample had just said, that the big need is gift aid and the most precisely defined group are the disadvantaged students like Group 69 and Group 70, students who for reasons having to do with their home financial background don't like to take on loans, and who probably shouldn't be working during the years of their education. The Council has approved such a fund. The President felt that it would be good if this were made a part of the Sesquicentennial Fund Drive. The faculty is going to be solicited. They can choose to give money or not give money for any purpose whatsoever, and there are a good many projects which may appeal to different individuals, but if money, as part of the Sesquicentennial Fund Drive, were earmarked for gift aid purposes, it would help toward reaching the Sesquicentennial Fund goal while also achieving assistance to underprivileged students.

Mr. Sample said that we do have a real need for gift aid monies for programs for disadvantaged students. These students are generally full-need cases, and there are all kinds of arguments for keeping the amount of loan assistance, or work while they are in school, at a minimum, which means that the gift aid portion should be substantial. We were able to fund Group 69 without any additional resources, incorporated in our regular financial aid program. The addition each year of substantial numbers of these students increases, really by a substantial amount, the amount of gift-aid fund that we need. Professor Gray asked whether, if donors specified that their funds be used for gift-aid for disadvantaged students, it could be administered with that specification. The President replied in the affirmative. Dean Harvey felt that, in view of the Council's action last spring, this stands as an information item, subject to implementation.

Dean Harvey had a question for Mr. Sample. Last spring in the discussion of the responses to the fee increase and needs of the students, the figure of 16 million dollars was frequently used. Twelve million had just been mentioned as the package actually being administered. What happened to the 4 million? Mr. Sample replied that Chancellor Snyder had said, last spring, that we really would not know what the needs of the students would be till we stopped and added them up. We have added them up now, and found them not quite so high. Also, the 15 million, or 16 million, dollar figure that was used, included the fee reduction for the TA's,

which was not included in the figures given here. If this and some non-Work-Study employment were included, we probably would have over 15 or 16 million. The 12 million is aid which is directly administered through the Aid Office.

Professor Farmer asked whether the loan guarantees were by I.U., by banks, government, or what. Mr. Sample said that his office had packaged guaranteed loans and asked the student to go to the bank. If the student could get the loan from the bank, then the aid office only certified and kept a record of it. These loans are federally insured. And then if the student could not get it at the bank, it was loaned to them directly.

Professor A. Brown asked what fraction of the money is given in the \$100 gift form without statement of financial need--that is, what part is purely merit scholarship? Mr. Sample thought less than a thousand awards, or perhaps \$100,000 out of 4 million in grant funds.

Professor Fatouros asked whether the Review Board had started to work and whether there had been appeals to it. Chancellor Carter thought the members had been selected but not yet officially announced. Student Government had the initiative here.

Professor Daniel asked if the office made provision for very short-term loans, for example, for teaching assistants who arrive from Europe and need the money to tide them over until their funds get here. Mr. Sample replied that the office made short-term loans up to \$100 for 120 days. Application is made one day and money is available the next. If it's an emergency, it can be done in one day. Professor Farmer added that any employee of Indiana University is also eligible to become a member of our Credit Union and borrow money there; teaching assistants qualify.

Professor Pratter asked about the statement that loans have become much more acceptable. Mr. Sample said that loan programs, including the guaranteed bank loan programs, despite the tight money situation, have been increasing rapidly over recent years. Since the gift-aid money is hardest to come by and the campus can only employ so many students, this leaves the loan area as the one that has been expanding.

Professor Remak felt that an endorsement of the faculty student aid fund by this year's Council would help, especially since it was somewhat general last spring. He moved that the Faculty Council authorize the Agenda Committee in consultation with the Foundation and University authorities to implement the launching of a college student scholarship fund in coordination with the Sesquicentennial Fund and that faculty members should have the chance, as alumni have, to designate on their endorsement whether they want it to go to disadvantaged students or possibly, if they want to, to some other purposes. Professor Farmer seconded the motion, but requested that consideration be deferred until after his own report.

Professor Johnston noted that it was frequently said, in fact sometimes shouted, last spring that some students simply wouldn't be able to come back next year because of the fee increase despite the pledges and good faith of Chancellor Snyder and other University officers. He asked if there were any way of determining if this in fact had happened in instances in which official determination of student need and the student's statement of his need have differed so much that the student hasn't been able to return. Mr. Sample said he would not want to say that it hasn't. Some students have written back indicating that they were not returning. In cases where a student rejected and indicated a reason, the office then tried to

review his application again and made the award if it could be justified. There must be some that didn't come back because they didn't feel that the offer was sufficient. Professor Breneman asked how many appeals were pending. Mr. Sample said none that he knew of.

The President reported that, while there were no final figures yet, freshman enrollment seemed to be higher than had been expected, and graduate level enrollment less than expected, for reasons that are difficult to determine. The draft may be very significant. He felt that some students did not come here because of fee increases. On the other hand, there were practically no letters from parents protesting the fee increase; there were a good many more on questions of guest privileges and so on.

Dean Yamaguchi asked about the special problems of foreign students. Mr. Sample said that his office did not administer foreign student aid; this was done through Dean Dowling's office. Funds for foreign student aid had been supplemented this year because of the fee increase and, as far as he knew, the needs of those foreign students who were here on campus last year had been met.

The President then recognized Professor Farmer who said that the Committee on Educational Policies and University Structure had been authorized by the Council last spring, at the time of the fee increase, to look into two problems: one was the short-run question of the adequacy of funds to guarantee the return of students. The other was the matter of budgets in general. A report was presented. The Secretary said the report had not yet been distributed to the Council because of variations in the depth of sub-committee reports and the feeling of the Agenda Committee that further consolidation and review this fall would be likely. Professor Farmer said that the Committee had concentrated on revenue increasing things rather than cost decreasing things because timing was such that it was virtually impossible to consider any cost decreases. About 80 percent of the University costs are labor costs and most of the labor is on long-term contract. Many other costs are also locked in, like coal for the power plant which is absolutely necessary, so the idea of substantial cost reduction in the short run seemed impossible. The Committee looked at revenue increasing possibilities in non-academic areas; the argument was that there are many things which the University does which are really not academic but which do have fees and prices which might be raised to cover the short-fall in funds for student support. The 4 million dollar short-fall apparently did not materialize. This leads, he thought, to a reconsideration of the strategy. It might be possible to generate some \$500,000 in extra revenue by raising prices of things, which would be rather painful. People who have blue stickers and so on might find this a little bit upsetting.

There might, he said, be three possible courses of action: one would be to be painful and raise a half a million dollars for a year or two, and perhaps put this into the direct grant fund for Mr. Sample's operation. A second alternative would be to leave out the more painful price increases and try to get a couple of hundred thousand dollars in increases and put this in the package. Presumably these funds could be combined with or used jointly with donated funds to create a bigger package. A third possibility would be to forget the raising of fees or prices and just to commend the Administration for its ability to raise funds under very tight circumstances. At the time of the fee increase there was a real question as to whether the students' needs could be met. The administration having done this, the committee, in a sense, has ceased its crisis function but perhaps should continue. Several of the sub-committees are still hard at work. In every case where one of the 36 sub-committees contacted an administrator he received nothing but cooperation

and full information. Professor Farmer felt that it had been a very useful exercise, for faculty members to talk to the administrators to find out just what the problem is. He posed the question of what the Council now preferred to do. Apparently a donation program is very much in order, but there is also the second option of changing some fees and making some surcharges.

The President felt that, in his efforts to raise funds for various projects, which include grants, scholarships, chairs, and so on, one of the great selling points could be that the faculty has had enough concern with these matters to contribute themselves. He referred to gifts, to begin with. If the Faculty Council should lay on a surcharge, it might apply also to the staff, the students, visitors to the University, and so on. While he would indeed encourage a search for additional revenue producing activities for this and other purposes, he would find that a direct faculty contribution would be a tremendous asset to the University. He mentioned the beginnings of a fund which Edna Ballinger asked be created, particularly directed toward aid to underprivileged students.

Professor Maxwell was concerned that, if the charges levied in the parking lots and so on were changed, how the portion of the resulting change in revenue attributable to that change could be identified, and also whether the faculty would be cognizant of what this would mean in terms of a shift of resources. For example, there is already a projection of such revenues tied up with building parking lots elsewhere on the campus. To change fees would affect the rate with which we build parking ramps all over the campus.

The motion previously made by Professor Remak was now re-stated as follows: THAT THE AGENDA COMMITTEE IMPLEMENT THE PREVIOUS DECISION OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL REGARDING THE STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP FUND IN CONSULTATION WITH THE FOUNDATION OF THE UNIVERSITY AND IN COORDINATION WITH THE SESQUICENTENNIAL DRIVE, INCLUDING SOME SORT OF PAYROLL DEDUCTION SCHEME. The question was called for on the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Professor Willbern asked whether it might not be desirable for the Faculty Council to be involved in some way with the Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aid, as it is involved in many other committees through the input of a member or two or three on the committee. If the Faculty Council were represented on this Committee in a way in which reports could be made to it from its own representatives, the sense of involvement and responsibility would be greater, he felt. The President said that he would consult with the Agenda Committee in the appointments to the Committee on Scholarships and Financial Aids so that the Faculty Council will have representation.

Professor Fatouros felt that, with respect to Professor Farmer's alternatives, there was no material on which the Faculty Council could make any sort of definite decision at this point. Professor Farmer replied that he was asking a strategic question. The report made last spring is really outdated by events, he thought; but he was not quite sure which way to go, because the original charge has in effect been discharged by events.

Professor Pratter had serious reservations that the Faculty Council has any role to play even in recommending these fee increases. At the time the proposals were made, he said, we were in extremis in the sense of feeling that there were urgent financial problems that would actually keep the students from coming here. One way or another, some of these fears have abated. He doubted that, in a more deliberate situation, the Council was the right kind of body to review fee increases, services, and the economics and consequences of the relation between

needs, services, and fees. Dean Harvey thought that Professor Pratter had raised a significant question, but that short of a determination that involvement in this matter of setting fee structures and user charges is not an appropriate function for the Council, the only thing to say to the Farmer committee at this time is for it to continue to do what it had been asked to do to begin with and to report with wisdom and discretion. Professor Johnston moved THAT PROFESSOR FARMER BE ASKED TO BRING BEFORE THE COUNCIL THE DELIBERATIONS OF HIS COMMITTEE, HIS VARIOUS SUB-COMMITTEES, AT THEIR PRESENT STATUS, WITH APPROPRIATE EDITING AND DISTILLATION. He felt this to permit Professor Farmer's middle course. This motion was seconded by Professor Osterburg. The question was called for and the motion was passed with two nay votes: A. Brown and Maxwell.

Professor Farmer said that the second part of the charge was to have the committee look at some of the longer run implications of the budget. There are other committees, like the committee on priorities which Chancellor Carter is creating, which may be involved. There should be something to report later.

Professor Thomas wished to make a motion concerning the question of faculty ethics. He moved that the President, in consultation with the Agenda Committee, appoint an ad hoc committee to consider the need for a faculty code of ethics; which committee should report back at the next meeting of the All-University Council with its recommendations. Professor Remak seconded this motion. Professor Thomas thought that by the next meeting of the All-University Council there would be a Faculty Affairs Committee, and that this ad hoc committee would then make recommendations to the new Faculty Affairs Committee. It would, he said, speed up the deliberations of the Faculty Affairs Committee on this subject and provide them with an agenda item.

Professor Breneman did not believe there can be a revision of the ethics code by the next meeting of the All-University Council. This ethics code is going to be a long problem if done right. The President thought there was a degree of urgency about this matter, to which he had addressed himself at the last Council meeting. He thought Professor Thomas was simply suggesting that preliminary groundwork be done in advance of the appointment of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Professor Pratter felt a little disconcerted by the suggestion that there was an urgent need for a faculty code of ethics, as if faculty morals were somehow crumbling all around us. Professor Shiner did not see what this interim committee could do before the other committee is appointed. The Parliamentarian was then obliged to point out that 5:30 had arrived and only by unanimous consent could the meeting continue. Since there was not unanimous consent to continue the meeting past 5:30 p.m., the Parliamentarian explained that debate on the motion was discontinued but that a vote could still be taken. A rollcall vote was taken and the motion was defeated with a vote of 16 ayes, 20 nays, and 2 abstentions.

Aye

L. Brown
Daniel
Farmer
Fry
Johnston
Lynch
Fatouros for Murray
Newton
Osterburg
Pilder
Bunke for Pinnell
Remak
Sunderman
Thomas
Wennerstrom
Willbern

Nay

Auer
Berkley
Breneman
A. Brown
Clark
Daugherty
Endwright
Gray
Harvey
Holland
Long
Ludlow
Ludwig
Panschar
Pratter
Richey
Shiner
Stolnitz
Shull
Yamaguchi

Abstain

Maxwell
Otteson

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

York Willbern, Secretary