

UNIVERSITY SENATE MINUTES

The first meeting of the University Senate for the 1969-1970 school year was called to order by Vice Chairman Lawrence A. Ianni at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 30, 1969, in Cogswell Auditorium. A quorum was present. John A. Polesky was reappointed secretary for a two-year term. The Vice Chairman introduced J. Bracken Burns and Anthony Delisi, Student Government observers. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as published. Tellers were appointed to count the standing votes in specified sections.

Richard A. Strawcutter, Chairman of Committee A (Nominating), said the nominees for the ad hoc committee to work with disadvantaged students were selected from people who have shown an interest in working with disadvantaged people. Patsy A. Zitelli moved and Myron H. Levenson seconded that the slate published in the agenda be accepted. The motion carried. The floor was then opened for additional nominees and Jackson W. Heimer was nominated. Gary L. Buckwalter moved and Francis W. Liegey seconded that nominations be closed. The motion carried. C. David McNaughton, Samuel G. Smith, and Robert W. Ensley were appointed tellers. The nominees were introduced and asked to stand. The ballots were distributed and a vote taken. The results of the election were to be announced in the Faculty News. The nominees were Dennis A. Bartha, John Chellman, Brooke V. Grant, James L. Gray, Jackson W. Heimer, Richard D. Magee, John E. Merryman, William R. Shane, Walter T. Shea, Jay M. Smith, Dorothy M. Snyder, Ford H. Swigart, and James C. Wilson. Those elected were John Chellman, Richard D. Magee, John E. Merryman, William R. Shane, Dorothy Snyder, and James C. Wilson.

The report of Committee B (Steering) was declared adopted by the Vice Chairman.

Robert L. Morris, Chairman, reported for Committee C (Curriculum) and explained the first item of the report. He said the Curriculum Committee felt it could not require all male students to take physical education since it was attempting to reduce the credits required for graduation to 124. The Physical Education and ROTC departments worked together to share the credits. The committee passed it on to the Senate for a one-year trial period. When reconsidering after one year, the arrangement was extended for another year. The committee continued to study the problem and finally adopted the statement in the agenda. Morris moved and Arthur F. Nicholson seconded the adoption of the following:

"Summary of Curriculum Committee Position at May 20, 1969 meeting: In the new catalogue under the section applying to general education the Curriculum Committee recommends that men have the option of taking ROTC for two semester hours credit for two semesters or of taking Health for two semester hours and Physical Activity for two semesters of one credit for each semester."

David G. Winslow spoke defending the compulsory ROTC and cited the articles he wrote, especially the one in a recent issue of Phi Delta Kappan defending Junior ROTC. He then read from the article.

Edgar W. Moore asked whether the item conflicted with the item on page 6 of the agenda from Committee J (Faculty Affairs) which was a resolution supporting ROTC. Robert H. Saylor, Chairman of Committee J, said that in the opinion of Committee J, the two were not incompatible. Committee J was prepared to make adjustments. He said he felt that there should be an option for ROTC since there are now sufficient numbers on campus to support it on an optional basis.

Charles B. Stevenson then presented the following prepared statement: "Ladies and Gentlemen--since the question of ROTC is being raised here today--and since I am no longer on duty, I feel there is information you should have in order to be an informed voting body, from one who had to live with ROTC and its problems on a daily basis for over two years.

"First I am sure you are aware that the Army's position concerning the type of ROTC a school offers such as voluntary or mandatory is up to the school. Second, I hope that you have heard that we are the only state college (university) with ROTC. Currently West Chester and Clarion have applications in for ROTC, along with over 100 other institutions nationwide. Only fifteen new ROTC units were established last year and that is the first time any were established since the 1950's when IUP received its contingent. Third, I know that a goodly number of students came here to take ROTC either because their parents wanted them to or because they themselves wanted to. They are by and large our above-average student.

"Now I would like to tell you about some events that occurred here on campus while I was PMS and similar ones are occurring now. Maybe you will remember a small group of anti-ROTC students who passed out anti-ROTC literature repeatedly before each drill period or class period and defaced the building with paint in 1967-68.

"There was a vote taken this year also--only Freshmen were allowed to vote--and it was done on the spur of the moment during the orientation meeting for ROTC. It was set up by the President of the Student Government, probably on his own with no apparent or announced approval from the Student Government members. Mandatory ROTC, of course, was voted down by the Freshmen. I wonder what would happen if the Freshmen voted on mandatory Freshmen subjects. The interesting thing is that all ROTC cadets at the cadet orientation were told by the President that the Curriculum Committee had already discussed the problem, voted on it, and sent it to us, the Senate, for further discussion today.

"Then, after much publicity, announcements, etc., a small group, estimated to be 150 students, marched on Clark Hall to protest ROTC. By my calculations they were less than two percent of the student body. I'm sure you are aware that national student demonstrations are scheduled for October 15, 1969, and monthly thereafter.

"The reason I have cited these few examples of radical activity is to give you some insight on how a small, vocal, and radical group of students and their advisers take action at this university. This is your university--the faculty and administration--supported by the taxpayers for the students. Since the students don't pay us directly as they did in history for our services, any dialogue should, I believe, include the taxpayers or at least we must consider their wishes.

"My basic concern today, though, is not whether ROTC should be mandatory, optional, or voluntary. Thank God I don't have to fight that battle anymore but I do have to face up to who is going to run this university--the administration and faculty--or a small group of students coached by their advisers.

"We are being threatened nationwide with a demonstration on the 15th of October. Why was there a demonstration a few weeks ago here on campus, especially after they were told the problem would be discussed today?

"A small group or groups of students are well organized to seize the initiative. Perhaps we are organized in name only--some common indicators of our degree of organization are the average attendance figures for Senate meetings. Last year only about 190 faculty members of 500 joined and supported the Faculty Association, the organization that lobbies for our pay raises and benefits. This year so far only 100 faculty members have joined. The other night at the memorial service for Dr. Pechan only 38 people showed up--less than half were faculty members. This man helped make IUP.

"Maybe I haven't explained my premise properly--it is that you are being challenged. You are being challenged by a small, vocal minority of the students to out-reform them for instance on dorm rules and regulations, out-change them on curriculum, out-evaluate them on rating professors, out-adjust them on the grading system, and outdo them in any other area where they choose to confront you.

"If my arguments so far don't relate to you or your understanding of the problem, permit me a short quote from the October 1969 issue of Harper's Magazine, an article by John W. Aldridge, Professor of English, University of Michigan:

'Thus the young have very large vested interests in keeping active the tensions between themselves and adults, and they take care to do this by making progressively more radical and unreasonable demands on universities, demands which they know perfectly well will not be met or at any rate they hope to God will not be met. The beautiful part of the strategy is that it can be continued indefinitely. Regardless of the concessions the universities agree to make, the young can always be outraged because they were not made earlier. **** In short, there will be grounds for confrontation forever, even if they have to be invented. The important thing is that the show must go on. There is too much at stake to allow it to close. **** For so long as the delicate balance of tensions is maintained, so long as the young continue their fight but continue by clever manipulation never to quite succeed in winning it, their status and security as a generation is assured.'

"I'm wondering if this relatively new body we belong to called the Senate can be responsive enough to such a challenge with only four meetings a year. Will we abrogate our right to govern by allowing a small group of vocal students to seize the initiative and dictate to us by demonstrations how we are to vote. If this small group of students really has the good of the whole school in mind, then the radical changes they push for would be just as valid if they were instituted after they departed.

"Many of you have spent a lifetime in the profession; many of you have spent a lifetime here at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I am hoping to spend the rest of my life in the profession. After today, I don't know whether I'll be here or not. However that may be, all I'm asking is that we not be hasty and rush into a vote on an issue that masks the critical issue: Is this University going to jump to the tunes of a small vocal minority or is it going to set its own tune in this Senate? We spend our lives in the profession and the students spend four years here.

"I sincerely hope that ROTC, which has been mandatory at this University for nineteen years, as have many other courses, is not going to be changed because of a passing fancy at Harvard or because it's just the most visible target and first on a list of demands by the SDS. ROTC will stand or fall on its own merits; however, we should not allow it to be used as a means of getting the radical's foot in the door."

Ronald L. Marks spoke in favor of voluntary ROTC and said the issue is ROTC and the vote should be on the basis of that and not on the basis of a conspiracy for or against ROTC.

J. Bracken Burns, President of Student Government, then requested permission to speak in answer to the statements made by Charles B. Stevenson. He said he was a veteran of two years military service. He said regarding the vote taken in 1968 on ROTC that the vote was to a question that was ambiguous at best. He added that the recent demonstrations consisted of many Freshmen in compulsory ROTC and that his tuition was paying the faculty. With regard to conflict between students and faculty, the students did not attend Senate meetings and challenge the faculty to a duel, nor did faculty attend Student Government meetings and challenge the students. As to who was running the University, he said there were three segments--faculty, administration, and students. He added that the Student Government had voted for voluntary ROTC.

Arthur F. Nicholson said that the Curriculum Committee had heard all sides and that the Committee felt that its recommendation was a sensible one for all the University. Robert L. Morris said the word "credit" should be inserted in the third line of the item after "for two semester hours." Werner J. Fries said he felt that there should be more discussion for something that has been at the University for 19 years. He added that the University had an obligation to the public at large.

Melvin R. Woodard asked John Chellman for the results of the election he conducted. Chellman said the vote on the question of choice between ROTC or physical education was 50/50 on the main campus and 60/40 for physical education at the Kittanning campus.

Raymona E. Hull moved to stop debate and it was seconded by Arthur Nicholson. The motion carried by a great majority. Robert L. Morris asked for a counted vote so that the tally could be reported to the Board of Trustees. The vote was 226 for the motion and 27 against it.

Robert L. Morris moved and Robert N. Thomas seconded that the Senate approve the remainder of the report of Committee C. Donald G. Eisen said he didn't see why there had to be a universal policy for credit for exemption tests when the policies for granting the exemptions varied from department to department. Morris said the committee had consulted with the English Department before making the recommendation. John E. Merryman said he wondered about the no grade being given for exemption tests considering the matter of honor societies and graduate schools. Morris said the exemption tests are courses for general education and it is difficult to set up a system of grades for exemption tests. A vote was taken and the remainder of the report was approved:

"Exemption Test Policy Adopted at July 23rd Meeting: The Curriculum Committee recommends that departments offering general education courses provide exemption tests for those courses observing the following guidelines: Exams should be evaluated by the department administering them. No grade should be given to students who win exemption, but credit will be awarded towards the 124 hours necessary for graduation. Credits earned by exemption should not count as part of the normal semester load of 15-16 semester hours. A student may be permitted to carry an overload, approval of which will be predicated upon demonstrated competence. (See Guidelines for Departmental Majors and Minors.)

"Course Requests Approved by Curriculum Committee: Drop the following courses from the catalogue: Art 220 Mechanical Drawing and Industrial Design, Eng 213 Pre-Renaissance.

"Change in Course Credits: Chem 331 Qualitative Organic Analysis--3 credits for one hour lecture plus 6 hours laboratory; HE 313 Quantity Food Service Management--3 to 4 credits.

"Change in Course Title or Number: All Student Teaching courses which carry 12 semester hours of credit, including all regular secondary, as well as the special areas of Art, Business, Music, SpEd and soon HPE, will hereafter be numbered as: Education 441. All Professional Practicum courses which accompany the above Student Teaching courses, and which carry two semester hours of credit, will hereafter be numbered as: Education 442. Elementary Student Teaching courses which carry six semester hours of credit, will remain numbered as: Education 321 and Education 421. All Professional Practicum courses which accompany the above Elementary Student Teaching courses, and which carry two semester hours of credit, will hereafter be numbered as: Education 423. Home Economics Student Teaching courses which carry eight semester hours of credit, will hereafter be numbered as: Education 431. All School Law courses which accompany the above Home Economics Student Teaching courses, and which carry one semester hour of credit, will hereafter be numbered as: Education 433.

"The present Education 451, Teaching of courses will be renumbered as follows: Education 451 - 'Teaching Science.....,' Education 452 - 'Teaching of Eng., Spch., Rdg.,' Education 453 - 'Teaching of For. Lang.,' Education 454 - 'Teaching of Math.,' Education 455 - 'Teaching of Soc. St.,' Education 456 - 'Teaching of Geog.,' and Education 457 - 'Teaching of Worl Cultures.'

"All other courses not listed above which have previously been prefixed 'ED' (Department Code #16) should either be assigned to the FD ED (Foundations of Education) prefix (Department Code #17) or assigned to the prefix of the department in which they are customarily taught.

"Education 356 (p. 207, 1968-69 catalog) should be assigned a different departmental prefix. Education 461 (p. 208, 1968-69 catalog) should be assigned a different departmental prefix. Education 302 (p. 223, 1968-69 catalog) is a 'FD ED' course and should be prefixed as such. Professional Practicum (p. 223) is correctly prefixed, but should be numbered to conform to above outline and listed under some separate heading other than the 'FD ED' department. All of the remaining courses on page 223 should be prefixed 'FD ED.'

"Econ 352 to Econ 325; Pol Sci 282 International Organizations to PolS 282 International Law and Organizations; Bus 331 Sales and Retailing to DE 331 Modern Merchandising; BE 433 Retail Practice to BE 433 Supervised Work Experience & Seminar in Office Occupations.

"Change in prerequisites: Econ 330 Industrial and Labor Relations, including Econ 122 as a prerequisite if accepted.

"Additional Courses: Art 412 Classical Art; SS 390 Studies in Social Science."

Donald E. Hoffmaster reported for Committee D (Academic Standards). He said three additional words should be inserted in the first item after the words "50-minute examinations" so that the wording would read, "50-minute examinations or equivalent thereof in the course of the term," and appending the statement "the tests should be returned and discussed with the exception of the final." Hoffmaster moved and Carl P. Oakes seconded to accept the first item on the report. Richard A. Hazley read from the minutes of the committee and said the minutes did not have a reference to a 50-minute final. He added that since this motion was not acted on in committee, the motion is out of order and he moved that it be regarded as such. Anthony J. Nania seconded and the following item was thus rejected:

"1. Final examinations: it is recommended (1) that every instructor be encouraged to give at least four 50-minute examinations or equivalent thereof in the course of the term, the tests should be returned and discussed with the exception of the final, (2) that the last of these, to be considered the 'final,' be administered on the last regularly scheduled University meeting of the class, (3) that department chairmen solicit of the scheduling officer a time for block examinations where they are felt necessary, and (4) that the calendar providing for meetings of the class be so extended as to provide for the examination time."

For item 2, Hoffmaster said the thirty hours would allow a full year for evaluation of the student before graduation. John Chellman remarked that medical technologists have a valid reason for being off campus during their terminal year. William R. Shane said there is an ambiguity in that part-time students earn 15 credits with an average of "C" and can then continue as part-time degree candidates. John E. Merryman moved, Arthur G. Shields seconded, and the motion carried that the item be sent back to committee:

"2. Residence requirements for undergraduates: it is recommended that in order to qualify for the baccalaureate degree a student who has transferred to the university is required to spend his terminal year in residence as a full-time student for a minimum of 30 semester hours; all other students, including those sometimes designated part-time, must spend at least one year in residence."

For item 3, Hoffmaster moved and Stanley W. Lore seconded that it be approved. James W. Laughlin said the item infers that the first degree was earned at this institution and does not make provisions for the first degree from another institution. Hoffmaster said the committee had in mind only those persons earning the first degree at Indiana. Richard E. Berry moved that the motion be changed to allow a second degree when the requirements for the degree are earned. A point of order was called that the Senate body could not legislate according to Berry's motion. Laughlin further stated that he felt the item did not clarify all situations. George B. Johnson moved, Blance W. McCluer seconded, and it carried to recommit the item:

"3. Qualifications for a second degree: it is recommended that in order to receive a second degree on the baccalaureate level a student must complete at least an additional thirty semester hours, of which those required for the major must be in the school from which he means to receive the second degree. The student must meet also all the special requirements of the department and school conferring the degree."

Smith moved to recess until 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, at a place to be named by the chairman. It was seconded by Richard F. Waechter and the motion carried.

The meeting was reconvened at 3:00 p.m. on October 2 in Room 32 of Weyandt Hall by Lawrence A. Ianni, Vice Chairman. A quorum was present. The two Student Government observers were J. Bracken Burns and Karen Binkley.

Donald E. Hoffmaster continued with the report of Committee D (Academic Standards). For item 4, he said the Junior Standing Program was inaugurated when Indiana was a state teachers college and it does not apply to some of the schools and departments at the University now. He said it is felt there should be an alternative.

Hoffmaster moved and Maurice L. Rider seconded that item 4 be approved. Raymona E. Hull asked whether it is correct that step tests to Freshmen were not given this year. John J. Hays said they were the ACT tests. Francis G. McGovern said he wanted to speak in favor of the item. All nineteen chairmen of the Arts and Sciences at a recent meeting supported a change as given in this item. Passage of this item would permit those schools and departments who wish to continue Junior Standing to do so. It is appropriate to permit the departments to create their own methods of evaluation. Ronald L. Marks asked that if the School of Education continues Junior Standing and the Department of Chemistry does not, where does a chemistry major stand? McGovern said the chemistry education student would be part of the School of Education and would be bound by the rules of the School of Education. A question was called and the following was approved:

"Status of the Junior Standing program: it is recommended that those schools of the university which desire to do so be permitted to discontinue the Junior Standing evaluation procedures which are presently in operation and that these schools devise a means of evaluating in some other way the standing of students who have reached the end of their second year."

For item 5, Hoffmaster moved and Dorothy F. Lucker seconded to approve. John J. Hays said professional education has been omitted in the item and student teaching could be pass-fail. Gary L. Buckwalter asked whether student teaching wouldn't be part of the major. V. J. Farrara spoke in favor of the pass-fail system. It gives the student freedom and it gives the student a choice. You are giving the student the option of taking a course that he otherwise would have fear of taking. Lorrie J. Bright said that item 5 both establishes and limits. J. Bracken Burns said he was present at the July meeting and he felt it was the intent of the committee at the meeting to both establish and limit.

Raymond L. Lee said that he believed that the committee reached its recommendation on the basis of a study by Dr. Cordier of thirty schools who had instituted a pass-fail system. Dartmouth was one which regretted its change and retreated to the position in the item 5. Myron H. Levenson asked how this was handled with regard to the Q.P. average. Lee said the intent of the committee was not to count these pass-fail courses for the Q.P. average. Patsy A. Zitelli asked whether the "pass" grade would be a "D" since this was a passing grade. Charles E. Weber asked about the persons who take a course as an elective on a pass-fail basis and then decides to take the course as a part of a major. Richard A. Hazley said the difficulty comes from the way in which the motion is worded and he felt that there should first be a definition of the pass-fail system.

Frederick W. Seinfeld said there would be the problem of the student taking the course changing his mind during the course. He might be doing well and want to change to a letter grade. Richard E. Berry said this is a matter that the students want. It would allow a history major to take a course in electronics if he so desired. Thomas E. Conway said he thought the item was too inflexible and noted that some departments have so many requirements that they do not have room for electives. V. J. Farrara asked whether the item applied to many students, a fair amount, or an insignificant amount of students. Ronald L. Marks asked whether there were mechanics of implementation in addition to what was printed in the item. J. Bracken Burns said some of the mechanics were discussed at the meeting. The student could not change in the middle of the semester. Only the computer center would know whether or not a student was on a pass-fail basis.

Lorrie J. Bright said the committee should have spelled out the details of the mechanics of the item so that people would be fully informed in voting on the motion. Robert E. Bernat said he felt the item should be defeated so that the committee could spell the items out more carefully and that delaying the item for a month would not keep it from being implemented for the next academic year. Robert L. Morris remarked that the Board of Trustees would have to pass on the item before it could be implemented. Irwin M. Marcus suggested that the item be defeated because of the failure to spell out the specifics but the Senate indicate that it is in favor of a pass-fail system. Louis L. Gold moved and George B. Johnson seconded to close debate. The motion carried. A vote on item 5 then rejected it:

"The pass-fail system: it is proposed that the institution of a pass-fail system be restricted to a total of 12 semester hours during the student's career, and also be limited to one course per semester in any one semester and the courses in general education and major and minor field be excluded from this system."

For item 6, Hoffmaster said the item was presented to the committee last July. At a meeting a week or two ago the matter came up again and Dr. Cordier said this item came out of Student Government, which said some faculty conduct their classes in such a poor manner or by just reading from the book. Hoffmaster moved and Myron H. Levenson seconded to approve the item. A member of the ROTC staff asked about when the instructor has a quiz or when the instruction is the type which requires pupil participation. V. J. Farrara said if the item is adopted, what is the function of the professor in the classroom? The professor has an amalgam of the knowledge which should be presented to the students. Raymona E. Hull asked what happens when the instructor schedules a test or a panel and the students would be absent. Hoffmaster said the instructor could have a one-minute quiz at the end of each class meeting.

Raymond L. Lee said that the student fails when he schedules a test and the student is not present. The non-attending student would get a failing grade for class participation. Robert H. Saylor asked how the catalog read with regard to this matter. Don-chean Chu had a catalog and read that "the university has no cut system." He added that class experience has an important part in the total learning atmosphere. S. Trevor Hadley said that what the student objects to is that he may have "A" on all tests but because of three cuts he will get a "C" in the course. William R. Shane said one way to encourage attendance is to have good class instruction. H. B. Johnson, Jr. moved to approve item 6, Vincent P. Miller, Jr. seconded, and the motion carried. The vote was 90 for and 46 against the motion.

For item 7, Hoffmaster said two people were being considered for honorary degrees in January. They were Samuel Loboda, director of the U. S. Army Band, and Estella Johnson of Cheyney State College. If the people were to be honored then, the item would have to be approved at this meeting. Hoffmaster moved to approve the item, and Donald G. Eisen seconded. Gary L. Buckwalter said that if item 7 was meant to be specific, he thought it failed specifically. He asked what the items "meritorious achievement" and "broadly based" meant. Robert E. Bernat said he thought the Senate should pass on the candidates before the persons are granted an honorary degree. Ralph W. Reynolds said he agreed. Louis L. Gold asked in what areas the honorary degrees were being given. Herman L. Sledzik said the degree of Doctor of Fine Arts was to be given to Loboda and Doctor of Arts and Letters to Johnson. A vote was taken which rejected the motion with 37 for and 67 against the motion:

"7. The granting of honorary degrees: Criteria (1) Public Service. Because it is a state-owned institution, honorary degrees awarded by Indiana University of Pennsylvania shall reflect recognition of meritorious achievement in an area of public service. (2) Meritorious Achievement. Meritorious achievement shall be an accomplished fact before recognition is given. (3) Extent of Achievement. The achievement recognized should be broadly based, and should cover a fairly extensive period of time. (4) Areas of Public Service. The areas of public service in which achievement shall be considered shall consist of the academic, scientific, public, business, and arts worlds. It is understood that religion or theology would be in the Public World, and authorship in any area. (5) Consideration will be given to any candidate satisfying the above criteria without regard to race, creed, political affiliation, or national origin.

"Procedure. (1) Recommendations for honorary degrees should be submitted by January 15 and may originate with the following: a. Board of Trustees, b. Alumni, c. Administration, and/or Student Body. (2) The Academic Standards Committee shall serve as a screening committee, and recommend the appropriate degree(s). Its recommendation(s) shall be transmitted directly to the President. (3) Final action on honorary degree awards shall be taken by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation by the President."

There were no reports from Committee E (Faculty Tenure, Etc.), Committee F (Graduate Council), Committee G (Research), Committee H (Student Affairs), and Committee I (Development).

Robert H. Saylor, Chairman, reported for Committee J (Faculty Affairs). He said the resolution was presented to the committee and the committee deliberated whether the resolution was a concern of the committee. It decided that it was for the following reasons:

"First, it pertains to a matter related to the philosophy, objectives and program or curriculum for which, to the best of our knowledge, a statement of conviction or principle to serve as a guide does not presently exist within the university.

"Second, the resolution was presented through a proper channel for action by the Senate.

"Third, the committee anticipated that action upon the 'optional ROTC-physical education package' to be presented by Committee C would not, regardless of the outcome of the vote, indicate explicit support for ROTC, retention of ROTC, and continued extension of credits for ROTC courses.

"Fourth, and finally, ROTC is a timely and vital issue to which the Senate should be prepared to address itself now and in the future."

Saylor said the committee accepted, with minor changes, the resolution which was transmitted to the Steering Committee with the request that it be placed on the agenda. The committee also requested that the resolution be considered early in the order of business and that the vote be taken by secret ballot. The request to vote by secret ballot was approved. Later, but prior to the meeting of the Senate on September 30, the committee approved two changes to the resolution so that, if necessary, the resolution would reflect consistently Senate action on the "optional ROTC-physical education package." Those changes are shown on the handout passed out at the start of the meeting. The first change requires the deletion of the word "continued" and the addition of the word "optional." The second change requires the substitution of the word "option" for the word "requirement." The word "compulsory" never appeared in the resolution.

of Senate Councilman, which said some similar changes to the resolution were made at the meeting in April of the year and the matter was brought up to the committee last year. It was not from the resolution and the item was presented to the committee last year. It was

and which is to be excluded from the agenda.

Saylor said it was the conviction of Committee J that the action taken by the Senate on the "optional ROTC-physical education package" presented by the Curriculum Committee was complementary to adoption of the resolution. It was also the conviction of Committee J that Senate approval of this resolution would provide principles to guide the Board of Trustees and all Senate committees affected by the principles. He then moved that the resolution, with changes indicated, be approved and George K. Seacrist seconded.

James M. Oliver said that ROTC needs no apology and is a part of the curriculum. William R. Smith said this is an unusual time since ROTC was mentioned earlier in the meeting. William R. Shane asked who drafted the resolution and why there was a secret ballot. Saylor said he was the original author. There were minor changes and then the committee approved. A secret ballot was called for because some people because of their position (ROTC) would be deprived of their vote. Lorrie J. Bright asked whether the Senate was assuring the Board of Trustees that in the future it would not remove credit for ROTC.

Richard E. Berry said that to prevent a military caste system he thought military instruction should be side by side with liberal arts education for the broadening influence, instead of military education on a far off mountain top or in a cave. Oliver W. Helmrich remarked that ROTC was a matter of national concern. Saylor moved to vote by secret ballot and Charles E. Weber seconded. The motion was defeated. W. Wayne Smith said that he regarded the "Whereas ROTC does not threaten free autonomy, etc." is contradictory to the item of a secret vote. Anthony A. Angeloni said that in the American democracy many things are conducted by a secret ballot. Charles E. Weber remarked that sometimes the Roberts Rules of Order are used and sometimes not. There were voice votes, standing votes, and now a secret ballot was requested.

Lawrence A. Ianni said he conducted the meeting on the basis of an amalgam of Roberts Rules of Order, Whitney, the By-Laws of the organization, and the manner in which the past Senate meetings were conducted.

Arthur F. Nicholson, Parliamentarian, said it is up to the wishes of the group how the meetings were to be conducted. The chairman may conduct elections in any way he wishes.

A motion to stop discussion was carried. A vote on the Committee J report was taken with 98 for the report and 37 against to approve the following:

"WHEREAS, The Senate of Indiana University of Pennsylvania believes that the existing form of the United States Government, a constitutional democracy and republic, with its recognized shortcomings, is worthy of preservation and continued support; and

"WHEREAS, Any national government, particularly one which needs and fosters open expression, is subject to internal and external stresses; and

"WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States directs the Congress to provide armed forces to protect and defend these United States from all threats, particularly those which advocate the overthrow of the legally constituted government; and

"WHEREAS, An officer corps is essential to provide the leadership within the armed forces; and

"WHEREAS, The officer corps should be composed of regular and reserve personnel to provide a balance between military and civilian influence and to prevent the evolution of an elite military caste; and

"WHEREAS, The reserve officer should be intelligent, well-educated, and able-bodied to provide leadership of the highest caliber; and

"WHEREAS, Colleges and universities offer the best source for such men; and

"WHEREAS, Indiana University of Pennsylvania is an appropriate source; and

"WHEREAS, The Senate believes that ROTC does not threaten free inquiry and academic autonomy which are the heart of academic freedom, but rather, offers the means of protecting such freedoms; and

"WHEREAS, The ROTC commissioned staff responsible for instruction is represented by men who are, with few exceptions, products of ROTC programs rooted in the traditional academic background; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the ROTC program should be retained at and supported by Indiana University of Pennsylvania; and be it further Resolved, That appropriate credit hours should accompany satisfactory completion of prescribed courses in the ROTC program; and be it further Resolved, That ROTC should be optional for all qualified Freshmen males, until the Senate, which is the appropriate body to consider any modification of this Resolution, deems otherwise; and be it further Resolved, That every effort should be made to be certain that prospective students are aware of the option for ROTC at this University."

There was no report from Committee K (Continuing and Non-resident Education).

Ianni asked if there were any questions on the report of the President's ad hoc Committee on Academic Vision. Albert J. Wahl said Dr. Hassler hadn't indicated what was to be done with the report. The report consists of things to be considered by the University. George T. Wiley asked whether the committee took into consideration House Bill 999 which, if passed, may not allow much academic vision. Arthur F. Nicholson said the faculty should consider academic vision regardless of what authority the University is under. Wahl said that House Bill 999 does seem to give room for such things as academic vision. George T. Wiley said the purpose of the bill is to give direction. Richard A. Hazley said he felt the document was important but in view of the state of fatigue of the group he felt the report should be considered at the next meeting. He moved that the item be placed on the agenda for the next meeting. It was seconded and carried.

John J. Hays moved that a body or a group be appointed that would deal with professional negotiations of the faculty as a whole. Ianni asked whether he moved for the election of an ad hoc committee. The item was referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Louis L. Gold moved that Committee D (Academic Standards) be instructed to consider a pass-fail system. It was seconded by Dale E. Landon and carried.

George K. Seacrist moved to instruct Committee D (Academic Standards) that it is the wish of the Senate that nominations or recommendations for honorary degrees be presented to the Senate body for approval. It was seconded by Thomas E. Conway and carried.

Richard E. Berry remarked that it is possible that two people were already invited for honorary degrees in January and it will be an embarrassment since the Senate rejected the proposed guidelines.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Polesky

John A. Polesky, Secretary

Upon a motion duly seconded and carried by unanimous vote, ~~WITH THE EXCEPTIONS NOTED~~, the Board of Trustees of Indiana University of Pennsylvania on October 17, 1969, approved the actions of the University Senate on September 30 and October 2, 1969.

EXCEPTIONS:

For the report of Committee J (Faculty Affairs), the Board of Trustees deleted the section in parentheses:

"RESOLVED, That ROTC should be optional for all qualified freshmen males, (until the Senate, which is the appropriate body to consider any modification of this Resolution, deems otherwise).

For the report of Committee D (Academic Standards):

The Board of Trustees deferred action, pending clarification, on item 4 (Status of the Junior Standing Program).

The Board of Trustees deferred action, pending reaction to recommendation that this policy exempt freshmen, for whom rules will be formulated, for item 6 (Class Attendance).

The Board of Trustees deferred action in accordance with that action taken in item 12, page 57, in the minutes of the current meeting, with regard to item 7 (The Granting of Honorary Degrees).