

INDIANA UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING - MAY 16, 1972

The meeting of the Indiana University Senate was called to order by Chairman Lorrie Bright at 4:00 PM on Tuesday, May 16, in McVitty Auditorium. A quorum was present.

A motion to dispense with the reading of minutes was passed.

Chairman Bright announced that a sub-committee of Committee B for study of the calendar has arrived at a proposal for the calendar. Members of the Senate may study same before the September, 1972 meeting. A copy has been sent to S.G.A. and will be distributed to all students.

Senator Rife announced that Don Eisen was elected new Vice Chairman.

Don Eisen - 45 votes
Susan DeMark - 36 votes
Marsha Mrozek - 26 votes

Chairman Bright announced the Board of Trustees meeting on Friday approved Senate action in all cases except one: on Dr. Hassler's recommendation five exceptions to the recommended salary increments to Steps F and G were made.

Debate was reopened on a previous motion to accept Committee B's recommendation regarding tenure for two individuals. After some discussion, Senator Bright ruled that 15 minutes should be adequate time for discussion.

Senator Faust made the following statement:

I was not present at the Senate meeting last Tuesday because I was called to Harrisburg for three days on University business. Dr. Mendizabal, who is a senator from my department, was with his wife who was expecting a child. I understand that Dr. McGovern, who was here, spoke on behalf of my department, and for that I am grateful. We are both deeply concerned as to the import of this vote today. There is no further reason to disguise the facts of the case or to conceal the department involved. One has only to read the Faculty News, where the minutes of Committee C were published, to become aware of the situation. I might add that this is the first time, to my knowledge, that Committee C has published names, causes and department, with respect to an extremely delicate issue. This in itself has been difficult for the members of my department who felt, and were led to believe, that their remarks and presence were to be confidential.

Allow me to give you a brief resume of the situation. Last October 26 the Tenure Committee of my department met to consider the two candidates in question. After a long, calm deliberation it was decided that they would be given a fourth

year of probation in order to make a truly valid judgment of their value to the department and to the University. These were both controversial candidates and, in view of the fact that there was no University-wide criteria for such evaluation, we felt that in order to be fair to them and to ourselves, we needed another year. The candidates then appealed to APSCUF who requested a hearing before my Tenure Committee. There was no precedent for such a hearing and it was arranged somewhat haphazardly. Tape recorders were used. APSCUF arrived with three representatives in defense of the two candidates. No one was there from APSCUF to represent myself or my Tenure Committee.

Our remarks in answer to questions put to us by APSCUF were attacked. We were treated as though we were guilty and yet this was to have been an informal hearing. We were told that APSCUF is supposed to represent us all; yet we were treated as adversaries. The tapes of the hearing were sent to Committee C. Consultation was then held with APSCUF, Committee C and the candidates without my knowledge or that of my Tenure Committee. We were not informed of any progress in the case. I was then called before Committee C to explain the stand of my Committee, which I did. Sometime later, my Assistant Chairman and I were invited to appear before Committee C to consider the appeal of the two candidates in question. At the same time anyone else in the department who had not appeared and who wished to do so was invited. Eight members of the Tenure Committee appeared. We were surprised with a confrontation with the two candidates in question and two representatives from APSCUF. No one had informed us of this confrontation. We were asked confidential questions, by APSCUF and the Committee, and were required to answer in the presence of the two men who had appealed. Our Tenure Meetings had been absolutely confidential yet we were now expected to reveal our secret votes and opinions.

Fully aware of the danger of lawsuits and threats of such action so prevalent on the campus today, we were reluctant to speak out boldly and frankly in front of the two non-tenured plaintiffs. As a result we were understandably vague and non-committal. A consideration of an appeal by the two gentlemen was to have been the purpose of the meeting as we understood it, but no appeal was discussed.

May I remind you that APSCUF is a new factor on the campus whose function in grievance cases is not defined. Since there are no behavioral ethics or conduct principles established either by Committee C or APSCUF, we as a department have to rely upon our own standards. It is crucial for the entire University to decide whether the opinion of 12 colleagues with daily contact with the aggrieved has more or less validity than that of 5 persons who do not have such contact. These are relationships which may extend 20 to 25 years with a cost of a minimum of 1/2 million dollars to the state. The highest degree of mutual

trust, respect, and confidence should be inherent in this relationship between colleagues and it should not be established without the most serious consideration. When a Tenure Committee votes 11 to 1 for an extended probation with no penalty intended, are we to have forced upon us two individuals whose desirability has not been established?

Twice we have been requested to reconsider and twice we have stood solidly behind our original decision. The second time we were instructed to make a tenure decision and under this pressure, we had no choice but to vote termination of contract, which we did with the usual year's notice if Committee C would not support the year's probation.

One more point: a dossier was prepared without our knowledge by Committee C which we would never had seen had not Dr. McGovern insisted that it be shown to me. It was destined for Dr. Hassler so that he might arrive at a decision. Upon examination I discovered that it did not contain a long memo of protest on my part to Committee C relative to the way the members of my department were treated at the Committee C hearing, nor did it contain Dr. McGovern's memo to the same effect.

The dossier does contain excerpted statements by various witnesses at the hearings, and these are commented upon by the two aggrieved parties in order to justify their arguments. Neither I nor any member of my Tenure Committee was given access to these remarks which often depart from fact and which extend to personal attacks on the competence and even the personal lives of the members of the Tenure Committee.

My Tenure Committee has stood solidly behind its original decision to grant one more year's probation in spite of all the attacks that it has suffered, because we believe that our decision is in the best interest of the University. I urge you to vote not to accept the recommendation of Committee C, because, if accepted, it poses a threat to the autonomy of every department on the campus, especially in view of the presence of APSCUF and the role that it is assuming.

Senator Saylor, Chairman, Committee C, offered further discussion, saying the first issue is the matter of autonomy. Departmental autonomy is a principle endorsed by him and all members of Committee C. A matter of interpretation may be in order, in that if those who exercise departmental autonomy are independent of external control, then there would be no reason for the existence of a department, or any other authority. We do exercise some controls over units in the echelon and Committee C has been charged by this Senate to exercise some control, particularly over professional personnel. In doing so, Committee C has tried to uphold the principles of the first amendment, and interests of all, due process and academic freedom. They have tried to get adequate supporting

evidence in all cases. This committee has been beset by problems in trying to obtain timely and accurate data.

Committee C then met in caucus.

Senator Saylor then reported that the committee felt Senator Faust's report presents a number of perceptions and interpretations at variance with Committee C's conclusions. They felt the Senate might consider hearing all the evidence available in order to come to its own conclusion. If the Senate wishes so, it has such authority.

Senator McGovern felt that neither the decision to release the individuals nor the position to permanently retain them is realistic.

Senator Strawcutter replied that the problem seems to be one of relationships and procedures. A department recommends to Committee C which recommends to the Senate. The department accepts responsibility for what they have done, but it is still a recommendation to the President and the Board of Trustees. It is then the President's and the Board's decision, and not Committee C's decision. If this reasoning is correct, it is understandable that Committee C might disagree with the department in interpretation of evidence. If the department feels Committee C has been capricious, then the charge may come to the Senate floor, but the Senate makes a recommendation.

Senator Saylor replied that Committee C did earlier endorse the department's recommendation to extend probation for one year, with the proviso that President Hassler would assure these two individuals they would not be summarily dismissed. However, additional data showed no teaching incompetency, etc., so they felt compelled to recommend tenure.

The motion to accept Committee C's report to approve the award of tenure to two individuals who were previously granted an extension of probation for an additional year passed by a vote of 71 ayes and 22 nays.

Senator Saylor stated that one other individual of the instructional staff was eligible for advancement to step G and moved that he be advanced. Seconded by Senator Eisen. Motion passed.

Senator Gallanar, Chairman, Committee D (Graduate) recommended withdrawing item 3 from the report, since there is still some discussion on it:

Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers, Mathematics 690,
Independent Study in Mathematics.

He moved the adoption of items 1, 2, and 4:

1. Foundations of Education 515, Decision-making in Curriculum Development approved with recommendation that it be accepted by departments as credit towards the Foundation of Education requirement in existing degree programs.
2. Special Education 566, Education of Children with Learning Disabilities.
4. Mathematics
Math 510 The Teaching of Junior High Mathematics

Math 511 The Teaching of Senior High Mathematics
 Math 529 Differential Equations
 Math 531, 532 Advanced Calculus I, II
 Math 533, 534 Complex Analysis I, II
 Math 535, 536 Real Analysis I, II
 Math 540 History of Mathematics
 Math 542 Curriculum and Supervision in Mathematics
 Math 552 Number Theory
 Math 559 Introduction to Abstract Algebra
 Math 561, 562 Abstract Algebra I, II
 Math 563 Linear Algebra
 Math 571 Geometry I
 Math 572 Geometry II
 Math 573 Topology
 Math 575 Foundations of Mathematics I
 Math 576 Foundations of Mathematics II
 Math 582 Theory of Probability
 Math 584 Mathematical Statistics
 Math 590-593 Topic Seminar in Mathematics
 Math 601 Methods of Research in Mathematics Education

Mathematics is dropping twenty-three courses from its present graduate curriculum.

Seconded by Senator D. Murdock. Motion passed.

No report from Committee E.

Senator Richard Murray, Chairman, Committee F (Student Affairs and Athletics) recommended the approval of items 1 and 2:

1. Approval of Student Organizations and Advisors.
 - a. Middle Eastern Council of Cultural Affairs, Dr. Maher Shawer, Advisor.
 - b. Donald Robbins, Business Advisor to the Oak.
2. Approval of use of University Facilities and Approval of Film Series.

Psychology Department Film Series requests approval of 1972-73 Film Series.

Seconded by Senator Croft. Motion passed.

Senator Murray moved the approval of item 3, stating that it provides for proxies in case the regular member of University Judicial Board is not available. Seconded by Senator Bosnick. Motion passed.

3. University Judicial Board (Statement #1)

The following is proposed for your consideration and action as a revision of existing University Judicial Board structure:

MEMBERSHIP AND OFFICERS:

1. Dean of Students is a permanent member.

2. Five faculty members to be selected as follows:
 - a. the Dean of Men or his proxy
 - b. The Dean of Women or her proxy
 - c. A faculty representative from Committee F or his proxy
 - d. A representative from the University Senate or his proxy
 - e. An appointee of the Dean of Academic Affairs from the Academic Deans or his proxy
3. Five student members to be selected as follows:
 - a. Four regular (two men and two women) and two alternates to be either elected or appointed from the general student body through the S.G.A., and
 - b. one student representative selected by Committee F or his proxy
4. The chairman of the Joint Judicial Board to be a non-voting member.
5. Members shall hold office for a term of one year, but may be reappointed. They will remain active until the formation of a new board. The Deans of Men and Women will have permanent tenure.

VOTING:

1. The Chairman shall vote only in case of a tie.
2. A quorum shall consist of five members, two of whom must be students.

Senator Murray moved the approval of item 4. Seconded by Senator Riddle.

4. Student Publications (Statement #2)

The student press shall be free of censorship and advance approval of copy and its editors and staff members shall be free to develop their own editorial policies and news coverage. Student editors must realize that freedom of editorial choice implies full responsibility for the content and authenticity of the contents of student publications.

The faculty advisors have the obligation to advise, suggest, guide, and counsel. Student editors should seek the advice of faculty advisors before items of questionable value go to print, but final decisions on what is to be published shall be made by the student editor of each publication. Editors must be guided, though, by a sense of accountability to their readers.

The elective offices to the student publications are the Editor of the Penn., the Editor or Co-Editors of the Oak, the Business Manager of the Oak, and the Editor and Art Editor of the Fine Frenzy Rolling Revue.

Any student of either sex shall be eligible for the aforementioned positions, and he need not be a major in any particular department. An applicant for the Editor of the Penn must have served at least one semester on the Penn staff to be eligible for office.

The editor of campus publications shall call for applications for these positions in which the terms of office have expired during the first week in December and April. These positions must be finally approved by the Student Government Association. Candidates will be screened by current members of the publications, according to the by-laws of each publication, and the most desirable candidate presented to Congress for its approval or rejection.

Editors and managers of student publications shall be protected from arbitrary suspension and removal because of student, faculty, administrative, or public disapproval of editorial policy or content. Only for proper and stated causes shall editors and managers be subject to removal by orderly and prescribed procedures. The Student Government Association, which bears the final responsibility for the appointment of editors, shall be the agency responsible for removal of student editors if circumstances arise.

The faculty advisors and the student editors are jointly responsible that publication costs remain within budgeted allocations.

Senator Knowlton read the following statement from Senator Laughlin:

I wish to speak to the proposal concerning new regulations for publications at IUP. It is my understanding, although the proposal is not stated as a substitute, that it is basically a substitution for that portion of students rights, freedoms, and responsibilities dealing with freedom of student publications. It was assumed by the members of the Senate and the Student Government at the time of initial passage by the Senate of the complete document dealing with Students Rights, freedoms, and Responsibilities that the document would serve as a guideline in governing publications, etc. here at the campus. My purpose in speaking against the revision is basically one in which any action affecting this document should be studied thoroughly with hearings conducted with the various segments affected. The proposal in effect says that the student publications should be answerable to student government and its readers, that SGA would be the only body who could question any action of the Penn. This is in opposition to the Senate's original purpose of having a body available to question concerns of various segments of the campus. In effect, the Senate, Committee F and all other areas of the University would be cut off from any concerns dealing with publications. It would create a situation where the student government would have the right to remove editors without the editors having any further recourse regarding their action. It would state in effect that Student Government could only disapprove the editors proposed by the Penn staff in any given year. It does not allow for Student Government to make recommendations of a new or other potential editors who might wish to be considered. As the proposal affects

the University, the Senate, publications of all nature on campus, Student Government, Administration, Student Coop, present existing policy on campus, I propose that it be resubmitted to Committee F for a full review in the year ahead and be resubmitted at a later Senate session following such a review.

Senator Murray said basically the segment to be concerned is the student segment. Student Government Association would be given the final right to appoint student editors. However, it would in effect act as an appeal board if problems arise; if an editor were to be removed, an independent board would be named for hearing the case.

Senator Knowlton replied this would limit student government to a narrow role, since they could only accept or reject student editors.

Chairman Bright, in stepping down from the chair, replied he felt the Penn should be separated from student government, in order to be free to criticize student government without disapproval for the editor. He does not want to see the student government exercise that power over the Penn.

Senator Bosnick said that he felt the proposal is not thought out well enough to be voted upon today.

Senator Ferrara moved to table the motion. On a second by Senator Eisen, motion passed.

Senator Murray moved approval of item 5. Seconded by Senator Pat Brisbane.

5. Visitation Policy (Statement #3)

1. Maximum visitation hours shall range from noon until midnight, Sunday through Thursday, and from noon until 2 a.m., Friday and Saturday.
2. A majority vote of all residents living on a floor will determine the floor's hours within the maximum hour limits. A resident may propose to the floor at any time a reconsideration of its hours, to be determined by a re-vote of all residents living on the floor.
3. All guests are to meet with their escorts before entering any living area of a resident hall and must be escorted at all times while in the living areas of the resident halls.
4. There will be posted at all entrances to each resident hall a list of the visitation hours selected by each floor. A list will also be posted at the entrance to each living area. Escorts are responsible to inform guests of their floor's visitation hours.
5. As a general guideline a roommate wishing to study will have priority to the use of the room. Roommate conflicts should be referred to the resident hall staff.
6. Guests must be escorted by the resident of a building at all times when they are visiting the living area of a resident hall.

7. The host or hostess is accountable for the actions of his or her guest while he is in the resident hall. The regulations governing each resident hall apply to all guests visiting the resident hall.
8. Guests are to use the public lavatory facilities in each resident hall, usually located in the main lobby. In buildings where public facilities are unavailable, guests should use the public facilities of adjacent buildings.
9. Responsibility for the overall administration of the policy shall rest with the resident hall staff in each building. Hall counselors will be especially concerned with unescorted guests, excessive noise or disturbance, damage to personal or hall property, misuse of lavatory facilities, and all other violations of visitation guidelines and general regulations.
10. Violations of regulations will be subject to action according to the established University judicial process. As in all other situations students are expected to identify themselves upon request of any resident hall staff member or any other University official.
11. Review of the Visitation Policy is the responsibility of the Student Affairs Sub-Committee of Committee F of the University Senate.

Senator Murdoch presented a statement from Dr. Laughlin:

What I wish to present is not intended to reflect negative action toward the proposed visitation policy at the campus. The proposal itself is the combined effort of both Committee F and an ad hoc committee who conducted the experimental visitation program this spring term. The concern I present to the Senate rather reflects the position of the Student Affairs staff with respect to the proposal as written. The proposal when submitted by Committee F for Senate review in effect dictates policy to be administered by staff within the Student Affairs area. Questions raised for Student Affairs staff are:

1. The assigning of responsibilities to Student Affairs staff by Committee F. Should the committee not include and utilize the responsible deans and directors when policies that affect the Student Affairs administrators are proposed as to the role they must play in any policy that affects their responsibility? The utilization of persons trained, employed as Student Affairs staff and their availability to complete tasks so assigned--are they to be ignored? Who is to be held accountable should proposals by their nature add responsibilities to existing staff members? The visitation policy as outlined does indicate responsibility, yet by virtue of point 11 ignore the Student Affairs staff involvement for future review and possible revision.

2. If security needs, supervision, and other factors are of concern to the total campus, should these not be considered prior to new policy implementation. Staff provisions, costs, provision for implementation, etc. must be available from somewhere and be part of any consideration of policy. Can Student Affairs assume that the Senate supports such needs when passage of Committee F action is requested.

Senator Bright asked for clarification on the second point.

Senator Murdock said, There may be a period in which the students themselves may want to have security within the dormitory i.e. signed in or out by someone actually there. It may entail asking additional student help or security be assigned. This could run to \$198,000 in order to maintain security. There is no estimate for the professional security.

Senator Kolega replied that no students are in favor of signing in and out.

Senator Brisbane felt that sign-in is worthless. There have been no bad results from the visitation.

Senator Hurlbut said students have responded favorably. The halls have been quiet, students have obeyed all the rules. Most sign in and out.

Senator Murray made the following statement:

The offered amendment is neither new, nor does its proponent espouse unconsidered provisions. As Chairman of the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee, I can justifiably speak for a demonstrated majority of students and faculty or committee who announced a sign-in and/or sign-out process cannot be claimed as the sole means to dormitory security, i.e., the personal security of women within women's residences.

For these reasons the Committee rejected the sign-in provisions:

- a. the process is easily and even innocently by-passed.
- b. the process does not ipso facto provide for or achieve any security measures even under 100% utilization and cooperation.
- c. the process seemed to be indicated as an excuse for the University in the event of a serious incident, that is to allow the University to claim that half-measures were achieving a semblance of security--in short, a facade, something that is without being. In rejecting sign-in the Committee was being nothing less than totally honest to the Senate. The solution to the problem of security was not to create a process of false security.

To cope with security the committee thought and provided the following:

- a. what is reasonable security is protection from bodily injury (property security, although important, could not be equated with more important personal security)
- b. the security of women in their dormitories was considered the dominant concern.
- c. surely the sex-crime and more or less "violent" crimes against the person were in society and on campus unpreventable crimes. The committee did not even discuss extension of visiting hours--to do that would have opened dormitories to public traffic beyond reasonable hours when campus residents are not awake and active, and when campus security is on duty.
- d. the escort provision, i.e., must be the saving feature of this policy--its violation is immediately conspicuous; its continuous violation draws attention. The sole privilege of a non-resident to be in a dormitory is that he has chosen to "visit", the sole means to identify the proper use of that privilege should not exist on a piece of paper in a public lobby--it should exist immediately and identifiably. We chose the escort provision to do just that.
- e. in the end, the least a hostess must bear is some responsibility for proper conduct of the guest--it is conceivable that residents who cannot entreat their guests to follow proper guest procedures must be denied the privilege of having guests.
- f. in conclusion, the means to reasonable and achievable security are in the policy--one cannot expect a committee, regardless of how eminent it may be, to foresee the unforeseeable; to provide for the unprovisional; to achieve the unachievable. Problems that arise should be considered in perspective to reasonable means to their solutions. The use of the term "security" and its equation with such imponderables as the "flag", John Philip Sousa marches, and Walt Disney cartoons is not the stuff from which policy is shaped.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I reject the argument "What harm can it do?" for false security is no security at all. I urge the defeat of this amendment and the passage of this policy in its present form.

Senator Hazely moved the question. Seconded by Senator Brisbane and motion passed.

Then the motion to approve the policy passed.

Committees G, H, and I had no reports.

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation, George Murdoch, Chairman, reported that senators had been provided with copies of their report and moved that the Senate continue to study the proposal in the fall, with plans to implement same first semester. Senator Dakak seconded.

Senator Tackett asked clarification as to whether this is faculty or course evaluation.

Senator Murdock explained it is a course evaluation.

Motion passed.

Ronald Green, Chairman, moved that items 8, 9, 10, and 11 under Committee B report of the Senate be taken from the table. Seconded by Senator Ferrara. Motion passed.

Senator Green moved acceptance of these items. He explained that objections from the Business Management Department had been withdrawn. Seconded by Bosnick.

Senator Oliver asked if Committee B will judge each case on its own merits?

Senator Green replied that Committee B has adopted a resolution to the effect that descriptions of new course proposals be carried in the Faculty News. In this case, following review of the hearings, both the economics course and the business management course were approved.

Motion passed to approve items 8, 9, 10, 11 of Committee B.

There was no new business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Submitted by



Cleo McCracken
Secretary