

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
September 16, 1971
Roof Lounge, Student Union Building

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors, Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Irwin, Lawrence, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Alton, Beall, Behnke, Bixler, Bogar, Byrne, Cutshall, Fleener, Galanti, Gifford, Grossman, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Levitt, Mandelbaum, Marks, Meiere, Merritt, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, O'Loughlin, Schreiber, Wagener, Weber, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Holmquist, McDonald; Professors Ashmore, Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Johnston, Mamlin, Nunn, Ochs, Ross, Sagraves.

Visitors: Dean Nevill; Professors Harris, Lund, Robinson.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of May 13, 1971.
2. Introduction of new members
3. Memorial Resolutions: Professors Close and Thelander
4. Report of Committee on Committees (Wagner)
5. Presiding Officer's Business
6. Executive Session
7. Agenda Committee Business
 - a. Representation of IUPUI on All-University Council
 - b. Study of Wage Freeze
 - c. Reapportionment of IUPUI Faculty Council

Chancellor Hine called the September 16, 1971 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes for the May 13, 1971 meeting. Professor Kelso noted that he was listed as being absent at that meeting, but had attended and had seconded a number of motions. The motion was made to accept the minutes as corrected, adding Professor Kelso's name. Motion was seconded and carried.

Introduction of New Members of the Council

Chancellor Hine introduced and welcomed the new members of the Council. The new members for the 1971-72 academic year are as follows: Patricia Beall, Graduate School of Social Service; Elizabeth Grossman, School of Nursing; Robert Marks, Herron School of Art; John O'Loughlin, 38th St. Campus; Elaine Alton, 38th St. Campus; Theodore Cutshall, 38th St. Campus; Don E. Fleener, Downtown Campus; Paul Galanti, School of Law; Elizabeth Navarre, Graduate School of Social Service; Robert Neel, 38th St. Campus; Arthur Nunn, School of Medicine.

Memorial Resolutions

The Chancellor asked Professor Behnke to read a memorial resolution on the death of Walter Donald Close. Professor Donald Kinzer was asked to read a memorial resolution on the death of Theodore Thelander.

Report on Committee on Committees

Professor Bruce Wagener reported for the Committee on Committees. He said his committee felt there would be a number of changes to be made in the structure of committee organization this year. They will try to reappoint individuals who have been on the committees and to fill in with new members from the Council and from other interested parties. He stated this report was a progress report because the contacting of all these individuals is still underway. His committee hopes by the next meeting to have before the Council a list of those recommended for the various committees of the Council.

Presiding Officer's Business

The Chancellor reported that the Student Affairs Committee had been working to develop a program for campus-wide activities for students. They asked him to appoint some faculty members on an Advisory Student Activity Fee Allocation Committee. He has recommended Dr. Ray Antley, School of Medicine, Professor Richard Fredland, Downtown Campus, Professor Kent Olson, Downtown Campus, and Professor Jeremy Williams, School of Law, to be on the committee to work with Dr. Hugh Wolf, Dean of Student Services. He added this will be the first time we have had a campus-wide program to involve and interest all students.

Wage Freeze Problem

The Chancellor said one of the most severe aspects of the wage freeze is that of the raises that were to be given to people who had a 10 month contract starting on August 15. Unfortunately, the freeze went into effect on that day, and the ruling, up to date, has been that these people would not be entitled to

the raise. The second aspect that seems in doubt is the raises that are involved in a promotion of a faculty member. The ruling at the moment on this seems to be that if the raise carried with it additional responsibility, the individual would be entitled to the raise, or at least that part of the raise that goes with the responsibility. The third point of controversy is parking fees. After the freeze was announced, the Chancellor said he asked Vice Chancellor Ryder and Mr. Lautzenheiser to get an official ruling regarding parking. The Chancellor went on to say that as far as the first two points he mentioned were concerned, the University became aggressive immediately in seeking correct answers. They contacted many outside agencies on the following general points: tuition fee and services increases; pay increases for 10 month faculty; 10 month faculty promotions; new faculty members, student employees, non-academic employees. The administration got in touch with the Vice President and Provost of the University of Illinois, the Vice President of Academic Affairs at the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, the Provost at Michigan State, Michigan University, the Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Michigan, the Provost at the University of Iowa, the Assistant Vice President for Administration at the University of Wisconsin, the Assistant to the President at Purdue University, the President of Ball State University, the President of Indiana State University, and Howard University. They also talked to law firms, one for the American Council on Education, a special labor council for IU, the National Association of State University and Land Grant Colleges, the American College on Education, the American Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Universities, the American Association of University Professors, and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Cost of Living Council Rulings

In one day the answer to a specific question was no, yes, maybe, no--all in the same day. The Chancellor went on to say that President Ryan's announcement was sent to the Cost of Living Council for comment. As of then, they have had no authoritative and complete and final answer to this question. However, the Cost of Living Council has issued a series of bulletins that have been collected in the central office that address themselves to the questions we all face.

The Chancellor said on the matter of 10 month people getting their salary raises, it appears at the moment this will not be possible. If it is to be possible in any way, rest assured that they will make it so, because they have struggled to get these raises approved and feel the faculty are entitled to them. It is the opinion of the University that we cannot go against the rulings of the Cost of Living Council.

As far as promotions are concerned, the Chancellor felt it now appears clear that an individual can get the promotion raise he was given this fall if it can be established that the promotion gave him additional responsibilities. He has asked each Dean to check through those promoted and to point out how his responsibilities had changed. Any decision made on faculty who will be paid this will mean retroactive action and the individual will get the salary they would have had without the economic wage freeze.

The Chancellor went on to say this is a very complicated problem, but wanted to assure everyone the administration has tried to get official rulings.

Parking Fees

Vice Chancellor Ryder next reported on the parking with reference to the wage freeze problem. He commended faculty and students for conforming to the policy that was put into effect on the first of September, even though further communication indicated it would not be enforced because of the freeze. The parking policy committee, chaired by Professor Bogan in Dentistry, has on it representatives from the students, faculty, administration, clerical and services personnel. Certain changes are in the process of being made to make necessary adjustments. In addition, he added, they have been pursuing questions with the Cost of Living Council, and based upon the latest information they have, they have recommended to the Chancellor implementation of the program as it states in the regulations with certain exceptions. Those exceptions include: (1) Roll back the rates on the green parking so they will be the same as the policies that were in effect here at the campus last year. The amount one pays is related to salary range. This would be in effect only until the freeze is over. (2) All meter areas, which were to go to 10¢ an hour, will remain as they are. (3) The level of fines was to increase. This will remain as is until the freeze is over.

Contract Obligations

Professor Alton asked if, in contacting other universities, any of them had started their contracts exactly on the 15th. Chancellor Hine replied he knew of none that started exactly on the 15th. He added our contracts would not have started then if the academic calendar had not been changed. Professor Alton asked if those contracts on a yearly basis, but divided up into a certain number of installments, would not be entitled to the full amount of the contract. She asked if any decision had been made on this. Chancellor Hine responded that no decision had been made, and that will depend upon what they decide to do after 90 days. He said he was more concerned over what is going to happen after the 90 days is over, because no problems are going to be solved in 90 days. He did not believe they would be able to make the raises retroactive, because apparently this has been ruled on. One of the things argued most strenuously is that the University has a contract with people and they should be allowed to fulfill it.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield Fees

Professor Kinzer raised a question regarding the increased fee for Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage. This went into effect July 1, which was the effective date of the salary increases. The fee increase for Blue Cross-Blue Shield was deducted from the first pay check. Chancellor Hine replied that has not been ruled on and that he would look into the matter. The contract with Blue Cross-Blue Shield was made effective by the University July 1. The coverage, he assumed, started July 1, even for a person who had a 10 month salary. He added he could not give a final answer on this at the moment, but it was an interesting point and should be ruled on.

Chancellor Hine added that regarding the parking situation, if improvements have been made, then increases will be allowed. In looking around you will find all kinds of improvements being made and he felt there is not another urban university in the United States that has such good parking facilities available.

Chancellor Hine assured the Council that as he gets more definitive answers, he will let them know. One unfortunate situation is the lack of communication that has gone on and he thought the Council would like to know just what the University has been trying to do to establish guidelines.

Agenda Committee Business

Professor Bogar reported he had received a copy of a letter to Chancellor Hine, from the All-University Council, requesting IUPUI send nine delegates to the All-University Council and one student representative. Chancellor Hine did not receive the letter on its original date of August 24, and Professor Bogar said he had just received a copy of it. The first meeting of the All-University Council is Tuesday, September 21 at the IU School of Business in Bloomington at 2:30 p.m. Professor Bogar went on to report that these representatives would only be temporary until the All-University Council gets some of its parliamentary and constitutional procedures worked out. He asked if there were nine people who would be interested in serving on an interim basis.

Resolution to Change Representation

Professor Norins said he had the feeling from the last Council meeting that the Council would not partake in the All-University Council, except by sending a representative to inform them of this. This idea was to be forwarded to Bloomington and he wanted to know if it had been done. Professor Bogar said the resolution the Council passed was that IUPUI did not see fit to send representatives to the All-University Council based upon its present structure and present representation. He said he sent this resolution to Professor Shaffer, secretary of the All-University Council, at the beginning of the summer. At the end of the summer he received acknowledgment from him that the resolution had been received and noted. Professor White added that he sent a copy of the resolution to all the members of the All-University Constitution Committee and received back a communication it had been received by the secretary of the committee. Professor Bogar repeated the motion was "that the IUPUI Faculty Council prefers a confederation of councils and each faculty council would have equal representation on this confederation. This preference shall be made known to the All-University Council and to the Constitution Committee." Professor Kelso felt the matter was a little more complicated and less clear. Professor Norins' original motion was in the following words "that the IUPUI Faculty Council express its opinion it would be for the preference of having a representative of its council meet with the representatives of other councils, rather than having a whole new university council, and that this intent be expressed to the current council." He thought that implied we would send one person to represent our Council. He added that on page 8, when the motion was called for question, someone not identified in the minutes said the motion is that we prefer a confederation of councils. It was not worded quite as strongly as the original motion. He felt our intention is not really clear from the minutes.

Role of Interim All-University Council

Professor Byrne thought some clarification was called for at this point. He thought there are two different questions before us. One is what do we choose to do with regard to the interim All-University Faculty Council. This interim faculty council is one section of the constitution of the Bloomington Faculty Council, which is evolving while awaiting approval of a constitution of its own for an All-University Faculty Council. He had the impression that anything

said at this time with regard to the kind of system-wide faculty organization that we would wish to move into would refer to constitution or that kind of government to which the proposed constitution is directed. The second question is what do we choose to do with regard to the organization now operative. In the past, there have been three representatives from Indianapolis operating on that organization. Over the summer a vote was taken and passed calling for a rearrangement of the numbers of representatives to be sent to this interim organization from the various campuses. There will be nine representatives from IUPUI and 13 from Bloomington, with representatives from each of the regional campuses. Therefore, the two different questions here are what kind of an all-university system wide faculty organization do we want and what do we want to do about what happens in the interim. Professor Bogar replied the latter question is what concerns us now. Professor Kelso asked what kind of business would go before this All-University Faculty Council. He felt nine faculty members is a lot to send to Bloomington, if all they are going to do is talk about something one man can report. Professor Bogar responded that he did not receive an agenda on this meeting. Professor Langsam felt Tuesday afternoon was a strange time for a meeting and asked if that would continue to be the meeting day. She thought most faculty have 5:30 p.m. classes or morning classes and are cut out of trying to attend the meeting. Chancellor Hine commented that the ratio of 9 to 13 was very good, considering Bloomington has more full-time equivalent faculty than IUPUI. If we do not send representatives down, we would be in no position to tell them we do not like a Tuesday meeting day. He urged Council to think carefully before deciding not to send a representative. He thought it wise to send a representative for planning purposes and if later the Council decides that the plans developing are not what is wanted, we would be in a better position.

Motion to Send Representative

Professor Meiere moved to elect one member of the Faculty Council to represent us in this interim period and that he be instructed to inform the people in Bloomington that the Faculty Council is inclined to withdraw unless some system evolves which has equal representation for the various campuses of IUPUI. Professor Levitt seconded. Professor White thought we ought to provide for at least one alternate. He suggested that Professor Meiere add this to his motion. Professor Meiere, with permission of his seconder, Professor Levitt, moved for the election of one representative and one alternate. Professor Nagy asked what the purpose of this representative would be--to merely report back to the Council or to engage in negotiation with representatives from Bloomington. Professor Meiere, in his opinion, felt the representative would represent our point of view in Bloomington and report back to us.

All University Committees

Professor Byrne indicated that at this Tuesday meeting, on the agenda is the election of new members to various committees of the All-University Faculty Council. There are five new nominees from IUPUI, along with others who are already active members of various committees. However precise the motion may appear, there are many individuals already involved with that organization in and through its committees and there is a possibility of one to five additional people being added. Chancellor Hine added that in this transition period no one knows just exactly what the All-University Faculty Council is going to do, but he was sure it would consider problems which have state-wide implications. He

assumed many IUPUI faculty members will want to be involved in these committees, whether the Faculty Council officially wants to be represented there or not. Professor Alton asked if our two representatives would have nine votes. Chancellor Hine assumed not.

Term of Representation

Vice Chancellor Buhner asked if we would send these representatives for just one time, or would it be for permanent representation on the Council. He was not clear from the working of the motion. Professor Meiere said the motion was to serve for the interim period. Professor Bogar replied the interim period is until April 1, 1972. Professor Levitt said as he understood the motion, it is simply to provide a person who would have certain kinds of duties. The term or length of time he did not feel was relevant at this point. We might decide to discontinue the services of this particular individual at our next meeting or to decide this person should go on until April. Professor Kelso said he assumed the representative could report back at the next Council meeting if the kinds of things they are talking about make it sensible to have a representative of each major unit of IUPUI. He assumed this person could be relied upon to inform us about this.

Purpose of Full Representation

Professor White thought Council ought to consider that by sending one representative, we would have one vote; whereas we are entitled to nine people and nine votes. Vice Chancellor Buhner felt we would make a serious error to send only one or two, or any number less than nine, unless it was really understood that this was just for next week's meeting. Miss Weber was concerned that since we do not know what is going to go on in this meeting, it could be a decision making meeting. Now we have the possibility of nine voices and it looks like we are throwing them away. She felt if we have nine votes, we should use those nine votes. Miss Langsam felt the purpose of an All-University Council is that it reflects not the nine voices of people, but the constituency those nine represent. Professor Meiere said as he judged the sentiment of the Council at the last meeting, we were hoping for the development of some organization that had a small number of people on the Council, with each person carrying the weight of his home institution. The intent of his motion was to indicate we want to participate in something with a small number of people, with equal representation. Professor Byrne felt we are using the number nine, when actually it is 11, because of the one student representative and the Chancellor is an ex officio member. The regional campuses are simply three members--one administrator, one student and one faculty. He added he had on several occasions tried to convey there are a lot of very important questions floating around Bloomington. One is that there be a system-wide school of environmental and public affairs. Another is the question of tenure.

Professor Norins added he thought it has been a sham the way the Council has worked in Bloomington for the last number of years and by continuing to participate, we continue the sham. He preferred that we let this be known, even if only at one meeting. He felt we would not lose out in any drastic decisions by showing our feeling. Professor Merritt said it was his understanding, after listening to discussion, we now have an All-University Faculty Council until the interim council comes up with a recommendation. The All-University Faculty Council has decided that representation be different this year, assigning nine to IUPUI and 13 to Bloomington. That is going to function until the recommendations of the All-University Council committee comes to a vote by the faculty.

Professor Merritt continued and said that in essence we have nine places this year and that is this year's faculty council, and that decision has already been made. The thing we are interested in is the representation in the ultimate All-University Council, not the interim body that is functioning until next April. Chancellor Hine replied that until the Faculty Council constitution is approved, we are in an interim situation.

Chancellor Hine called for the question. The motion that the Faculty Council elect one individual and one alternate to attend Faculty Council meeting in Bloomington for the All-University Council was voted on. The vote: 18 ayes; 16 nays; motion carried.

Election of Representative to All-University Council

Professor Kelso nominated Professor White for the position. Professor Meiere nominated Professor Norins. Professor Nagy nominated Professor Byrne. Professor White was elected as the representative, with Professor Byrne as alternate. Professor Weber asked about sending along proxy votes with the representative. Professor Langsam felt that the suggestion was contrary to the general feeling of the group here. The whole idea of sending one, not nine, is that we do not want to participate. If we give one person nine votes, then we are participating. She felt developing a proxy would be contrary to the motion.

Motion

Professor Kelso moved the Faculty Council authorize Professor White to exercise as many votes as he can cast. Professor Weber seconded. The vote on the motion: 13 ayes; 10 nays; motion carried.

The Council then convened into Executive Session.

After reconvening the Council into open session, Chancellor Hine excused himself from the meeting and Vice Chancellor Ryder took the chair. Professor Bogar continued discussion under Agenda Committee Business.

Study of Wage Price Freeze

Professor Bogar said regarding the wage price freeze, it is the opinion of the Agenda Committee that there has been one significant omission in the counsel and advice that IU has received from various universities, from legal counsel, and various professional societies. That significant omission has been the faculty of IU. Therefore, the Agenda Committee is charging the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council to make a report, due at our next meeting in October, in terms of a report on whether or not the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends complete concurrence with the wage price freeze as interpreted by the administration, or whether it recommends some non-concurrence of the wage price freeze, or if it recommends any further action beyond any specific verbal or written communication with the administration. There are several faculty that are looking at the wage price freeze and its interpretation here at IU. We have read in the newspaper where several people from the Law School feel perhaps the letter of the law was not interpreted correctly. There is also the spirit involved in the interpretation by President Ryan and the principle of faculty input into decisions and interpretations of vaguely worded statutes. He asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to try to coordinate their efforts with similar efforts which are occurring

in the School of Law. Professor Bogar added that he had received communication from one regional campus that they too are in the same process. Vice Chancellor Ryder informed the Council that the 38th St. Faculty Assembly passed a resolution in support of the resolution relative to the wage price freeze submitted by the faculty of the IUPUI Law School and presented to President Ryan on September 10. That assembly supports in particular paragraph 5 of the resolution, which urges fuller disclosure of presentation of the University before the Cost of Living Council, and in addition, representatives of the faculty being appointed to act as full participants in the proceedings for the Cost of Living Council. Copies of this resolution are in the process of being sent to the Chancellor and the Faculty Council. Professor Bogar informed Council that President Ryan, at dedication day of the Downtown Campus, received a communication from several members of the School of Law. He added he had not seen this communication, nor had it been circulated to the Council or general faculty. Vice Chancellor Ryder said there had been more than one communication sent to President Ryan from people in the Law School. One was signed by Law School faculty and deans. There were additional individuals who had sent in comments. He wanted to be sure we were talking about the same thing. Professor Bogar asked if there were two documents. Professor White informed us there had been three documents--a letter from Professor Harvey, one from Professor Beaver, and a statement of faculty and deans. Professor Bogar urged anyone with particular notions about the interpretation of the wage freeze for IU employees to contact Professor Bixler.

Professor Meiere said the Faculty Affairs Committee had lost one of its members and asked for an additional person to be added. Professor Wagener said he would see someone was appointed as soon as possible. Professor Bogar said that the local chapter of AAUP is discussing the wage price freeze and the Faculty Affairs Committee might want to coordinate and study with them. Professor Max at the 38th St. Campus is president of that organization.

New Council Members

Professor Wisner spoke next for the Election-Apportionment committee. He said that last spring that this committee held an election and elected members for representatives at-large. At that time alternates were listed, to step in in case they were needed. Now they are needed. Professor Nevill has been named Acting Dean of the 38th St. Campus and, as such, according to the Constitution, should take his place on the Council. Professor Wisner was named Assistant to the Dean and he must, according to the constitution, step down. Therefore, Professor Nevill will take his place on Council and the at-large alternate is Peter Sehlinger to replace Professor Wisner. In order to keep the balance of four faculty to the ex officio, we need four more elected faculty. Professor Bogar said that since July 1, there are two other academic heads appointed. One is for the Division of Education and the other the Division of Business. The constitution reads "The Faculty Council shall be composed of elected and ex officio members, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, and the academic head of each unit shall be an ex officio voting member. Additional ex officio voting members may be proposed to the Council for approval.' One other point relevant is that whenever a new unit or school is established, and certified by the Chancellor to the Council, the new unit shall be entitled to representation in the Council in the same manner as other elected units.

One problem is we do not at this time have any method for electing unit representatives for the School of Education and School of Business. Prior to this time they were lumped into the Downtown Campus. Professor Merritt said they must also come up with a constitution. Vice Chancellor Ryder suggested to table the motion until next meeting, at which time we could have a full dress discussion and action. Professor Merritt thought it was the intent of the constitution that this should occur at the next election, not every time this happens throughout the year. Vice Chancellor Ryder added he thought there was a ruling by the parliamentarian at one time that someone who became an administrator could fill out the rest of the year until the next election. Professor Kelso moved to table the motion on the floor. The motion was seconded and carried.

Professor Bogar said he would defer other items listed under Agenda Committee Business until the October meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

BB:mn

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
October 14, 1971
Roof Lounge, Student Union Building

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Irwin, Lohse, Nevill, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Professors Bixler, Bogar, Byrne, Cutshall, Fleener, Galanti, Gifford, Grossman, Jarboe, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Levitt, Marks, Meiere, Merritt, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, Nunn, O'Loughlin, Schreiber, Wagener, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Holmquist, Lawrence, McDonald; Professors Ashmore, Alton, Beall, Behnke, Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Higgins, Hutton, Johnston, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Ochs, Ross, Sagraves, Weber.

Visitors: Professors Archer, Casebeer, Harris, Rhome.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of September 16, 1971.
2. Report of Committee on Committees
3. Resolution on Summer Schedule
4. Report of Academic Affairs Committee (Subcommittee on Undergraduate Structure)
5. Report of Faculty Affairs Committee
6. Presiding Officer's Business
7. Agenda Committee Business
 1. Approval of By-Laws, 1971-72
 2. Election to All-University Council
8. New Business

Chancellor Hine called the October 14, 1971 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes

Chancellor Hine asked for approval of the minutes of the September 16, 1971 meeting. Professor Byrne commented that on Document #1, attached to the minutes, there were two members listed who have a change in rank and this was not indicated. Dean Lohse pointed out that Professor Schreiber's academic rank was also listed incorrectly. The Chancellor asked the Secretary to make a note of this. Professor Langsam moved to accept the minutes as corrected and Professor Byrne seconded. The motion carried.

Amend Agenda

Professor Meiere asked to amend the agenda for the meeting to add a new item of business. He moved to insert, between items 2 and 3 on the agenda, the consideration of a resolution passed by the 38th St. Assembly on the summer session calendar. Professor Cutshall seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Report of Committee on Committees

Professor Wagener distributed a copy of a report from the Committee on Committees recommending the committee appointments for 1971-72. He said there were two committees not listed yet, that of the Athletic Affairs Committee and the Resources and Planning Committee. He added that his committee was very much aware of a problem that has existed since the Council started, and that is the question of student representation on committees. Therefore, at the committee's last meeting, they decided that Faculty Council committees should have student representation. They also felt that the individual committees should be charged with the task of obtaining the student membership as seems best for their particular area of concern. They further recommended that the chairman of each committee forward, not later than December 1, the names of the students on each committee. If the Committee on Committees does not receive these student names by December 1, they will place the student representatives as they deem necessary. Professor Wagener moved that his slate of committees be approved and implemented. Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Jarboe asked what the (n) referred to on his typewritten report. Professor Wagener replied it means a new member and the asterisk means a member of the Faculty Council. Professor Casebeer pointed out an error in the committee report for it listed him as a member of the Council. It was also pointed out that Frances Rhome was listed as a Council member. Professor Wagener said his committee was working under the supposition that there were four additional members placed on the Council at its last meeting, and that Professors Casebeer and Rhome were to be two of these four. Chancellor Hine asked if this would make a difference in distribution. Professor Wagener replied it would not change it that much, but they did try to maintain a one-third grouping of Faculty Council members on each committee. The motion to approve and implement the report was carried.

Student Representation on Council Committees

Professor Wagener moved that the placement of student representatives be approved and implemented. Dean Taylor asked if any attention was given to the criteria by which students would be chosen by the particular committees. Professor Wagener

felt that the individual committees would probably be best for they know their area of concern and they also know, in most cases, those individuals who could supply them best with names of students. He added one problem is that many of our student bodies are not that active and we have a difficult time getting nominations back from them in any formal way. He supposed if the committee would care to utilize that system of going to the student assembly, that would be perfectly acceptable. But basically, the Committee on Committees is placing the burden of selecting student representatives on each committee. Professor White indicated that the Student Affairs Committee had asked the Dean for Student Services to write the president of each of the student organizations of each of the campuses and from that they would draw names. They received only two responses from the campuses, so he did feel there is a bit of built-in lethargy. Chancellor Hine felt it was important to find representative students by contacting student councils, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Deans, or any other techniques, rather than depending upon individual knowledge. He expressed concern that we have students on the committees who are representative and interested. Professor Langsam felt that when we have 6,000 students, there is no such thing as a representative student. The student councils are elected by less than 7% of the student body and that is not very representative. Chancellor Hine added he was eager to get students to work on committees and hoped it would be on the basis that would give student input true meaning. He asked for the vote of those in favor of having students on the standing committees. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Committee Chairmen

Professor Levitt asked how the committee chairmen are designated. Professor Wagener replied that many of these committees have already met and have elected their chairmen. Professor Langsam informed Professor Wagener that the Metropolitan Affairs Committee had not met and suggested he ask one of its members to call the first meeting of that committee. Professor Wagener asked Professor Levitt to call the first meeting of the Metropolitan Affairs Committee.

Resolution on Summer Schedule

Professor Cutshall handed out copies of Document 71-72-7, a resolution from the 38th St. Assembly and moved this document be approved. Professor Kelso seconded. Professor Kinzer felt that if 38th St. finds an eight week session acceptable to their academic needs, it could be adopted and adhered to at the 38th St. Campus, within the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee, without requiring the Downtown Campus to go on an eight week session. In other words, there can be two six-week sessions, an eight-week session, a three-week session, a five-week session, a seven-week session--all going, as long as they remain within the beginning and ending dates. Chancellor Hine thought, as he remembered it, the summer schedule was left flexible, as long as people ended and began at the same time. What happened in between was up to the individual units. Professor Langsam felt the problem here might be implementation. She felt we might investigate how an individual unit proceeds to get on an eight-week session. Professor Byrne stated he did not favor the resolution as presently worded for he found it ambiguous. It seems to suggest we go on the record of being in favor of a "single eight-week session," rather than the two six-week sessions which is the position we did adopt.

Administrative Decision

Professor Cutshall said the Chemistry Department had a staff meeting to determine summer offerings and a number of people suggested eight week courses, according to the IUPUI calendar as presented by the Academic Affairs Committee. But the word came back that they could not do this and they would have two six-week sessions. They were to arrange their courses accordingly, except for some very special cases where one course would be condensed into an eight week summer session for a full year of organic chemistry. But for any one semester course, they were not given that permission. Therefore, they felt the spirit of the document was not being followed. They are perfectly content with the idea of two six-week sessions as long as the eight week session is also followed. Professor Langsam asked who the 'word' was from. Professor Cutshall replied he got the word from his chairman and that word was from an administrative decision higher up. Chancellor Hine asked Vice Chancellor Buhner to comment on this. Vice Chancellor Buhner felt it was true we have attempted to take literally the two six-weeks calendar. He felt he has always been clear that where it is literally impossible, as the case in the resolution, to encompass the minimum requirements for the course in a six-week term, an exception would be made.

Registration Problems in Summer

Vice Chancellor Buhner said one thing that has to be taken into account is the pattern of registration enrollment. We hope to be on an automated registration system next year. We are on a manual system now and there is simply a practical limit to the amount of registration and enrollment our staff in registration can handle. If we have summer programs starting up at all times during the summer, we will run into impossible physical, mechanical situations. We simply will not be able to service ourselves in terms of simple record keeping. He added that John Williams, Registrar, is very willing to accommodate as much flexibility as possible to varying types of enrollment, but he simply cannot promise to 'deliver the goods' if we have a protracting enrollment period. Mr. Williams has recommended we have two main enrollment periods, one in the beginning of the first six-week period. During this registration period, people would register for the first six weeks, the second six weeks, and for any other terms being planned for the interim. Then there would be a second registration, but not as major as the first enrollment. This would be at the start of the second six weeks. We must remember, though, that as soon as we complete the second registration, we immediately go into registration for the fall term.

Program Development

He added he has taken the position that we must not permit any kind of special scheduling be disruptive of the total program. We urgently need every student and every student here needs us. He had to take the position in order to have some conformity, and not have chaos, because he did get many, many different kinds of recommendations, and finally decided that the compromise was the policy adopted to stick with the original six-weeks period. He again repeated he was anxious to accommodate to the obvious special cases. He added he thought we would make a serious error if we back off the two six-week schedule for summer. He admitted that there are difficulties, but we must increase our productivity, must provide more opportunities for students, and must expand our program. This summer we will not be able to expand our program because it is not in the budget, but

experience with a split two six-weeks schedule this summer will give us the experience we need. Vice Chancellor Buhner went on to say he has put the question of the two six-weeks schedule to people in student affairs and has asked them to be alert to student reactions. He could not report accurately at this point, but he was told by those in student affairs that students like the pattern basically of two six-weeks format. They like it because it offers them a heightened opportunity for getting more courses. A hard working student can get close to 15 hours out of his summer schedule. They look on this as an opportunity. Many housewives and mothers have told him how bad this schedule is, particularly because it does things to their summer vacations. But the fact remains, there is a net gain of two weeks for everyone on the 10 month pay. There also is a gain of two weeks vacation time. You get two weeks more in summer on the six-week pattern, assuming you teach a full load in one of the six week sessions. The policy now forbids you to teach more than the equivalent of a full load over both sessions. You also get a very solid period of time off between the winter term and the spring term. In concluding, Vice Chancellor Buhner suggested that the Council permit the administration an opportunity to work with those who feel that, on the record, they can show that the six-week period is not educationally feasible. They will make every effort to adjust to that and he made further assurance that if they cannot adjust the total program in terms of the special cases, he would go to a one eight-week session. He would like a little more time to see if we cannot accommodate the educational needs of those, who say with reason, that six weeks is not feasible.

Availability of Students

Professor Jarboe disagreed with three assumptions made in the resolution. He felt experience has shown that science courses can be taught in six weeks. There is also no evidence that students do that much homework between classes. This is an assumption that he felt was not valid. Another assumption is that students will not take a daily class. He has taught students daily classes for an hour and a half session in summer school. The assumption that a majority of students coming from outside will not be available for the first six weeks of summer is also false. He thought that over one-third of the summer students are in education and he is counting on at least as many students this summer, if not more, than last summer.

Departmental Option

Professor Meiere said it has been stated publicly by chairmen of at least two departments at 38th St. that they have to curtail their programs by cancelling summer classes in the higher contact hour courses. He proposed we go along as we are now, but institute an eight week session, starting as the calendar says on June 20, two weeks before the second six-week session, and to let that be utilized by departments at the election of departments rather than at the election of a unit. Professor Langsam felt that along with that, since at the first major registration students might register for the second six weeks, they could also have registration for the eight week classes. It, therefore, would not require more staff at registration.

Motion to Refer to Academic Affairs Committee

Professor Kelso suggested that in view of Vice Chancellor Buhner's statement that the administration would be happy to consider this on a case by case basis, it seemed to him better to set aside this as something to be monitored by the

Academic Affairs Committee and allow individual negotiation to go on. He did not feel the Council had enough data on this to make a basic decision. Therefore, he moved that the Council refer this resolution to the Academic Affairs Committee with a concept in mind that will allow reasonable time for negotiations and discussions to take place. If that does not produce a satisfactory resolution, there will be a body that those who are unhappy may go to and they can talk about it in a context of specifics and report back to the Council. Professor Kinzer replied that it was part of the original Academic Affairs Committee resolution, adopted last year, that they continue to serve this function. He felt that rather than submitting opinions to the Academic Affairs Committee as to the inadvisability and impracticality of taking a 15 week course, squeezing it into an eight week course, and then saying it is impossible to squeeze the same course into six, that someone supply some factual information as to what students do in summer. We do not know what our student body will or will not do. For this reason he thought we ought to engage in some experimentation.

Summer Schedule Deadline

Professor Meiere asked what the cutoff date would be which would make it physically impossible to make any changes in the calendar. Vice Chancellor Buhner said we were under some pressure from Bloomington and Lafayette to say what our summer calendar is to be. We already have certified the two six-week calendar in broad detail, not specifics. There are no classes scheduled. He added he thought the summer schedule should be in within the month of October. He felt we would have time for adjustment, negotiation, and to make a determination of whether or not we will make the two six-week schedules work. Again he stated he was just as concerned as everyone that educationally this summer program be defensible and he would be as quick as anyone to abandon the two six-week schedule if not feasible. He added he meets regularly with the undergraduate deans of the entire campus. He has put the question several different times to show him that a combination of an eight and two six-weeks calendar that was not carefully controlled, would not be disruptive. He thought this is the question he must keep asking. He is not the final arbitrator--the faculty sets the calendar. But he does feel it is not in the interest of the original calendar to go into a kind of experimentation for summer that has not been carefully examined as to how it will best serve both our interest as teachers and the interest of students.

Student Reaction

Professor Langsam thought there might be some way of getting some useful information. An example was given that an aggressive, interested student might take 15 hours during the summer. Her feeling was that even our brightest students are hard put to take more than eight hours during the summer and then go on for a full program for another whole year. Perhaps after checking through records we could get some idea of how many hours students normally take during the summer. She added that in Bloomington, with pre-and postsession, you have close to the same kind of time span. She did not feel students are going to take that many hours. Professor Kinzer said also, in utilizing a twelve week summer of two six-weeks each, a 15 week course in a regular year could be moved into a twelve week pattern with half of it in each session, or on a one and a half credit basis.

Motion to Amend

Professor Meiere thought that Professor Kelso's motion would be rather disruptive for the coming summer and moved to amend the motion to say that we request the IUPUI Faculty Council to institute an eight weeks summer session to begin on June 20 and for this to be utilized at the department's discretion. Professor Langsam seconded the motion. Vice Chancellor Ryder said if we put a date of June 20 on it, then it will deal just with this summer. He added it seemed to him that when you give this discretion to a department to determine on its own how it is going to function in relationship to all the rest of the University, this is not appropriate. It seemed to him that the department head, Dean, and Dean of Faculties need to consider the academic problem of teaching a particular course over that period of time, as well as the interrelationship with other programs. He added, when the two six-weeks session was adopted, he pointed out that we were going to have problems of articulation, if we assumed that anybody could have it any way they wanted to. Medicine could have any session they wanted to, along with Dentistry, Law and Nursing. However, when you get the 38th St. and Downtown Campuses involved, these are integrated programs and you cannot separate them on the same basis that you would other distinct units.

Motion to Table

Professor Byrne then asked to move that the motion and amendments be tabled until the next meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council. Professor Kelso seconded. The motion passed 24 - 7, with one abstaining. Professor Byrne asked the record to show that he is in no way opposed or unsympathetic with the concerns expressed by the 38th St. representatives. He felt, however, he was not in a position to make an informed judgment on what are the capabilities of the University or this Council to resolve what has become an extremely complicated question. He expressed hope for a more informed presentation of where we are at a month from now so we might be able to do something.

Report of Academic Affairs Committee

Professor Kinzer reported the Report on Undergraduate Structure was approved by the Academic Affairs Committee and was now being presented to the Council. (This report will be attached to a notice of a special meeting to be held November 30, 1971.) His committee recommends that this Council consider seriously what actions it might take and what should be recommended. The report is a result of practically a full year's series of meetings, investigations and discussions conducted by the Academic Affairs Committee, not only on undergraduate structure, but graduate. The Academic Affairs Committee has designated two subcommittees, one for undergraduate and one for graduate structure. He added he hopes to have the graduate report ready for submission to the Council at the November meeting. His committee sought three objectives in the two reports on academic structure: (1) that the faculty have continuous monitoring responsibility in both undergraduate and graduate affairs at the broadest policy level; (2) that the faculty be responsible for academic decisions at all points; and (3) that the desired end of our proposal is for autonomy (that is local responsibility, decision making, in the city of Indianapolis) as quickly as possible in all academic areas. In achieving the last of these they have thought to use the concept of a peer decision and responsibility. They recommend that in discussing this in the way it might apply that one think of the individual faculty member who might be on a committee here in the city, or a

faculty group in the city of Indianapolis, as peer of another faculty member or faculty group, if both of them have an equal degree of autonomy to make decisions here without reporting to either of the parent campuses. If they do not have this degree of freedom, it seems to him in this context they are not peers. Professor Kinzer next introduced Professor Casebeer, who was chairman of the undergraduate subcommittee. Professor Bogar asked about the minority report that was to be appended to the report. Professor Casebeer replied that the minority report consisted of a letter from Professor Friedman of the History Department of the Downtown Campus and another letter from Professor Cutshall of the Chemistry Department of the 38th St. Campus. These letters should be appended. Otherwise, there is no other minority report and the silence of the members who were not present at their last meeting signifies that they accept the document along with the rest of the committee.

Background of Report

Professor Casebeer continued and said he wanted to give a brief background on this report. During the whole academic year last year his committee was in weekly session. His committee first started out with people from the Downtown Campus Assembly, who were to revise the constitution for that campus. They proposed to the Faculty Assembly to only set up an interim constitution, which they did, and which was accepted unanimously. They set up communications with other undergraduate units of IUPUI to set up an overarching undergraduate government to represent special and unique interests of the undergraduate faculty. In November, the 38th St. Campus joined the group. Their group was interested in structure, not government. The report now presented to Council is that joint committee's proposal on structure. There is another proposal on government which has been distributed to every full-time and part-time faculty member on the campus as of last May. Then, as a result of a meeting held by Vice Chancellor Buhner, at which there were a number of administrators and faculty members, members from Herron School of Art and Normal College joined the committee. Subsequently, they were then appointed by the Academic Affairs Committee as its Subcommittee on Undergraduate Structure.

Ideal vs Compromise Structure

Professor Casebeer said his report represents a possible structure--a compromise structure--and is the only point at which his committee could arrive at agreement. Only with disagreement on many issues of the structure did his committee arrive at the compromise. There was, among the members attending the last meeting, unanimous acceptance of the policy statement attached on page 4 of his report. The statement was made in the last committee meeting by several of the members in attendance that they did not believe that the structure proposal that was made was at all operable unless this policy statement was accepted. It is vitally connected to the structure proposal. Otherwise there would be imbalances that would make it very difficult to achieve their objectives.

Faculty Representation

The functions and relationships of faculty-school-department was of interest to his committee. Their central concern was what has been described, on page 1 of the report, as the Faculty of Human Affairs, and on page 2, the Faculty of Science and Technology. He explained, as on page 3, they had no representation from the faculty of what they have called the Faculty of Health Affairs and the

Motion to Accept Report

Professor Neel moved to accept the document and to place it on the agenda for the next meeting. Dean Lohse seconded.

Motion to Amend, Adding a Special Meeting

Professor Langsam moved to amend the motion by moving for a special meeting of Council to consider this, where not only the full Faculty Council might be in attendance, but that other members of various groups with interest could attend and offer their ideas. Professor Wagener seconded. Professor Kelso thought there are always things that seem more important than others, and if we start having special meetings for one thing, then everyone will want special meetings. He said he was opposed to the amendment. Professor Casebeer replied that he felt this document is rather important, particularly since it involves about 10,000 students and many faculty. Professor Merritt said he could see no reason why this document could not be a major point of business at the next Council meeting. We could invite outside people to attend that meeting also. Professor Nagy suggested asking the Agenda Committee to clear the agenda for next month. Professor Bogar replied that he would have to defer some items on the agenda of this meeting until the next month.

Vote on Amended Motion

Chancellor Hine asked for a vote on the amendment to have a special meeting to discuss the document. Motion carried. Chancellor Hine said that since no one had stated when this special meeting would be, he assumed the Agenda Committee would take care of this.

All University Council

Professor Bogar said everyone would recall that it was the wish at our last meeting to send one representative to the All-University Council to express our view of non-participation in the All-University Council as it was then proposed. However, the Agenda Committee looked again at that position and a summary of their position is stated in a memo that Council members received by mail. We do need to send nine people down to the All-University Council to represent our interest during this interim period and to present the proposition that the permanent All-University Council be based upon equality of representation rather than based upon the proportion of faculty at each campus. He next handed out a ballot with nominations for election to the All-University Council. Professor Byrne said he found this ballot unacceptable, for all members nominated were male. He nominated Miriam Langsam, Elaine Alton and Helen Weber to be added to the list. Professor Langsam declined nomination. Professor White said we must vote on these people at this meeting because the next meeting will be Tuesday, October 19. Professor Fleener nominated Frances Rhome. The Council added the names of Frances Rhome, Elaine Alton and Helen Weber to the ballot. Elected were Professors James White, Arthur Norins, Bernerd Bogar, Bruce Wagener, Paul Galanti, Paul Nagy, Edmund Byrne, Frances Rhome and James Carter.

(Secretary's Note: Professor Nagy later found that the meetings of the All-University Council were in conflict with his class schedule. Professor Victor Hackney was next in order of votes and agreed to serve on the delegation.)

Membership

Professor Bogar asked to clear up confusion about membership. At the last meeting of Council, Professor Wisner raised three points about the membership of the Council. The first had to do with the appointment of a new Dean of an existing academic unit, Dean Nevill. Our parliamentarian has ruled that based on precedence when a new dean assumes a position of an existing academic unit, he will take his place on the Council at that time. He informed Dean Nevill of this fact. The second item had to do with Howard Wisner assuming administrative duties. The precedent for that occurred when Miles Standish became Assistant Dean while serving on the Council. It was the ruling at that time that he would serve out the year on the Council. Therefore, Professor Wisner will serve to the end of this year. The third item had to do with if an additional dean is added, does the Council have to be reapportioned in terms of adding four elected faculty positions. Our precedent on that was that elected positions are only added at election time and not during the Council year. Therefore, although Mr. Wisner did mention who those four people would have been, the motion was tabled until we could look at these particular items. There will be no additional elected representatives placed on the Council until the next election. Professor Bogar apologized to anyone who was informed differently.

By-Laws

Professor Bogar distributed copies of the By-Laws for 1971-72 and said the only change concerns Item 8. Item 8 concerns the election or appointment of the Committee on Committees by the Agenda Committee. In the old By-Laws the Committee on Committees was elected by the Faculty Council. The problem here is of timing and of getting the Council going. It is the Committee on Committees which must get together all of the Council committees, appoint them, readjust for new faculty people, and he felt that taking a meeting to first elect or nominate a Committee on Committees would postpone for at least a month or more on the formation of our committees. With this recommended change, the Agenda Committee could appoint the Committee on Committees the prior summer, in order for them to begin work immediately in the fall. Professor Levitt moved to postpone consideration of the By-Laws until the next meeting. He had a number of comments to make and thought other people might also. Professor Cutshall seconded the motion. The vote was taken and the motion passed 12 - 7.

Student Representation on All-University Council.

Professor White added that we have a student representative on the interim All-University Faculty Council. That student is Michael Cavanaugh of the 38th St. Campus and his alternate is Ross Stovall of the Law School.

Report of Faculty Affairs Committee

Professor Bixler reported that last March his committee was asked to extend their activities to study the uniform promotions area and report back to the Council. He said this has opened a Pandora's box of problems and it looks like they will not come to a resolution of this problem for some time. Therefore, he will report on this later.

Wage Price Freeze

The principle report Professor Bixler wanted to make to the Council was a result of a direction given them by the Agenda Committee. His committee was asked to specifically do three things: (1) determine whether or not there is faculty concurrence with the wage price freeze as interpreted by the administration; (2) whether they recommend any specific actions; (3) to coordinate their activities with other related activities on the campus. He said their approach to this problem has been one of interviews, discussions, informal committee meetings, and meetings on a private basis. They are also in the process of surveying the faculty at the present time in attempting to determine some of the perimeters that may be involved in any proposed or obvious inequities. Some of the questions they are asking regard part-time status, 10 month versus 12 month appointments; 10 month and 12 month payment installments, and the question of option available for 10 and 12 months. He added he would not report their results now because they are not complete. But as a result of their activities up to this stage, they feel they are in a position to answer some questions posed to them by the Agenda Committee. In regard to question #1, whether there is faculty concurrence to the wage price freeze as interpreted by the administration, there is not faculty concurrence. In regard to point #2, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends to the Council that they approve a resolution. He added that the reason he feels that some action is appropriate at this time, even though their initial thrust has not been completed and they have not completed all their efforts, is because they have discovered that the nature of the problem seems to be one of communication problems between faculty and administration. Therefore, something should be done quickly and they feel that the creation of a committee, as proposed in the resolution, will satisfy that problem of communication. He next moved for the adoption of the resolution (Document #3, attached). Professor Byrne seconded. Professor White suggested that in the first "be it resolved" the word should be "recommend" instead of "approve." Professor Bixler agreed. He said that under Item #2, the word "regional" should be omitted, as they do not wish to be selective in any way. Vice Chancellor Buhner suggested that in the final "resolve" it should read " . . . the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors of IUPUI, and the Chancellors and Faculty Council of each of the various campuses" It might be well, he thought, to communicate to the head of each campus as well as to the Faculty Councils. Professor Archer from the Law School said he wholeheartedly supported this resolution. He had a meeting with Dean Hartley on all the aspects of the wage price freeze and asked him if he would consider creating a committee similar to the committee mentioned in the resolution. The response he received from Associate Dean Webb was that his office would make no initiative to create this type of committee, the reason being their office has been working through the Chancellor. So, until the All-University Faculty Council creates such a mechanism, they would continue to work through the Chancellor. So Prof. Archer felt if this resolution was sent to the All University Council, they might create such a committee.

Motion to Accept Resolution

The motion to accept the resolution was voted on and carried. Professor Bogar said he would contact the Secretary of the All-University Council to see if this resolution could be placed on the agenda for its next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
November 11, 1971
38th St. Auditorium

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Irwin, Lohse, McDonald, Nevill, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Professors Alton, Beall, Bogar, Byrne, Cutshall, Galanti, Gifford, Hutton, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Levitt, Marks, Meiere, Merritt, Neel, Norins, O'Loughlin, Ross, Schreiber, Wagener, Weber, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Foust, Holmquist, Lawrence; Professors Ashmore, Bixler, Behnke, Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Grossman, Higgins, Jarboe, Johnston, Langsam, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Nagy, Navarre, Nunn, Ochs, Sagraves, Fleener.

Visitors: Professors Bynum, Duerden, Levinson, Harris, Judy.

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of October 14, 1971.
2. Proposal for College of General Studies (Buhner).
3. Report of Academic Affairs Committee on Summer Calendar, 1972 (Kinzer).
4. Presiding Officer's Business
5. Agenda Committee Business:
 - a. Approval of By-Laws, 1972.
 - b. Report on All-University Council Meeting, October 19, 1971.
 - c. Announcement of Special Meeting of Council and General Meeting of Faculty.
6. New Business.

Chancellor Hine called the November 11, 1971 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of October 14, 1971 were corrected to show that Dean Nevill proposed approval of the Resolution on Summer Schedules (page 2).

Proposal for a College of General Studies

Vice Chancellor Buhner said that copies of this proposal had been distributed quite widely to the Chancellor, each of the Deans of the IUPUI academic units, the Secretary of the 38th St. Faculty Assembly, the Secretary of the Downtown Faculty Assembly, the faculty of Normal College, the faculty of Herron School of Art, the faculty of the Division of Allied Health Sciences, the undergraduate faculty of the School of Nursing, the Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council, and to the Educational Policies Curriculum and Development Committee. He felt that the faculty might wish to approve the concept of the School of General Studies. It provides a large number of opportunities, not only for the clientele that it is designed to serve, but it provides an opportunity for the existing schools, divisions and colleges, and those that are coming on ahead, to be considerably more independent in their work, to be free of the problem of mediocre preparatory compensatory education, and to devote themselves more exclusively to the disciplinary task at hand. He felt that the proposal is one that marks an opportunity for the faculty. Although the faculty itself cannot adopt the School, it can recommend it to the Chancellor and he in turn to the Board of Trustees. He added he recognized the funding is short and that this is not the time to mount massive new programs requiring large infusions of operating capital. Nevertheless, we can take existing resources, we can go to the General Assembly, and we can go to federal and other funding sources. He added that this represents a proposal that we simply cannot turn down. He did not feel it had to go through in exactly the same form in which he has presented it to the Council, but that the concept offers a rare opportunity in the future organizations of IUPUI.

Discussion

Dean Taylor asked if it was anticipated that any appropriate committee of the Council would react to this prior to action being taken by the Council. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied he did feel this proposal should have some input from this body, but it was not for him to refer it to a committee. Professor Kelso asked how Vice Chancellor Buhner saw the screening mechanism working at enrollment and registration time for one entering the existing programs of the Downtown Campus, 38th St. Campus, or some combination, and this program for General Studies. He asked if an incoming student does not know what he should take at IUPUI, if he belonged in the School for General Studies or in an existing program. Vice Chancellor Buhner said the proposal provides for the person who is uncertain and who does not know where he is going or presumably is not ready for entry into some professional or academic program as such. He is automatically in the School for General Studies by the terms of the proposal as it now stands. The person who is not ready for any level of college work, but by various diagnostic means can be shown to have potential, is in the School of General Studies. Professor Meiere asked if the Vice Chancellor was going to ask for

approval of the Council for this proposal. Vice Chancellor Buhner said he would like approval as soon as he can get it, for this has been in the works for over a year. At present it is very difficult to get this program started simply because he does not know where the money is going to come from. They can make some modest beginnings, but the sooner the Council endorses this proposal, the sooner they can start moving. Once it is approved, another group will have to go to work and to define it further before it can be taken to the Board of Trustees.

University Division

Professor Meiere felt there seemed to be some overlap between this program and the present existing University Division. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied there is no overlap because the University Division is absorbed into it, and serves as a kind of vestibule for the School for General Studies. The University Division as such will proceed to exist and its purposes, programs, and functions will be there in a much larger context. Professor Meiere asked how the School for General Studies would extend and interact with the freshman year programs now at the 38th St. Campus. Vice Chancellor Buhner responded that if one is talking about the engineering program, in which the freshman year is part of the academic organization, the student who meets the requirements for entry goes directly into that school. But if a student comes out of high school and clearly shows a potential for engineering, but does not have any background, he would go into the General Studies program until such time that engineering was willing to take him. He added that many people may think this is an open admission program, but he wanted to make it very clear that he does not regard the proposal as such. He regards it rather as opening the door wider to those who should go to college, and if it develops well, it will offer them more opportunities for development within college once they are there. Presumably it will cut down on the failure rate of those who should be in college. It is not intended for the person who should not be in college. He added these requirements are sophisticated mechanisms that are obviously not addressed in this proposal and that have to be developed as they design the school, implement it, staff it, develop its programs, and get them approved.

Continuing Education

Professor Wagener asked how Vice Chancellor Buhner saw the relationship between the School for General Studies and the continuing education program. He also asked him to define substantive programs. Vice Chancellor Buhner said substantive programs refers now to programs that are academically discrete, not necessarily preparatory, remedial or general. The DGTS programs are good examples. The Division of Technical Studies has a number of paraprofessional programs. He asked Mr. Bynum if he was using the right definition for substantive. Mr. Bynum felt a better example would be certificate programs. Vice Chancellor Buhner went on to say the language of the proposal might lead one to suppose that what is being proposed here is an absorption of what today exists as continuing education. He would be rather skeptical as to whether or not continuing education should be included in the purview of the School of General Studies. To the extent that continuing education means professional occupational retraining for people who have vocational careers being interrupted, then he would think that the School of General and Technical Studies should very much be involved in the concept of continuing education.

The College of General Studies and Substantive Programs

Professor Kinzer asked to return to the word "substantive," which is on Page 6 of the report. He read: "Substantive programs are those with defined curricular offerings that lead to a recognized degree or certificate." He felt the next sentence: "Many students will pursue these existing substantive programs which will be coordinated under the aegis of the School of General Studies," also bothered him. He thought the effect of that sentence is to make the entire institution a School of General Studies. Vice Chancellor Buhner responded that this was never the intention of his committee. This is a problem of language, and the School for General Studies is not intended to be the umbrella of the undergraduate area. Mr. Bynum said the language is a little confusing here, but it was not the intent of the committee to make it the total institution. He added six months have passed since the committee was in its active phases, and he personally has had some time to reflect on some of the things which have been done. He discovered that there could be points where some shifting could be done in one way or another and some total change of detail could happen. Professor Wisner said it was the intent of the committee that General Studies might develop programs, maybe associate, maybe baccalaureate programs, which would then be coordinated and carried out and these students would stay in it. It was not intended that it would cover any of the programs now existing. Vice Chancellor Buhner cited an example by saying if the beginning course in English was a prerequisite to a program, the person in General Studies would take that beginning course in the Department of English. Professor Kinzer still felt that the word substantive programs appears in three different successive sentences of the document, defined in the first sentence, given an umbrella fashion in the second sentence, and lastly stated that students will have access to some programs which are elsewhere. Vice Chancellor Buhner felt where it is important to the student's program that he take a course in another existing divisional ongoing substantive area, that he would have access to it. They were not saying, however, that the History Department or English Department is automatically captive. This involves the relationship--interdisciplinary, intercollegiate relationships--between the School of General Studies and whatever other substantive programs are involved.

Relation of School of General Studies and Other Schools

Professor Byrne said he was in general sympathy with the basic idea of a School of General Studies with many of the proposed programs that are in general referred to within the proposal. However, he felt that attention ought to be given to one of the greatest inadequacies of the committee that developed the proposal. It was in no way directly represented by any of the undergraduate faculty, and accordingly, those who would be most directly concerned with the relationship between the School of General Studies and other schools or divisions. He also read the document as suggesting or implying the policy of open admission. This may or may not be the intent, but the problem needs to be dealt with. On Page 4 of the document, we are informed under Number 5 that "students who do not meet the entrance requirements or retention standards of other schools should be admitted to the School of General Studies." Then when you turn to Page 6, and the context Professor Kinzer was referring to, one is left with the possibility that a student will be admitted. If this is not the intent, then there is obviously great need for clarification of just how the ongoing presently existing academic programs will or will not serve the needs of yet another school. A

further problem that arises in the same context, namely that of the relationship between the School of General Studies and academic baccalaureate degree granting programs, is whether or not the School of General Studies will or will not grant credit. He assumed that if we are talking about certificates and degrees, then we are talking about credit granting programs. Accordingly, we then are once faced with the problem of transfer from one school, namely the School of General Studies, to any of the number of schools or divisions. Therefore, it seemed to him the question of the relationship between the School of General Studies and other programs seems to need far more clarification. Chancellor Hine suggested the Council give some thought to what they would like to do with the report. Dean Nevill said the DGTS program could provide some guidelines. He added some of the problems that Professor Byrne had raised have already been solved within the IU complex. He felt Council should move in a general way to accept the proposal in principle and have some group seek its implementation pending adequate funds. Professor Neel seconded the motion.

Admissions Criteria

Professor Neel asked to raise an additional question about admission standards. He read the proposal as saying there are no admission standards of any kind. He thought these standards should be spelled out for there has to be some criteria as to whom they are going to admit. Vice Chancellor Buhner said these policies are spelled out in the document. He added it was not intended to be a general, uncategorical open admission program. It does open up the admissions, but it is not intended to be 100 percent open. Professor Norins said as he understood it, if a student does not matriculate in one of our other programs, then the General Studies program is the one he is in. Vice Chancellor Buhner said he did not want to leave it there with that particular description, but that this was true. Professor Meiere said he was in favor of exploratory nature of the programs, but was against the substantive programs if they lead to degrees. He felt it is inappropriate for the School of General Studies to grant undergraduate degrees at all. Professor Levitt asked if the report would be transmitted to some other committee to be worked over. He also asked for a clarification of the words "counseling and guidance." He said there is no such service at present available to students in general at the University, and there was some question in his mind as to whether the school would require such a special service of this nature. If there is to be such a service, he thought the structure of it might be worked out to provide something more up-to-date, more mildly innovative than the old "counseling and guidance." Mr. Bynum said in the University Division, counseling is the core of what they do. They provide entering freshmen, who are given basically exploratory type programs of the IU mission, with academic advice and counsel. This is basically their job. There is counseling being done now and they feel it is rather successful. He added the North Central Association visited recently and they commented about the apparent quality of counseling that went on at the freshman level. In this particular proposal, then, it was intended that counseling would continue in a very strong way throughout the School of General Studies. Professor Bogar said if the Council wished the document to be referred to a Faculty Council committee, it should go to the Academic Affairs Committee. He added that this is the second proposal we have which has to do with the basic revision of the structure of IUPUI. What concerned him is what kind of procedure we would want to evolve in order to handle these very important structural questions about the future of IUPUI. On November 30 there is to be a special

meeting to discuss the undergraduate curriculum proposal from a subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee. He added he would like to get together with the Agenda Committee and the administration to see where these proposals go from here and from other units. Chancellor Hine said he preferred to let the Council decide what they wished to do with the report. Obviously they cannot rewrite the document or settle all the questions at this time. He assumed referring it to a committee would be logical.

Motion to Refer

Professor Kelso moved that the Faculty Council refer this document to the Academic Affairs Committee, and in addition, request that committee to consider not only the desirability of bringing it back to the Faculty Council promptly, but the question of whether or not it would be appropriate to have this item discussed and included in the discussion on November 30. Professor Merritt seconded. Professor Kinzer asked if the document would be distributed to the general faculty, and if the proposal on undergraduate structure would be sent prior to the 30th meeting. Professor Bogar replied that the proposal for General Studies had been sent with the last set of minutes to all the IUPUI faculty, and the proposal on undergraduate structure would be sent out shortly. The motion that the proposal for a School for General Studies be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee to be considered along at the time of the special meeting of the Faculty Council on November 30 was voted on and the motion passed unanimously. Chancellor Hine added that this proposal will be looked at by the Commission on Higher Education, so it will have a long way to go before any implementation might be possible.

Report of Academic Affairs Committee on Summer Calendar

Professor Kinzer read a report from the Academic Affairs Committee (see Faculty Council Document #7, attached). Professor Kinzer moved for the adoption of the report and Professor Kelso seconded. Professor Levitt said the adoption of a report implies that any recommendations of action are moved and forwarded by the body. If there are no recommendations for action in a report, no motion is necessary, for the report is accepted when read. Now the motion made is calling for some action, the recommendation for action to refer to a committee. So, he asked to have those parts of the report spelled out. Professor Kinzer replied the question arose at the last Council meeting over the interpretation of the application of the self contained idea for particular courses or a particular combination of courses. They simply have in this case spelled out what was in their minds when they made the original recommendations. So in this sense it should be elucidation. The other is a recommendation that the decisions on matters of this kind be in the hands of deans and administrative officers, rather than the hands of the Council and the Academic Affairs Committee in the application. Chancellor Hine said he accepted the motion because he wanted to have this as a stated opinion of the Faculty Council. There are some policy matters that are being discussed in the report, as for example, they want to base the summer session on the credit hours whether it takes six, eight, or twelve weeks. This is something he felt deserved to be put in the record as the official action of the Council. Although it may not require an actual action, it is a policy matter that is being considered. Professor Levitt replied he simply wanted to make it clear that when the Council votes on this to accept it or not, in effect it is voting to accept any action or policy behind it. Chancellor Hine asked for the vote on the motion to accept the report. The motion carried unanimously.

Presiding Officer's Business

Chancellor Hine informed Council of the final official enrollment figures for this year. He said IUPUI now has an official total count of 16,580 students for this year. It represents a 13½ percent increase over last fall. The IU regional campuses throughout the state recorded a comparable increase of 10.2 percent and the Bloomington campus was up 1.2 percent. He added that in studying this, there is a trend for the higher proportion of full-time students, especially among undergraduates. The budget is a little different in terms of dollars. Our budgeted prediction for increase of student fee income was very close to what we received. The amount of income we have is very little more than we had estimated. He added he saw no great relief in our budget problems for 1972-73 because of increased income. We have more full-time students, but many more of our part-time students took fewer hours than last year. Vice Chancellor Ryder showed a graph that had been prepared showing the slope in terms of head count. By 1975 or 1976 we will be in the 25,000 count. He added it is interesting to note we have 6,120 full-time students in the undergraduate area. If you add on to that the students in medicine, dentistry, etc., it comes out to be 7,640. Almost half of the total students going here are full-time students. The number of full-time students is increasing in proportion to the number of part-time students. Professor Merritt asked him if he had taken into account the drop in medical students which will begin around 1975. Vice Chancellor Ryder said there are some very serious drops taking place and soon there will be an oversupply in various areas, not only in Ph.D.'s, but also in the undergraduate teaching area.

Wage Price Freeze

Chancellor Hine next gave a progress report on Phase II of the Wage Price Freeze. He informed the Council President Ryan had appointed an ad hoc committee to work with him on developing details of the wage price freeze phase II, and disseminate information about it. He said he was called to name three people, and after consulting with the Secretary of the IUPUI Faculty Council, he recommended that the committee of three from IUPUI be Dr. Bogar from the Downtown Campus, Dr. Max from the 38th St. Campus, and Professor Edward Archer from the Indianapolis Law School. The Chancellor went on to say that early in October he received information that the University of Michigan had ruled that their ten month faculty members were not covered by the wage price freeze. Since their policies seemed to be the same as ours, Vice President Hartley wrote a lengthy letter to the Office of Emergency Preparedness in Chicago asking for a ruling on this. Their answer was that the Cost of Living Council has not deviated from its original ruling that a teacher may receive the increased salary rate of the 1971-72 contract during the freeze only if that teacher had received an increase rate prior to August 15. They are conducting an investigation of the University of Michigan's salary schedule. He continued and said he hoped that he can work out methods of paying the 10 month people what the contracts said. He has formed a review committee and they have been considering individual cases of faculty members affected by the freeze. He asked Dr. Buhner to comment on this review committee. Vice Chancellor Buhner said his committee had been receiving requests for review of wages from the deans and individuals. Although the Chancellor's original charge was that the deans were responsible for submitting review cases to the committee, the committee has taken the position it will accept any and all requests for review, whether it comes from individuals or deans. The committee has a very limited

framework of references and can only operate under the guidelines established by the Cost of Living Council, as interpreted in the Consumer Clearing House Economic Emergency publication, and enunciated by the office of the President of the University. The committee had to this point in time certified 52 cases and have been able to exempt part or all of the amount frozen for 14 individuals. Professor Alton said she had been told that faculty at Indiana State University had already received a check which paid the retroactive amount for all of the 10 month faculty. She added that at Ball State University, their board stated that the amount of the increase, including the retroactive amount, would be in their November 30 paycheck. Chancellor Hine said he would look into these situations. Professor Kirch said he was informed that Indiana State University raises were related to their summer session pay and that is why they would get raises. Professor Meiere said he was confused on the number of committees that are working on the wage price freeze problem and asked for clarification. Chancellor Hine said the review committee is composed of Vice Chancellor Buhner, Professor Weber, and Professor White. The state-wide committee working with President Ryan is to develop guidelines and work out policies for Phase II and is an ad hoc committee. Professor Meiere asked if the All-University Council recommended creation of a committee, and if that then would be a third committee. Chancellor Hine said that this committee is the President's committee, to which he named Professors Bogar, Max and Archer. Professor Meiere asked if the IUPUI Faculty Council resolution for the creation of a committee, the membership of which was to be determined by the faculty councils of each campus, was forwarded to the interim All-University Faculty Council. Professor Bogar replied that when the resolution was approved by the All-University Council, there was concern on the part of IUPUI delegates about the method for appointing this committee. They thought it would be a more expeditious method to contact the Chancellor of each campus, and in consultation with the secretary from each of the faculty councils, to come up with a list for the President for this committee. Chancellor Hine added that he had no objection if the Faculty Council would like to select their own representatives, rather than the ones he chose. He felt at the time that there was some urgency in originally appointing these men and he did not want the committee to meet one time without IUPUI representatives. Professor Meiere moved that the Council officially approve the three people chosen by the Chancellor to be on this ad hoc President's committee. Professor White seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Indianapolis Center for Advanced Research

Chancellor Hine reported that the Indianapolis Center for Advanced Research is moving rather rapidly and it appears that later this year they will be able to say they have matched the challenged gift of Mr. Krannert for this facility. This Indianapolis Center for Advanced Research is under the general direction of a group of directors, with three members from the IU Board of Trustees, three from Purdue, three from the Chamber of Commerce Industrial Committee, and three from the Mayor's office. They have working under them a science advisory committee and there is a sponsoring committee raising money. He added he wanted the Faculty Council members to get more acquainted with this project, and if they have any comments, they would be welcomed. This could prove to be a very important educational project, as well as one for industry and research in this community.

Committee on Goals and Objectives

Chancellor Hine announced that he has appointed a committee on goals and objectives for IUPUI. The committee has been working diligently and soon will develop a document setting out the general goals and objectives of our educational institution. It is the charge of this committee to prepare a document and that this document be circularized widely and exposed to various committees. This committee consists of: Professors White, Norins, Bogar, Bynum, Juillerat, Dean Lohse and the two Vice Chancellors. Professor White is chairman of the group. Comments regarding the work of this committee may be sent to the chairman.

Agenda Committee Business

Professor Bogar asked Professor White to comment on the interim All-University Council meeting of October 19, 1971. Professor White reported that the resolution creating an ad hoc faculty committee on the wage price freeze discussed previously was approved by a rather substantial vote. He added there was a general feeling of pleasure that IUPUI did have a full delegation present and he thought this would be very useful during the future. He said the All-University Faculty Constitution would soon be in final form and ready to be presented to each faculty council.

By-Laws

Professor Bogar moved the By-Laws for 1971-72 be approved and Professor Wagener seconded. Professor Levitt asked why there was a change in procedure for constituting the Committee on Committees. Professor Bogar responded there was too much of a time lag between the opening of the semester and the election of a Committee on Committees. Through the new procedure, they felt they could appoint a committee during the previous summer and they could be working prior to the opening of the fall semester. Professor Levitt asked if this committee could not be elected at the last Council meeting of the year. Professor Bogar said they could be, but at the end of the year there are a great number of elections which take place. However, when you move a body from an elective position to an appointed one, there could be objections. Professor Levitt felt the Committee on Committees was the most important Council committee in the sense that it controls all appointments of committees. He thought the Agenda Committee included members who were not elected members of the Council. Professor Bogar informed him the four members on the Agenda Committee are elected members with the Chancellor being an ex officio member. Chancellor Hine asked for the vote to approve the By-Laws for 1971-73 and the motion carried.

Special Meeting

Professor Bogar informed Council of a special meeting to be held November 30 to discuss the undergraduate structure of IUPUI and the School of General Studies.

All Faculty Meeting

Professor Bogar reported there would be an all faculty meeting at 4:00 p.m. in Lecture Hall Room 101 of the Downtown Campus on November 18, 1971.

New Business

Vice Chancellor Ryder informed Council they have been working on possible consolidation of facilities. Tentative plans have been made to consolidate the

psychology and business faculty to the 38th St. Campus. Both of these groups have been consulted and appropriate accommodations will be made available at 38th St. for them. Classes in these areas have been scheduled either at 38th St., at the Downtown Campus, or the Medical Center. This means that as far as classrooms are concerned, we can accommodate them. There are many reasons for this consolidation, one being the elimination of the cost involved in maintaining two buildings and another being parking availability. He went on to say the back of the Burger Chef building will house the offices for the psychology faculty and the business faculty will move to the Krannert building. Chancellor Hine added that these changes are still in the recommendation stage and details will have to be worked out.

Purchasing Regulations at IUPUI

Professor Norins said the faculty at the Medical School has expressed concern over the amount of procedure one has to go through to make purchases and moved that the Faculty Council request the Chancellor's office to investigate the purchasing procedures that the University has imposed with the view of simplifying them. Professor Wagener seconded the motion. The motion carried.

University Club

Professor Wagener reported that the University Club is sponsoring a luncheon on December 1 at which time Mr. Bourt SerVaas will speak. Notices of this luncheon will be sent to all faculty soon.

By-Law #10

Professor Merritt asked how the Secretary dealt with By-Law #10. Professor Bogar responded he found it very difficult to enforce this By-Law. When he does notice a member being absent for two or more meetings, he usually sends them a letter. Professor Merritt said he was concerned about one-third of the Council being absent the last couple of times. If members do not wish to serve, he thought the Council should know why. Professor Levitt felt that By-Law #10 simply authorizes the replacement of an individual who is continually absent, such as on sabbatical leave. It does not say the members should be policed. Chancellor Hine suggested the Secretary give some thought to this By-Law and what should be done about it.

Parking Statistics

Professor Levitt asked that the Council be given some statistics on the parking situation. In September he made this request to the Secretary and was informed that his request had been sent to the Parking Committee. To date, Professor Levitt had received no reply. Chancellor Hine assured Professor Levitt that figures are available on how many green, red and blue stickers and parking spaces there are and added he would see if he could get the statistics.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

The special IUPUI Faculty Council meeting of November 30, 1971, was opened by Chancellor Hine at 3:30 p.m. The Chancellor said this meeting was an open faculty meeting for discussion of the proposal for undergraduate structure.

Professor Kinzer indicated that at the last Faculty Council meeting the suggestion was made that any individual who might have responses to this proposal to put them in writing and send them to him. He summarized the comments and questions he had received:

1. What is the rationale for the re-grouping that is described?
2. Why shouldn't psychology be in human affairs and why shouldn't geography be considered a science.
3. A comment about the over-abundance of deans--a top heavy administration which seems to be created.
4. A comment as to the confusion and/or possible lacks of communication deriving from the extensive committees which would obviously have to come into existence to make this structure work at the school level, at the departmental level, the faculty level, and the all-university level.
5. How does the proposal increase the possibilities for autonomy in the city of Indianapolis?
6. Would individual departments gain any more autonomy than they now have?
7. Another comment had to do with the possibilities of interdisciplinary developments, to the effect that departmental structures created as they are in the document tend to harden.
8. A comment that the Statement on Colleges and Universities, which is appended to the structural proposal, does not seem to apply in the way the proposal says it does. That Statement deals with the relationships of governing boards for presidents and faculty and does not bear on the relationship of schools and/or on the independence or dependence with each other.
9. A comment about the feeling of a lack of a general philosophy or overall supervision, coordination or regulation of academic programs.
10. One person seemed to be reluctant and asked what was the hurry.
11. The fact that the faculty in the undergraduate programs in allied health areas were not a part of the undergraduate structural committee and should be included because they are involved in the undergraduate programs, courses and units of the schools of IUPUI.

Chancellor Hine asked Professor Casebeer, chairman of the subcommittee on structure, to comment.

History of Committee:

Professor Casebeer said he first would like to go briefly to the background of this particular committee. It originally began with five faculty members from the Downtown Campus that were appointed to revise the constitution of the Downtown Campus. They created an interim constitution and recommended that an overarching undergraduate government be developed. They contacted the 38th St. Campus and found Professor Fortier was heading a committee on structure for undergraduate departments of IUPUI. The two committees then merged. This presented a basic problem to begin with, for half of the committee was committed to developing an undergraduate government for the undergraduate departments, and the other half of the committee was committed to structure. Some of those in structure did not see the need for an undergraduate government and some of those in undergraduate government felt the structure could be worked out after government was established.

He went on to say the documents they came out with were not frantically or quickly produced. The committee met almost weekly during the whole of the last academic year, and had some 30-40 meetings, with some lasting as long as six hours. They did get two documents produced. One was the structure proposal and the other a proposed constitution for an undergraduate consortium. These two documents are sister documents and are related to one another. He felt that some of the questions Professor Kinzer posed would be answered if the people asking the questions had the knowledge of the proposed constitution. He continued and said that later in the year Vice Chancellor Buhner called an open meeting of administrators and faculty, and the representatives from Herron and Normal College were added to his committee. This gave a total of 18 faculty members on the committee. If one reviews the names on the committee, one will find they represent a wide stand of departments. Out of 18 departments, there are 15 represented. The structure proposal is not ideal. Some members of the committee were very discontent with it, while others were quite content. He said he never took sides on this and tried to arrive at consensus among his 18 committee members. What the structure proposal represents is not something ideal, but it represents something possible. This structure proposal will operate until January of 1973. As far as the consortium goes, it is not an undergraduate government, but a consortium, and will self-destruct in February of 1972. The consortium will be chosen from elected faculty.

Reply to Faculty Comments;

Next Professor Casebeer commented on the questions from Professor Kinzer. He said the rationale for grouping is an agreement of 18 people on the kind of structure we should have. As to the consistency of the grouping and why should not psychology be in human affairs, he said psychology did not want to be there. According to the psychologist on his committee, they wanted to be in the sciences. He said his committee was not one with any power, only a committee that tried to simply reflect the needs of the people. As to the over-abundance of deans and a top heavy administration, he said he thought that would be for the consortium to work out. Now we have deans for each one of the schools, along with associate and assistant deans. In reference to autonomy, there was a very strong feeling in his committee that within individual schools the departments would have a considerable amount of autonomy. By autonomy they did not mean to have every single thing that they want, but autonomy in academic affairs, autonomy in matters of curriculum, autonomy in matters which are spelled out in the policy statement attached to the document. The areas in which they are talking about are handled in the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities which says faculty has primary responsibility. This is the sort of thing that this structure is involving--the rights it is involving--that the faculty has primary responsibility in fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter, research, faculty status, method of instruction, and those aspects of student life which relate in the educational process. As to the confusion and lack of communication deriving from extensive committees at school, faculty and all-university levels, he said this was possible, but he did not know. It is up to the consortium to work out. He hoped that the consortium would work with department heads. As far as interdisciplinary possibilities are not apparent and departmental structures tend to harden, Professor Casebeer said that speaking personally, he would say that is right and is a very bad situation. Some of his committee worked very hard to get a structure that would permit opening for interdisciplinary operations and development.

As for the Statement on Government in Colleges and Universities not applying, it does apply, he added, for it describes the kind of areas, the kind of legislative powers, that they hope all undergraduate units will have. As far as its general philosophy denying any overall supervision, coordination or regulation of academic programs, these appear to be departmental matters and it depends on a definition of academic program. For instance, one of the most crucial elements of academic program, in which the administration and faculty would have to cooperate (and this is spelled out in the Statement on Colleges and Universities) is budgetary matters. How does a department get its money, how much money does it get, how is that money distributed, etc. Obviously this requires a joint effort at this particular point. What the document is asking is that insofar as it is possible is that they be departmental matters and the department be given control over academic affairs--the teaching element--because they feel they are best equipped to do that.

As far as full scale reform is concerned, his committee spent a year getting this document out. They worked very hard, with some members of the committee working on this 20 hours a week. That is working at top pressure and they weren't dragging their heels. They tried some full scale reforms. It is a fact that the faculty in allied health was not involved in that part of the structure committee. This has always been the question, should health people come in or not come in. It was debated with his committee and halfway through, Herron and AGU came in. This was a snowball development that eventually could have included the faculty in health. In this particular program the consortium could be expanded to include a representative.

Undergraduate Government:

Chancellor Hine asked if anyone had questions. Professor Wagener asked why the document dealing with the government consortium was not included. He also asked if someone could give him some rationale for separating graduate and undergraduate structure. Professor Casebeer replied that the IUPUI Faculty Council was interested solely in a structure proposal and not the government proposal. He added he thought the consortium document should be attached, but the Council had not concerned itself with it. He thought the constitution should be widely published and more carefully looked at for it asks for several things which might be rather controversial in determining the undergraduate departments' directions. It should be read because it really is asking that 200-300 faculty members engaged in undergraduate education determine their own direction to satisfy undergraduate education. This is one of the reasons for the split between undergraduate education and graduate education. The undergraduate faculty felt that its problems as an undergraduate faculty, educating approximately 16,000 students at this particular campus, were not understood. At the time his committee started on this, 40% of the membership of the IUPUI Faculty Council was in the School of Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, etc. Yet we were teaching 14,000-16,000 students at that particular time. Where are we represented? Where are the part-time faculty members (about 300) represented? The consortium recommends that they be represented because this is one third of our teaching effort. They want them represented, want the undergraduate faculty recognized as an entity, and want to be given some degree of self-determination to express itself. They did not combine with the graduate committee because they do not have much influence over it. The graduate subcommittee on structure is now being coordinated through the Academic Affairs Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

Professor Harris asked to what extent a structure can operate without a government. Professor Casebeer replied his committee never answered that question, and when they set up the consortium and constitution, they recommended the structure and government committee be integrated and work as a single committee. It was a real problem, solely because some were interested in structure only and others were strongly interested in government.

Procedure for Implementation:

Professor Harris asked how they proposed to put the two together. Professor Casebeer answered that what they were doing right now, of bringing the structure proposal before all the faculty, was one way. But what they will do in the future, they do not know. They have handed out constitutions to everybody and do have the mechanism setting up the voting method. They could distribute it right now and send out ballots for everyone to vote on. However, he did not want to do that because what the consortium is attempting to do is to implement, modify, and extend this structure document, and not very many people know about this structure document. This is the very first all faculty meeting we have had, so before his committee asks for a vote on the consortium, they want to know what they are voting to implement, modify and extend. Whether or not this structure is to be approved by the IUPUI Faculty Council before everyone votes on the consortium, or whether it isn't approved by the Faculty Council, they can still view the consortium and do some more work on this. These are questions the future will have to determine.

Professor Harris asked about the wisdom of withholding all action until structure and government can be put together. Professor Casebeer asked Professor Kinzer to comment. Professor Kinzer said he did not see any need for an undergraduate faculty organization. He asked the question of what does the faculty govern. As far as he could see it, undergraduate degrees are the nature of undergraduate faculty organization and faculty government, and that is what the faculty governs. He could not see there is any need to separate the two. He responded to Professor Wagener's previous question about why the government document was not attached by saying it is not addressed to the Faculty Council or the Academic Affairs Committee. It is addressed to the straight academic units of IUPUI and they are responsible. Professor Casebeer added that it has never been the express desire of the Faculty Council to have an undergraduate government. It has been the desire of the undergraduate instructors to have undergraduate government.

School of General Studies:

Professor Meiere asked about the purpose of this special meeting and how it will be run. He asked if this was to be in part a form for expression of ideas with individual faculty members without being selective. Chancellor Hine responded that the meeting was to be open discussion of this particular proposal and he assumed and hoped there would be expressions of opinions about the general subject. Professor Meiere said he had very strong opinions about the particular document being discussed, but it seemed to him that before detailed discussion could continue, that the School of General Studies should be included. His department has very strong opinions of how the School for General Studies fits into the overall structure of the University, and particularly, with suggested changes which are reflective of interaction between this proposal and the proposed School of General Studies. He asked if it would be appropriate to have some discussion of the School of General Studies and responses to how that would interact with the structure.

Professor Bogar responded that the Agenda Committee, in consultation with the Academic Affairs Committee, decided not to include discussion of a proposal for a School of General Studies at this meeting. The proposal for a School for General Studies was presented to the Council and to the faculty as a whole last month. It was requested the Council look at this and was suggested perhaps the proposal could also be included along with the proposal for an undergraduate schema and both would be discussed at this meeting of November 30. Aside from certain technical problems of including the proposal for a School of General Studies, they decided that since both were substantive, they felt the proposal for a School of General Studies had not been as widely circulated and they decided not to include the proposal for a School of General Studies in the matter of this meeting. There are now several proposals pending before the Council and faculty: one concerns undergraduate structure, one a proposal for undergraduate government, another a proposal for a graduate structure, and another a proposal for graduate government. These last two will be looked at during the December 9 meeting of the Council. Another is the proposal for a School of General Studies. He felt we would have to arrive at some simultaneous melting at some time. Professor Meiere said he felt we could live with a structure which was slightly less than perfect, if it was a structure. It is possible to have two organizations coexist, but then IUPUI is living proof that this is not the way we are proceeding. From his point of view, establishment of structure is much more important than the structure itself. You have to have something to go on if you are going to build. He thought what the committee had probably arrived at was a conclusion. There are a number of different structures which would serve the purpose. The only major revision he proposed would be a school of interdisciplinary studies. He reasoned: (1) it is good in its own right, and (2) if such a school is not established, the School of General Studies will come into being and will just absorb what we ordinarily think of as interdisciplinary efforts. He thought this was not the purpose of the School of General Studies.

Professor Wagener asked Chancellor Hine to comment, as chief administrator, on how he saw the need for re-structure or the urgency of this. Chancellor Hine replied that he came to the meeting to listen to ideas and concepts of the faculty, but did want to point out we must have some kind of structure that probably will have to be taken in steps. He felt the reason it is important to discuss this general schema is to make certain that we have the opinions of the faculty, and if we do make any transitional steps, that they not be in conflict. He could see many things about the schema that can be debated, but the general pattern that is set up here is what he thinks should be discussed. We should also think about the overall structure and how it can be developed in the future. Obviously it will be many years before we come to a complete implementation of a schema of this complexity. He concluded by saying that he did think this is important we consider this and we must take some steps that will formalize the undergraduate academic programs that we have into some kind of an organization.

College of Liberal Arts:

Professor Barlow felt that what is most obvious to him about the general pattern of the structure is the complete destruction of any sort of liberal arts college idea. Other segments remain approximately intact. With this idea, a liberal arts college leading to a B.A., the arts and sciences organization seems to be completely missing, completely removed or destroyed in this general pattern. He asked why the committee did this and what its rationale for doing this was. The reason he wanted to know this was that whatever this consortium does, if a general pattern of arts and sciences college is missing, the chances of the consortium bringing it

back seems to be rather slim. So academic structure, no matter how much revision the consortium may do, seems to him to be passing on the end of the arts and sciences college of IUPUI. Professor Casebeer asked Professor Byrne to respond. Professor Byrne felt he did not know really why he should be the one to respond to the question since there were other people on the committee who were strongly unfavorable toward the idea of a college of arts and sciences. These are questions that are not easily answered, but he thought part of the difficulty is that a certain recognition, however official or permanent it may be, that the concepts of IU mission and Purdue mission are with us, and perhaps will remain with us for at least awhile. He added he would prefer to hear the people from 38th St. respond to why the concept of faculty is preferred to that over college. One might also ask a similar thing of why is not it called the College of Science and Technology or Division of Science and Technology. It isn't, it is called faculty, and as he understood it, there were some very interesting reasons for preferring what they take to mean somewhat looser structure than college. Another reason you do not see a proposal for a college of arts and sciences is that the proposal itself got the minimum approval within the committee itself.

Professor Barlow asked if minutes were taken to present arguments for this minimal approval. Professor Casebeer said when the two groups broke into subgroups, Professor Langsam chaired the one on government and Professor Fortier the one on structure. The structural proposal emerged from Professor Fortier's committee and then the committees re-assembled with both documents and debated them both. He asked Professor Fortier to respond to Professor Barlow's question. Professor Fortier said what they were interested in doing was merging with faculty with a structure that had units within it that had some common orientation and thinking, and with methods that would perhaps link them together.

Rationale for Separate Faculties:

Professor Wagener asked what the academic rationale for this was. If there is no academic rationale, but instead political power, then he thought it should be talked about. Professor Beck said what happened was there were people who were more interested in a college of liberal arts and sciences and those who were interested in the government committee. When they split into structure and government, these people went to the government committee. Those that were the scientists and technologists could not understand how you could devise government without having structure. What the structure committee did then was to sit down with all the degrees, listed them, and they began putting them in places and finally came up with this structure. To the extent that there was representation from various areas, they had an input as to who they would like to be associated with and where their grouping would like to be. To the extent that people in individual areas were represented on the committee, each was placed where the representative wanted to go. If you were not represented on the committee, then someone else had to make up their minds and this the committee did. Professor Casebeer added that out of that committee came a rather well organized proposal for the organization of the faculty of science and technology because of the heavy representation on the committee. However, for the faculty in human affairs, when it went to the general committee, there were many disputes on that and some reorganization. Serving as a representative of the english department in the school of language and literature, he talked with Professor Barlow and Professor Wagener regarding their association with literature. His committee worked out a school of language and literature to the satisfaction of those departments in this structure proposal.

Professor Langsam thought arts and sciences is a nice tradition, of all knowledge gathered together in arts and sciences, but said we do not teach natural philosophy any more and the communication that goes on between arts people and science people is minimal. She thought if you take the arts faculty and ask them who is in the science faculty, they do not know because, in fact, they do not like them, and in many cases, they dislike them. They do not like their discipline. If you do want to maintain a facade of a great over-branching knowledge, it is not by dividing up into faculties of this and that. As far as communication is concerned, where the students specialize, it is in an area that is limited. Having a faculty or school does not stop people from talking together or from students taking courses. It is primarily a basic administrative unit to take care of similar problems, share facilities, and have some communication on joint curriculum problems. For instance, with people in one science, such as physics, talking about certain problems of teaching a course, the people in chemistry are most likely related to what they are doing, not the people in history. Arts and sciences is a nice tradition and label and that is all it is. Professor Wagener thanked Professor Langsam for giving probably the first idea of one of the rationales for this.

Professor Meiere said he would speak against the concept of a college of arts and sciences. He thought it fair to say that people in Purdue mission areas, either currently or historically, dominate the science end of it, at least outlined in the science and technology program, and the reasons these people do not like a concept of a college of arts and sciences is based on two assumptions: (1) these people are glued together for the purpose of setting academic degree requirements and curriculum requirements; and (2) these people are glued together to pass upon promotions for faculty members. There is a strong philosophical thought behind the separation which is the feeling that people outside the sciences should not vote on degree requirements in science and vice versa. The scientists have no particular qualifications of standard degree requirements in history. If you accept the assumption that these people are glued together for the terms he outlined, which set degree requirements and promotions, he thought it is unacceptable to the people in sciences that they be lumped together with the people in arts. Professor Meiere continued and said the second point, that of political reasons, is a very dangerous subject to touch on, but he thought it is probably true that if the college of arts and sciences was established, that the Purdue mission areas would be forced to go their own separate way, and whether it is forced or their own enforcement, that is a political reality. Purdue areas will not be allowed to participate in such a structure.

Professor Harris said we should be mindful of the kinds of students that we usually train at the university. First of all, do you want a science student to know nothing but science. Or on the other hand, would you want a student in an area of arts and humanities to know nothing but that and only that. Therefore, for that reason he strongly supported Professor Barlow's conception of an arts and sciences division as a means of passing on some type of relative knowledge of which can enrich any student's background. He thought all the talk about to what extent the faculty in different areas communicate is totally irrelevant. Professor Langsam said the University Division, which is outside and not touched by the structure, is an area in which students get arts requirements and science requirements.

Future Academic Autonomy:

Profesoor Kinzer said there is an interim between now and 1973 in which there is autonomy in the city of Indianapolis for degree purposes in those degree programs

which are part of arts and sciences at IU at Indianapolis. What is lacking at Indianapolis is a college structure which could change to suit local conditions, local needs, local talent, to change the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree (IU degree) in its general nature. In pursuing what Chancellor Hine said, he said we must concern ourselves with the practical problem of how to get from where we are to where we want to be. We have that problem now until 1973, at which time we are presuming that Purdue is going to extend autonomy to its faculty in the city of Indianapolis and they are going to extend that autonomy, according to Professor Meiere, with strings attached. There is a point beyond 1973 when there is an interim in which he thought the Casebeer proposal fits with this governmental proposal for changes thereafter. It seemed to him we have to face the fact that at the present time there is faculty control, faculty autonomy in the city prior to 1973 within the structure of the college of arts and sciences of IU Bloomington with no college of arts and sciences considered in Indianapolis. The independent, autonomous unit of IUPUI consists of those degree programs in the city which are free to act. He did not know why that program, which is independent, autonomous and free and the thing we want, should be destroyed. This is what he thought the Casebeer proposal accomodates.

Professor Sams said she was concerned that representation on the committee was not what it might have been. She was also concerned about the academic rationale and the practical rationale regarding placement of some of the schools where they are in the proposal. She said she wished to speak of nursing. The Associate of Arts program in Nursing was recently placed in the School of Nursing. She wished to suggest that Nursing should be one school with a unified faculty.

Professor Casebeer said he would point out the areas in which he thought his committee did have general input. In the school of science, with the exception of the department of geology, he felt there was general seeking of information and agreement from all involved there. The school of technology was represented well, and at the time this proposal was made, it was generally agreed to. Human affairs was represented by one from nursing, by himself, by a representative from business, who only attended one meeting, by a representative from education that attended only 6 meetings, and by a representative from both Herron and Normal, who were added late. The school of social research is the only area in which many departments have not been canvassed and is most controversial of all of them. Professor Barlow said he did not feel there was any input from the language as far as he was concerned.

Representation on Undergraduate Government:

Professor Mirsky said that a study he read, published by the National Science Foundation, on interdisciplinary structures and research pointed out that in their experience, the best and most fruitful interdisciplinary research was done as a cooperative venture between discrete departments rather than through the establishment of an interdisciplinary department which was engaged in such research. The main point he wanted to raise had to do with representation. In article III (reference here is to the proposal for a consortium on undergraduate government) it talks about representation of the faculty, and geology is conspicuously absent. There are only two full-time people in geology and they feel they are being unrepresented in the proposed structure. He added that criminal justice was another area that was not being represented. Both departments are degree granting departments. Professor Mirsky felt representation for small departments was grossly

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL

Thursday, December 9, 1971
Law School

Members Present: Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Lawrence, Nevill, B. Taylor; Professors Alton, Bixler, Bogar, Byrne, Cutshall, Galanti, Gifford, Grossman, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Levitt, Marks, Nagy, Navarre, Norins, Nunn, O'Loughlin, Ross, Schreiber, Weber, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Chancellor Hine; Deans Holmquist, Irwin, Lohse, McDonald, J. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Beall, Behnke, Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Fleener, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Meiere, Merritt, Neel, Ochs, Sagraves, Wagener.

Visitors: Dean East; Professors Hotopp, Rothe, Standish.

AGENDA

1. Approval of minutes of November 11, 1971.
2. Proposal for a Graduate Organization (Kinzer).
3. Final Report of Committee on Committees (Wagener)
4. Presiding Officer's Business.
5. Agenda Committee Business
6. New Business

Vice Chancellor Buhner opened the December 9, 1971 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council.

Approval of Minutes

Professor Bogar, at the request of Professor Merritt, asked to correct Page 6 of the minutes. In the first paragraph, third sentence from the bottom, it says "Professor Merritt asked him if he had taken into account the drop in medical students which will begin around 1975." The word "medical" is incorrect and should not be there. Professor Byrne noted that on Page 4, a few lines prior to the heading Admissions Criteria, and on Page 5, under the heading Motion to Refer, he noted there was a motion and that it was seconded. He did not see any vote taken on the motion. Professor Bogar said that was correct and asked the Parliamentarian if he wished to comment. Professor White ruled that the motion to refer was a substitute motion and that is why no action was taken. Vice Chancellor Buhner ruled that, according to the Parliamentarian, the motion by Professor Kelso, which was a referral motion, superceded the motion made by Dean Nevill and seconded by Professor Neel. Professor Norins moved to accept the minutes as corrected. Professor Alton seconded and the motion carried.

Proposal for a Graduate Organization

Professor Kinzer reported that the Academic Affairs Committee asked that a graduate structure, as well as an undergraduate structure, be constructed. They decided to utilize a subcommittee of their own to start from scratch and provide this structure. Their procedure was to ask each of the deans of IUPUI where they knew there was a graduate program in existence, or knew one was in the prospect of formation, to name one person to be a member of the committee. This committee met with Professor Kinzer, organized itself, and elected Professor Standish as chairman. The Academic Affairs Committee asked the subcommittee to follow the same guidelines they had asked the undergraduate subcommittee to follow. That was to acknowledge where we are, to recognize where we want to be, the objective being a greater degree of autonomy in the city for all programs as possible, and to keep in mind the points which Professor Standish reiterated in the first portion of the report; that is, faculty control in the decision making process relating to academic content and academic procedures, the promotion of the concept of peer group judgment for the development of graduate programs, and to recognize a continuous monitoring function for graduate education as for undergraduate education by the Faculty Council at the broadest policy level. Professor Kinzer said that the Academic Affairs Committee wants a discussion of the proposal, and if necessary, a referral back to his committee for some recommendations and guidelines.

Philosophy of Subcommittee

Professor Standish reported his subcommittee tried to write down some of the philosophy that they had, that they developed, and their approaches to the problem. He thought he would review briefly the way his subcommittee saw it, for this is the context in which the committee had to work. There are now existing active graduate programs on this campus that are referred to as academic and professional programs. The academic programs on the campus currently are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate School at Bloomington, or in some cases, the Graduate School at Lafayette. The professional programs are administered by the various professional schools. There is now on this campus an Office of Graduate Studies, with a director, and with graduate programs to be accredited in the fall of 1972. A point that concerned the committee was what constitutes academic and professional. He added

that most people know that there have been several proposals made for a specific organization of graduate education at IUPUI, and what he proposed to do at the meeting, was review the current organization, indicate the attack the previous proposals had taken, and finally show what his committee developed.

Alternative Forms of Graduate Organization

In the first chart he showed what exists at the present time, in that there is an academic graduate council that is made up of departmental representatives. The chairman of this council is elected from the academic faculty at large. Then, one of the first proposals created referred to a professional graduate faculty in academics and this would make up the general graduate faculty. The dean (in the illustration) means director as it presently stands. Professional graduate programs were under the aegis of the so-called School of Graduate Studies, but they still maintain about the same independence that they have had previously. Then, he continued, this program was subsequently revised and created separate graduate study sections, with suggested groups of sciences, humanities, arts, social and behavioral sciences. The chairman of these various study sections would then comprise an advisory committee. He said he did not pretend to interpret them or try to define their relative merits, but simply wanted to give this as background material. Professor Levitt asked if this second proposal superseded the first one. Professor Standish said he did not know if it superseded it or not, but it was just one that was brought along later. It is one which the subcommittee of the Academic Affairs Committee proposed, but did not submit. He was showing this one to show that there were many ways that one could approach this problem.

Before he went into detail about the proposal that his subcommittee presented, he asked everyone to forget any previous words or terms that they may have heard. Everyone has heard of the Academic Graduate Council, but he wanted all to forget this because his committee used this in an entirely different context. He added that all should recognize that his committee had made a number of rather arbitrary decisions and came to some conclusions on their own in order to present a definitive proposal. They feel the proposal has built into it an orderly transition from what we have now to what they, as a committee, thought all would like to have some time in the future. We are not committed to start on this particular track that they are proposing and are not committed to that forever. Adjustments can be made and his committee recognizes this. They think that they have built in some checks and balances and hope they built in faculty control that has been asked for, the monitoring at least by the Faculty Council. They hope the peer group concept is promoted in it, and most important of all, they feel best about the opportunity to coordinate the total graduate effort at IUPUI.

Basic Organizational Structure

To begin with, the committee felt the basics of any proposal would be to name the organization. They named it the School of Graduate Studies. Within this School of Graduate Studies they felt there should be some bodies, so they named an Advanced Studies Coordinating Council, which would be the governing body of all graduate programs, both academic and professional. And then, because they felt that any effort to change the track we are now on, which is academic and professional programs, would be such a turn about from what we have done for years, they felt they should retain a council that would be concerned primarily with academic programs and another council that would be concerned primarily with professional. So the governing body would be composed of the Advanced Studies Coordinating

Council, with two divisions below, called the Academic and Professional Graduate Councils.

Optional Substructures

Now this is where several options come in. First of all the academic and professional graduate faculty will make up, as has been previously proposed, a general graduate faculty. The Academic Graduate Council and the Professional Graduate Council may at their option, designate particular study sections. For example, he would not visualize at the present time an academic graduate council that would want to divide up into three study sections, but it was the purpose of his committee to devise an organization that might accommodate growth and development in years to come. This was simply one way to do it. The professional study sections could create study sections if their programs would require it. He felt there would need to be a great amount of growth take place before this could happen, but there are options built in to do so. He added that we may be near, or perhaps now are at the point, where we might be ready to create study sections that would be devoted to biologic sciences. There is now a group, which is called the Academic Graduate Council, that is made up of departments and disciplines which are concerned with biologic sciences. The biologic sciences study section is made up of the basic sciences and this study section is what now comprises the Academic Graduate Council, or did before they added on the people from the Downtown and 38th St. campuses. The physical sciences might also be involved in this particular study section. In humanities, the suggested disciplines might be education, business, law and psychology. The professional graduate studies sections might at their own option, choose to divide up into divisions, and a natural division probably would be medicine, allied health, dentistry and nursing. These are clinical sciences and seem to be a rather clearcut grouping. The applied sciences would suggest that maybe engineering and industrial operations and mathematical sciences would fit in another group. The behavioral sciences might be law, social service, and psychology. These, then, are options that the professional graduate council could have and the academic graduate council might have, to determine what disciplines and departments might be represented in these various study sections.

Advanced Coordinating Council

The Advanced Studies Coordinating Council would be made up of the chairman and chairman-elect of each of the graduate councils. The chairman of each of these three study sections would be represented also on the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council. His committee felt there should be equal representation, and so they designated that the professional graduate study sections and the professional graduate council would designate three members, in addition to their chairman and chairman-elect to serve on the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council. This council would set the general policies, admission requirements, and would review the activities of the two councils. It would be able to rule on new graduate programs, programs that have not previously been available, interdisciplinary programs, because it was felt that neither of the two councils might be able to objectively do this. This body would also, if necessary, serve as a board of appeals. The actual work, or the main amount of work insofar as individuals, either academic or professional, would be directed by the individual graduate councils--the academic graduate council and the professional graduate council. These again would establish the policies that applied to strictly academic or professional. They would determine methods of enrollment, registration, the way they might want to accept students, and many of the things being done now by the current academic council.

Again, the individual study sections, at least on the academic side of the ledger, would approve new courses, could make changes in graduate courses (revisions and/or deletions), and would rule on appointment to academic graduate faculty. But their recommendations would be forwarded to the academic graduate council, as they would not have the final ruling on it.

Professional Graduate Council

On the professional side of the chart, we would have the professional graduate council which would be made up of the directors of the various professional graduate programs. His committee had put in three possible divisions here, but the constitution as written, says that this is simply at the option of the professional graduate council. If they want to create divisions, if they think it is necessary to help their work, they could do so. It was felt, at least by some of the committee, that possibly this would be just an added committee to go to and might not help. However, he could see that you could find groupings of the various professional programs that would have common goals and efforts, perhaps common approaches to graduate education, and might therefore find some reason to meet to develop interdisciplinary programs. At any rate, the directors of these various programs would make up the professional graduate council and from that group would be chosen the chairman and chairman-elect, plus three individuals who would serve on the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council. Again the functions of the professional graduate council and the individual study sections would be very comparable to the academic council.

Flexibility of System

Again he asked to emphasize that the names they have used, although they are used presently, are now used in a different context. Secondly, his committee has taken some license and made some decisions on their own about who should be in what division and he was certain that not everyone would be able to agree on the same ones that the committee has chosen. They have built into this an Advanced Studies Coordinating Council, whose job it is to see that there is appropriate representation in the proper study sections, and the academic graduate council and professional graduate council in turn are supposed to see that if they decide to make study sections, that these be properly constituted. There is an element here, which his committee recognizes, that many may feel that they are in the professional side and think they ought to be on the academic side and vice versa. There are others who recognize that there are disciplines that cross lines, such as biophysics. Biophysics may be a physical science or a biological science. There is a method to solve this. Someone would have to determine, probably the academic graduate council, where their primary allegiance should be. There is, in other words, opportunity to make these kinds of adjustments without upsetting the whole system.

Discussion

Professor Byrne said it seemed to him, from a somewhat hasty reading of the proposed constitution, that the so-called study sections are rather important and have important roles to play, including determination of who may or may not be a member of the graduate faculty. Some disciplines such as law, psychology, education and math have been mentioned twice under different groupings. Since it was mentioned that some determination would have to be made as to where their primary

orientation would be, and that if people wanted to have input somewhere they would be ex officio, he wanted to know if the ex officio would be voting or non-voting. Professor Standish said this would be established by the study section itself, or if there was a problem, by the council. Professor Standish said that as far as approval of graduate faculty is concerned, the final approval of this is up to the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council. Professor Byrne said he did not believe that is the way it is written in the proposal. It says the study sections will determine in accordance with policies set by the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council.

Placement of Disciplines

Professor Standish replied that the intent was that a function of the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council would be to approve graduate faculty appointments recommended by the councils. Regarding duplication in areas, the subcommittee arbitrarily picked these out, knowing it would take forever if they took a poll for a decision. He said he would not argue that, for example, english belongs either in one place or another. Only the people in english might know this. Professor Nagy said this suggests a basic confusion if these are all arbitrary groupings and there is a basic confusion regarding distinction made between professional graduate studies and academic. As the chart shows, the arbitrary groupings happen to balance out. There is almost an equal number under professional and academic. He asked if there was a justification for the basic distinction between professional and academic. Professor Kinzer replied that for instance, if you acknowledge that a Ph.D. in education is an academic matter, and an Ed.D. is a professional one, you can see the distinction in that particular regard. Professor Levitt asked why the committee chose to deliberately rule out the M.D., D.D.S., and J.D. degrees as coming under professional graduate studies. Professor Standish said he thought the term for those had been used as terminal professional degrees. In one context, he supposed they are graduate degrees, and yet those in nursing, medicine, law and dentistry are pretty well structured. The jurisdiction probably falls more locally within schools whereas graduate programs, even in the professions, are more apt to cross over. With regard to identifying professional versus academic, he said there is argument on both sides.

Determination of Graduate Programs

Professor Langsam said that Professor Standish said the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council was the one to determine programs and she was not sure whether he meant new programs or whether he meant any courses. She also said that when he made the comment that he felt the various councils could not be objective and that determination of where various people belong was something that was personal to a discipline or school, and that matter had to be taken up by the individual discipline or school, she would argue that to have eight people, of whom none may actually belong to even a related discipline, determining the kind of program that she might want, for example, to institute in history, would have to be very objective, but might also be totally ignorant. If we have three levels, two of which are related at least for people who are supposedly aware of what academic and professional means, she could not understand why we are removing ourselves from program input to a level where you have a maximum generalization. Professor Standish said the Advanced Studies Coordinating Council would act on new interdisciplinary programs, things that definitely cross lines, perhaps from one side to the other. Who else is going to be able to make a decision about this, except the people that are involved on both sides.

Professor Standish said they did not give any great effort to define what is academic and what is professional degree or program. There are those who feel that all graduate programs are academic. Others feel those programs which are associated with a particular school might well be a professional degree. Professor Levitt felt that the way the proposal is set up, there will be all kinds of questions about what belongs in the professional graduate study part. He felt that the way it is lined up, it is on a hypothetical, not realistic, basis. For example, the professional degree given by the School of Medicine is an M.D. It doesn't give any other professional degree. If it granted a Ph.D., it would probably be in a basic science subject, which really would belong under the academic side. He felt the point of getting an advanced degree in dentistry, nursing or medicine, as the committee defines advanced degree, would be largely academic, not professional. Professor Standish said the School of Medicine is now developing a masters in anesthesiology and trying to develop something in public health. They have more or less said they ought to be on the professional side. Professor Levitt said he saw professional as almost being synonymous with practitioner, as opposed to teacher or researcher. Professor Standish said it was his personal feeling that there should be no distinction between academic and professional. His committee felt, though, that because we are currently tied into professional versus academic, to suddenly change this would disrupt the whole system to the point of non-recovery. They felt they would rather start with something like this and maybe work in a way to get them intermingled and interspersed to the point that there was no longer any distinction.

Relationship to Bloomington and Lafayette

Professor Bixler asked what he meant by "disrupt to the point of non-recovery." Professor Standish answered and said the academic programs are now tied to the Bloomington and Lafayette Graduate Schools. There are two ways we can go. Either stay tied to them, even though we might become accredited, or become completely autonomous from the two Graduate Schools. Another way would be to have some kind of tie up with Bloomington and Lafayette, but we ought to be able to make decisions on our own. So as long as this connection is maintained, he thought we are going to have to stay with the academic side of this; otherwise, if we say there is no difference, then that means everybody has got to be approved not only here, but through the Graduate School in Bloomington and Lafayette. Professor Langsam asked if he was suggesting that since our academic problems are linked to Lafayette and Bloomington, that we are, as a school, going to push that under the rug and just separate ourselves from the problem. So that instead of marching together, the academic side could remain tied for the next 20 years to Bloomington and Lafayette and we can avoid the problem in the professional schools. Professor Standish replied that until such time that we are accredited here and until the Board of Trustees says we are autonomous, he did not feel we can get out of this track. If you want a graduate degree here, you must go through Bloomington. Professor Langsam felt then the structure collapses. If we can't speak for ourselves from the academic side, we can't really vote or improve programs. We don't fit in as an equal part in the whole operation. Professor Standish said we can approve programs, but the fact remains that so long as there is a Graduate School, they are still going to have the final say or jurisdiction. It is true that we should be able to get gradually more and more independence to make a decision. Professor Bixler asked if he was saying that the professional graduate council then is a mechanism for creating a separate school of graduate studies for IUPUI. Professor Standish said that if the time comes that autonomy is granted here, it

might be the decision of this group to make it one. Professor White asked Professor Standish if his committee had discussed the question of autonomy and its evolutionary aspect with Dr. Shrigley or Dean Shull. Professor Standish said he did not. What they did was try to look at what we had and what we wanted to go to and the easiest way to get there. No matter how they looked at it, they recognized that there is a tie up with the Graduate School in Bloomington and Lafayette and as long as that is there, there is going to always be an academic graduate program and a professional graduate program. He added that the subcommittee did have an alternative structure which did not differentiate between academic and professional studies.

Relationship of Academic and Professional Programs

Professor Langsam asked if the programs that are independent are lumped together so they continue to be independent and the ones that have problems are over here because the committee did not know what to do with them. She asked if this is what happened. Professor Norins said he didn't think that was the way it started. For example, the problems in the medical school were quite different than the problems of the rest of the schools. Originally at Bloomington the professional schools and medical school were separated from the rest. For example, in the medicine program a student gets an M.D. degree and then goes on for 3-4 years in residency training. Since we call it a residency, it did not fit in and because of this difference in education, that is why medicine was separated out. Professor Langsam felt he was making a very good argument to suggest that what is needed is a unit which can deal with medicine's separate problems as opposed to an overarching structure which lumps all the problems of post baccalaureate degrees into one area. Now we have a policy statement made by seven people, plus one person representing his subdivision. She asked if this was the kind of group that can best solve their particular problems or someone else's particular problems. They are going to set admission policy and she asked if there are differences in graduate admission policies. Will this group set policy for all graduate students? She asked what "general policy" meant. Professor Standish replied this is what is laid out in all graduate bulletins. The group would keep things going and assure there is equitable representation and serves as the sounding board for the overall growth of the university.

Motion to Refer

Vice Chancellor Buhner noted the time and thanked Professor Standish for his detailed presentation. He inquired of the Council what it would like to do with the proposal. Professor Levitt thought a complex report like this should be referred to its original faculty committee for re-formulation and moved this be done. Dean Lawrence seconded. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked if Professor Kinzer cared to respond, since it was his committee to which the report is being referred. Professor Kinzer said that those who think they have some way of defining professional and academic should provide him with some definitions. Professor Nagy asked about a previous proposal circulated by Dr. Shrigley. That proposal did have a vote taken on it and he wanted to know its status. Professor Standish said it was circulated to the faculty and there was a 45% return and the majority approved the document. Professor Rothe said a constitution was developed and sent to the full faculty of IUPUI. He thought 40% returned and 3/4 were in favor. He asked what the Faculty Council was going to do with this constitution, since it has gone to the faculty and been approved. He thought it would be reasonable to amend it, rather than disregard it. He asked if the faculty would be able to look at the present proposal and vote on it. Vice Chancellor Buhner said that

without attempting to amend the motion, it could be noted that there exists at least two other versions of constitutions. One constitution was put to a vote and a subsequent constitution, which saw a less wide circulation and was an amendment to the first, was not voted on by any group of faculty. This third version is before the Council. The chair suggested the Academic Affairs Committee might look at all three documents. Professor Kinzer replied this already had been done. Professor Langsam thought we needed some kind of communication with the appropriate graduate schools in terms of their definition of an academic program. She was not suggesting a complete discussion, but thought there should be some type of communication between us and Bloomington and Lafayette with regard to the academic programs. She felt we can have a proposal, but what happens if they say they are sorry and they don't like it. They might not like it because this has gone on without any formal discussion. Professor Levitt thought all these comments were not pertinent to the motion on the floor and felt they sounded like instructions to the committee if the motion is passed. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked for the vote on the motion to refer the report back to the Academic Affairs Committee for further study. The motion carried.

Report of Committee on Committees

Vice Chancellor Buhner noted that since Professor Wagener was not present, the report from the Committee on Committees would be carried over until the next Council meeting.

Presiding Officer's Business

Vice Chancellor Buhner said he had no business to suggest, but did thank the Law School for their hospitality.

Agenda Committee Business

Professor Bogar said he wanted to report on action taken by the Council in which they recommended to the All-University Council the creation of an ad hoc committee on the wage price freeze. There was some confusion on the Council's part as to how many members would represent IUPUI on that committee. While the Council elected three, it seemed that these were recommendations to President Ryan, from which he chose one person. Professor Bogar will represent IUPUI on that ad hoc committee. He reported the committee has met twice and while he did not want to go into detail, he felt the university is making a vigorous effort to secure equity in terms of withheld salary increases for the 1971-72 year. He did say that shortly there will be a statement on this coming out of the President's office. This ad hoc committee is rather unique, in that there are representatives from each of the campuses of IU and they all have attended these meetings, which have been held in Indianapolis. They have met both times with Vice President Hartley and the University Council. Professor Byrne asked if Professor Bogar knew what significance, if any, should be attached to University Council Travis' ruling that IU faculty are not under contracts. Professor Bogar replied he was not aware of that statement and could not comment. He added that Mr. Travis has been very helpful in the work of the committee.

Professor Bogar next reported that the Agenda Committee and all chairmen of the standing committees will meet on Friday, December 17 with Mr. Tom Coffey, who is here in connection with a consulting visit in preparation for the North Central Accreditation Association visit.

Professor Bogar reported that he represents IUPUI on President Ryan's Advisory Committee. He felt that President Ryan feels that our unique position here, meaning the combination of the merger of two universities, presents to him certain kinds of organizational problems, for which he is willing to entertain suggestions from the faculty and administration. He said he would soon be appealing to the faculty, and the Council in particular, if they have any recommendations which they wish passed on to President Ryan through his Advisory Committee. He added he would be glad to receive those recommendations.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernard Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
Thursday, January 13, 1972
Law School

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Lohse, Nevill, J. Taylor; Professors Beall, Bogar, Cutshall, Fleener, Galanti, Higgins, Hutton, Kirch, Levitt, Marks, Meiere, Nagy, Neel, Norins, Schreiber, Wagener, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Irwin, Foust, Holmquist, Lawrence, McDonald, B. Taylor; Professors Alton, Ashmore, Behnke, Bixler, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Gifford, Grossman, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Kinzer, Langsam, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Merritt, Navarre, Nunn, Ochs, O'Loughlin, Ross, Segraves, Weber.

Visitors: R. Bogan, R. Bryant, E. Harris

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of December 9, 1971.
2. Report on visit of North Central Accreditation Association (East).
3. Report of Committee on Committees (Wagener).
4. Report on Parking Developments.
5. Presiding Officer's Business.
6. Agenda Committee Business.
7. New Business.

Chancellor Hine called the January 13, 1972, meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes:

Professor Bogar reported that Dean Lawrence sent him a memo correcting the minutes of December 9, 1971. The change refers to page 6, third paragraph, eleventh sentence from the bottom, which now reads: "Dean Lawrence agreed, but said that consultations are necessary with schools themselves." There being no further suggestions for changes, it was taken by consent the minutes be approved.

Report of Visit of North Central Accreditation Association:

Dean James East gave a summary of the topics covered on December 17 when Mr. Tom Coffey, the Assistant Executive Secretary of the North Central Accreditation Association, visited the campus. He said Mr. Coffey traced the history of the North Central Association, which is one of six regional accrediting associations. The North Central accredits on an institutional basis as opposed to professional accrediting bodies which accredit by subject areas. The Association has a policy of operationally separate accreditation for institutions of multiple campuses. This does not mean that the campuses must be administratively separate. Operationally separate accreditation was first granted to IUPUI in 1969, at least to part of the programs. In 1969 North Central accredited the undergraduate programs at the 38th St. Campus and the Downtown Campus. The visitation will be held some time between November 1, 1972, and January 31, 1973. There will be about a ten man team who will accredit IUPUI at the highest level at which degrees are granted and that means at the doctoral level. When the team is here, it will ask to see reports given by professional accrediting bodies and the results of their visits on campus. The team will be here for four days and the results of the visit will be announced some time in March of 1973. In terms of results, Dean East said we could get unqualified accreditation or qualified accreditation on the following basis: We could get accreditation qualified on the basis of submitting periodical reports. Another qualification might be to have another visitation within a three year period. Another possibility, but not likely, would be the revoking of accreditation. All members of the team visiting will be from outside Indiana and they will be from similar institutions. In the academic areas they will try to use what they call generalists, people who know quite a bit about several different levels. At the undergraduate level, they will review programs in broad disciplines. At the graduate level, however, they must be more specific. They have to look at specific master and doctoral programs. In looking at these graduate programs, they will try to use people on the team from major areas of graduate study available. The team will have an opportunity to look at a preliminary report before they come for the visit. One report they will look at is called "self study" report. The self study report should be submitted to the North Central office by June. The second report they will look at, which must go in some time next fall after registration, is largely a statistical report called "institutional data", which gives information on enrollment, number and qualifications of faculty, budget information and so forth. The team that comes will make the recommendation to the executive board of the Association. The basic thrust of the North Central is to be of assistance to the institution.

Institutional Self-Study:

Dean East said we are now involved in an activity of self study which is more than just simply to account for the status of various programs. They are asking us to look very closely at ourselves on a departmental level, on a management basis, and to be very analytical, for they are very much concerned in knowing if we are aware of problems we face and what plans we have to overcome these problems.

Therefore, he has asked program heads to comment on the description of their program, a statement concerning their major strengths, and a statement concerning the major limitations or weaknesses of their programs. He thought most of the departments have done this and so have the various schools. The accreditation review is not a pass-fail arrangement. They will give us in a written report some of the strong points of our institution and they will point out areas of concern and weaknesses, and will make suggestions for overcoming them. Accreditation at the doctoral level here simply means that we are doing a satisfactory job. Beyond that the North Central is not rating the quality of the institution. Because the accreditation is on an institution-wide basis, we have to look at all areas to make sure where the strengths and weaknesses are. As Mr. Coffey pointed out, continued Dean East, it is true that you might have one or two areas of major weaknesses, but that is probably not going to be enough to pull down the overall results.

Institutional Autonomy:

When there are major weaknesses throughout the university, this gives a total effect that there may be problems that can be overcome or resolved. He added Mr. Coffey said the existence of a faculty constitution is important, but this will not cause the institution to lose its accreditation. For example, the relationships between Lafayette and Bloomington are not going to cause the institution to lose its accreditation. There is no one particular thing that will cause an institution to lose such. After the initial visit, they will give us unqualified accreditation or qualified accreditation. When we get unqualified accreditation, this generally means that the accreditation is good for ten years. Mr. Coffey indicated, however, that the Association is looking at this very carefully and are now considering the possibility of having mature institutions revisited every five years. Granting accreditation makes it possible for an institution to be autonomous, but it does not have to be. The North Central Association does not want to get involved in the question unless the situation to an institution is detrimental to the campus. In other words, said Dean East, Mr. Coffey pointed out responsibility between campuses is a responsibility of the school. If the team feels, however, that a campus should be separate, they would say so.

Dean East continued and said it is not too difficult to point out the present problems if you go over the self study report. Very often when you go about a self study, it is easy to say in departmental reports that we have a shortage of staff and personnel. Every report said that. Everybody is making an appeal for more staff and more money to develop their program. But you have to go beyond that quantitative measurement of your department or school. So the executive committee is now working with this very problem. They are going to be talking with each of the schools, asking questions about their report, and trying to get the schools to look again at the report to make sure they are satisfied with it before it is ready for final draft. The North Central Association is a voluntary association and a visit by that group is a requirement of membership. There are annual dues in the Association and an examination fee at the time of the visit. The main thing in the visit is the professional judgment of those people who visit us.

Statement of Goals and Objectives:

Chancellor Hine said the committee is working diligently to prepare the report for the visit. Professor Bogar said that when Mr. Coffey was here, he stressed the importance of judging an institution in the manner in which they are carrying

out their own goals and objectives. He asked Dean East if we had any statement of goals and objectives. He knew there is a committee working in that area, but wanted to know what was going to be used as a benchmark of what we plan to do as to what we actually are doing. Dean East replied that the goals committee is working on this problem. The question came up in a meeting of the North Central Association executive committee about whether the ad hoc committee was mainly preparing for this report or visit of North Central, or if this committee was one that will be a long-range planning committee. Therefore, he could not answer the question. He did know the whole question of purpose of the institution is probably the most critical, at least for the report. The executive committee feels we should get something in writing now, because it can always be changed, even if it is only to say that at the present time there are no clearcut goals institution-wide. Maybe the clearer statement of goals can be found in the reports of the various schools, because we know that the professional schools, for example, have particular missions and these are clearly stated in their reports. He thought the undergraduate units understand what they are supposed to do to various programs they handle. It was his personal recommendation that we should start getting at stating where we are presently, and then as we work through this year and beyond, we can always refine that. The North Central will look at the initial statement and it should be a statement of history and purpose. They will keep measuring whether or not if we agree on one thing and they will measure almost all the reports with that one, two, or three major thrusts if that is what we say. Professor White reported that Dean East will be meeting with the goals committee in the very near future. Chancellor Hine commented that the goals and objectives committee grew out of an assignment that was made to the same group last spring to prepare materials to present in response to Resolution #8 in the legislature. This resolution mandated each of the campuses to write a report stating how far they were developing toward autonomy and their general problems. We do have, he believed, in every unit some objectives that are fairly well spelled out. The goals and objectives committee was challenged to prepare some overall goals for IUPUI and it was not appointed primarily to write a report for the North Central Accreditation Association visit. It was thought that this committee could in very deliberate fashion interview many people, students, administrators, faculty and staff, and come up with a report that might well be a benchmark for many years to come. He assumed that the goals committee would be far enough along in their work that they could be of help in preparing material for the North Central Association visit. He also assumed that the goals and objectives committee will continue to work even after the North Central Association visit is finished, perhaps basing some of their report on the recommendations of the North Central Association. That might add another facet to the problem.

Input of Faculty and Students:

Professor Meiere asked about the possibility of the accreditation team talking with people as far down the ladder as departmental chairmen. Dean East said they are very much interested in talking with faculty and students. It will be a thorough examination. Chancellor Hine said he had been on several site visits and they do want to talk to everyone. Many faculty will be asked what their goals are. If an individual teacher does not know what the individual goals of his class are, it will be a demerit. They will ask also how does one program fit in with some other related program. If the people in math do not really know what physics is doing, somebody will make a little note of it. Professor Meiere asked if the faculty would be provided with a summary of what is given in writing to the accreditation team. Dean East responded they could see any of the material available now from a member of the executive committee. The executive committee, starting January 26, will be asking the deans if their

faculty has seen the material and if they have some idea of what is being said about the unit. They are trying to get people to read what is being considered presently, and certainly the final report will be available, as will any of the preliminary material. Chancellor Hine asked Dean East if a dress rehearsal had been considered. Dean East said they thought when the executive committee goes around, they will want to go to locations and talk to various deans, but beyond that they have not thought of having a mass visit. The reason they are going to locations is that they intend to read the material very carefully and intend to ask questions and they want some answers. Professor Nagy asked if the accreditation team would be using the 1969 report in their visit and if it would be wise for faculty to review the report. Dean East said the 1969 reports, one submitted to the President of Indiana University for the visit of the Downtown Campus and the other presented to the President of Purdue for the visit to the 38th St. Campus, will be made available to the ten man team. They will ask specifically of these two units what has happened since then, and if organizational problems were pointed out before, what has been done. Dean East said his copy is available to faculty, but must be read in his office. Chancellor Hine commented that it is a detailed procedure and a time consuming procedure, but he thought most would agree that the time we spend in self study in preparing for critical visits has some side benefits. Therefore, he urged all to do it very carefully and conscientiously.

Report of Committee on Committees:

Professor Wagener recommended faculty to serve on the Athletic Affairs Committee and the Resources and Planning Committee of the Faculty Council and moved the acceptance and implementation of these committees. (See Faculty Council Document #10, attached.) Professor Nagy seconded. The motion carried.

Report on Parking Developments:

Vice Chancellor Ryder said he did not think it was surprising that any member of the faculty, staff, or student body here would be bewildered by this new parking system as complex as things are here with this University, having various locations, and all kinds of part-time and full-time students and faculty. The parking system initiated partially last spring and then fully in August of this past year has helped. The rapid growth of the institution creates many problems which are difficult to foresee, for construction of new facilities sometimes requires re-designation of lots and/or complete elimination of lots. Another factor affecting the parking situation is the working hours of employees. We have a hospital area that runs around the clock and, obviously, we have several shifts of people moving in and out of here, as well as a large contingent of visitors, patients, part-time faculty, part-time students, resident faculty, and volunteer workers. So all of these create problems that need to be dealt with in any kind of parking system we have. Another factor which affects the parking situation is the establishment of parking policies which provide for preferential parking for faculty and key staff, in other words, blue parking. Establishing a parking policy does create problems in administering any program. Thus, if we said all faculty and students could come on a first come, first serve basis, and we simply provided enough spaces to take care of all of the students and faculty who would be here on this campus at any one time, that would be more flexible and there would always be parking spaces, even though you might have to walk further. The parking policy committee did establish two different faculty preferential parking policies. Of course, if we were to provide a single space for every full and part-time faculty and student, we would not have enough land to provide the spaces.

Calculation of Parking Needs:

Vice Chancellor Ryder said now the basis for our estimations of parking space demand comes from a study entitled "An Estimation of Parking Demand at a University Campus Serving Commuter Students" by Professor Harold Michaels, a Purdue University civil engineer who is nationally recognized in his field for the development of parking facilities. IUPUI fits, in Vice Chancellor Ryder's judgment, his models very closely, but obviously requires refinements to the unique local conditions. He thought since we really only got into this system in August, it is a question of being able to adjust as quickly as we can to meet unexpected requirements, and also to study the parking patterns based upon Michaels' prediction models, and then make refinements and be able to predict in the future our requirements.

In calculating the demand for student parking spaces, one must consider the number of students in class during each hour of the day and evening for the whole week. According to Michaels' study, the ratio of students with parking stickers to spaces could go up to 5 to 1 in a commuter campus. Faculty and staff could go up to 2 to 1. Both these ratios will depend upon the relative proportions of full and part-time faculty and staff. Our assignment of spaces has been based upon experience with this system and our best judgment about unique factors. We do plan to refine our procedures in making these estimates, since this will be very important when it comes to considering the development of parking garages, which is one of our considerations now. We are thinking of about \$2,000 a space in a parking garage, whereas flat space now is running over \$300 a space.

Vice Chancellor Ryder continued and said that Professor Levitt expressed concern over some of the above factors. For example, Professor Levitt pointed out that in the figures he received, he had the student parking area ratio to be not quite 2.5 to 1. Since he was not aware of this system, he raised a question of whether this was high or low or what. When you consider that it could go up to 5 to 1, then obviously as far as the red parking stickers are concerned, we are in good shape. He felt 2.5 to 1 was a fair figure and we could go up at least close to 4, when you consider that there is a lot of free space in the area. The amount of free space is something like 54 spaces less than the amount of space available on a fee basis.

Now in the green faculty and staff area, the figures Professor Levitt received were 1.5 to 1. Professor Levitt interrupted and said he did not receive these figures, but computed them himself. Vice Chancellor Ryder said according to the guidelines, we should be able to afford 2 to 1. With respect to blue stickers, Professor Levitt's figures were 1.5 to 1. However, the figure of 12,049 decals sold included 250 pool stickers and that is a duplicate of the others, for you cannot have two pool cars on the campus at the same time. So it really gets down to a total of 999 stickers and of those, 368 are volunteer faculty who are in here part-time, 146 are residents, and 485 are regular full-time faculty. This adds up to 999 and we have 843 blue spaces. Therefore, you have a ratio of about 1 to 1 instead of 2 to 1. Therefore, Vice Chancellor Ryder maintained that the current existence of free and paid parking spaces is adequate, but there are certain problems that exist. First of all, there is a strong desire on the part of most faculty, administrators, staff and students to park within 50 feet of the building they want to enter. That is a problem. We have been developing parking facilities and are going to develop some others in cooperation with General Hospital on the north side. In front of Long and Ball Residence we are going to develop a kind of inner drive with parking along both sides of it.

Then we have authorization to construct three parking garages. We have authorization, but not the money. Therefore, we have to find a way to get either private support or float bonds and pay it from the cost of parking fees.

Parking Committee Policies:

The parking policy committee has established policies that exist now. This committee is chaired by Dr. Bogan from the School of Dentistry, and has six staff or administrators, five faculty, one clerical, one service and three students serving on it. One of the students is from the Downtown Campus, another from 38th St., and the other from the School of Medicine. Another complaint, and perhaps the most important, results from a policy which was established and supported by the parking policy committee primarily at the request and insistence of the people from the hospitals. That is a policy which says that at 2:30 p.m., in the areas immediately surrounding the hospitals, there will be no enforcement of the parking policy. The rationale behind this is that the people who come on the 3 to 11 shift will be leaving the hospitals at 11 p.m. and many of these people are women. In terms of their security, they felt they should be able to park as close to the hospitals as possible. Now what happens frequently is that someone who has bought a blue sticker is replaced by one of these people at 2:30, because he left at maybe 2:00 and came back at 4:00. When he comes back, all the spaces are gone. Vice Chancellor Ryder thought this represents a tremendous number of the complaints received, particularly from blue and green areas being concerned about available spaces. He said he has asked the parking policy committee to reconsider this decision and evaluate it from the point of view that perhaps we can provide adequate security necessary in the area to eliminate any fears at night. Ron Bryant has provided a police car in the area at the time of the shift change with its red light turning, so that people could turn to that if there was a problem. We also have increased the lighting in the area. He added he thought it is the sincere desire of the administration to deliver an effective and efficient parking system and the parking policy committee has really worked diligently to make adjustments and refine the program. He added they do appreciate the constructive criticism that anyone might have.

Distribution of Parking Spaces:

Chancellor Hine asked Professor Bogan if he wanted to add to Vice Chancellor Ryder's report. Professor Bogan said that if there is a problem with parking, it is probably one of distribution. There are many areas where we have completely adequate parking, even more than enough, and other areas where it is quite tight. Obviously the areas it is tightest are the areas where there is not additional, sufficient space to rectify the problem. Secondly, the parking policy committee has identified and tried to publicize to people in different segments of the campus that they have appointed a number of subcommittees representing individual areas. So, if someone has a problem, complaint or suggestion, people are available who are familiar with the problems of that particular area. Professor Hutton asked if the committee has thought of a way to make some arrangements for the ill and elderly people to get from the parking areas to the clinical areas by some means, since they cannot park close. Professor Bogan said they have thought about it, but did not come up with a solution. They have markedly increased the amount of visitor parking in the center of the campus, but at peak times this too is inadequate. He added they realize they have a responsibility to patients, but everyone on campus would like to have a parking lot in the Medical Center devoted to their needs. We have to divide up as equitably as possible. As far as waiting stations for patients are concerned, he did not

recall that ever having been recommended. Chancellor Hine said this has been mentioned, but it presents a logistics problem. It would be difficult to set up a delivery service for our patients. However, it might be possible to find a place where they could wait, out of the weather. Professor Fleener asked about the drive around Riley at the northeast corner. He felt people really zip around there, and thought the area is a real safety problem. Chancellor Hine suggested we ought to install some safety bumps to slow people up a little here.

Validity of Parking Studies:

Professor Levitt asked how pool stickers were duplicates and to explain that. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied that, for example, if three people buy a pool sticker and each car has a sticker, only one car may be on the campus at the same time. Professor Levitt felt you could not discount the whole 250 pool stickers. Some of those cars are driven; in fact, you do not even know how many to discard. One problem, he felt, is that there is apparently no account kept anywhere of how many decals are sold by area. Problems are different in different areas of the campus. If you talk about the Downtown Campus, or 38th St. Campus, you are talking about a liberal arts community. Faculty come and go in a much different way in a liberal arts community than they do at the Medical Center. In fact, the majority of the people at the Medical Center are 8 to 5 people. So there is an acute problem that takes place at the early morning hours and which lets up in the middle of the day. He had not heard any complaints about the lifting of parking regulations at 2:30. He thought the objection is that when you come in, you cannot find a parking place. He felt the analysis Vice Chancellor Ryder gave is kind of like a strong logical structure that stands on a single questionable premise, and if you pull out the premise, the whole structure collapses. He said Vice Chancellor Ryder kept going back to Professor Michaels, who is one isolated person, who said on a commuter campus we can have 5 to 1 or 2 to 1. In the first place, he was sure there is another expert somewhere who might not agree with Professor Michaels and who might have a different estimate, a different set of figures, to say nothing of what experience suggests. Professor Levitt did not think we have a typical commuter campus. He thought Professor Michaels was referring to a regional campus or an extension. He did not feel he was talking about the professional colleges that we have which are different in their parking patterns from the liberal arts college. He felt it is appalling that no attempt is made to restrict the number of decals that are sold. He felt if you acknowledge the fact that in a particular area you have so many blue spaces, then it seems to him that policy should dictate that just so many blue decals are sold. He felt to say that green areas are 49% over-subscribed or that they could be over-subscribed 100% according to Professor Michaels is a bad consolation. He felt the matter needs some different kind of analysis, some different approach for it is going to get worse, not better. He also understood that the high rise parking garages were unfeasible for IUPUI. The law requires that if they are financed by public bond issues, that the bonds must be retired or whatever payments are made entirely on the basis of fees charged for parking. He thought that would probably put it out of the range of most of us, for nobody would pay that kind of money.

Parking Garages:

Chancellor Hine reported we have had feasibility studies for this campus about parking garages. He was quite disappointed to find that the one made most recently recommended that no parking garage be built to the north of the Medical Science Building and the south of the proposed Regenstrief Health Center. Their

reasoning was that they did not want to bring all those people into that area to work. But Chancellor Hine's reply to that was that they are going to bring people in to deposit them and drive out, so you double the traffic hazard. He added they have had other people take a look at this and they all say they do not believe they could recommend a parking garage in an area that has so many free spaces that are not occupied. This is true, for we have free spaces that are within two blocks of the University Hospital that have never been filled. He also felt, however, our problem is that the people want to park close by and they are willing to pay in order to do so. So within the last month he has asked for a re-evaluation of this by one of the commercial companies and they should reply soon. He would not be too surprised if what they may recommend that we have a parking garage in the area that will help serve Riley, Marion County General, and the Regenstrief Health Center. That is in the future, however, and will not help anyone this spring. But he just wanted to point out that there has been re-evaluation of some of the experts that really took time to sit down and see what our problems are. It is true that a person can casually drive around the campus and say they would not recommend a parking garage. But when they get to interview people and can see the problems, they change their minds. He would not, therefore, discount in the long range a parking garage to serve the complex hospitals just mentioned. Professor Levitt asked just where they drive around and see all these parking spaces. Chancellor Hine said there is a lot south of the Dental School that has never been filled. There is adequate free parking on campus, but unfortunately, it is not where it is needed most. The experts say who is going to pay to park in a parking garage when they can walk a block and park for free. The answer is that there are many people who would pay and this is what the Chancellor said he had been telling them.

Peak Hour Parking:

Professor Neel asked to comment about the peak time for certain areas. In the morning hours the peak time is around the hospital, but when you get to Cavanaugh Hall at 5:30 p.m., you can hardly find a parking place anywhere. He understood it is the same way at 38th St. Vice Chancellor Ryder felt we have a situation here that needs to be analyzed here on the spot and that somebody's formula will not necessarily fit these precise conditions. We do need to evaluate this and we have used our best judgment in initiating the program. If we do the studies and make refinements of them, we should be able to predict what the situation is going to be here. Professor Levitt stated it would be very useful if the Safety Department would keep an account of the decals that are sold by area, for he felt it would be very revealing. Chancellor Hine thought it might be possible and very useful to have the person, when he purchases a decal, indicate what area he would be most apt to use. That might give us the facts that would be useful. Dean Nevill asked if the Veterans Administration parking system was connected with our system. Chancellor Hine replied it is independent. Professor Meiere said Purdue University collected several hundred thousand dollars from fair patrons and he was not sure what has happened to that money. Rumor has it that it is obtained and earmarked for the technology building parking. He asked if this was true. Vice Chancellor Ryder said he thought this was a transaction between the two universities that has not been completed, but that as far as Purdue University is concerned, it will be turned over in total to Indiana University for the purpose of parking.

New Parking Areas:

Chancellor Hine said he realized this is a difficult problem and a very complex one that deserves constant study. He was convinced that we are doing more from the administration's side than the faculty realizes. For example, parking

to the south of Coleman and Long Hospitals seemed a very logical thing to do. But in times of ecology, there were all kinds of complaints about getting rid of the green grass. It took him several months to get approval of the Board of Trustees to develop the inner road which is much needed. We have so many outlets between the hospitals and Michigan that it is very inefficient. We will have to cut down and close some of those and put them in areas that will be controlled by lights so it will be easier to get in and out. We are developing some landscaping, so the appearance will be actually enhanced and we will add some parking spaces right where they are needed. He asked to report that he has gone to the Riley Board several times to build a parking lot for Riley Hospital. They have tentatively agreed to take a look at a plan that would improve the parking for Riley. This will be good because it will relieve the pressure elsewhere. But it has taken months of careful talking and study to be able to get them to even listen to such a proposal. He wanted to say merely that they are aware of the problems and are working on them. It is going to get worse when you start constructing a Medical Science Building and a Regenstrief Health Center. That is why he is talking very persuasively to build a parking garage in that area. They are trying to anticipate problems that are going to be really much worse than now in a year or two if this construction does begin. In the meanwhile, they would appreciate suggestions and also hope for a little patience.

Presiding Officer's Business:

Chancellor Hine reported there was turned into the legislature this year a supplemental budget request for IUPUI, based upon an estimation of unexpected expenses totalling about \$1,300,000 in operating expenses. For example, Blue Cross-Blue Shield prices have gone up and the University's part will go up appreciably. There was an increase in our social security payments we must make. This was not unanticipated, but it is the kind of thing that is difficult to budget for. Increased cost of coal, oil, phones, electrical bills were not anticipated. We were the only division of Indiana University or Purdue University that asked for a supplemental budget appropriation for capital expenditures. We have asked for consideration of the SET building. We asked for \$10 million for the SET building for this biennium and only got a total of about \$6 million. We are now asking for enough to complete this building as planned, pointing out it would be much more economical and desirable to build it as a unit rather than in phases. We have also asked for additional funds for the Medical Science addition which will be sorely needed when the impact of the state-wide medical education plan hits this campus next year. Federal funds apparently are not going to be available to help build this building because they have been frozen. Consequently, if we are going to have a Medical Science Building, which we need desperately, we are going to have to depend upon state funds. All this has been requested, and the Chancellor said he appeared before the higher commission on education to defend it.

Wage Price Freeze:

Concerning retroactive pay raises, Chancellor Hine reported that on December 10 President Ryan asked for a ruling of paying retroactively pay to people who are caught in the freeze. On the 17th of December the IRS reported that the ruling on retroactive pay would be deferred until President Nixon signed the bill authorizing this. On the 22nd of December President Nixon did sign the bill. On January 6, however, IRS stated that the bill the President signed made it possible for the President to make arrangements to pay. So IRS is waiting for the President to make arrangements to pay. The Chancellor added we did not get the money that was withheld. The state budget agency did not give to universities a certain percentage of the money that was appropriated to them because they knew

we were not paying these raises. We assume that if the President's ruling is that these are going to be paid, then the money will be released to us. The Chancellor asked Professor Bogar if he cared to comment since he is on President Ryan's special committee on the wage price freeze. Professor Bogar reported in the meetings of the ad hoc committee on the wage price freeze, and in the letter by President Ryan of December 10, they took great pains to point out that we were not asking for a retroactive pay increase. Rather, their plea was based upon several issues which they felt exempted us from the freeze initially. They felt that this was not only the most strategic approach, but also the most logical since they felt these issues substantively did exempt us from the freeze originally. Professor Bogar felt the committee's arguments were very substantial and cogent ones.

Chancellor Hine said there would be an IUPUI basketball game on January 22 at 7:30 p.m. at Ritter High School. IUPUI will play Kokomo.

Agenda Committee Business:

Professor Bogar reported there was no Agenda Committee business. Professor Neel asked what happened to the academic structure proposal. Professor Bogar replied the minutes of that special meeting would be circulated, along with a related document which talks about a consortium for undergraduate government. Any comments should be sent to the Academic Affairs Committee.

New Business: Cancelling of Classes, January 21, 1972.

Professor Cutshall referred to a memo sent to all faculty and staff by John G. Williams, Registrar, having to do with late registration and drop/add. The statement, with the approval of Vice Chancellor Buhner, dismisses classes on Friday, January 21, 1972, to enable maximum participation of faculty and students in late registration and drop/add. This statement bothered him, for the loss of class time on this particular day is rather critical for some people who have their schedules already made out. The faculty are supposed to have the power, according to the constitution, to fix the academic calendar. He always interpreted this to mean that the faculty are the ones that take initiative to cancel classes on any given day, add additional days, and so on. It seemed to him that the registration officer had not consulted with the faculty about setting up this day of cancelled classes. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied that cancelling classes on that Friday grew out of a number of considerations. One of the more important ones was that in our present stage of development, it is very difficult to get the kind of staff mounted into our registration and enrollment procedure to provide for a systematic and openly efficient late registration program which involves changing of classes, dropping and adding, and late registration. They found in our present stage of development it very difficult to see how we can provide a week long service. The whole business of late registration and drop/add has become a fairly massive one. We have to have the people and machinery available to handle the situation. We were then faced with an alternative, either do this over a week or concentrate it on Friday and Saturday. We thought the best possible opportunity administratively to accomplish this was to have it on two days.

Another factor is that throughout the period of late registration, traditionally we have had difficulty in having the very people present in the system who needed most to be there, namely the faculty, to advise students. Experience has taught

us that the faculty are unable, for a variety of reasons, to be present during the period of enrollment activities that take place after the start of classes. They are involved in teaching classes, seeing students, and starting the normal routine of the semester. So it seemed that perhaps the only way to be certain that faculty could be available to service students in academic counseling was to simply clear the deck and make a day clear for this. Vice Chancellor Buhner said this was not an arbitrary decision between the registrar and himself. It was discussed in great depth and in great length in a group of undergraduate deans and representatives. Beyond that, the Chancellor put it on the agenda of the council of deans, made up of all academic deans of IUPUI. At no point was this ever said to be an ideal way to do it. If it does not work well, he assured everyone it would not ever be done again. On the other hand, if it does work well, he would propose to do this regularly, or some version of it. Hopefully we will not have to suspend classes, for he is opposed to that like everyone else. He added that we are still on a manual system of registration, but this is not where we hope to stay. Vice Chancellor Ryder has a program which he hopes will get us on an automated system of registration and enrollment. Hopefully this system will obviate the need to stop classes. Chancellor Hine added that he hesitates to cancel classes at any time and he was a little critical when this came up late. Nevertheless, we do have a difficult problem and he hoped that the faculty would cooperate in trying to make this work. He agreed that this is not the proper way to do it, for it should have been announced last summer or last fall.

Professor Cutshall said he appreciated the detailed explanation, but nonetheless, he felt the Council ought to act on this and if the Council disapproves, then he assumed that means we cannot cancel classes. Professor Levitt moved a resolution of support for the Williams-Buhner memo. Professor Neel seconded. Professor Schreiber replied the meeting had no quorum. Professor Levitt felt any action that was taken in the absence of a quorum would not become official until the minutes at the next meeting are approved by a quorum of the Council. Dean Nevill felt there is a slight difference here between setting a schedule and cancelling classes. He felt the faculty does have the right of setting a schedule, but affirmed the Chancellor's right to close the school if he feels it is for good reason. Professor Cutshall wanted to know if there was any possibility at all in scheduling a make-up for this period. Some lab classes will be behind because of this cancellation. Vice Chancellor Buhner said we would make every effort to make it up, and that some people have already accommodated for this. Chancellor Hine called for the question. The resolution legalizing the action previously taken about Friday, January 21 was approved. Chancellor Hine replied we would follow the suggestion and any action will be ratified at the next meeting.

Chancellor Hine said he has been concerned at the lack of communication that exists between administration and faculty. Therefore, effective immediately, he has appointed Noel Duerden as Director of Information Services at IUPUI. He will be responsible for the operations of the News Bureau, IUPUI presentations, and will be responsible for coordination for our information services for Indiana University and Purdue University.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
Thursday, February 10, 1972
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Vice Chancellor Ryder; Deans Foust, J. Taylor; Professors Alton, Bogar, Cutshall, Fleener, Galanti, Gifford, Grossman, Hutton, Jarboe, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Levitt, Mandelbaum, Marks, Meiere, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, Nunn, O'Loughlin, Ross, Schreiber, Wagener, Wisner.

Members Absent: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellor Buhner; Deans Holmquist, Irwin, Lawrence, Lohse, McDonald, Nevill, B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Beall, Behnke, Bixler, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Higgins, Johnston, Mamlin, Merritt, Ochs, Segraves, Weber, White.

Visitors: Dean Wolf; Professors Bonser, Duerden, Harris.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of January 13, 1972
2. Report on School of Environmental and Public Affairs
3. Presiding Officer's Business
4. Agenda Committee Business
5. New Business

Vice Chancellor Ryder called the February 10, 1972 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order. He introduced Noel Duerden, Director of Information Services, to the Council and said he would be attending the Council meetings in the future.

Approval of Minutes:

Professor Langsam moved the minutes be accepted and Professor Wagener seconded. The motion carried.

Report on School of Environmental and Public Affairs: (See attached Report to All-University Council.)

Vice Chancellor Ryder introduced Dr. Charles Bonser, who is the special assistant to the President for the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Professor Bonser said he was glad to have the opportunity to talk with the Council about what has happened so far in establishing the University's new School for Public and Environmental Affairs, and about plans that are now being developed to actually put the School into operation. In 1969 the IU Board of Trustees requested the Faculty Council to explore ways in which the University might more directly relate to the needs of society. The Council appointed an Academic Priorities Committee to examine this and in 1970, they recommended a School of Public Affairs. The report of the Academic Priorities Committee then was transmitted back to the Faculty Council in Bloomington and the President established an All-University Committee to examine this report and pursue the idea. The All-University Committee next made a report to the University Council in March of 1971, recommending the establishment of a School of Public and Environmental Affairs. The All-University Committee accepted the basic philosophy behind the recommendation of the Academic Priorities Committee, but they added to it. They said they endorsed the idea of a School and they embellished on the kinds of things the School should be in to. They also said they felt that the School should give a special focus in the direction of the environmental area. This was a pressing concern, nationally as well as state-wide, and they felt that by indicating the term environmental within the public affairs title, that this would express to the general public and build support within the University for more emphasis on these kinds of programs one normally would find in the traditional School of Public Affairs. They also recommended that the charter of the School, rather than being restricted to the Bloomington Campus, be broad enough to allow all of the campuses of the University to engage in these programs to the extent that they wished. This recommendation then was transmitted to the IU Board of Trustees and on the 27th of March, the Board of Trustees approved the proposal of the University Council. At this point the Higher Education Commission was in the process of being established. Early in October then the President asked Professor Bonser to take on the assignment of preparing the materials for the Higher Education Commission to consider the idea of the School and to begin the developmental work of getting people together who have this kind of interest, talking about what kinds of programs they might develop, deciding where the School ought to be heading, and doing some organizational kinds of tasks. On January 14, the Higher Education Commission formally approved the School. Since that time, they have had a number of committees trying to decide on precisely what the School was going to be in terms of the kinds of academic programs it will have and what kinds of research it will head toward.

Need for School:

In the School of Public and Environmental Affairs they will train people for public service in a variety of functions and to perform applied public policy research. As shown in the charts presented by Dr. Bonser, employment in the state and local government sector is projected to increase 52%. In the federal

government sector there is a 10% increase, so there is not a great deal of growth anticipated there in employment. Manufacturing is projected at 11%, the construction industry at 35%, finance, insurance and banking at 24%. So the state and local government sector is the most rapidly growing sector. He next illustrated how these needs are now being met, with people who are trained in the public administration and public affairs area. In 1970 there were only 362 bachelor degrees awarded in the whole nation in the area of public administration. Of these, 252 were in the mid-continent through the west coast. Most of these, in fact 244, were awarded in California alone. So in the midwestern area, 18 degrees were awarded. It is obvious that the current thrust of the educational institution is not to train people at the bachelor's level for work in this area. He pointed out that at the master's level, it has been estimated that the needs are estimated to be increasing 5,000 per year for master's level people. In 1970 there were around 1,000 turned out nationally and the demand has been building, but not being met.

Professor Bonser then referred to a breakdown of employment within state and local government. He indicated there was a 52% projected increase in government employment, including people employed in primary and secondary schools. Between 1955 and 1965 the greatest demand for people in the state and local government was in the educational sector. We had an 82.6% rate of growth in that decade for school teacher kinds of people, due to the baby boom. Between 1965 and 1975 the trends reverse, due to the tapering off of the number of children moving into the public school system. Now, the non-educational sector is the most rapidly growing area in the state and local government.

Professor Bonser next indicated the projected rate increase in various areas within the state and local government sector. Only a 17% employment increase is expected in highways, but the School of Public Affairs will not train people primarily to work in highway areas, so essentially, there will be no engineering people. However, in the health and hospital area you have a 62% rate of growth, and he felt the program headed by Dr. Hopper in Health Management would fit into this category. Housing and urban renewal is 88% and the environmental kinds of problems almost 80%. In terms of current vacancies, in 1971 there were listings for 126 city and county managers nationally. The source here is the City and National Management Association. For urban planners, there were 560 vacancies in 1971, and for general public works administrators, engineers and so on, there were 818 vacancies. The source is the American Public Works Association.

The last illustration referred to a California study made in 1966 and it calls attention to the fact that while there are needs for new people to enter these professions, we have also the problem of attrition for people are retiring and/or moving to other kinds of employment.

Need for a Special School:

In the state of California by 1985 they expect 2,314 vacancies because of attrition. Dr. Bonser said, therefore, there is a great command for the people of the type they are talking about turning out in a School such as this. One might ask why we need a new school to do this for universities turn out people for public service and have done so for a long time. He felt one of the reasons why this is particularly crucial is that we have a new kind of focus to train people for this sector, aside from the fact that the demands are growing by leaps

and bounds much more rapidly than has been the case in the past when we did turn out people with a lot of different academic backgrounds to work in these areas. Secondly, the university system has had a number of programs that have floated around for a long time, many of which are homeless, and probably have not been able to do the job they could have done had they been provided a central focus and colleagues to work with. Both organizationally, and as far as the university is concerned, it makes it much more clear to the general public what we are about if we can provide a central focus for programs that are already in existence. Besides, it also helps in attracting outside funding for programs of this nature. Another reason that is often given for a separate program of this type, and he quoted from George Frederickson, a well-known public administrator, "The two keys to organizational viability for public affairs education seem to be separateness and bridging." Most specialists in the field now agree that the best programs in public affairs in the country are those that have some or another form of separate status in the university. Dr. Bonser added Mr. Frederickson goes on to say "The assessment of public affairs education done in 1967 concurred in the separateness argument and added the importance of bridging from schools or departments of public affairs to other professional schools and social sciences. For a school of public affairs to make a real impact on the quality of government, it should not only influence its own students, but impact the students of those departments and schools that supply the bulk of public servants. To facilitate this the school of public affairs should relate to other departments and schools in the university. The best bridges are built in three ways: first by a cooperative exchange of students and faculty; second by the judicious use of joint appointments; and third by research ventures that relate public affairs questions to policy questions." Dr. Bonser said he thinks one of the things that a school such as this can do is build bridges to all kinds of academic departments. It is the only way a school like this is going to be able to perform its function. It also is going to allow the traditional academic departments to do things that they would not be able to do in any other way. They simply have to have another kind of organizational mechanism, in his opinion, that would be of access to accomplish things that they just cannot accomplish within the traditional departments within which they find themselves. He said he was not saying they should break off, but it gives them another avenue for such things as interdisciplinary research and interdisciplinary educational programs.

Organization of School:

The School, Dr. Bonser added, as the committees working on this are developing it, seems to be in three divisions. There should be an academic division, a research division (which will be primarily engaged in contract research), and a technology transfer or technology applications or communications division. Most people involved feel we should have some work in the direction of technology transfer or technology applications or communications. This, he felt, is of some importance in the environmental area, for instance, to transmit to city-county officials what some of the possible technical solutions are for the environmental problems we are facing. He added these things are still open to question and none of them are settled yet.

Academic Programs:

The academic programs that seem to be coming out are master's level programs, undergraduate level programs, two-year associate degree programs, and in-service training programs. The School, when it went before the Higher Education Commission, requested the authorization for a doctorate in public affairs. He said he

did not know how fast that will come along, but he guessed when it does come along, it will be a very small effort. It was his feeling that students with an interest at the doctoral level will be more specialized and gravitate more toward sociology, political science, and other disciplines.

In the master's program, there appears to be two types. The first is called a master's in public affairs and will be a 48 hour degree. It will consist of three basic components, the first being a total component where students would be required to have proficiency in quantitative tools of analysis, behavior tools and economic tools. The second part of the master's in public affairs is heading toward a systems look at public management. The third and final phase would allow students to follow particular tracks. For example, you could pursue the urban planning track, the city management track, or the environmental track.

The second kind of master's degree will be labeled an M.S. and will be a one year or 30-36 hour degree. It will be designed to do two things. First, the people who will be eligible for it will be those who have had considerable experience in a governmental sector already; for example, five years of experience or equivalent in public administration. Now this M.S. would be more closely tailored then because of the kind of people and the particular needs of the student. For instance, say a person has worked for the FBI for fifteen years, he obviously does not need any track work in public safety area, but probably needs work in quantitative analysis, systems analysis, or general management. So his program would be kind of a generalized program in the public administration area. On the other hand, you could have a person who spent alot of time in government, but never really developed a track. He might decide he wants to pursue public safety or environmental management. In his case, you probably work with tools and more work in a particular track area.

The undergraduate program will probably not be greatly different from most other undergraduate programs. At the undergraduate level students are dispersed throughout the university and you are constrained by what the rest of the university is doing in terms of time frames. Because of this, there will be less innovation in the undergraduate program structurally. His committee has discussed a model where undergraduates would take two years general education courses and in the junior year, move into a public administration core of material and then move into electives. One innovation that the committee is toying with is to incorporate a cooperative education option, or internships. The particular proposal that is before the committee now would allow a student, for example, the summer between his sophomore and junior year, to spend the summer working in the local government area. Then the next year in the fall semester he could work in the state governmental area and the following year perhaps move to a federal internship. One thing that the committee is most concerned about is to make sure that any internship that is proposed by the school is an educational experience and not simply a way for the student to pay his way through school. Since they are talking about offering credit for this kind of work, it means it will require alot of supervision, both before the student enters the internship, while he is in the internship, and after he is finished. So it is an expensive program to administer for it takes alot of professional time to work with these people during the course of the internship.

In the associate degree program, he felt there are several directions a two year program could take. For instance, he had a discussion with some governmental people from Gary and they are interested in the Gary campus working with them to provide an associate degree program for Lake County governmental employees.

Professor Bonser concluded and said all these programs are under study and discussion now and there is nothing formal to present to the President's policy committee yet. They hope to have some programs going on some campuses next fall, both at the undergraduate and master's level. He added that the next question would probably be how will these programs and the School relate to the various campuses of the University. He said he guessed the only way he could answer that is that nobody is really quite sure. He thought it depends upon how the faculty, students and administration of various campuses feel about it. If they think it is a high priority item, what are the possibilities within their own institution for getting these things under way. Therefore, he said he was encouraging the faculties to start thinking about these programs.

Funding of School:

Professor Langsam asked if the School is basically located in Bloomington if the funding is from the Bloomington budget. Professor Bonser replied no and that the School will report to the Academic Vice President, which is in the system budget of the University. Professor Langsam said she questioned how the various campuses that are to be encouraged to participate and how assistance is to be offered. One of the problems, she thought, of programs of this kind is a lack of funding. She thought here on the IUPUI campus, both in environmental and metropolitan studies, they have not received funding and could do better jobs with it. She asked how does our relationship to the School relate to actual monies and also for autonomy of developing programs. Professor Bonser replied that faculty always have the autonomy to develop programs, provided they have funds of course. But one way the thing might develop here with the programs mentioned could possibly become the core for such a program here. His own feeling was that by grouping some programs that are going in this area, he thought they would be much more visible than they could possibly be by kind of floating on their own. He added that if the faculty decides how they want to proceed, precisely what kinds of programs they want to offer, what it is going to cost, then he would do his very best to help get whatever funds he could. Professor Langsam said what concerned her is a certain number of existing programs already in action or operating and at the moment the School has no programs. Since there are existing programs, how do we relate in terms of getting a share of the pie and when the report does come through, she would like to see a very specific statement on this issue. Professor Bonser said that he has told everyone what his thinking is on the school and asked if they could tell him if they think there is a possibility for a unit such as this on this campus. If so, then what should it look like and what will it cost and what are its objectives. Professor Langsam felt they would be able to provide this information. Professor Kirch asked if Professor Bonser had any personal commitment from President Ryan as far as funding and faculty. Professor Bonser replied the proposal for the School said that it would have its own faculty, with its own budget and the right to promote and grant tenure to its faculty.

Attraction of Funds:

Professor Bonser's feeling was that the School would have some full-time faculty and some joint appointment faculty. For instance, he could see within a traditional sociology department finding people with different kinds of interests. Some may be more theoretically inclined and some more inclined along application theory. It could be that the applications oriented sociologist would be interested in having a joint appointment with a unit such as this and because of that interest might be interested in working on research across disciplinary lines for people who have the same problem kind of focus. The President has not said 'here is how much money you have to develop the School' and Professor Bonser did not

feel it would work that way. He felt we would have to say these are the programs we have in mind, that is what it is going to cost, and then work the best we can to fund it. He thought the area has all kinds of possibilities for outside funding. The National Science Foundation has set up a whole new division which means research applied to national needs and they are application oriented. The federal government is not interested any more, it seems, in funding programs that do not really indicate what it would mean to society in an application sense. The School we are talking about fits this description. He felt if we can give it enough visibility by grouping units together, we can attract the kind of funding to do things in a really big way. He felt a unit such as this would have a very strong say in university resources, if it does the job it is capable of doing. Professor Meiere said there has been serious effort on the Indianapolis campus toward environmental and urban affairs research, and probably slated more toward physical or natural sciences research than administration, but so far, no federal funds are available. He asked if there is any mechanism or any part of the population in Bloomington that could cooperate with this effort in Indianapolis. Professor Bonser replied he hoped so. If we can figure out projects that are truly interdisciplinary, he really thought there are big research funding possibilities. Professor Meiere asked if there is any formal mechanism for people under him who provide contacts with Washington. Professor Bonser said in the research division mentioned, he has asked to have people who can fill the coordination role in getting people together, getting to talk about possible projects, filling the marketing role, and keeping close wraps on what is happening in Washington funding programs and the possibilities for projects we are interested in. They expect to be active in this area and are working with Dean Merritt's office.

Organizational Structure:

Professor Meiere asked if there is no formal mechanism now where we can go and apply for funding and Professor Bonser replied that there is no mechanism at all now. Professor Meiere asked if he had a time schedule for this. Professor Bonser felt there is a chance they would have that going this spring. He said some of the units he has mentioned that are floating are being merged and with that merger, there will be some realignment in terms of job assignments. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked if he was talking about Bloomington only. Professor Bonser said he hoped not. The units he was talking about are there, but he is hopeful that they can expand it throughout the state to serve all interests. Professor Bogar said the uniqueness of this program is that it is the first such program which is an IU system-wide program, and asked how Professor Bonser envisioned the administration of that program taking place at both the system level and at the local level. Professor Bonser replied that they would have to feel their way for it is the first program and they are not sure how it can work or ought to work. He said what he would try to promote at the system level is a coordination function. The person who would work in this capacity at the system level would be responsible for coordinating the academic programs, so that a student can take part of the program at one location and part at another location. He thought we ought to try it for he thought the system level should coordinate with the academic programs at all levels and should also coordinate the research things discussed. How the School is articulated on each of the campuses he thought is a function of what the campuses want to do. It is up to the administration, faculty and students at that campus. How they organize administratively is up to them and it is obviously going to go administratively through their own Chancellor. He added he does not believe in tenant organizations on campuses and he does not think it works. Professor Norins felt there is some contradiction

between what Professor Bonser said and what he said before about systems having their own departments. Professor Bonser replied that he guessed when he was talking about the school, he meant he was thinking of it across the whole campus in a sense that it would hopefully be an independent kind of agency or department, depending upon its significance and interest of people, for all departments in schools now decide their own faculty hiring and promotions.

Educational Philosophy:

Professor Kelso asked what action, if any, the Faculty Council was being asked to take. He added he did not quite understand the concept for ordinarily you have a junior college that focusses on the nature of jobs and decides job requirements. Then you try to train people to perform precisely to that job. That is one approach. Another approach is that you have an organized body of knowledge, skills or methods that you think are very good things for solving a certain set of problems. But apparently neither of those approaches exist. There is no suggestion that the body of knowledge that makes certain people in the university more desirable than others to be in your faculty. It is as if the faculty is being asked to break away from the unit it is in. It is similar to an outside recruiter among our faculty. He said he was curious about the educational theory of what is happening here. Professor Bonser said to answer the question of what is the Faculty Council to do, he said he was not asking them to do anything except think about how this might be implemented on this campus. He said he has been talking with the administration of IUPUI, but how things are anticipated here is going to depend on the faculty, for they are going to be asked if they want to move in this direction, and if so, how do they want to do it. Professor Kelso asked then if it was Professor Bonser's thinking that he wants people to decide what kind of requirements will turn out a good city manager and what his job skills are. Professor Bonser said now, with regard to the particular tracks, they do have committees working on these topics and they are all university-wide committees. Professor Kelso asked about theories of dealing with people while you are administering, for example, law. Professor Bonser said he could not go into all of this in detail for he is not a behaviorist. There are behaviorists on the committee and this is the kind of thing that they have been taking up. They are far enough along with some of this program development to be sending out copies for information very soon. Professor Kelso said then there will be some kind of blueprint that is open-ended that will attract people on the faculty now, as well as some not on the faculty, to recruit themselves into the program. Professor Bonser replied that what he thought the philosophy ought to be is you get knowledgeable people in terms of what is needed to design the program and then you ask what kinds of skills in terms of faculty do we need to teach and run these courses and programs. Then you ask if there is anybody on campus that has the skill and the interest to go in this direction. If so, there are two possibilities. One is to cross-list a particular course. You may have a quantitative course that precisely answers the total need, and if so, why build a new course. On the other hand, you may decide there is a particular course need that is not being met anywhere in the university, but there is a faculty member in political science who has just that skill and interest. Of course, if there is neither a course available, nor a faculty member available to teach a needed requirement, you hire a new one, if you can find the money. Professor Kelso asked what if a faculty member says he does not want to have one-third of his time to go to the School, or that some dean says he wants him to go. Professor Bonser replied it is up to them and must be negotiated with the appropriate people. Vice Chancellor Ryder thanked Professor Bonser and added he felt that this is something the Academic Affairs Committee should look at. Professor Kinzer replied that if there was any further information around about the School, his committee would like to have it.

Presiding Officers Business -- Student Fees:

Vice Chancellor Ryder said as a result of the recent newspaper publicity regarding student activity fees, Dean Hugh Wolf, Director of Student Services, was present and would report on this. Vice Chancellor Ryder pointed out that as of July 1, 1971 the student services programs of the Downtown Campus and 38th St. Campus were reorganized into a single organization with Dr. Wolf as director of that area. The other units, Normal College, the Medical School, Dental School, Law School and Herron are coordinated, but are not directly under the direction of Dean Wolf in terms of the implementation of student activities. Student activities in these schools are coordinated and operated with staff who report to their respective dean.

Dean Wolf reported we do not have a uniform activities fee at IUPUI. There are a number of activity fees at IUPUI, some of which are assessed in varying amounts with some units subject to this fee and other units not. He said that as Vice Chancellor Ryder indicated, the concept of establishing a central IUPUI activity fee fund was approved and the fund was established last summer. Once that decision was made, there was needed the mechanism for allocating monies out of that for who gets what. The mechanism that was created was establishment of the IUPUI activity fee budget committee. This committee is made up of 11 students who were selected by the student governments in the 11 components or units that make up IUPUI. There are 11 students on this committee, five faculty members who were nominated by the student affairs committee of that body, and himself as a non-voting chairman. This committee then is charged with responsibility of recommending allocations of activity fee money from the central account. The committee met for a period of about 5 weeks straight doing nothing more than organizing themselves in terms of internal procedures that they were going to follow, and they developed a set of criteria and approved a set of guidelines. The criteria were for the allocation of funds and the two most important ones were (1) they would give preference to the campus-wide kinds of programs and activities in allocating funds; (2) that any one student group ought to be eligible to apply for these funds.

When the committee recommends that a certain student group receive an allocation of funds, those recommendations are then forwarded to the Vice Chancellor and Dean for Administrative Affairs, who approves them, raises questions about them, etc. The recommendation then goes, after it has been approved by the Vice Chancellor, to the Chancellor who approves the allocation of these funds. Assuming that a student group goes through that process, they receive an allocation of activity fee money to put on a certain kind of project or program. As the group extends the funds, they submit a voucher which is a request for a check to be written to pay a certain expense. Those vouchers must be signed by the treasurer of the particular student group, its faculty advisor, and a student services officer. So there are really three reviews. The voucher is then forwarded to the business office, where there is a review there, and then assuming everything is in line with what the budget request was and the guidelines, the check is written and the bill is paid. Dean Wolf said this was the system under which we are operating at the moment for the allocation of funds or expenditure of funds from the central IUPUI activity fund.

Uniform Assessment:

Professor Meiere asked if this system has been used since July, 1971 for these particular funds and Dean Wolf replied yes. Professor Langsam said as she understood it, a certain percentage of those funds went back to each campus on a per capita basis. She asked if those funds returned to the Downtown Campus are under the same guidelines, such as university-wide interest, or can student groups with specific interests come and get money through their own individual student governments. She asked about departmental groups or departmental clubs, like the English Club. Dean Wolf responded the English Club has received an allocation of funds from the IUPUI activity fee budget committee. Professor Langsam said in other words they were university-wide interests. Dean Wolf said in the judgment of the committee they were. Everyone who is receiving an allocation of funds from this committee gets a set of the guidelines. Professor Langsam asked what happens to the money that goes back on a per capita basis. Who controls these funds and what kind of funds are we talking about. Dean Wolf replied there really has not been that kind of thing happen. What has happened is every individual group requesting some money has come to the committee and received an allocation of funds. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked Dean Wolf to comment about the generation of funds aside from the university fee and what they can do with that and how that is accounted for. Dean Wolf said they found, for example, that money was all over the place in all kinds of different accounts and they spent a great deal of time trying to track down where all the money came from. First of all they put it all in one account. He added before anyone gets suspicious, no student group lost one penny of what they had in this process. In other words, if they had \$500 July 1, 1971 they have still got it, unless they have spent it. All they did was just put it where they could get an accounting report and give it to the organization. They set up two different kinds of accounts. If the money that a student organization had in the past was the result of activity fees from past history, it was put in a series of accounts numbered 700 series. If they found out that this money was the result of somebody voluntarily putting it in, they put it in a series of accounts numbered 710. All of this they refer to as "self generated income" and is basically student money. It has nothing to do with what has been collected by the university. It is the result of, for example, self-assessed dues, various work projects like washing cars, selling light bulbs, etc.

Collection of Fees:

Professor Bogar said he was not quite clear on Dean Wolf's statement that the present student activity fee is collected from the Downtown Campus and 38th St. Campus students. He asked if it is not collected from Herron. Dean Wolf replied that Herron does not have an activity fee, but a voluntary one. Sometimes they collect it, sometimes they don't. That is why he started out his discussion by saying we do not have a uniform activity fee at IUPUI. Professor Bogar asked if other units have activity fees collected and if they retain those. Dean Wolf replied some do, for example, Normal College and Nursing. What has been done here is the establishment of a central IUPUI fund which is made up basically of the undergraduate fees collected from the Downtown and 38th St. Campus students, plus some contributions to the central fund which have been made and are being made by some of the other units.

Professor Langsam asked who the 11 students on the committee represented. Dean Wolf said they represent the nine units or schools that are across the bottom of the IUPUI stationary, plus a representative from the Division of Business and one from the Division of Education. Professor Langsam felt all of these people are actually not contributing money on a voluntary basis and yet they sit and determine what is happening basically at the Downtown Campus and 38th St. Vice Chancellor Ryder said Education and Business all register at the same time and same place and pay the fee. Professor Langsam asked if it was correct that a Herron student sits on the board and Dean Wolf replied yes. She next asked what Herron contributes to the fund. Dean Wolf said he did not know the exact amount, but they have made a contribution. Vice Chancellor Ryder said the amount is in relationship to the number of students they have. Professor Langsam felt this then was not a voluntary contribution. Either everybody contributes, and therefore a student from each unit sits and helps decide on how to allocate the money, or they don't. Dean Wolf said everybody is contributing, but without a uniform fee being assessed throughout IUPUI. People have to contribute in different ways. Professor Schreiber reported that at Normal College they have a \$5 activity fee, but recently were informed by the Dean of Student Affairs that they have to make a certain contribution based on the number of students they have.

Professor Meiere asked Dean Wolf if the system he outlined was not in effect when most of the incidences listed in the newspaper came out. Dean Wolf said that was correct, for the news article did not really refer to the system in existence now. Dean J. Taylor felt it could be said that considerable attention was given to things that happened prior to the institution of this system, the result of which indicated that in every instance that the cases were over-stated or inaccurately stated. Vice Chancellor Ryder agreed and said there were alot of mis-statements and distortion of the situation.

Abolishing Student Fee:

Professor Bogar asked Dean Wolf about doing away with the student activity fee. He asked him if he felt we would be better off without it. Dean Wolf responded that he had given it alot of thought and the abolishment of the so-called mandatory activity fee has infinite appeal to him from an administrative point of view. However, the thing that does concern him is that he really would have to raise a question about how well, if at all, some good, needed activity programs would be able to support themselves on a self-sufficient basis. Some things like newspapers could generate their own income, but when you get into the area of the student activity board and what some of us might agree student government ought to be doing, they would either have to change their image from one of being service oriented in trying to do things for the student body to a kind of a profit making one. Their number one objective would not be providing service, but generating money. He really thought that some valuable service might be lost by that kind of thing. Professor Langsam asked what plans there are for a student newspaper representing all the various groups. Dean Wolf replied there is no intent that the newspaper be strictly undergraduate. He concluded by saying the establishment of this fund was an attempt to do something that lots of people seem to be saying that we need to get some IUPUI program going campus-wide. In his judgment he felt it best that those student groups that have been selected by the budget committee as their agents to put on a program to put on a good, responsible program.

Agenda Committee:

Professor Bogar said he had distributed to the Council names of nominees to two Council committees. One is the Nominations Committee, which nominates persons to the office of Secretary and Parliamentarian, and the other is the Election-Appportionment Committee, which conducts the at-large election to the Council each spring and decides on any reapportionment that has taken place over the course of the last year. He moved that the six persons listed for nomination to the Nominations Committee be elected. Professor Langsam seconded. The motion carried. Professor Bogar moved that the six faculty persons listed for nomination to the Election-Appportionment Committee be elected and Professor Langsam seconded. The motion carried. (See Faculty Council Document #12, attached.)

Professor Wagener felt there has been some change in terms of the make-up and apportionment of the campus and that the Election-Appportionment Committee should take a look at such questions as the apportionment of the Downtown Campus, the 38th St. Campus, and the position of the Division of Business and Education as to what their status is on the Council. He moved that this be included within the charge to the committee specifically. Vice Chancellor Ryder felt they could accept this without a formal motion and ordered the committee to consider Professor Wagener's comments. Professor Bogar added that aside from the reapportionment due to any changing relative numbers of faculty throughout the system, that according to the constitution, the addition of any new units which merit representation on the Council is primarily an administrative decision. The constitution says that such divisions must be certified by the Chancellor.

New Business -- Cost of Medical Insurance:

Professor Alton distributed a memo she prepared because she had become concerned that the Blue Cross-Blue Shield rates have increased each year for three consecutive years and she had heard a rumor that they were going to increase again in the coming year. She reported that the person who is under TIAA retirement is paying \$112.44, which is 228½% of what he paid in 1970. The family subscriber who is under TIAA is paying \$301.68, which is 232.8% of what he paid in 1969-70. Because of this, because she heard the committee in Bloomington is considering a new medical carrier, and because she knows that there are other companies that will offer as good or better policies than the ones mentioned, she thought this should be looked at. She moved that this matter be referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee for investigation and possible recommendation and that they be asked to report their progress at the next meeting. Professor Norins seconded. Professor Meiere said, as a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee, he wanted to point out that the committee did investigate this specific matter and reported to the Council at the end of last year. He felt we are all getting a very rough deal, but felt his committee did everything they could about this problem. Professor Alton said the change in the percentage that the university contributes toward the person who is under TIAA only occurred this last time. In other words, the increase this last year was passed on completely to the person who has TIAA retirement. For people who do not have TIAA retirement, the university still pays fifty percent of the coverage. Professor Bogar felt we should take another look with some specific kinds of recommendations. Professor Meiere thought the weight should come from official Faculty Council action. Professor Langsam asked if Professor Alton's memo had been circulated to the total faculty and Professor Alton replied it had not. Professor Langsam recommended that this

be added to the minutes of this meeting, get circulated to the faculty, and be put on the agenda for the next time for discussion for some specific recommendations as to how we should proceed. Vice Chancellor Ryder said the motion on the floor is that this be referred to the faculty affairs committee and thought Professor Langsam's intent was that they should come forward with a recommendation to the Faculty Council which could be acted upon at the next meeting. Professor Gifford felt it should not be sent out to the faculty until the Council decides what they want to do about it. He felt the Council ought to make a decision and then ask the faculty what they want to do. Professor Cutshall asked what kind of recommendations the Faculty Affairs Committee did make. Professor Meiere said the recommendation was just not to take any action. Professor Cutshall suggested that before a vote is taken in terms of a motion to make a decision, it would be good to have some authoritative person give the Council comparisons of several plans so we would know what we are talking about. Professor Alton replied that in April of 1970 there were comparisons made of the Purdue plan and the Indiana plan and she had a copy of that comparison that she would be glad to let anyone see. But she did feel that it is imperative that we make some wishes known before we are faced with the accomplished facts that we are having an increase in the rates, for if we want to compare the cost and several different plans, it could be too late and we might have another rise in Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Professor Bogar said he supported the original motion by Professor Alton and thought getting it back to the Faculty Affairs Committee would at least get this to a group which could start asking some of these questions. The question was called for and the motion carried. Vice Chancellor Ryder said that in looking at the total picture of fringe benefits, there are benefits on the IU side as opposed to the Purdue side which are better than they were with Purdue. So if you look at the total picture, you can't take one item, but that doesn't take care of the question of why it is that health insurance should be more expensive on one side or the other.

Parking:

Professor Levitt said that on Page 5 of the last minutes the basis for estimation of parking space demand comes from a study by Professor Harold Michaels and that according to his study, the ratio of students with parking stickers to spaces could go up to 5 to 1 in a commuter campus and 2 to 1 for staff and faculty. He said it turns out that there is a document entitled "Estimation and Parking Demand at a University Campus Serving Commuting Students" which is a master's thesis by Mary Ann Zimmerman, submitted in fulfillment of a master of science in civil engineering degree in June of 1968 and deals with the Hammond and Kokomo campuses of Indiana University and Purdue University. It does not contain any estimates of how much overage there could be in parking spaces, and it is simply a basis for determining how many parking places are needed. He knows of no study which could at the moment furnish a basis for estimating how many parking places might be needed here, how many decals should be issued, etc. He said on the Purdue campus the ratio of faculty decals to parking spaces is 1.25 to 1, which is like 5 for every 4. Vice Chancellor Ryder responded that the Purdue campus is not a commuter campus and it is obviously quite different. He thought the only thing he could do is to give the Council a report on the evaluation of the study that was made at 38th St., which is similar in every respect to the area, with the exception of the Medical Center itself. This is the basis upon which he made the report and upon which we have made the judgments and upon which he would say it is working extremely well, with some exceptions in the Medical Center area.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

FACULTY COUNCIL

Thursday, March 16, 1972

Law School

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Lawrence, Nevill, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Professors Alton, Beall, Bixler, Bogar, Boyd, Byrne, Cutshall, Fleener, Gifford, Grossman, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Levitt, Marks, Meiere, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, O'Loughlin, Ross, Schreiber, Wagener, Weber, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, Lohse, McDonald; Professors Ashmore, Behnke, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Galanti, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Johnston, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Merritt, Nunn, Ochs, Sagraves, White.

Visitors: Professor Harris.

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of February 10, 1972.
2. Report of Academic Affairs Committee on Undergraduate Structure (Kinzer).
3. Report of Faculty Affairs Committee on Fringe Benefits (Bixler).
4. Presiding Officer's Business.
5. Agenda Committee Business.
6. New Business.

The IUPUI Faculty Council at its meeting of March 16, 1972:

1. Approved the minutes of February 10, 1972.
2. Heard a report from the Academic Affairs Committee on Undergraduate Structure (see Faculty Council Document #13). The report was adopted in principle.
3. Heard a report and recommendations from the Faculty Affairs Committee on Medical Insurance Costs (see Faculty Council Document #15, attached).
4. Heard a report from Chancellor Hine and Vice Chancellor Buhner on the appointment of an Affirmative Action Committee and a Commission on Women.
5. Elected a Faculty Board of Review (see Faculty Council Document #17, attached).
6. Received a report from the Election-Appportionment Committee which increased the unit representation of the School of Medicine by two members and increased the unit representation of the School of Nursing by one member.
7. Resolved a summary of the actions taken at each Council meeting be placed at the beginning of the minutes of each Council meeting.

Prior to the call to order, Chancellor Hine reported on the enrollment and enrollment projections for IUPUI. The total current spring enrollment is 15,867, which is an increase over last spring's term when the enrollment was 14,553. This is fewer than the fall term of 16,580. The full-time total undergraduate population went up from 6,204 to 7,376. The part-time enrollment was from 8,349 to 8,491. Now students enrolled include 11,093 undergraduates, 2,138 in professional schools, and 2,636 in graduate programs.

The Chancellor thought it might be worthwhile to report on the total head count projection. (See Faculty Council Document #14, attached.) According to the best estimates they have, the total enrollment for the Fall of 1976 for Indianapolis will be 25,146. This is based upon an orderly growth of between 8 and 9 percent per year from 1971. Professor Kelso asked if this would call for new college buildings, in addition to our present quarters. Chancellor Hine felt we would at least have to have one new building, for there is no way we could handle that amount now. He added that assuming that we have sufficient budget for faculty and facilities to house students, our enrollment can reach this amount, according to the experts. Professor Langsam said that in view of the fact many universities are getting into the 25,000-30,000 range and are limiting their enrollment, she asked if any thought is being given to where IUPUI wants to be in the next 20 years. Chancellor Hine replied and said they have considered this, but there is no definite answer yet. This will, he added, require careful attention on the part of the long-range planners.

Chancellor Hine noted with pleasure that Stephen Wise, a Herron Art student, was the winner of the first prize in the national poster contest for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Call to Order:

Chancellor Hine called the March 16, 1972 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes:

Professor Langsam moved the minutes of the last Council meeting be approved as distributed and Professor Wagener seconded. The motion carried. Professor Meiere suggested the minutes be sent out with address labels without the envelope to save money. Professor Bogar said he would give this consideration.

Report of the Academic Affairs Committee:

Professor Kinzer moved the Faculty Council resolve itself into a committee of the whole to carry on discussion of the document on undergraduate structure and that the discussion be limited to twenty minutes, with the Council formulating whatever motion seemed appropriate after discussion. Professor Langsam seconded and the motion carried. (See Faculty Council Document #13.)

Definitions:

Professor Kinzer began by saying that the definitions of department, college and school, are seen by his committee as statuses to be achieved rather than created in fact by the document. That is that the department is actually a corporate faculty body which defines a major.

Of second importance is the distinction they have between a college and a school. His committee feels they have provided a basis for distinguishing between the academic and the professional. On Page 5 of the report, the committee asserts

they think the Faculty Council has the authority to approve the document and that if it does not, then it becomes an item for the following meeting of the Council.

Course of Action:

Chancellor Hine asked if this was a recommendation for the administration and Professor Kinzer replied the Academic Affairs Committee, following the statement in the IU Faculty Constitution, and a somewhat less forceful statement in the IUPUI Faculty Constitution, thinks the authority is within the faculty. Chancellor Hine felt it should be addressed primarily to the Commission of Higher Education for they will have to approve any such motion as this. He added he would be inclined to consider it himself as a very strong recommendation to the administration.

Professor Byrne stated he was in general in favor of the proposal, supported the idea of phases, and supported the goal of autonomy. He believed it crucial a significant effort be made to determine where and to what degree different units have autonomy, and where they do not, how they get to it. He did question, in II-B-6, whether or not we would want to entrust the role of overseer to the IUPUI Faculty Council.

Timing of Implementation:

Another point Professor Byrne raised had to do with the question of phases. Under Phase I, the purpose is to group departments and subject matter areas presently existing. This, he felt, if one is to be concerned about autonomy, is one of the more difficult and troublesome aspects of the proposal, if there are autonomous and non-autonomous, or more autonomous and less autonomous, departments operating together under what is in Phase I called college or school. He suggested people might be interested in knowing where the University Division would be located in this proposal. He also said he was not quite clear what is meant by a common curriculum in II-B and why one would want to charge a college to set about having one. That seems to be pre-empting their own rights and is diametrically opposed to the definitions of department, school and college set forth in I-B-3, to the effect that they would determine curriculum and whether or not there was to be a common curriculum or not.

He next asked what was meant in the second sentence in the next to the last paragraph of II-A, "at the Faculty Council level, if the matter should not be decided at a department or school-college level." He found this statement ambiguous and yet extraordinarily important because it is asking or attempting to state the hierarchy of relationships in faculty decisions with regard to curricular or structural arrangements. He felt this needs editorial work.

Role of an Institute:

Professor Byrne continued and said he questioned the term institute. He felt an institute as defined is something that would arise ad hoc out of a certain need not met by the regular units. It seemed to him that this could be worked out within the structure of the unit as constituted. Only when one would want to move beyond units or a multi-unit level, then the notion of an institute becomes extraordinarily important. There is nothing contained in the document

to suggest how such an institute might be established and is something that might well be developed during the next academic year by the next Academic Affairs Committee.

Academic Autonomy:

Professor Kelso asked to what basically is the problem to which the report is addressed. He did not quite understand the notion of academic autonomy. Autonomy suggests freedom, but freedom from what and to do what that cannot now be done. He also wanted to know what is achieved by this organization of colleges that is not currently within our grasp or achievable with the structure that we have. Professor Kinzer responded that generally speaking, the academic departments with degrees in the IU mission of the Downtown Campus have autonomy in the determination of their majors apart from the department in Bloomington. However, the major here operates within the College of Arts and Sciences as defined at Bloomington, for there is no local College of Arts and Sciences. On the other hand, the undergraduate degree programs at the 38th St. Campus are Purdue oriented and are fulfilling the same majors as determined at the department level at Lafayette and the members of the sections in Indianapolis of the subject matter areas are members of the Purdue University department. In the one case there is a departmental autonomy in the city, and in the other case, there is not departmental autonomy in the city. If curricular changes were to be made at the college level by units of the Downtown Campus, they would be difficult. Previous experience of changing the foreign language requirement was chaotic.

Professor Kelso asked if he would be correct in saying that there really are two things happening in the document. One is that regardless of the structure at IUPUI, whether it is schools, departments, or colleges, that they should have autonomy within IUPUI--as permitted by state law. The second thing is how they should be organized within IUPUI as themselves. Professor Kinzer added at the same time recognizing that all the way through this the mission concept remains. Professor Melere pointed out that as far as Purdue mission areas are concerned, it is his opinion that the Purdue system is in the wings ready to grant autonomy as soon as matters like this structure can be worked out.

Inclusion of Programs:

Professor Wisner noted that industrial supervision had been omitted from the departments listed in the School of Technology. Professor Kinzer replied that it is impossible to find any document available at IUPUI which lists all curricula and all courses. Professor Neel commented that the committee does not expect this to be a permanent structure, but it is a beginning. It will be constantly changing as schools and groups develop into larger units and as they plan interdisciplinary degrees. We have to have a beginning, or we are not going to go anywhere. Professor Wisner agreed and said that he has been on the beginnings of a number of things and once you get it down in black and white, it is the bible. So if we can get these things straightened up now, it is just that much easier.

Professor O'Loughlin asked what was meant on Page 4, under B-1, where it talks about developing a College of Science and Engineering. Professor Kinzer responded that it is his presumption that a college-school makes its own decision and that there should be two bachelor of science degrees, one for engineering and one for science. He hoped there is nothing in the document which prevents it. He presumed that any college or school defined degree would have a general outline of a common set of choices which the student might operate within. More precise definitions belong at the departmental level.

Impact on Students:

Professor Langsam felt there seems to be very little indication of what happens to a freshman who comes to IUPUI. She asked if he immediately enrolls in a college of science or college of liberal arts. Professor Kinzer replied the Academic Affairs Committee has three documents referred to it by the Faculty Council. One is for undergraduate structure, another a report of the task force for the School of General Studies, and the last a graduate structure. The report of the task force for the School of General Studies has certain recommendations within it on curricular revisions. His committee is taking them in that order. He thought if all goes well, at the next Faculty Council meeting they would discuss the particular one Professor Langsam asked about. They have made provision here for a division and whether it is to be used by the University Division is not for his committee to say. But there is provision here which allows that kind of structure. Professor Langsam asked if there would be any problem in just attaching to this a division for the first year. Professor Kinzer replied if you see the division as having a degree function or certification function as an academic unit, he thought there are problems. But if you do not feel that way, then he did not think there are any problems.

Mission Assignments:

Professor Byrne asked to restate his concern about III, Phase II. It says that in effect the mission concept is not in the power of IUPUI or the Faculty Council to change. Yet in Phase I it is proposed there is to be a College of Science and Engineering. He asked what happens to a student who thought he was an IU student, but suddenly discovers he has a vocation to physics. Does this student have to transfer from IU to Purdue, or vice versa under different situations. He felt this is problematic enough in the transition state we are now in, but it becomes complex in his mind if that kind of confusion is canonized as a college, assuming that the mission concept is to prevail throughout Phase I. Granting that this kind of problem is exactly what the Academic Affairs Committee would like to see worked out, he was not clear how it can be, if we are to interpret the statement strictly that we have nothing to say or do about the mission concept. Professor Neel replied that on Page 5, number 5, they have asked the Vice Chancellor to be responsible for securing autonomies and being aware of mission areas, with great circumspection to guarantee students that existing degree requirements will be fulfilled in good faith during the period of transition. They hope, in the long run, the mission concept will die a natural death and that IUPUI will be giving the degree, not an IU or Purdue degree. This means we give our own degree on requirements set here on this campus. We should be working on those requirements starting now, for we should have worked on them a year ago. It cannot be done, however, until we have a structure within which we can do it. He added there are serious problems now with the mission concept. For example, he has students who are double majors in computer technology and psychology. They are IU psychology students, but since computer technology is a Purdue mission, IU will not accept it. These are problems we are going to have to work out and that should be easier to work out when the structure is set up.

Professor Kelso felt he now understood the document better and it seemed to him he could support it with two amendments. One would be to delete I-B-2, thus avoiding having to decide or take position as to whether this is a recommendation or legislative action by the Faculty Council. Another would be to amend II-B-5 and say "it is recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs be responsible." So we would avoid the problem of legislative authority and yet recommend the report.

Responsibility of Institute:

Chancellor Hine asked why the committee thought of an institute as having degree authority. We have many institutes now in the University that are interdisciplinary in nature that perform a valuable function, but do not give degrees as an institute. Professor Neel replied that the committee's statement on that was brought about primarily by the report on the School of Environmental and Public Affairs. They did not know how to handle it, whether to put it in as a sub-school or an institute. They chose the latter.

Professor Meiere objected to the word "college" referring to Science and Engineering. He preferred "school." He asked if the Faculty Council approves the document, if faculty will be able to submit small corrections. Professor Kinzer replied he assumed if the Faculty Council approves it, it can make changes any time in the future. Professor Nagy pointed out that on Page 5, III, #2, third line, "school" is used in reference to Science and Engineering instead of "college." Professor Kinzer replied this was an error and it should be "college."

Graduate and Professional Education:

Professor Kinzer asked of people in graduate education if the distinction between college and school had merit in resolving the question that has come up on the graduate proposal in distinguishing between professional and academic graduate programs. Chancellor Hine pointed out that in the professional schools they have many colleges of medicine and dentistry, as well as schools of medicine and dentistry. They are considered synonymous. Professor Kinzer agreed they are used almost interchangeably. Chancellor Hine felt all of these are details we will have to address ourselves to eventually and hoped we would not have a situation where the college is the biggest unit around and encompasses everything. This represents many problems.

Motion to Adopt:

The Chancellor asked the Faculty Council what action they wished to take on the report. Professor Byrne moved the adoption of the report and Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Byrne asked to discuss his motion to decide if he wanted to table it till next meeting, considering the questions raised about editorial or substantive changes. He asked Professor Kinzer in what fashion the Academic Affairs Committee would constitute a monitoring device to receive suggestions and disagreements. Professor Kinzer replied he felt the Faculty Council could refer the document again to the Academic Affairs Committee to be acted on at the April meeting, but he hoped not.

Motion to Amend:

Professor Wagener felt the 38th St. and Downtown Campuses representative assemblies should look at this for comment and recommendations. He asked to amend this be done. Professor Kelso seconded. Professor Langsam felt the faculty, through distribution of the Council minutes, had the opportunity to read the document and to approach any member of the Academic Affairs Committee with their comments. She was concerned about another document getting into the machine of endless faculty meetings and was against sending the document to the representative assemblies. She felt it appropriate to make a note in the minutes that people with concerns could go to the Academic Affairs Committee with their recommendations.

Professor Neel reported he has several calls on the document. All were in favor except one who was opposed to the whole thing. Professor Wagener felt comments should be allowed to be included in some way and if we passed the final document, he would at least have the spirit with the idea that certain amendments can be made afterward, if they are seen fit.

Withdrawal of Motion to Amend:

Professor Langsam asked Professor Wagener if he would consider withdrawing his amendment if there is understanding that there shall be some way of registering concerns and having them put in and recorded. Professor Wagener agreed and Professor Kelso agreed.

Motion to Amend:

Professor Kelso moved to amend the original motion by deleting I-B-2, adding to II-B-5 "it is recommended the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs will be responsible," accepting the report, adopting it in principle, and requesting the Chancellor to take appropriate steps to insure this implementation. Professor Meiere seconded.

Professor Nagy asked Professor Kelso if the spirit of his amendment was to challenge or question the legislative authority of the faculty. Professor Kelso replied that he detected at the beginning of the meeting some area of disagreement between the Chancellor and the committee with respect to ultimate authority on the matter of academic decisions and felt there was no reason for us to take a position on it without having considerable debate on it. He did not feel it necessary in adopting the report to get into the whole area, so he preferred to not take a position. Professor Langsam disagreed and said by making that change we have taken a position and by removing something and saying that the faculty does not have the authority to legislate on these matters. Professor Byrne said these matters do not depend upon the document developed by the Academic Affairs Committee. If they depend upon anything, they depend upon the documents referred to, as well as the constitution of the state of Indiana, which along with the other documents, does not depend upon any judgment we may make today. If the position that has been argued on one side is correct, it will stand whether we vote for it or not. Therefore, he had no objection to the entire motion.

Vote on Amended Motion:

The question was called for. The motion to accept the report with modifications that I-B-2 be deleted, on Page 5 the words "it is recommended" be added, and to adopt it in principle, requesting the Chancellor to implement it, was voted on. The motion carried.

Professor Langsam recommended the Faculty Council congratulate the Academic Affairs Committee for a job well done. Chancellor Hine felt the Committee did a creditable job. He felt there are a few minor points that need to be debated, but they do not take away from the excellence of the report. There are some matters that are administrative, for as he mentioned earlier, the Committee on Higher Education has to be considered.

Faculty Affairs Committee on Fringe Benefits:

Professor Bixler reported on medical insurance costs (see Faculty Council Document #15, attached). After reading the report, he said his committee's general conclusion was that the coverage provided by Blue Cross-Blue Shield is excellent and broad, for it covers quite a number of facets. Perhaps the faculty might be desirous of less coverage, in which case they would certainly have lower premiums. He said their report was submitted as a report and they did not wish any motions taken upon it. They simply wanted to record their recommendations for action and it is up to the Faculty Council how they wish to handle it. Chancellor Hine asked for comments and discussion.

Ratio of Premiums to Claims:

Professor Norins reported that Dr. Battersby, a member of the All University Committee on Insurance, found that the money that has come back in payment of claims has been very fair over the 25 year period. In other words, the schedule that has been used, or the formula of what we put in as faculty and then what comes back out to us, has been a very fair distribution. The problem comes up in the sense of how much it costs or how much is spent in medical care and it runs up to a lot of money. There are many things that are difficult to compare in different policies. These things never prove out equitable to different groups. So we have gotten our money's worth and what we must look at in the future is what kind of coverage do we really want. One possibility mentioned is the Medical School setting up a health maintenance organization that might be able to cover the faculty. It sounds good, but it would be highly unlikely we would embark on such a thing at this time. It is something that will continue to be looked after in regard to the future. Professor Meiere felt there is very little question in the overall picture that somebody is getting their money's worth from the insurance and to benefit us personally, it is not profitable to look around for a new plan or carrier. He thought many people feel we are not getting our money's worth from the University for they see the employee insurance being paid 60 percent by Purdue and 35 percent by IU. He felt the question the Faculty Council would have to decide is whether they want to press the University to come up with the additional contribution.

Professor Alton asked if Professor Long's committee has investigated the idea of a deductible. Professor Bixler replied he was not aware of what Professor Long's committee looked at, but it is a strong point that the out-patient clinics were one of the major areas of increased costs and it certainly is the difference between the present IU and Purdue plan. The Purdue plan is cheaper, but it has a number of deductible clauses in it which obviate these smaller claims.

Professor Byrne said he found it hard to believe that there could only be one package offer. He felt it desirable to have a variety of packages, along with perhaps major medical.

Total Fringe Benefit Policy:

Chancellor Hine made a report as a member of the general policy committee for fringe benefits for IU. It is a complex problem and one that deserves much attention. A year ago a committee was appointed to investigate the entire fringe benefit package. The committee has met twice a month since that time and has made some progress in bits and pieces. They have been disappointed because they have not come to grips yet with the overall problem of what kind

of fringe benefit package should we have. Some think we should offer only major medical and let the individual take care of all other claims. This would be very inexpensive and could well be covered. Others want more coverage. So when you talk about which is a better plan, you have to put quotation marks around better because it varies from one person to another. The BC-BS program is costly and they have had all kinds of explanations given to them as to why. For example, in IU a relatively high percentage of people are in Indianapolis. Indianapolis hospital costs are higher than in most parts of the state. Therefore, if it is a system contract, it is going to be a problem to be equitable because people in Indianapolis are bringing up the cost around. This is merely an example of the complexity of the problem. He said soon there will be information to present to the Council on different packages. For example, we ought to take a look at having one carrier for all insurance. This should result in some economies if we had one carrier for the total package. This should be investigated, along with the broad range of coverage that is available, and then we have to decide what is best for the most people. The Chancellor said he preferred to have a lot of this optional, requiring only those items which the University has the responsibility for.

Disability Insurance:

Professor Byrne asked if the Chancellor's committee has considered disability insurance. He understood the Treasurer of IU would not sign the package for the Purdue people. Chancellor Hine said Purdue University has disability insurance and wants to continue it. They can get this insurance only if the employer signs it. The Vice President has hesitated to sign it for only one unit of the University. His committee is considering this and he felt sure they would recommend it system-wide. The University now has no objection to the Purdue people having it, as long as it does not require the signature of the IU treasurer. Professor Norins reported the Faculty Handbook does say IU people have disability insurance if you have been at the University five years and are tenured. This is based on TIAA-CREF. Chancellor Hine said that was only for early retirement because of disability. As he understood it, the coverage the Purdue people want is a two month coverage for disability.

Different Costs for Different Family Types:

Professor Navarre hoped that when the committee is discussing with insurance companies they look at some more flexible scheduling in terms of family types. For example, a mature family where children are grown, or a single adult with a dependent or two, really needs a different level. To have them pay the full family rate with maternity benefits is putting a greater burden on family types. Many insurance companies are moving toward this. Chancellor Hine replied this is true, and another complication is that many people join the faculty after they have their own insurance plan established.

Presiding Officer's Business:

Chancellor Hine reported he has asked the Affirmative Action Committee to change its charge because of the complexity of the situations that have been developing regarding possible discrimination against faculty, staff and students. At the request of President Ryan he appointed a Commission on Women and this Commission will address itself to possible or alleged discriminatory practices against women because of sex. They will not get involved in discrimination against women because of political stand or color. So, the Affirmative Action Committee has been asked to meet to develop procedures and guidelines to determine what the Commission on Women will do. He wants the committee also at the moment to

serve as a hearing committee for the cases that have been already brought to their attention where discrimination is alleged. This committee will not, in the long range, be a hearing committee. The Chancellor next asked Vice Chancellor Buhner to report on this.

Vice Chancellor Buhner said he was not free to comment on the present case because it is not concluded. He reminded the faculty they are dealing here under federal statutes, specifically the Civil Rights Action of 1964 and two Executive Orders. Various universities are being called to task for their compliance. The Affirmative Action Committee is working on a compliance action plan. Presently the Committee is hearing cases. One case involves an allegation of discrimination of denial of equal employment opportunity by a student employee with respect to a supervisor. The other case involves a long series of incidences going back two or three years in which a female employee alleges discriminatory practices. The committee has conducted an informal hearing on the first of these two. He added he did not wish to comment further because there is still evidence to consider from other sources. He said the committee will not continue to hear cases, but will be making some recommendations. The Affirmative Action Compliance Plan, which they will be recommending to the Faculty Council and others, will contain within it the procedure they will recommend for handling disputes past the point of conciliation and interpersonal adjustment.

Agenda Committee Business:

Professor Bogar reported on the nominations to the Faculty Board of Review (see Faculty Council Document #17, attached) and moved the nominations be closed. Professor Neel seconded. Dean J. Taylor asked about the criteria used in selecting the group nominated. Professor Bogar replied the qualifications are stated in the constitution and refer to a rank distribution within the Board. The motion to accept the nominations to the Faculty Board of Review was passed.

Professor Wisner reported on the Election-Appportionment Committee (see Faculty Council Document #16, attached). He said his committee has reapportioned the Council and the School of Medicine has been increased by two representatives and the School of Nursing increased by one. This will accommodate the changes in numbers in faculty. Regarding the at-large seats, they must be four times the ex officio number. Therefore, we have 16 at-large representatives to elect. The projected time plan in his report will not be met, but ballots must be returned by March 22 to be counted. Professor Kirch will act as temporary chairman of counting the ballots. Professor Wisner moved his report be accepted and Professor Wagener seconded. The motion carried.

New Business:

Chancellor Hine reported that the Board of Trustees has given approval to develop a career status of professional librarians in the IU system. This Faculty Council may want to consider at some future date having librarians represented at the Council in some way. They are to have a progression of ranks established and the same kind of promotions will be made available to them.

Professor Meiere said that at the November meeting of the Council they requested an investigation be made on purchasing procedures and regulations. He asked if there had been any progress on this. Chancellor Hine replied he has made some firm recommendations to the Vice President and Treasurer to streamline purchasing procedures and to date has received no response.

Professor Wagener reported the Faculty Club is sponsoring a luncheon on March 23 at the Law School. Guests and speakers will be Mr. Bowen and Mr. Bodine from our State legislature.

Professor Wisner resolved that a summary of the actions taken at each Council meeting be placed at the beginning of the minutes of each Council meeting. Professor Neel seconded and the motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
Thursday, April 13, 1972
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Lawrence, Lohse, Nevill, J. Taylor; Professors Alton, Beall, Bogar, Byrne, Cutshall, Fleener, Galanti, Grossman, Jarboe, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Levitt, Marks, Meiere, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, O'Loughlin, Wagener, Weber, White Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Holmquist, Irwin, McDonald, B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Behnke, Bixler, Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Gifford, Higgins, Hutton, Johnston, Langsam. Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Merritt, Nunn, Ochs, Ross, Segraves, Schreiber.

Visitors: Dean Bynum, Professor Harris.

Agenda:

1. Approval of Minutes of March 16, 1972.
2. Interim report and discussion of University Goals and Objectives (White)
3. Report of Faculty Affairs Committee on Promotions Procedure (Meiere).
4. Presiding Officer's Business.
5. Agenda Committee Business.
6. New Business.

The IUPUI Faculty Council at its meeting of April 13, 1972:

1. Approved the minutes of March 16, 1972.
2. Heard a report from the Goals and Objectives Committee of IUPUI (See Faculty Council Document #19, attached).
3. Heard a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee on Recommended Procedures for Promotion for IUPUI Faculty (see Faculty Council Document #18, attached).
4. Heard a report from Vice Chancellor Ryder on Refund of Parking Fees for Students for First Semester.
5. Was informed of a General Faculty Meeting to be held Tuesday, May 9 at 4:00 p.m. in LH101 of the Downtown Campus.

Chancellor Hine called the April 13, 1972 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes:

Professor Kinzer reported that on Page 3, the fifth line from the bottom, he said "there could be two bachelor of science degrees," and not should. Chancellor Hine said that on Page 2 he was quoted as saying that the report from the Academic Affairs Committee should be addressed primarily to the Commission on Higher Education. That should be changed from "addressed primary to the Commission" to "eventually approved by the Commission." The creation of any new school or offering of any new program of any kind has to be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education for approval. He added that when Professor Kinzer reported it is impossible to find any document available at IUPUI which lists all curricula and all courses, he would recommend inserting the word "one" in front of document. We do have this information available, but it is just not available in one place, and even if it were, it would be out of date the next week. Professor Jarboe moved the minutes be approved as amended and Dean Lohse seconded. The motion carried.

Motion to Amend Agenda:

Professor Meiere moved the agenda be amended to insert after Item 2 a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding recommended promotion procedure. Professor Cutshall seconded. Professor Byrne asked the need to discuss this document and if it was significantly different from the document previously received. He wanted to know if there was any reason to consider it now rather than after members of the Council have had an opportunity to read it. Professor Meiere said he had some comments on the document prior to the Council's studying the document in its final form. He added he would not ask for approval of the document at the present Council meeting, but felt the points that the Faculty Affairs Committee would like to stress should be pointed out in time for them to be considered. The motion to amend the agenda was passed.

Interim Report and Discussion of University Goals and Objectives:

Professor White reported he would very briefly bring the Council up to date on the Goals and Objectives Committee's activities this year and to tell what they still have to do. The committee consists of Dr. Bogar, Vice Chancellor Buhner, Dean Bynum, Dr. Juillerat, Dean Lohse, Dr. Norins, Vice Chancellor Ryder, and himself. The two Vice Chancellors serve as ex officio members of the committee.

History of Committee:

The committee was originally appointed by Chancellor Hine about a year ago in response to Senate Resolution #8, which was passed by the 1971 session of the Indiana General Assembly. This resolution asked all regional campuses of state universities of Indiana to prepare a document for the Indiana Legislative Council stating when they might be ready for local autonomy and what steps should be taken in order to implement this autonomy. Although IUPUI is not a regional campus, it was decided it would be wise for us to present a report and to engage in some self study ourselves. We presented a report suggesting that we preferred re-organization of the systems approach of Indiana University in something we called a confederation, that we believed we were ready to have greater institutional self-management at the present time, that we had been granted a great deal of institutional autonomy already, and what we needed is funding and support to help the authority which had already been given to the Chancellor and his delegated officials. The Goals Committee was reconstituted in the fall of this

year by the Chancellor with a charge to prepare something of the nature of a five and ten year master plan considering such things as academic programs and planning; physical development of the university; fiscal resources; administrative structure including administrative relationship with the central university; relations with alumni; relations with the General Assembly; and most importantly, what are the needs and aspirations of the students and faculty of IUPUI.

Initial Work of Committee:

The Goals Committee considered how to begin to identify goals for the university and once these goals had been identified, how to ascertain certain objectives that might fit under each of these goals. They looked to see what other similar urban universities might be doing and found other schools are undertaking similar types of self-study. They commenced session with a meeting of various community leaders and next held a retreat on March 29, 1972. This retreat was the first general meeting in which they tried to involve all of the academic deans and key faculty members from each of the constituent units of IUPUI in a discussion of goals and objectives. They are now undertaking a series of meetings with students, leaders of the various student groups at each of the schools of the university, with the local IUPUI chapter of AAUP, and open faculty meetings beginning with the Downtown Campus and 38th St. He felt everybody should be aware of what the committee is doing, be informed, and have input in its deliberations. The Goals Committee will have a newsletter to send to all faculty, staff and student organizations that will be sent out shortly.

Professor White continued and said Chancellor Hine has further charged the Goals Committee to prepare a preliminary report for review by the Deans, faculty, and the Faculty Council of IUPUI. This preliminary report will be given to the Chancellor for his presentation to the Commission on Higher Education by the first of July.

Summary of Retreat Held by Committee:

Professor White reported the three goals that were presented to participants at the March 29 retreat have been distributed to members of the Council (see Faculty Council Document #19, attached). They have additionally promised participants of that retreat a summary of the discussions and will distribute to the members of the Council a summary of the general discussion. These goals are ones that they have identified but are not yet in final form. The Goals Committee would welcome input, either at the present Council meeting or at future meetings or sessions with the committee. The goals and objectives listed are examples of some of the goals they believe might be wise for us to explore. Chancellor Hine thanked Professor White for his presentation and asked for comments or questions.

Discussion of Preliminary Goals:

Professor Nagy asked if the committee had made any distinction between the term goal and the term objective. Professor White replied goal is the major topic and and objectives are what will be used to implement the goals. Professor Kinzer asked if the objective under Goal 1, open admission, was something which applies to all programs. Professor White replied for discussion purposes it does. Obviously it was phrased very briefly to stimulate discussion, because they essentially want to be told by the faculty what open admission should mean for this university. Professor Kelso asked when the committee hopes to have a final report. Professor White replied they should have a preliminary report by June 15. He hoped that by December of this coming year they would have completed a rather substantial report and would have had full discussion with faculty, administrators, students and alumni, which they would publish.

Implementations of Goals:

Professor Byrne asked how one would anticipate goals and/or objectives being implemented at this university in the next five or ten years. Professor White responded that, for example, take the first objective of open admission policies. They might suggest there should be open admission policies devised for a certain type of student or in a certain school, or they might suggest there has to be additional funding and the funding has to perhaps increase student fees, increase legislative appropriation, outside foundations or something of this sort. Chancellor Hine added that he asked the committee not to come in with broad, general statements, but some more specific kinds of recommendations or objectives. Obviously implementation would have to go beyond the report and would require that something be done beyond the report. Professor White said it is for other people to implement the report of the committee. Professor Neel asked if the report would be approved by the Council. Chancellor Hine thought this report should be studied by the Faculty Council, but he did not think of it as particularly a Faculty Council document. Rather it is a document prepared to give us a benchmark of where we are now and where we want to go in the future of a very comprehensive nature.

Innovative Goals:

Professor Nagy asked if there would be anything in the report which would be more innovative and to identify it in terms of goals and objectives. Professor White replied he did not think he could say that anything is totally innovative, but the whole idea of open admission certainly is innovative. Remedial education is a bit innovative also. The priority of vocational and professional education, as they looked at it, is a new approach to the whole vocational commercial education pattern. There are other things they have discussed that are innovative in nature, but they are not at a point yet to really put them out until they have some supporting documents. Vice Chancellor Buhner added that we are coming up for a North Central Association accreditation visit next winter and a normal part of any North Central visit is a self-study document. One factor North Central looks for is the analytical factor, that is to say, when you say self-study, what have you said that you know about yourself in terms of strengths and weaknesses and what do you propose to do about it. By a consensus between the steering committee for the North Central Association and the Goals Committee, it is understood that the major burden for the analytical aspects of the self-study will fall on the Goals Committee, rather than on the steering committee for the North Central visit. This represents a slight departure from the format of many North Central visits.

Professional and Undergraduate Education:

Professor Kelso felt that the goals and objectives that we are going to have the opportunity to think about in the years to come is the relationship between professional schools and the undergraduate schools. They had a discussion in the Law School about the possibility, for example, of admitting students in the Law School if they had exceptional records in college after three years, which is a departure from the present plan. There is a great deal to be said for such an interrelationship, particularly because with matters to explore about a possible Ph.D. or when one would get an undergraduate degree if he entered Law School after three years. It seemed to him the whole area of new ways of interrelating the professional and undergraduate schools of this university is an area for possible innovation, including the use of professional school faculty in undergraduate programs and vice versa. Professor White replied that was a good point

and it was included as one of the goals they thought about discussing at the retreat. The simple fact was they had to limit themselves to three goals because of the one day time element. Professor Neel asked if the faculty would get more information on this. Professor White replied everyone will be getting information within the next month. A newsletter will go out to bring everyone up-to-date on the Goal Committee's activities and they hope to send this out in two week intervals for the next several months. Chancellor Hine said it was his hope that the Council would have an opportunity to look at an early draft of the proposed report and then discussions can go on in a little more meaningful way.

Need for Specific Priorities:

Professor Bogar commented that the Chancellor had said he wanted more than just broad goals spelled out. But if you look at the goals on the sheet, you will find that they really don't say anything. What does it mean to make available university educational opportunity to meet the needs of youths and adults? So the committee felt that really their job was to get down to the nitty gritty and to really set distinct priorities. Another suggestion the committee has received is that this be an urban university--a university with an urban thrust. Now what does that mean? He said he has been toying in his mind to struggle with that for a long time. What do you do differently if you are a non-urban university. Everybody agrees we should be an urban university, but what he thought we really have to grapple with, and where the real intellectual work has to be done, is once we say that, what kind of commitment and priorities do we want to accept and what kind of directions do we want to project as being consistent with that broad generalization.

Goals and Objectives Committee of Downtown Campus:

Professor Byrne asked to enter the following statement into the minutes of the meeting: "Early this year the representative assembly of the Downtown Campus established a committee on philosophy and objectives for the Downtown Campus. This committee is releasing its first two reports, together with a questionnaire, addressed to the Downtown Campus faculty within the week. In some important respects the present thinking of the Downtown Campus committee differs significantly from that of the Goal Committee, if one may in any sense identify the latter's thinking with material distributed for discussion at the recent retreat. The Downtown Campus is not, however, persuaded that such differences as may arise between its proposals for the Downtown Campus and those of the Goal Committee for IUPUI must necessarily be reconciled. For the origins, scope and responsibility of the two committees are, it would seem, essentially different. The Downtown Campus committee, responsible to its faculty governing body, is concerned only with helping to articulate the directions of the academic unit for which the Downtown Campus is and will be responsible for. Their charge assumes some special significance perhaps only in as much as the Downtown Campus includes programs taught by no more than 1/13 of IUPUI's full-time faculty taught to as high as 1/4 of IUPUI's students. One implication that could be drawn from what these rough figures can only suggest is that no generalized goals or objectives for all of IUPUI can possibly get by unqualifiably through a unit so atypically constrained. To demand that it do so without altering other variables, however academically lofty one's motives, would result only in further frustrating the expectations of those whose modus operandi at this university is not infrequently of an entirely different order." Chancellor Hine replied he was sure that

Professor Byrne's comments were not intended to imply that we should not make the study, agreeing of course that we can come up with one objective probably that would be applied to all of our eleven units.

Role of School Committees:

Professor Wagener asked Professor White to comment, in terms of the committee, what the stance or approach of subordinate committees in various units should be and how they interface with the Goal Committee. Professor White responded that he did meet with the chairman of the Downtown Campus committee on planning and objectives about two months ago and he suggested as they proceeded, he believed they would have some information to give us that would be useful to us. Professor White added his committee would be delighted to receive information on what is being done by each of the constituent schools of IUPUI. They would find this very helpful because they obviously are not a group trying to determine the destiny of each of the schools. Each school presumably is studying this. He thought one of the communications from the Chancellor to the Deans suggested this and that they might want to re-study their current goals and objectives. He believed each school has recently prepared a missions statement for the Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs which the Goals Committee is going to study.

Report of Faculty Affairs Committee:

Professor Meiere circulated a document entitled Recommended Procedures for Promotion for IUPUI Faculty (see IUPUI Faculty Council Document #18, attached). He reported the Faculty Affairs Committee feels that a uniform procedure for promotion should be established for the University. After two years of committee meetings and a poll of the general faculty, they are making the recommendations now before the Council. He added he would not ask for the document to be voted on at the meeting, but that it be placed on the agenda of the May meeting for a vote at that time.

Promotions Procedure:

Professor Meiere began by pointing out what this procedure would or would not do if adopted. It does not attempt to set the criteria for promotion. The Faculty Handbook specifies that teaching, research, creative ability and service are criteria for promotion. His committee places the interpretation of these criteria with the individual schools of the University. Therefore, they are concerned primarily here with procedure and not criteria. What the document does attempt to do is to preserve the rights of faculty members, both for the nominee for promotion and for those faculty members responsible for recommending promotion. For an individual these rights include the knowledge of what the individual must do to be promoted, the right to nominate himself or a colleague for promotion, the knowledge that his name is being placed in nomination for promotion, and the reason for rejection if this should happen. For the committee members recommending promotion this means the knowledge of the reasons for rejections of their recommendations, if this should happen, and information concerning promotions which were obtained without faculty involvement. Professor Meiere next referred to the flow chart in the document and pointed out that this is an attempt to summarize the procedure. He reminded Council members that the preliminary version of the document, without the chart, had been distributed to the faculty, but some changes have been made and he recommended that the individual Council members read the final version in its entirety before voting at the next meeting.

Basic Role of Unit Committee:

The basic committee in this scheme is the unit committee. This is organized at the school or college level and it is mandatory in their recommendation. It has to exist. Below the unit committee the primary committee may or may not exist, at the discretion of the school as specified by the school's constitution, or where the constitution does not exist, as specified by the Dean. Nominations for promotion flow through the unit committee in the ways indicated. They flow from the primary committee, if it exists, or they come from the nominee or from the Dean of that particular unit. It is noted that the unit committee has the authority to vote yes or no on promotion and recommendations coming from below, except for the Dean where they can only recommend and thus pass on recommendations from the Dean. They can stop nominations from the primary committee or the nominee, but they cannot stop it from the Dean.

IUPUI Promotions Committee:

These nominations must flow through the unit committee to an IUPUI promotions committee. In this scheme the IUPUI promotions committee has representation from each school or college of the University. It is hoped that in practice the real decisions will be made by some combinations of the unit committee and the primary committee, depending on the school. However, the overall IUPUI promotions committee does have the power of approval or disapproval. The nominations then proceed to the Chancellor and no attempt has been made by the Faculty Affairs Committee to specify what the Chancellor does, except that he explain to the promotions committee any rejections of their recommendations. He explained the dotted lines on the flow chart coming back simply indicate the flow of information for rejected nomination. For example, if the Chancellor rejects the nomination, the reasons go to the IUPUI promotions committee. If the promotion committee rejects a recommendation, it goes back to the unit committee.

Results of Faculty Poll on Promotions Procedure:

Professor Meiere said in response to the faculty poll concerning the preliminary version of the document, it showed that 239 respondents approved and 37 disapproved. He hoped that each Council member would take the time to make sure he is fully aware of the feelings of the faculty members in his area which may or may not agree with the overall summary.

Mandatory Submission of Recommendation:

Chancellor Hine commented on the statement that the unit committee could stop the nomination and he asked if that meant they would hold it or would they just disapprove it and pass it on. Professor Meiere meant that if they vote yes, it goes on and if they vote no, it is not given to the promotions committee at all. It is returned to the people who originally started the recommendation with the reason for their objection. Chancellor Hine felt this point might be debatable. Dean Lawrence asked if a unit committee can forward a recommendation for promotion to the promotions committee without having any commentary from the Dean. Professor Meiere said that would be up to the unit committee. Within the procedure, if the unit committee so chooses, and the school constitution so specifies, that could be possible.

Nomination by Dean:

Professor Navarre said since the functions of the primary committee and unit committee are somewhat different, she wondered if the primary committee does not exist, does the unit committee then take on the nominating function or does it then fall back on the individual or to the Dean. Professor Meiere said it takes on the nominating function on its own, plus receiving nominations from individual faculty members. The Dean's nominations are not treated in the same way as nominations from the individual faculty members or a primary committee, in the sense that they cannot be stopped by the unit committee. However, they can say that they disapprove for some reason. Professor Weber felt that the item on Page 2, number 4, under B, would be an injustice because to put the power to stop a promotion among one's peers instead of among a group which is wider would be opening a way for injustice for certain people. If a unit committee can put a negative comment as it goes forward to stop it, she hesitated to see this kind of power put in a unit committee. Professor Neel agreed and said he could see a problem on the other side, for where the unit Dean promotion goes through regardless of the unit committee or the IUPUI promotions committee, he thought if you can stop one, you should be able to stop both. Chancellor Hine thought this was a point that the Faculty Affairs Committee would want to defend, because there is a chance for debate. Professor Kelso suggested that having negative responses come back to the committee rather than to the Dean may be creating some problems that are not necessary. The Dean can soften the negative response with information about next year's salary, etc., whereas the committee has no such way of softening the blow.

Guidelines for Promotion:

Professor Byrne said he understood Professor Meiere to say the basic committee would be the unit committee. He wondered, in the judgment of the Faculty Affairs Committee, what is the function of the IUPUI promotions committee. If the unit committee is to develop its own criteria, guidelines and judgment for different units, he did not conclude that the IUPUI promotions committee could operate with no guidelines. He supposed that there are some guidelines, although they are not indicated as to where they come from. If that is left open, they may differ moderately or maybe even dramatically from the guidelines developed within and utilized by the units. His conclusion was that he was not sure he was persuaded that the unit committee would necessarily work out to be the basic committee. Professor Meiere replied that Item 2, under C, says the IUPUI promotions committee shall develop printed guidelines for its operation. His committee does not propose to say what these should be, but do suggest the guidelines. Professor Levitt said he was not sure what is meant by guidelines. He could see some higher committee, perhaps the Chancellor's office rather than committee, ruling on whether a particular faculty member has met these thoroughly objective guidelines. But when it comes to evaluating teaching or research or service or clinical work, he did not see what the higher level committees can do at all. He saw no value in the unit committee and saw the promotions committee as futile. None of these committees have the ability to evaluate the performances of the individual faculty members. He only saw the primary committee as being able to do this. It seemed to him we are just setting up a kind of gratuitous hierarchy here. Professor Meiere replied that an attempt has been made to set up a procedure which will fit the University as a whole, and as such, it may operate differently in one school than in another.

Communication with Dean:

Dean J. Taylor did not see from the flow chart how the Dean finds out what happens if a promotion is not approved. Chancellor Hine asked the committee to consider this for the next meeting. It seemed to him that if promotion has any effect that would be in addition to recognition of an individual's ability, it might be for the Dean to be in a position to correct the changes or have something to say to the person about why he was not promoted. He wanted the Faculty Affairs Committee to consider carefully whether or not they really mean the unit committee would only know about the people that are not being promoted. Secondly, he asked they consider carefully the dates on the list. Professor Kinzer suggested the committee consider the advisability that in the reporting of cases failed in promotion there might be some reasons why the lower committees themselves should make a record and keep it for the future use of successor committees.

Professor Alton was concerned about the extent to which this might both politicize and publicize the promotion. If someone is refused promotion, then maybe 25 people would know all about the whole thing and she did not like that idea. Professor O'Loughlin said he had information that Purdue's promotions will still go through Lafayette and he wanted to know how this would fit into the IUPUI promotions. Chancellor Hine thought the Faculty Affairs Committee should consider that also because we do not want to put Purdue mission people under double jeopardy by going through too many sets of committees. Professor Alton wanted to know if there is any provision for feedback to nominees if they are not promoted and why. Professor Meiere responded that is not shown on the chart, but there is a provision for that. There is some question as to who will handle it at the moment, but under Item B, 5, it says the unit committee shall be responsible for informing each nominee of the results of his nomination. It has, however, been suggested that this may not be the right way to do it.

Administrative Input:

Chancellor Hine thought it might be helpful for the promotions committee to have the comments of the administrator. The flow chart did not indicate how the Dean might be told reasons for failure to recommend promotion and he thought it would be desirable to have the administrator involved, particularly if the Dean has decided to talk to the nominee about reasons for no promotion and what he can do about getting promoted next year. He thought in general the chart was good and it is really about what we are doing now and that many faculty do not know it. There is a little mystery involved about getting promoted and it can be dispelled by a report and chart such as this. Professor Levitt felt what we are doing now is bad, for what comes back in feedback, for example, when promotions are turned down by the IU Board of Trustees, is "insufficient evidence." What he has done is to take that same person's papers for next year, word for word, re-submit them and then the promotion goes through. Chancellor Hine replied procedure-wise this is what we are doing, not the results of the procedures. Professor Levitt felt that is part of the procedures.

Publication of Promotion Criteria:

Professor Byrne said if the IUPUI promotions committee is to develop its own guidelines, he wondered if the Faculty Affairs Committee has considered whether these guidelines are to be made public, to be reviewed by any individual or any unit, and under what considerations. Professor Meiere said they have recommended

these become public. For example, under II, A, these guidelines shall be made available to any faculty member and one copy shall be forwarded to the unit committee. Professor Byrne said these are not guidelines for the primary committee, but for the unit committee. He was referring to the guidelines which the IUPUI promotions committee is charged to develop itself for its own operation. Professor Meiere said it should be consistent up the line. For example, in C, 2, the IUPUI promotions committee shall develop printed guidelines for its operations, one copy of which shall be on file with the Secretary of the Faculty Council. Now as far as review, the answer is that nobody will review the promotions committee guidelines formally. You have to stop somewhere. Professor Byrne said he failed to appreciate that the IUPUI committee is concerned only with procedures and not with criteria. He would conclude from that in operation it would in effect establish uniformity of criteria. Professor Meiere said he did not mean to imply that the promotions committee would not be concerned at all with criteria. What he tried to convey was that it is criteria for the university as a whole, it should be administered by the promotions committee, but it should accept the criteria and interpretation of broader criteria as based on the individual schools. No one, not certainly the Faculty Affairs Committee, would challenge the statement that interpretation of any sort of university-wide criteria has to be made by the people primarily involved.

Professor Norins asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had given any account to the time involvement in being on the IUPUI promotions committee. Professor Meiere said they made no attempt to come up with a time figure, but have considered the time it takes quite seriously, both from the point of view of faculty time spent and how it affected these dates they are subject to. They acknowledge that it is a very time consuming job and very difficult. Chancellor Hine urged anyone to get in touch with the chairman of the Faculty Affairs Committee if they feel strongly on some items that were not mentioned. He assumed that the committee might come into the next meeting with consideration of modifications of some of the things on the basis of the discussion held during the Council meeting.

Presiding Officer's Business: Refund of Parking Fees

Vice Chancellor Ryder reported that last spring at this time the system-wide IUPUI parking policy committee was established to bring together all the units of IUPUI with a common policy. It made recommendations to the Chancellor on policies, procedures and rates for the parking system. It was decided that an effective date of September 1 would be appropriate, since the classes would be starting on the 25th and this would give all students, faculty and staff an opportunity to receive the information and to conform to the policy. The deans approved this in early June and the Board of Trustees approved the policies, procedures and rates on the 14th of August. On the 15th or 16th of August President Nixon established the freeze. Vice Chancellor Ryder and Mr. Lautzenheiser then asked the IRS if we fit under the freeze and if so, how. The response was yes, because we did not have substantial notification of the changes prior to that date. So we said we would make modifications which seemed to fit, keeping in mind that the rates for blue stickers was not a change, but there had been a change on the green from a graduated scale to a flat \$3.00 a month. For students there were paved parking lots behind the Downtown Campus and the Law School and the rate for students was \$12.50, with the same thing being charged at 38th St. The parking committee had recommended a reduction to a \$10 fee and this would be applied uniformly on those lots. So the position was taken that as far as students were concerned, that the \$10 rate was not an increase in parking, and so would not fall under the freeze situation. They had anticipated

increasing parking meter rates from three hours for 25¢ to 10¢ an hour. In the fine area the recommendation of the parking policy committee was an increase from the graduated \$1, \$3, \$5 fine to \$3 for the first violation, \$5 for the second, and \$10 for the next. So we rolled back those rates. Basically we left the meters the same, rolled back the fines, and rolled back the staff parking. Therefore, we said we were conforming to the freeze.

Complaint of Violation of Price Freeze:

Some student groups filed a complaint with IRS saying that since they had parked in certain lots near the Law School free last year and now were having to pay, that this represented an increase in price. There was no price before, but now there was a price, so therefore that is a price increase. So we discussed this with IRS but they gave us no specific ruling. They did show us a ruling which had come out of the Cost of Living Council which they said might apply and said if we wanted any more information on this we were to send a letter to Chicago asking for an exemption. We sent a letter which asked for clarification, asking was that specific situation that the students brought up a violation and if so, we would like an exemption. That was the 29th of September and in January we got word that we were in violation. We got together with IRS and after considerable consultation and negotiations, it turns out the position that IRS is taking is that we were in violation on the students in the first semester and only on those areas that are associated around the Law School and the Downtown Campus. Basically it was because we had not completely concluded the development of the parking facility.

Rates for Second Semester:

Now there was a question about the second semester as well. However, the Cost of Living Council has taken the position that governmental units after January 26 are exempt completely, and we can charge anything we want for parking, fees, etc. However, the publication of this ruling in the federal register was previously announced in the newspapers on December 23 and so IRS said they wanted to determine whether that would be the date or January 26 would be the date. They have now determined that December will be the date, and therefore, we may charge anything after that time. So the position is that we do not have to rebate anything for second semester, but do have to rebate to students only in the areas of the Downtown Campus and Law School areas for the first semester. The amount would be a rebate of \$5 for full-time students and \$2.50 for part-time students. The rebate will be made to all students.

Fee Rebate:

Vice Chancellor Ryder added they are now in the process of determining precisely how they will make this rebate. Professor Neel asked if there is provision also to include rebating a fine a student acquired first semester. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied it does not. Professor Meiere asked for an estimate of how much it is going to cost. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied they are not sure about this because they have to go through records to determine full and part-time, but he would estimate it between \$20,000 and \$30,000. This will affect our ability in the future development of our parking facilities. Professor Kelso said he is a member of the American Bar Association's Council of Legal Education, which is an accrediting body of the Law School, and in that capacity has received reports throughout the year from law schools with respect to their problems, developments, and their relationships between faculty and students. He felt he knew something about student bodies throughout the country, having personally visited 120 law schools, and he said it was his opinion we have a very responsible group

of future professionals and we should take great pride in that. Vice Chancellor Ryder agreed and said these students have worked within the system in a very effective way.

Agenda Committee Business:

Professor Bogar said there will be a report from the Nominations Committee regarding the Secretary and Parliamentarian at the next Council meeting. The Election-Appportionment Committee will also report at the next meeting.

The next scheduled Council meeting, and the last, is the May meeting. This meeting has a very packed agenda and Professor Bogar thought the meeting might be called a half-hour to forty-five minutes earlier than usual.

Professor Bogar informed the Council that the All-University Council in Bloomington has called off their April meeting, which is the second postponement in a row. That body will not meet again until September.

Professor Bogar reported the Chancellor and the Agenda Committee have tentatively set Tuesday, May 9 as the day for the IUPUI Faculty Meeting. This meeting will be at 4:00 p.m. in LH101 of the Downtown Campus.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
Thursday, May 11, 1972
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Nevill, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Professors Alton, Bixler, Bogar, Cutshall, Galanti, Gifford, Grossman, Jarboe, Kelso, Kinzer, Langsam, Levitt, Meiere, Merritt, Nagy, Navarre, Neel, Norins, O'Loughlin, Ross, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Chancellor Hine; Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, Lawrence, Lohse, McDonald; Professors Ashmore, Beall, Behnke, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Fleener, Higgins, Hutton, Johnston, Kirch, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Marks, Nunn, Ochs, Sagraves, Schreiber, Wagener, Weber.

Visitors: Dean Bynum; Professor Royer, Mr. Duerden.

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of April 13, 1972.
2. Report of Academic Affairs Committee on College of General Studies (Kinzer).
3. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee on Promotions Procedures (Meiere).
4. Agenda Committee Business.
5. Presiding Officer's Business
6. New Business.

The IUPUI Faculty Council at its meeting of May 11, 1972:

1. Approved the minutes of April 13, 1972.
2. Received and approved a report from the Academic Affairs Committee on a proposed School of General Studies.
3. Heard and adopted a resolution of appreciation to Professor Bogar.
4. Received and approved a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee on Promotion Procedures.
5. Elected an Agenda Committee for 1972-73.
6. Heard a report on the appointment of a Committee on Committees for 1972-73.
7. Received and approved a report from the Election-Appportionment Committee.
8. Approved the recommendation of the Secretary that IUPUI's representatives to the All-University Council remain the same until such time as the All-University Council is reorganized.
9. Elected Professor Paul Nagy as Secretary and Professor Paul Galanti as Parliamentarian.

Vice Chancellor Ryder called the May 11, 1972 meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council to order.

Approval of Minutes:

Professor Kinzer moved the minutes of the April 13, 1972 meeting be approved and Professor Langsam seconded. The motion carried.

Report of Academic Affairs Committee on College of General Studies:

Professor Kinzer moved the Council go into a committee of the whole for a ten minute period to discuss Faculty Council Document #20, a report from the Academic Affairs Committee on the proposal for a School for General Studies. Professor Meiere seconded. With no objection, the Council moved into a status of a committee of the whole.

Professor Kinzer reported the document was divided into two parts, I and II. Part I contained responses and recommendations on the proposal for the School of General Studies. Essentially the Academic Affairs Committee recommended that the proposal be referred back to the task force with some suggestions as to what it might do. The second part of the report included features which they saw as separate.

Professor Kinzer asked for questions, comments, or suggestions on Part I. Professor Bogar asked if basically the recommendation in #5, Page 2, in effect covered the whole report and if the other recommendations were what the task force should consider in its further work. Professor Kinzer replied that #1 through #4 are weaknesses in the task force statement which his committee did not feel qualified to resolve. Recommendation #5 recommends this be returned to the task force for their consideration and his committee suggested they re-work it and include those features which are in the remainder of that paragraph.

Professor Kinzer asked for questions on Part II. Professor Langsam said the committee made a distinction in II-1 that they think it is unwise to combine certificate or degree programs with non-credit courses of the continuing education type. She asked where courses fit that are offered for particular groups for credit. For example, she cited IU at Gary setting up a program for people working in the mayor's office. Professor Kinzer replied they see that credit courses, whether they are focussed toward degree or certification, ought not be in the same operating unit as continuing education. Professor Navarre said they are having the same problem at the Graduate School of Social Service for people are not satisfied with non-credit continuing education. They want credit for continuing education, not to lead to a degree, but to amass more credits.

Location of General Studies:

Professor Nagy asked about Page 4, #3, paragraph D, which states that one of the functions of undergraduate education is "general." He asked if this suggested that the general part of the school of general studies should be taken over by the existing arts and sciences program, and if so, he wanted a clearer explanation. Professor Neel responded that in paragraph C, they have indicated that this kind of general program should be given consideration in each of the major schools of science and liberal arts. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked if that meant there can be no general education function in the sense you would have cultural courses in the general studies program and are all such courses to be in the arts and sciences. Professor Neel replied they are simply saying these schools should set up the general education program. Professor Kinzer said this

does not mean that there is no proper place for general studies, but it seems that general studies has to be a great deal more precisely defined than it is anywhere in the document from the task force.

Professor Meiere reported that on Page 4, item 4, it states that IUPUI clientele desperately need college or unit catalogues. He added that faculty need those also. He asked the chair if it had any knowledge of a catalogue for next fall. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied there would be no catalogue for next fall for undergraduate areas. One of the problems is the process between now and the structural reorganization. Vice Chancellor Buhner reported it is almost impossible to come up with an all IUPUI catalogue that would not be even more misleading than the documents we have had until now. He personally recommended to the Chancellor we have no general catalogue until the organizational matter has been settled. Hopefully this will be in the near future. It is the administration's intention that as soon as this organizational matter is cleared up, Mr. Duerden will be asked to go to work on a format for a general publication. However, there is no way to get it done by this fall.

Role of Continuing Education in General Studies:

Vice Chancellor Buhner commented that the report from the Academic Affairs Committee was one of the best he had ever read coming from the Council and it pointed out many of the weaknesses of the original task force proposal. First, he said there is no question that the original task force was not as representative as the committee report wished it had been. Secondly, he too agrees that continuing education in the classic sense should not be included in the purview or the structure of the proposed school of general studies. However, the task force did put it there, and he thought it fair to say that if you ultimately have a general studies school, there will inevitably be a continuing education function evolve from that school because such a school will address itself to vocational, paraprofessional, and other types of programs which are inherently terminal in nature and which will prepare a person for only limited job horizons. In that sense he thought we all might agree that we would hope that any school, whether it be continuing education, the school of medicine, dentistry, or any other, will address itself increasingly to the notion of continuing education. But in the sense in which continuing education is the function of Dean Burley's operation, which is the division of continuing education and is a vehicle for doing all of those things we cannot do, and perhaps should not do within our regular operating budget, he certainly agreed and personally never intended that it be assumed as part of the proposal. However, when you ask a group to write a proposal, one thing you do not try to do is rewrite it after they get through with it. Therefore, he accepted the report when he got it. So he assured the Council that the administration fully understands the point and never intended that continuing education, in the classical sense (the adult, vocational, recreational, cultural kind of program) was never intended to be part of the school of general studies. The third point he stressed was that he supports the notion that the university division and the existing guided studies program merge.

Visibility of School of General Studies:

Vice Chancellor Buhner did want to communicate the concern that he and others have that IUPUI must get itself into a highly visible posture of response to some of the urgent needs of our clientele and our community around us. By community, he meant the central state region, the eight counties comprising central Indiana. He felt we should respond to the fact that there are people who are not in high

school who should be in some form of higher education and cannot get in some form of higher education, for they should be part of our responsibility. He did not think we should attempt to do the total job of educating this great area between the high school and college, but it is our function to do a substantial part of it, particularly until the state finds ways to find other institutions to pick up part of the job. The state already has a start in this direction with Indiana Vocational Technical College, and Vice Chancellor Buhner felt that no one would want the general studies program to invade that area that is already earmarked for Ivy Tech. Nevertheless, there remains a great void and it is just not all remedial, preparatory and compensatory education. Much of it is substantive education and much of it is career oriented, professional oriented and service oriented education.

Budget:

Vice Chancellor Buhner felt strongly that the Council ought to make it possible for the administration and faculty to move together toward the concept of a school of general studies. He added he recognized that the recommendation of the committee falls short of saying that, but he would like to have a motion that would enable the administration to proceed with the concept of a school of general studies in an overt, objectifiable way and in a way that is out in the open. He said much is made in the report about the problem of budget. In a memo that he used to distribute the task force report he said that clearly the IUPUI operating budget for 1971-72 and the projected budget for 1972-73 has no leeway in funds for establishing such a school and we cannot permit vital existing programs to be eroded by new ones, however meritorious the latter. But in the spirit of Chancellor Hine's six point charge to the general faculty on May 18, we can plan, we can make a commitment, and we can look for other ways to fund this and other urgently needed programs. We can work hard at the proposition that our present priorities are not immutable, and we can change. We can look to the case to be made before future sessions of the general assembly and we can fairly raise the question whether our present modes of operations are as efficient or as effective as they might be. He assured the Council that no one ever intended that the concept of general studies, if accepted by the Council, would be permitted to erode in any way or take from the financial support which is already in short supply for the rest of the program. Once we make a commitment to it, we can find ways and means for getting the job done.

Statement of Commitment:

Vice Chancellor Buhner concluded by saying this is a highly urgent matter and is one we cannot keep hidden for a year or so as we work internally. He hoped the Council would give a kind of endorsement that will let the administration make a commitment. Professor Kelso was unsure what it means to talk about a commitment to a program which calls for a structure without approving the structure and without being sure that the structure is the best thing to do. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied that the Academic Affairs Committee report begins with the statement that they are not against the concept of a school for general studies. They say their committee notes a number of criticisms of the proposal for general studies; their comments, however, should not be interpreted as disapproval of the underlying philosophy of the task force proposal. That is the kind of commitment he was talking about. As far as structure is concerned, if you mean school structure, such as deans and faculty, these details are not specified either in the proposal or in the report from the Academic Affairs Committee. Professor Kelso responded that the Academic Affairs Committee seems to deal with the philosophy very adequately, but straddles the notion as to whether or not we

really need a general studies school. Vice Chancellor Buhner agreed the report does stop short of that and saying to implement the school. The committee builds in a one year waiting period before the Council should be asked again to consider a school of general studies. He felt there should not be that kind of a time binder on it. He would like the Council to adopt the concept of a school for general studies, to mandate the administration to put this back in the hands of the task force as expanded under the guidelines of the report, and then to report on a definitive structure to the Chancellor, to be able to go to the Board of Trustees and President of the University to include it in their recommendations for long range organization at IUPUI, and to get it accepted by the Board of Trustees as a commitment to this campus. Professor Levitt felt the structure should be seen and then we could talk about concept.

Motion to Accept Report:

Professor Kinzer moved the acceptance of the report and Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Nagy felt that the approval in principle that Vice Chancellor Buhner has asked for if not explicit, then is quite strongly implied in the report. This is a major decision on the part of IUPUI and the decision cannot be made apart from other aspects of the development of this university. There are important connections between a general studies program in its final form and the emerging undergraduate programs in other areas. He did not think the decision itself on the general studies program can be made independent of the larger picture. Vice Chancellor Buhner felt this was part of the format of undergraduate organizational recommendation the Council passed at the last meeting. He sees this as a kind of an amendment or rider to do what we have at the last meeting of the Council. In that sense, he sees it as part of the total package, part of the total commitment. He did not follow where Professor Nagy felt it does not fit in the total context of the undergraduate structure. Professor Nagy replied perhaps he misunderstood, but he thought what he was calling for was a kind of strong approval from the Council toward the idea of general studies, apart from all the specific ways in which the concept would have an effect on existing programs.

Review of General Studies by Goals and Objectives Committee:

Professor White reported concern has been expressed in the Goals and Objectives Committee meetings for a school of general studies. This comes up time and time again in their discussions with people who want to know what we have in mind with regard to a program of general studies in order to make the educational opportunities of an urban university more available to everyone within the community. His committee has responded with the fact that there has been a task force appointed, the task force has reported, and the matter is currently under consideration by the Faculty Council and its Academic Affairs Committee. It seemed to him that in the light of this concern they hear expressed to them almost daily, that it is important we move forward to a commitment to a general studies program, and a commitment to the principle, as well as to the implementation. He personally felt there should be some sort of implementation of the general studies program as soon as possible, and as soon as the undergraduate structure reorganization is finally presented by the Chancellor and approved by the Trustees. He believed the community, both internal university community and external university community, wants this.

Concept of an Urban University:

Dean J. Taylor felt he is committed to the urban concept and general studies, but what we are committed to do ought to be perfectly clear for if we do what one public wants, then the other is going to be dissatisfied. If you do what one

public wants with reference to certain services or expansion of services in the immediate area, another public is going to be dissatisfied and those trying to implement these programs are going to have to live with their decisions and the turmoil that may well result from the wrong emphasis. In this sense that is why he would be very much in favor of a commitment, but he could not see from what he has heard that we would get any more commitment than is expressed in the beginning part of the committee's report. He failed to see what an extra commitment consists of that is not going to say precisely what we are going to try to do, what we are going to try to get money for, and how you are going to try to do it. He would hope that what he understood to be the spirit of the urban concept that we were fairly well committed, but he has found that even among faculty, the understanding and appreciation of what this connotes is a widely varying thing. To say we are going to make an urban university, without in some way specifying, is not to commit us to anything that we, as a unit, would want to be moving toward. We need to be committed to something very specific.

Timing of Implementation:

Vice Chancellor Buhner asked the members of the committee if the following kind of administrative reaction would be in the spirit of the motion to accept. Bearing in mind we are in substantial agreement on everything except degree of emphasis and degree of what he is calling commitment, he asked if they could set this up administratively in a phase program in which you start off with phase planning, then go to a council of general studies, and then, over a period of one, two, or three years, to a division, and ultimately a school status. This would build in a schedule. He asked if the committee would consider this a perversion of their report. Professor Kinzer replied he would consider it so. Professor Neel felt he did not see in the report from the task force committee exactly where it is going, how it is going to get there, or the mechanism by which it is going to arrive. He could buy the step by step proposal, if it was not implemented until we had the total picture. He did not care if it was brought up for discussion again and again, but he wanted to see the total package before making any commitment on it.

Professor Meiere thought the beauty of the report was it answers some fears of people that can see the school of general studies as a threat. The beauty of attaching certain reservations along with the commitment is that it answers some fears that presently exist. There is a great deal of difference between a commitment at all costs and a commitment with some reservations or conditions.

Motion to Amend:

Professor Kelso moved to amend the motion to approve the report by deleting from the report recommendation II-3-E, which calls for a full year's time line. It seemed to him if the matter is one of importance and if we are agreed we should become an urban university, that it is not proper for us to say we are not going to think about it for a full year. Also, if the task force can resolve some problems by becoming more specific and getting this back in less than a year, he saw no reason for the Council to say they would not listen. Professor Jarboe seconded. Professor Kinzer responded the recommendation for the one year time lapse is there because we need time to get the undergraduate degree function in undergraduate units operating. It is not to defer general studies, but is to get what we are presently committed to underway and completed. There is no reason why the task force cannot in the same year return to its job and come up with a proposal which is rather specific about what general studies is. One

of the problems is that general studies is awfully general and he would like to see it a little more specific. He would be very much opposed to the Faculty Council giving a blank check to a non-existent program or non-existent school to go ahead and do it. He would like to see what it is we are approving before we approve it. Professor Neel added the Academic Affairs Committee did simply not want the proposal to come back to the Council for adoption or action until such time it is completely spelled out. Professor Kelso felt if the Council wants to indicate to the Chancellor its concern about implementing the undergraduate structure proposal, he thought the Council ought to do it directly and not tie to it the general studies program. The vote was taken on the amendment and it carried. The motion to accept the report as amended was voted on and carried. Vice Chancellor Buhner stated he would keep the Council informed on the progress of development on this and wanted to go on the record as cooperating.

Resolution of Appreciation:

Professor White read a resolution of appreciation to Bernard Bogar, Secretary of the Council (see Faculty Council Document #22, attached). He moved for its adoption and Professor Norins seconded. The motion was carried.

Report of Faculty Affairs Committee on Promotion Procedure:

Professor Bixler reiterated some of the basic premises upon which the Faculty Affairs Committee developed their document originally. Their guiding principle rests on the fact that in our particular cultural system, while faculty and academic promotions are a pretty unique phenomena, it only occurs in very fine and well defined situations and has responsibilities and privileges thereto appertaining, and there are privileges very well defined for each rank. They felt that the document is not an idle one, but has great significance for this university. Therefore, they have spent a considerable amount of time trying to implement this particular philosophy into the creation of the document itself. They were well guided by some rights of the individual faculty member. First is the right of an individual to nominate himself or a colleague for a promotion; second is knowledge of what the criteria are for upon which this promotion will be based; third is an evaluation of the criteria by his peers, those who know his abilities and achievements best; fourth is the knowledge that he is under consideration for promotion; and finally, if the promotion request is rejected, a statement of the reasons for rejection so that he may be better able to prepare himself in the future for consideration. By the same token, the committee felt there were some rights to be protected for the committee members who are considering these promotions. These rights are the right of assurance that the committee deliberations will be given serious consideration by others involved in the promotion procedure, and the right to stated reasons why their recommendations have been denied.

Professor Bixler continued and said the committee deliberations over the past two years have been an attempt to direct the construction of the document that will, without being burdensome and unwieldy, accomplish these goals. They felt they have been faced with an almost infinitely complicated problem, due to the heterogeneity of the various academic disciplines in this university campus. They have met at considerable length with all of the representatives of the various nine schools, hopefully accomplishing a welding and amalgamation of the problems and ideas in view in each of these disciplines.