

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
September 10, 1970
Law School

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Behnke, Bixler, Bogar, Byrne, Challoner, Daly, Forney, Glover, Hackney, Higgins, Hopper, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Mandelbaum, Meiere, Merritt, Norins, S. Ross, Sagraves, Schreiber, Simmons, Wagener, Weber, White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, Lawrence, McDonald; Professors Ashmore, Berkshire, Boyd, DeMyer, Friedman, Garner, Gifford, Hutton, Levitt, Mamlin, Nagy, Nevill, Ochs, J. Ross, Tennant.

Visitors: Professors Levine, G. Lukemeyer, J. Lukemeyer, E. Shrigley; W. Spencer

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of June 25, 1970.
2. Presiding Officer's Business
 - a. Welcome to members
 - b. Committee structure of IUPUI
 - c. Progress report on fringe benefits of IU and Purdue
3. Agenda Committee Business
 - a. Election of Review Committee
 - b. Election of By-Laws Committee
4. New Business

Chancellor Hine called the meeting to order. The minutes of the June 25, 1970 meeting were approved as distributed.

The Chancellor introduced the new members of the Faculty Council and welcomed them. New members of the Council for 1970-71 academic year are as follows: Dean Benjamin Taylor, Herron School of Art; Glen O. Sagraves, School of Dentistry; Paul J. Nagy, Downtown Campus; Forrest T. Meiere, Purdue 38th St. Campus; C. Conrad Johnston, School of Medicine; James Ashmore, School of Medicine; Edmund F. Byrne, Downtown Campus; David Challoner, School of Medicine; James T. Higgins, School of Medicine; Everett E. Jarboe, Downtown Campus; Charles D. Kelso, School of Law; Eugene E. Levitt, School of Medicine; Isidore Mendelbaum, School of Medicine; Sidney Ochs, School of Medicine; Joseph C. Ross, School of Medicine.

The Chancellor then commented that he was to talk about committee structure of IUPUI. He said he wanted to comment on something someone told him not long after he became the Chancellor. The first rule of effective university administration is that under no circumstances should a president, chancellor, or even a dean, appear to have any ideas. If he wants something done, he should carefully plant the thought in some unexpected place, wait patiently for it to root or grow, act surprised and suspicious of the idea when it is brought to his attention, and then yield reluctantly to overwhelming pressure. Along this matter of committees, the Chancellor found it desirable when he first got into office to appoint quite a number of committees. Many of the committees were the type that probably should report to the Faculty Council, but some were administrative and reported directly to him. He was alarmed to find the number that he had appointed. He made the comment to Vice President Hartley in Bloomington and Dean Hartley said Bloomington had done the same thing and had a total of 128 committees that were actually operating, either administrative or Faculty Council. The Chancellor felt IUPUI was not in that league yet, but did have quite a number of committees. He met briefly with the Agenda Committee and went over the committees that had been appointed with the thought that some would report directly to the Faculty Council group and some would be administrative. The Chancellor said he was going to try to keep IUPUI committee appointments to a minimum. On the other hand, he felt there are many times subjects should be considered by faculty committees to recommend procedures to administration. Professor Bogar added that the Agenda Committee did go over the extensive list of committee structure and allocated to those committees what they thought would best be served by being part of the Faculty Council, those which they thought would best serve by being administrative, and those committees they thought perhaps should be administrative with Council representation. This list will appear in the minutes of this meeting and will be gone over in the October meeting of the Council. (See Faculty Council Document #1, attached.)

Chancellor Hine then stated that he was instructed by the Council to make a report on fringe benefits of IU and Purdue with the thought that they could be made acceptable to both groups as the merger takes place. The following is the Chancellor's list of fringe benefits: (1) method of earning tenure; (2) eligibility for vacations and sick leave; (3) eligibility for sabbatical leaves; (4) date of retirement from active duty; (5) TIAA payments; (6) fee remission policy; (7) policy regarding Blue Cross-Blue Shield; (8) long term disability insurance; (9) major medical insurance; (10) life insurance; (11) parking privileges; (12) policy on purchase of athletic contest tickets, discounts in bookstores. There are some differences between the Purdue and IU fringe benefits. Some of them are substantive, some are not. For example, both Purdue and IU have seven holidays each year, but they are slightly different. The question is which group or list should be taken. The difference is that Purdue gets an extra Christmas day and does not get Good Friday. IU gets Good Friday, but gets only Christmas and New Year's during the

holidays. This is primarily for the non-academic staff. The retirement age for Purdue is 65, but for IU it is 70. Naturally there are some people that would rather work until they are 70 because they will get a better retirement policy than they would if they must retire at 65, since both IU and Purdue are under the same TIAA arrangement. In some cases some of the people would prefer to retire at 65. At IU you can retire at 65, 67, or 69, but you must retire at 70. His question was how should we approach this problem of benefits. Because if we go for the fairer one of the two, it probably will cost more. An example is Blue Cross-Blue Shield. If we increase the benefits of Blue Cross-Blue Shield, obviously it will cost more. Some would prefer not to have the best Blue Cross-Blue Shield policy because of this. He said further that his progress report at the moment is that they are studying these benefits and they do recognize there are some differences. The differences in many cases are a matter of interpretation by the individual involved as to which he prefers to have, whether he pays more and gets better, or pays less and has less. Professor Kelso asked if the study was limited to ironing out the differences or was the Chancellor also considering possible improvements or additions. Chancellor Hine answered that at the moment he had done nothing but collect data about the current policies of the two universities. He did report that at IU there is a study being made about the overall fringe benefits policy. A few years ago it was generally accepted that IU had a very fine policy and there have been developments in recent years that suggest that IU's policy is not the best available from TIAA. This is being studied, but he has seen no reports. Professor Langsam asked if there was anything by law that restricts us to Blue Cross-Blue Shield as opposed to some of the other insurance companies. The Chancellor replied he was quite sure there is nothing in the legal statutes about it. He thought that for many of these, for example the insurance program, IU pays the entire cost of the first \$3,000 of insurance. He assumed that it is almost mandatory that everyone wants it. Purdue, on the other hand, pays approximately the first \$2,000 of term life insurance and then they pay the first 50% in excess of \$2,000. IU pays all of the first \$3,000 and then on more than that the individual contributes 40 cents a month. So you have to get down and really study out which is better and see what and who is involved in order to determine it. It is not quite as simple as saying we will take all of IU's and ignore Purdue's, or take all of Purdue's and ignore IU's, or even to try to get the best of both. By best it means what the individual thinks is best. The Chancellor then asked how the Council wanted him to approach this problem from now on. He felt he could come in another month or two with a few recommendations, if the Council wished, and with what appears to be feasible and desirable for the Council's recommendation. This probably would be subject to some discussion by the Board of Trustees later, but he would like to go to the Board with a recommendation from the Council. He again asked to be given a little more time to come in with a recommendation for fringe benefits for IUPUI. Professor Langsam asked if it would be possible to have a copy of the Chancellor's findings in order to study it because she imagined there are some complexities and some would like to wait and have a few weeks to study it before making a recommendation. Chancellor Hine said he thought it might not be as simple as that. His report now is about 29 pages of discussion on fringe benefits, including discounts at the bookstore. Professor Kelso suggested that this matter has two phases. One is simply to iron out these differences and get something in writing so that there is better understanding. This is particularly important in recruitment when we try to tell what the fringe benefits are. We need a publication we can hand someone and we can feel assurance this goes along with the whole package. Now we simply have to say we have pretty good policies. It seemed there are improvements and changes that might well be deserving of serious consideration. Chancellor Hine agreed, but to say which is better depends upon each individual. Professor Kelso agreed and said right now he was thinking about fee remission, but a little later he would be thinking about disabilities.

Chancellor Hine said this is the problem and it may be that we will have to come up with what appears to be the best compromise for all concerned. Until we get to that point, however, he again said he would appreciate comments. He repeated that if it was satisfactory to the Council, he would ask for more time and try to condense the material for distribution. Professor Daly asked to enter another complexity for consideration in delving into these matters and that is the problem of people who are technically part-time. He said there are many people who are full-time as far as activities are concerned, but as far as the University is concerned are only part-time. Chancellor Hine agreed and said there are many very valuable people on this campus that do good jobs teaching with no fringe benefits at all because TIAA contracts say you must be full-time only to receive benefits. He said he had tried for years to get that modified and that it is even more complex in the School of Medicine when a man is, technically speaking, full-time but half time for the University with the other half-time at Marion County General Hospital. Professor Wagener felt there were some other items that might be considered here like travel, convention fees and publishing aid. Chancellor Hine said he was hesitant to make a firm policy on travel that the deans would be made to stick to because no one would be happy with it. We do now have a policy, but it is not well enforced. If the Council wants this put on the list, it could be discussed. He asked that the minutes of this Council meeting show that he requested any additions and they will be considered. Professor Wagener asked about input from the Faculty Council on this subject through the Faculty Affairs Committee. Chancellor Hine said he wondered if the Council would like to have this kind of an approach to the problem. He added it might be worthwhile for the administration to put this up and then send it to the Faculty Affairs Committee for their review prior to bringing it in the Council meeting. Professor Bogar said that it seemed to him that this topic is important not only to everyone in the Council room, but to every faculty member. A comparison of the two systems would probably take a whole year to do in deciding upon which aspects of the system are most preferable. He thought that in a year or shortly thereafter we would be at a point where we could instigate our own systems. He asked if rather than merely to just compare the most desirable parts of two plans, if there could be a third plan or option plan. Chancellor Hine said that there might be a third or option plan open to us now, but we would have to get approval. We could start something that might be accepted state-wide for IU. He felt there was no need to wait a year to start comparing the changes, but when there is money involved, sometimes you have to negotiate with an outside agency. Since it could take a while, he did not think we would want to wait that long, but we could start this fall. Professor Bogar thought maybe the use of the school assemblies in some manner would get reaction to these plans from the entire faculty. Chancellor Hine felt that we should first have a firm recommendation to be discussed. Professor White asked if it would be possible to get faculty reaction to this at a fall or spring general faculty meeting. Rather than dealing with each individual school, here you would be gathering all your faculty for some specific suggestions. Professor Langsam felt having just one recommendation may be a problem. She felt there should be some choice or alternative offered. Then if faculty feel they prefer a less beneficial benefit plan, it is an option they can consider. She felt this kind of alternative offer would be more productive. Chancellor Hine commented he hoped that we could give a choice on this, like Blue Cross-Blue Shield. He would like to have two or three levels of support if Blue Cross-Blue Shield people would buy it. This way some people in some age brackets could buy one kind and some buy another. This also is why we will have to have a little time involved here before we can come up with what we consider to be the ideal situation. But he agreed that if we could give the choices, then we will have something we could take to the Faculty Council and then take to the entire faculty as long as the choices are logical, legitimate and realistic.

The next topic for discussion was Agenda Committee business. Professor Bogar said the Agenda Committee had nominated one ad hoc committee and one standing committee for the Council's consideration. The ad hoc committee is the By-Laws Committee which reviews the By-Laws in order to see if there are any changes that should be made for next year. He said he personally had several suggestions for changes in order to streamline procedures. He moved that John Glover, Howard Wisner and LaForrest Garner be elected to this committee. Dean J. Taylor moved that the nominations be closed. Motion seconded by Helen Weber. The original motion was passed unanimously.

The Review Committee is otherwise known as the Committee on Committees. Last year this Committee was composed of only three people and it was felt it operated at somewhat of a handicap because of that fact. With only three people on the Committee, it really did not have access to knowledge of all of the individual schools. This year it was expanded to a six member committee. This is a standing committee and its election is mandatory because it must come in at the next meeting in October with recommendations as to the committee structure. Since the committee structure was established last year and staffed last year, it fundamentally will be concerned this year with some of the marginal changes to the standing Faculty Council committees. This means adding new Faculty Council members to committees of their interest where vacancies exist and also soliciting non Faculty Council members who wish to serve on some of the standing committees. Primarily the very long and detailed report of the Review Committee from last year will serve as a continuing structure as far as our standing committees are concerned. Professor Norton is no longer a member of the Faculty Council, but Professor Bogar asked him to serve on this committee as a consultant, since he was the chairman of the Review Committee last year and he felt it would be highly efficient to have his advice and counsel on the new committee. Professors Boyd, Byrne, Weber, Wagener, and Higgins have agreed to serve on the Review Committee for the coming year. Therefore, the Agenda Committee nominated the following people to the Review Committee for the 1970-71 academic year: Drexell Boyd, School of Dentistry; Edmund Byrne, Downtown Campus; Helen Weber, School of Nursing; Bruce Wagener, Purdue 38th St. Campus; James T. Higgins, School of Medicine. Dean J. Taylor asked if it was anticipated that there be a limited number of members or restrictions on members of this committee. Professor Bogar said there were restrictions. Last year the Review Committee consisted of three members of the Faculty Council. During the year we saw that it was a handicap in terms of having complete knowledge of IUPUI and the Faculty Council amended that to no more than six members. Now what we have is five members of the Council plus one consultant. Dean J. Taylor asked what the justification was for non Faculty Council persons on the committee. Professor Bogar answered by justifying their selection of James Norton to serve as a consultant because there was a tremendous technical and mechanical problem which Professor Norton has already gone through in communicating with the entire IUPUI faculty, in terms of what interests they have. Professor Norton sent out a two page questionnaire to all members of IUPUI faculty last year. He drew up the questionnaire and went through the mechanics of sending it out and collating returns. This was our justification for a non Faculty Council member. This does not set any precedent, however. Professor Bogar was asked if this slate of five people instead of three as the By-Laws state is in violation of the By-Laws. Professor Bogar said the By-Laws were amended to read no more than six members on the Review Committee. Professor White said he had been searching his opinions and there was an opinion last spring to the effect that the Review Committee could not be larger than three unless the By-Laws were changed and so they were amended. Chancellor Hine felt the motion was an acceptable legal motion. Professor Wagener said it was a separate

opinion that the chairman of all Faculty Council committees be a member of the Faculty Council. But he also presumed that the Faculty Council could designate a non Council member could chair if they so desire. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously. Professors Boyd, Byrne, Weber, Wagener and Higgins will make up the Review Committee for the 1970-71 academic year, with Professor Norton serving as a consultant. Professor Bogar went on to say he felt last year the committees were just basically getting organized. He thought this year they should be much more productive in terms of substantive work and this is already coming to bear. Several committee chairmen have come to the Agenda Committee seeking places on the October and November agenda for committee reports.

Vice Chancellor Buhner said he wanted put in the record two items of program development that were taking place in the Chancellor's office. First was the Metropolitan Studies program. Professor Miriam Langsam is chairman of the Metropolitan Committee, appointed by the Chancellor well over a year ago. That committee made a number of recommendations and out of those recommendations has come the establishment of a tentative Metropolitan Affairs Department and a Consortium on Urban Education with several other institutions in Marion County and Johnson County area. The beginnings of a curriculum in urban studies has been approved, but not as a degree program, although the objective was developed first of all for an undergraduate baccalaureate and ultimately for a master's degree. The program is headed by Dr. John T. Liell, who formerly was with CAAP and is presently Executive Director of the Consortium on Education, Associate Professor of Sociology at the Downtown Campus, and Director of the Metropolitan Studies Planning Program. The Vice Chancellor went on to say there is a second program which is developing from the Chancellor's office that has to do with law enforcement education. For many years the undergraduate program Downtown has tried to cope with this long standing need. They hope this will develop as a separate program temporarily through the Chancellor's office. A part-time consultant has been employed from Bloomington and his charge is to hopefully develop a very thorough audit of the law enforcement agencies and their offices in the area, to see what the education needs are, to receive word of where the various law enforcement people are in terms of their educational level, and to see if they are potential certificate students, baccalaureate or even master's level students. They hope this program will lead into a baccalaureate that will be unique to IUPUI. They expect to work very closely with state criminal and justice agencies, the Law School, and the Graduate School of Social Service. The Vice Chancellor hoped to be able to report to the Council over the course of the year, maybe by second semester, that perhaps there will even be one full-time faculty member and an academic program soon. He went on to further comment that Vice Chancellor Ryder reminded him of the recently approved Master of Science degree in Industrial Psychology. This course comes from the Psychology faculty at the 38th St. Campus and not through the Chancellor's office. This degree has been approved by the Chancellor's office and the Board of Trustees at Purdue and has been approved for assignment to this campus. Chancellor Hine felt this was another indication of IUPUI's growth.

Professor Forney asked if we have any standards or training requirements for the campus security people. He said there was an incident that week that pointed out something which has worried him for some time. He wondered if there was any way the guns could be taken from the police officers. Chancellor Hine commented that there has been a new man appointed for state-wide security for Indiana University. There already has been a study completed as to recommendations for improvement of security. The chances are that there will soon be a dramatic reorganization of

our safety department. Professor Forney asked the name of the person who will be in charge of the University security. Chancellor Hine said the position has not yet been approved by the Board of Trustees and he could not say who the person was, except that he was a high caliber person. He felt the announcement should come from the Board of Trustees anyway. If anyone on the Council is interested in talking with this new man, the Chancellor felt it could be arranged. Professor Meiere asked if this would affect the 38th St. Campus also. Chancellor Hine said it was all inclusive and he had asked specifically that this man be a city-wide director.

Professor Kelso asked what the procedure is for putting new topics of concern for discussion before the Council. Professor Bogar said originally the only avenue of communication was through the Agenda Committee. However, early in the Council meetings the membership felt that even though something had not gone through the Agenda Committee that there should be an open space in each meeting so new topics could be brought up. This is why we have the heading "New Business" on the agenda. Something can be brought up from the floor, but to get anything substantively thought out, it should go through the Agenda Committee and the appropriate standing committee whose business the topic would be.

Professor Langsam said she had read in the newspaper about four days ago that a legislative study commission on higher education was meeting with the various presidents of the state universities. She was a bit concerned about some of the topics on that including what can the legislators do to tenure members of the faculty who are "radicals." She felt that one of the very important things seems to be to have some real channel of communication, especially with legislative sessions coming up. Chancellor Hine responded to her comment about that particular meeting saying no decisions were reached. At the meeting someone did talk about tenure appointments, but there really was nothing to report of a substantive nature. He thought it might not be a bad idea for him to try to remember to call up the Secretary and see if somebody from the Faculty Council could sit in on the meetings. He felt these meetings were not usually the kind that come up with any kind of decisions, but are more or less discussion-information types of meetings.

Professor White reported to the Council that he had asked the University legal council for an opinion on whether or not Faculty Council meetings are open to the public. He added he would report his findings to the Council at the next meeting.

Chancellor Hine then said they were reporting to the Board of Trustees for their comment that IUPUI wishes to create an office of racial ethnic programs in Indianapolis and he has asked Dean Joseph Taylor to be the acting director of this office until it can be organized. This will be an all campus organization to study problems associated with racial and ethnic problems. Each campus division is doing something in this field. Since there is no coordination among these divisions, no one actually knows what all is going on. This office is designed primarily to coordinate what is being done and to make recommendations. He simply wanted the Council to know this office is designed to study problems associated with minority groups. Professor Langsam asked whether this was a problem or policy making office or was it a department with courses. Chancellor Hine said this office will report to his office and may recommend courses and programs to be added to various schools. It is designed to study the overall program and to give some leadership to the important aspect of education. He felt this should be campus-wide and it would eventually have a permanent chairman.

Chancellor Hine next stated there was some discussion about what should be done this fall around election time from the point of view of students taking part in political activities. He added there are some universities that are talking about dismissing classes for a week or two to allow the students to go out and campaign for candidates. It is the opinion of IU, and shared by Purdue, that this would be contrary to the type of activity that a public institution reflects. If we start having our students lobby, our tax exempt status could be challenged. On the other hand, he did want IUPUI students to know about elections and be involved. So, the Director for Student Services, Dean Hugh Wolf, has been working on a program which will be announced shortly and will be designed to attract students to come in to listen to discussions of political issues by candidates of both political parties. He said this is not yet formalized and if anyone on the Council has any ideas about this, please do not hesitate to see him or Dean Wolf. The Chancellor proposed, and they so far have agreed, we ask leaders of both parties to have a session some time not in class time, but perhaps after school. He hoped this could be done prior to election. Professor Langsam felt this was wonderful, but that is not the point the students are interested in. Rather, they want to get involved in a more substantive way. Chancellor Hine agreed with Professor Langsam and he too was not certain how many students even want to listen to this type program. He hoped that students will want to work in the precincts, but they cannot do it during school hours by having us close school. Chancellor Hine felt it should be known that the University as a whole has strict rules regarding the use of its facilities. Copies of these rules have been given to each dean and he assumed that each dean would be careful in making University space available, except within the guidelines which have been established. Chancellor Hine said it was the recommendation of Dean Wolf to have an organized series of lectures announced in advance, of the informative nature, not necessarily political. Then if the student wants to attend on his own, he can. A sponsored program by the administration would be well announced and completely bipartisan. Professor Weber asked if it would be possible to give students information about finding party headquarters and be given names and addresses of people. Chancellor Hine felt if we follow through with having party leaders of both parties come in, they could distribute this information. Professor Byrne was wondering also if there might be a need to raise the question to what extent do we enlarge the scope of education within the context of urban renewal and metropolitan studies and develop a functional approach to education in response to student needs, requests and demands. Chancellor Hine thought probably we could get by without doing anything about the political process this year. The question is should we not point out to our students that we think it is important for them to be concerned about political issues and should we not give them a chance to get informed. Professor Kirch said the students at the Downtown Campus would put on a program just like what was being discussed and will whether it is approved or not. Chancellor Hine responded that he did not object to them doing that either, so long as it is done in a way within the guidelines of use of University facilities.

The Chancellor said the deans now have been given instructions for completing the IUPUI promotions form. Each school will have a slightly different schedule as to when this will come back to the Chancellor's office. He thought everyone realized that IUPUI has its own promotions committee. This promotions committee makes recommendations to the Chancellor and he in turn sends them to the President's office and he to the Board of Trustees. They are not screened by a Bloomington committee.

The Chancellor also informed the Council that the University Code of Student Conduct for IU and the code for Purdue University are available for students.

IUPUI does not yet have a code of their own ready, but hopes to next year. These present codes vary a little, for example, in the method of determining innocence or guilt. Professor White said the Student Affairs Committee has been working on the code over the summer and hopes in a few months to have a completed, suggested code for IUPUI.

Vice Chancellor Ryder wanted to make one comment about the Columbus operation of IUPUI. He said last December that Bloomington and Lafayette had agreed that Columbus should be a responsibility of IUPUI. This matter has been studied for some time and a resident director has been appointed for Columbus. This is not a major expansion at Columbus, but a consolidating of our efforts and an attempt to study needs there. The Center is housed in a community facility with Ivy Tech, but the courses are still held at the local high school. He felt the enrollments would be substantial. Chancellor Hine commented that you may hear rumors that IUPUI is starting to develop its regional campuses and he said this already had been called to his attention by some legislators. This is not true. Columbus is the largest city in Indiana that does not have a regional campus from one of the Big Ten Universities. So it seemed logical that we do this. The director of this center, Mr. Emerson Gilbert, will survey their needs and arrange programs that will be helpful to them, the community and us.

Dean J. Taylor commented on the lack of sensitivity that sometimes is attributed to and actually present in the University. Our image as a University is that of not being particularly sensitive to the less privileged people. We are trying to build an institution here in the midst of an area that was vacated to make possible this institution. We are reminded that we have been accused of being insensitive too often and we have made this a prophecy fulfilled. We have documented many instances wherein several of our schools have actually, in dealing with these students, shown something less than the sensitivity than they ought to be shown being the kind of institution that we are. We had in the past week an instance where campus security offices did not show this. He hoped that we would not become too preoccupied with the regular business of the day that we do not try to diminish the gap between these separate factors on this point and in every one of us and every one of the segments of IUPUI. He thought that insurance companies will tell you that they are paying quite a bit for glass in buildings that have been broken. This in part is attributable to the lack of the feeling of belonging and the lack of reason for caring that many people have. They may not do these things, but they see who the person is who is doing this and do not want to get involved enough to say "wait a minute" or something like this. He wanted to say this because people in Lockefield have to be reassured and it is tragic that people attempt to go their own way and try to do well have to spend the time to do this. But the sins of the past are catching up with us and there has been enough uncertainty about the families in Lockefield and of what the University's intentions are. There are enough local politics, both city and county, involved and people like to keep it alive. If you remember that last summer the newspapers were filled and people discovered that there were things wrong in Lockefield. We had a situation where the mayor sent his representative out and the Health Department had to make a survey to see whether or not conditions were conducive to good health, when the people who walked down the street could see the garbage every day and police could see dope being transferred on the corner and had not done much about it. So that is the setting in which we work and it is a kind of politicking. He urged that anything we can do as an extension of the work we do day by day, in order to protect our efforts and an opportunity to do the work we would like to do, that we would try to increase the sensitivity of ourselves and our colleagues. He thought then we will be in a better position to know that in our area we do not believe this could happen when accusation comes out and he was not certain in most

of the areas we can say that and that is why he thought it is important to do the best job we can. Chancellor Hine thanked Dean Taylor for his comment. He thought it was true that we have been pretty quick to "talk to talk" and we need to do certainly the "walking" now. Lockefield Gardens is a great concern to us. We have no plans to take over Lockefield Gardens, but they do not believe us. He was pleased to notice that they have announced a \$2 million dollar improvement plan for Lockefield Gardens. This may well help to dispel this feeling of apprehension about the big bad university that is ready to overwhelm Lockefield Gardens. It is a difficult problem and he said it is frustrating sometimes because he does not know how to approach the problem. He could go out and tell everybody every day that we are not going to do anything with Lockefield Gardens. He could say, however, that there are no plans for us taking over Lockefield Gardens, but unfortunately as a scientist, the Chancellor said he was trained that he should never use two words, "always" and "never." Twenty years from now it may well be something will happen, but he could not say that because people would say that in the back of his mind he has the idea and it eventually will happen. He reported the University has no plans for Lockefield Gardens except to cooperate with them and the same is true for the surrounding territory. He thought too that like it or not, we are going to have to take a long look and then do some acting in the matter of the underprivileged. It is difficult for some people to understand why in our professional schools where we are overwhelmed with applicants, good applicants, we should try to take a few people who may not have quite such good qualifications, but we take them in because they represent minority groups. The time has passed and the answer is yes, we must do this and it is being recognized nationwide as part of our obligation. We have to keep the standard high but we also have to develop systems that will make it possible to take these people, give special care or training or special instruction of some kind to bring them up to the level we want. It will not help us or the country if we turn out second level lawyers, for example, just because they happen to be a minority group. So we have problems and we must not shrug our shoulders and walk away from them or it will meet us coming back. He understood that insurance companies are giving a week's notice to many of the university campuses cancelling their insurance all together because of the bombing in Wisconsin. He heard this and that there are some universities that are scheduled to be closed the second week of school this year. We are in a situation where we cannot ignore this problem. We cannot on one hand say we are going to do something and then turn around and prove by our actions that we do not really mean it.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernard Bogar, Jr.

Bernard Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
October 8, 1970
IUMC Roof Lounge

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Irwin, Lawrence, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Ashmore, Behnke, Berkshire, Bixler, Bogar, Byrne, Forney, Friedman, Garner, Gifford, Hackney, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Meiere, Merritt, Nagy, Norins, Ochs, S. Ross, Sagraves, Schreiber, Wagener, Weber, White.

Members Absent: Deans Foust, Holmquist, McDonald, B. Taylor; Professors Boyd, Challoner, Daly, DeMyer, Glover, Hopper, Levitt, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Simmons, Tennant, Wisner.

Visitors: Professors Lukemeyer, Schmidt, Paul, Weeks; William Spencer.

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of September 10, 1970.
2. Interim Report of Staff Affairs Committee.
3. Discussion of Committee Jurisdiction.
4. Report of Review Committee
5. Report on ad hoc Committee to Study Use of University Facilities for Political Purposes.
6. Agenda Committee Business:
 - a. Report of By-Laws Committee
 - b. Report of vacancies on the Council
 - c. Report on All-University Council
 - d. Parliamentarian's report
 - e. Election of Agenda Committee
7. Presiding Officer's Business.
8. New Business.

The minutes of the meeting of September 10, 1970 were corrected as follows: Line 30, page 3, the word "instigate" is changed to "establish"; Line 12, paragraph 2, page 8, delete "So it seemed logical to do this" and insert "Since Columbus is close by, it is logical for us to offer courses there, with no implication we are going to start a regional campus;" Line 2, paragraph 3, page 6, change "council" to read "counsel"; page 7, insert at the end of paragraph 1, "Professor Meiere added it was his belief that it was Purdue policy classes could be dismissed by an individual professor if that professor thought that the activities outside the classroom were related to the content of the course." The minutes were approved as corrected.

Report of Staff Affairs Committee:

Professor George Gifford, speaking for the committee, introduced Professor Owen Paul, who chairs the Labor Relations Subcommittee, and Professor Beth Schmidt, who heads the Staff-Relations Subcommittee. Professor Gifford added that his committee will be reporting to the Council periodically and would welcome any input from the Council to these two subcommittees. He further felt that the Staff-Relations committee can serve an important liaison function between the various groups of IUPUI. Professor Paul described the role of the Labor Relations committee. His committee has been broken down into three subcommittees: the benefits committee, the work-study committee, and the human relations committee. He asked that the Council consider the possibility that a single benefits committee should be formed to handle both faculty and staff benefits. He questioned the need for two committees, if one committee will cover both, adding that he felt there was a large area of overlap. Professor Gifford then mentioned the work-study problem. He felt that there is a problem with work-study in that work-study is getting to be a large part of the labor problems here. He thought that, as he understood it, we might not be getting our fair share of work-study allotments relative to Bloomington. Professor Langsam asked if the work-study problem should be part of the Student Affairs Committee. Professor Gifford replied that it is right in the middle of labor problems. Chancellor Hine urged Professor Gifford to get in touch with Mr. Archer of the School of Law, who has worked quite a bit with unions. With regard to the work study program, it was the Chancellor's understanding that IUPUI is independent in regard to its quota of work-study people and that funds for the program come from the Chancellor's budget and from each of the Deans. He felt quite confident that the basic part of work study is under our control since we fund it. Professor Meiere questioned if the Council had a work-study committee. Professor Gifford said this was a subcommittee of the Staff Affairs Committee only. Chancellor Hine commented that we have no clear-cut guidelines at the moment for committee activities. He felt we should not duplicate efforts.

Staff-Faculty Relations Subcommittee:

Professor Gifford then asked Professor Schmidt to report on her work with the Staff-Faculty Relations Committee, a subcommittee of the Staff Affairs Committee. She stated they found their purpose as finding some means of drawing the faculty administrators closer together so that they can promote a feeling of belonging to the university family here. This subcommittee has met and they learned of several activities functioning. One is the IUPUI Women's Club that is for staff, faculty and administrators. At Purdue they have a Faculty Women and Wives Club. They also have a University Club. Some of the areas to look into that were recommended

for IUPUI were: (1) establish a school song and school colors; (2) promote something comparable to the victory variety show and the IU sing; (3) hold convocations and have an auditorium series; (4) develop a university club with subgroups of common interest (such as bridge club, bowling club); (5) mix students in various classes; (6) hold a basketball tourney. Professor Friedman asked why no one from the Downtown Campus was represented on this subcommittee. Professor Schmidt replied that there was no specific reason for this. Professor Kelso asked if there may be considerable overlap and function occurring in committees. He said he heard several subjects mentioned which are being mentioned on a committee that he is on. He wondered if the various standing committees could put down a range of subjects at which they are presently dealing with so that other committees might have some relationship to them or can intercommunicate in some way. Professor Weber responded that we do have the Committee on Committees and that this is their duty. The Chancellor agreed that the Committee on Committees is the appropriate mechanism to do this. He added he felt it very important that we do keep everybody informed of what we are doing because we do not want to have two different committees setting up a basketball tourney, for example. He added he thought that we could prevent this by asking each of the committees to keep the Secretary or the Committee on Committees informed of the scope of the committees, and as we get more experienced, we will be able to sort committee functions.

Committee Jurisdiction:

The second item on the agenda was the discussion of committee jurisdiction (Faculty Council Document #1). Professor Bogar said it had come to his attention, since the distribution of his report, that the report is not all inclusive and there are some committee names down that are misnomers for other committees. For example, one standing committee of the Faculty Council which is not listed is the Resources and Planning Committee. Therefore, this committee should be listed as one of the standing Faculty Council committees on the list. Professor Higgins asked if the Research Computation Committee belonged under standing Faculty Council committees. Professor Bogar replied that this was what the Agenda Committee decided to recommend to the Council and that is a question for the Council to decide. He added that Vice Chancellor Buhner asked to have the Educational Policies and Curriculum Development Committee (EPCD) included on the list under administrative committees. Professor Bogar asked if Professor Norins would comment on the inclusion of the Research Computation Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Council. Professor Norins responded that he felt this committee fits right down the middle. In some standpoints he felt it should be a Faculty Council committee because it is a committee that is made up to be an advisory committee to the Research Computing Center. On the other hand, he felt there is good reason why it should report directly to the administration. He added that he would, as head of it for the last two years, tend to think it has worked quite well as an administrative committee, although he thought in the future it might well be handled as a committee of the Faculty Council. Chancellor Hine commented that he had envisioned one of the functions of this committee to be that of interesting and informing the faculty of the facilities of the Research Computation Center and thought it could well report to the Faculty Council. When it comes to wanting more equipment and better personnel, it probably could report to administration. He also thought an important function of the committee would be that of educating the faculty to the use of the Research Computation Center. Professor Kelso felt there

was question in his mind about the relative jurisdiction of the Computer Policy Coordinating Committee being the Research Computation Committee. Chancellor Hine responded that the names might not be quite definitive enough.

Composition of the Computer Policy Coordinating Committee:

Vice Chancellor Ryder said the Computer Policy Coordinating Committee includes a number of different areas and is composed of the chairmen of these various committees, such as the administrative data processing, hospital data processing, computer science, technology and education technology. The Research Computation Committee includes the directors of the various computer centers. The idea is to coordinate all these things relating to computing and data processing. The Research Computation Committee has faculty members from all over the university and it is not that faculty are not being represented, but the real question is do you want that particular committee to be a standing committee of this body. The committee, as it stands now, could report to this Council periodically if the Council so desires, even if it was not a standing committee of the Council. Professor Kelso questioned the need for two committees. He thought one seemed to absorb the other and has within it the technical expertise that would be necessary to interest and inform the faculty of the facilities. Professor Kelso felt also that we would be better off with one committee rather than two. Vice Chancellor Ryder felt there was no need for a Research Computation Committee of the administration if the Council will also have such a committee. Professor Kelso said he was questioning whether there should be a committee as part of the Faculty Council body. Professor Higgins said, as a member of the Review Committee, he recommended that the Research Computation Committee not be established as a standing committee for the simple reason that these committees are established in the Bylaws and once this is established, it will be an ongoing thing. As an administrative committee, it can be established and abolished from the Chancellor's office at will as they are needed. Professor White pointed out that Article 8 of the Constitution provides the Faculty Council to be empowered to create such standing ad hoc committees which it deems necessary to carry out the business of the Council. So he presumed that statement implies that the Council may dissolve any committees that it creates.

Motion by Professor Higgins:

Professor Higgins moved that the Research Computation Committee be removed as a standing committee of the Faculty Council. The motion was seconded by Professor Kelso. Professor Norton said the Computer Policies Coordinating Committee is distinctly an administrative policy committee and is charged with such things as deciding how to distribute hardware monies between the various centers and what tasks a computing center should perform. The Research Computation Committee is the outgrowth of the old computer committee on the Medical Center campus and is now intended, in his opinion, to serve primarily as a communicating arm between the faculty who use or could potentially use the computing center and to inform faculty of the services that are available. This is why he felt it is primarily a communicating link between the faculty and it properly should be a subordinate to this body. Professor Norins said he might have misinterpreted the discussion, but he thought they were discussing where this committee should fall, be it administrative or Faculty Council, and not whether or not it should exist. If we are talking about whether it should exist or not, then he felt there ought to be more discussion. Chancellor Hine interpreted the motion to mean the committee

would be deleted from the list of Faculty Council committees. The motion did not say it would be placed anywhere else. Professor Higgins asked to amend the motion to say the Research Computation Committee be listed as an administrative committee. The Chancellor asked for those people who believed that the Research Computation Committee should not be a standing Faculty Council committee to please vote affirmatively. The motion passed 20 affirmative, 11 negative. The Research Computation Committee will not be a standing Faculty Council Committee. Since the Chancellor appoints the administrative committees, he assured the Council he would appoint this committee because he felt it does have an important function. Professor Meiere asked if a Faculty Council committee has to be chaired by a Council member and administrative committees do not. Chancellor Hine said the administrative committees do not and asked the Secretary for a ruling on the chairing of Faculty Council committees. Professor Bogar said the ruling is that Faculty Council standing committees shall be chaired by one of the Faculty Council representatives on that committee, but membership is not limited to Faculty Council members on Faculty Council committees.

Resources and Planning:

Professor Kelso expressed delight to see that we did have a Committee on Resources and Planning because he first was surprised to think we did not have anybody thinking about what the campus ought to look like a few years from now. He said he assumed that the Committee on Resources and Planning should consider such matters as new schools, new computer buildings, new parking lots, etc. He asked if there could be a possible overlap of jurisdiction of the EPCD committee and wondered where one important subject is being handled. That subject was how we can best relate the undergraduate school to the advanced schools on this campus, which will ultimately be very much fed by the undergraduate school. He felt there are a host of opportunities for developing productive relationships between the undergraduate school and the professional advanced schools that we are going to lose if we let the University fall into common patterns too quickly, without having given these matters consideration at a time when things are still developing. He cited, for example, perhaps legal and medical courses ought to be taught in the college or college students permitted to take courses in the professional schools. Perhaps we ought to look at dual or overlapping credits in advanced placement of some combined degree programs. He added further he felt a resources and planning committee might get involved with parking lots at the expense of other matters and that the curriculum and/or educational development committee might concern itself solely with the development of the undergraduate department. We have become highly conventional with the people in the college not really knowing much about a prospective law student or prospective pre-med student. Chancellor Hine felt this is an important subject and said we are faced with the problem of studying the service courses that are being offered. He has asked Vice Chancellor Buhner to study this matter. Now there is no one committee that is looking at the overall picture and he thought maybe there well should be. Vice Chancellor Buhner has been charged with studying this aspect of it and it might be that it could well be expanded as an administrative committee, but certainly with faculty input.

Educational Policies and Curriculum Development Committee:

Vice Chancellor Buhner responded that what Professor Kelso outlined pretty well described the intent of the Educational Policies and Curriculum Development Committee. This committee will take a very hard look at priorities. Many agree that the undergraduate program has got to have tremendous impetus over the next few years, and that impetus will influence graduate programs. This is one

assignment we are giving that committee. The committee also will look at the whole problem of academic organization, organization for the future, and how to stay flexible. It will be looking at the relationship of facilities to the problem. He felt he sees no other way to avoid overlap, but basically this committee is an all-encompassing academic committee. There are no administrators on it. It has one department chairman and he said he would welcome the addition of a Faculty Council representative on the committee. Professor Langsam then asked for clarification on the role of the advisory committee for humanities. The Chancellor thought that at the time the Science Advisory Committee was appointed by Dr. Doris Merritt to study relationships in science as far as the new Institute for Advanced Research is concerned, she realized that we had a Science Advisory Committee, but did not have a non science advisory committee. He thought she did recommend this and there was appointed an advisory committee for the humanities. He said he would check this out and come back to the Council on a definite answer on this.

General Classroom Building:

Professor Langsam then asked for a definition of the "Humanities" classroom. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied that it was a general, comprehensive faculty office-educational facility classroom building. Chancellor Hine commented it might best be called a "general classroom building committee." Director Lohse asked about the comment in parenthesis that follows the different planning committees toward buildings, saying "with the addition of a Faculty Council representative." She wondered if this meant there will be a Faculty Council representative on that committee. Chancellor Hine said that it was the intent to have one man on the committee who would feel obligated to report back to the Faculty Council. Professor Meiere felt he would like to see the committees for the buildings as Faculty Council committees. Professor Bogar commented that there were at least two aspects which go into physical planning here. One is the technical aspect in which they felt best be left in the hands of the administration, and that the other is what the buildings are all about, in terms of priorities, direction and growth. The fact that these committees are administrative does not mean that there is no faculty input into them. Professor Meiere asked if the chairman, for example, of the committees is appointed at the same time the committee is. Professor Bogar replied yes and he is appointed by the Chancellor. They felt that would be the most efficient and correct procedure for these committees. Professor Kelso said that as a member of the Faculty Council he could not see that he would be of much use to anyone deciding how many square feet per student ought to be in a science lab and he could not imagine much of the Faculty Council wanting to read reports of this type. He thought we would just be wasting time to try to think at that level. Professor Wagener thought that the Resources and Planning Committee should be the committee that would consider general policy and recommendations of the faculty relevant to these buildings and that would be a much more logical place and to leave such technical matters within the hands of a specialized committee.

Library Coordinating Committee:

Professor Bogar then informed Council that in the report an Administrative Library Committee is listed. The correct name of that should be the Library Coordinating Committee and that this is technically an administrative committee, composed of all of the heads of the various libraries of IUPUI. The Agenda Committee felt that our Faculty Council Library Committee should establish a much closer

communication with this Library Coordinating Committee. Vice Chancellor Buhner said the Library Coordinating Committee resulted from the recommendations of a planning committee originally appointed by Provost Penrod and continued by Chancellor Hine. It recommended three basic things: (1) There not be at that time a central library administration; (2) It recommended the establishment of a coordinating committee to be chaired by the Dean of Faculties; (3) It recommended the institution of a professional council of librarians. The committee report was accepted on an interim basis by the Chancellor and these two committees were instituted. He thought it is very important for the Council to be aware that there is no central library administration and that this Library Coordinating Committee is, in effect, carrying on the primitive functions of central library administration. Its membership is made up of the heads of the libraries and the chairman of each of the school library committees. The professional council is made up of the heads of the libraries and meets quite often and basically initiates topics of discussion for the agenda of the coordinating committee. He added he was not defending this arrangement, but it is simply that the Council should be aware of how we are attempting, at this point with success, to coordinate the Library Activities Committee.

EPCD Committee:

Professor Friedman then expressed concern about the Educational Policies and Curriculum Development Committee. It seemed to him like a policy making or policy recommending committee that does not have any direct line to faculty. It does have direct lines with the Vice Chancellor's office. He felt it overlaps considerably with what he felt would be functions of the Academic Affairs Committee, which does have the need to bring before the Council decisions of various kinds. He thought he could see, for example, that this committee will be making recommendations we will be acting upon without those recommendations ever coming before us. Vice Chancellor Buhner said he would welcome representatives from this Council on this committee and he hoped that the Academic Affairs Committee might function more in a way he thought EPCD is going to function. His office needs much more rapid, constant, sustained advice and recommendations than he can get from any other existing group.

Committee on Committees:

Professor Bogar reported that a recommendation would take place further on in the meeting that the Review Committee, which they hoped will be named the Committee on Committees, will not be merely a one time committee assignment, but rather will be an ongoing committee responsibility designed specifically to find the procedure or affect the procedure of placing Faculty Council members not only on the standing committees at the beginning of the year, but on any other committee assignments which come up during the year. Chancellor Hine said he was quite eager to have Council representatives on some of the committees and that is why he wanted to be sure there is a technique evolved that would make it possible to have those representatives soon.

Building Planning Committees as part of the Faculty Council:

Professor Meiere asked to go back to the discussion on the committee on buildings. He felt the Faculty Council is missing a large part of its responsibility by not including the building committees as standing committees of the Council. He said he is on the planning committee for the Science, Engineering and Technology Building and suspected the Faculty Council would not be happy with it. He thought that

either the committee should be transferred to the Faculty Council standing committees or the Faculty Council should require and insist on a report from them. He added he felt the Council should certainly keep up with these building committees. He felt it would be better if this committee was a Faculty Council committee, rather than an administrative one. He moved that the planning committee for the Science, Engineering and Technology Committee building be changed to a standing committee of the Faculty Council. Professor Byrne seconded. Professor Kelso noted that he thought it was understood that committees may be called upon to report to the Council on their given topics at any time. It seemed to him that we could now raise the question as to whether or not this particular committee is functioning. Perhaps the appropriate step is for the Faculty Council to call upon this planning committee to give Council a general report on its activities to date. Professor Langsam responded that there seemed to be a difference between getting reports and having a committee as your very own. She thought that perhaps some of the Council are not as concerned about these buildings and what is happening inside these buildings as others. She felt the Faculty Council should have the kind of initiative power with regard to doing some of the planning rather than receiving reports. Professor Wagener moved to amend the original motion to the effect that the three planning committees be ad hoc committees of the Faculty Council rather than standing committees. Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Meiere and Professor Byrne agreed to the amendment of their motion. Professor Meiere added he felt these committees would carry more weight as Faculty Council committees than as administrative committees. Professor Schreiber stated the people on those committees are members of the faculty and some are Faculty Council members. He questioned if you would get any different input just because someone is elected to the Council than you do just from faculty members. The Chancellor said when the planning committee first came in, it had an 80 million dollar building proposed. If this had been the report of the committee, the administration would not approve such a request. The planning committee, as he understands it, is really an administration problem. The faculty can decide what they need, but the administration has to decide whether to go for a 80 million, 40, 20, or 10 million dollar building. So there is an administrative function here that has to step in quite early and while the Faculty Council should be represented, he felt it is still administrative. Vice Chancellor Buhner noted that these three committees appointed by the Chancellor each has a faculty member as a chairman. He asked the Parliamentarian what would be the situation with respect to the chairmanship if these became ad hoc Faculty Council committees. Professor White felt that under normal procedure the chairmanship would have to be changed and the chairman would have to be a member of the Faculty Council. Vice Chancellor Buhner felt the chairman should be someone who the administration can work with well because the chairman can make or break this type of committee. He felt we now have three excellent chairman. Chancellor Hine then asked that all those in favor of the motion that the three planning committees be ad hoc committees of the Council to please vote affirmatively. The motion was defeated 26 to 5.

Motion to Accept Agenda Committee Report:

Professor Bogar moved that the Faculty Council accept the report of the Agenda Committee outlining committee jurisdiction with the changes noted. The motion was seconded by Professor Weber. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Committee Elections:

Professor Bogar next conducted elections to the Agenda Committee. Elected were Professors Norins, Wagener and White.

Changes in Bylaws:

Next Professor Bogar discussed the Bylaws which were adopted as of October, 1969. An ad hoc Bylaws Committee was appointed last month in order to make recommendations for change in the Bylaws and they recommended the following changes:

In Section 4, the second sentence reads: "The Committee shall each year apportion the Faculty Council as of February 1 and conduct elections to the Faculty Council prior to April 1." The recommendation is that April 1 be changed to May 1. In the last sentence, "The Apportionment-Election Committee shall report the results of each year's elections to the Faculty Council at the Council's last meeting in April," the word April should be changed to "May."

The next recommendation concerns Section 8. "There shall be a Review Committee," should be changed to "There shall be a Committee on Committees." By prior action of the Council, the Review Committee was enlarged from membership from 3 to 6 elected members from the membership of the Faculty Council. This change also should be noted.

The last recommendation is in item 6 a, where the word "comprehensive" should be deleted from the sentence.

Professor Kelso moved that the changes be accepted. Professor Wagener seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Review Committee:

Professor Norton moved that the nominees as shown in the Review Committee report be elected to the indicated committees and that the Metropolitan Affairs Committee be enlarged to nine members. Professor Byrne seconded. Professor Kelso said he noticed that the Board of Review is not mentioned in this report and asked if this committee is selected at some other time. Professor Norton reported that the Committee on Committees is charged with the standing committees of the Faculty Council (eight of them) and the Agenda Committee, Apportionment-Elections Committee, and the Faculty Board of Review were differentiated from these eight standing committees. The motion to accept the report as given was passed unanimously.

New Members to the Council:

Professor Bogar said that due to several leaves of absences it was necessary to replace three members of the Faculty Council this year. Two of those represent school units, and their replacement is the responsibility of the school units. One is from the Purdue Campus and Vice Chancellor Ryder informed him they will have their replacement next week. This replacement is for William Nevill who is on leave. The second replacement is from the School of Medicine for Donald Merritt. The School of Medicine has already informed the Secretary that Professor Merritt's replacement is Professor Arthur White. The third replacement was from the at-large representation and must be filled by the Election-Apportionment Committee of last year. The procedure is that the next unelected nominee on the list now serves as the replacement on the at-large basis. The Election-Apportionment Committee informed the Secretary that this replacement is Professor Harold Chetkow from the Graduate School of Social Service and he will replace Professor Joe Ross, who has left the School of Medicine.

Political Activities:

Vice Chancellor Buhner next commented on the various suggestions made at the last Council meeting regarding the University providing a means for political experience for faculty, staff and students during fall elections. He said separate guidelines were established from which a statement was issued. The position paper is now available. Basically the position establishes the fact that the University is not and cannot be a partisan body in any sense of the word and that it also, as a University by definition, must take account of the world about it and recognize that world must in part, at least, flow through the normal life of campus. So the position paper makes very clear, as a policy matter, that the University is not taking a position and will not in any way, shape or form knowingly aid any candidate. But it will make its facilities available to students, staff and faculty who do have political objectives in mind. The only limitations are the national and state laws. He stated this report will be widely circulated and sent to deans, students, student leaders, counselors, advisors. The Chancellor asked for any comments and since there were none, instructed Vice Chancellor Buhner to file the report with the Secretary and to distribute it widely.

Security:

Under Presiding Officer's business, the Chancellor mentioned that at the last Council meeting he mentioned there was being a study made of the security and safety departments for IU. This report has not yet been delivered, but a man has just been appointed to head up state-wide security for IUPUI. He is a former FBI man and comes very well recommended. His name is Irwin Owen. He also added that the Board of Trustees approved the Office of Racial and Ethnic Programs for IUPUI and Dean Joseph Taylor has agreed to serve as acting director of this office until a full-time man can be identified.

Parking:

Under new business the Chancellor said he would have to have a Faculty Council committee to advise him on problems associated with the parking situation. Hearing no such motion from the Council, he said he would see there is a faculty committee appointed to give him some information about parking.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
November 12, 1970
Law School

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Irwin, Lawrence, McDonald, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Ashmore, Berkshire, Bixler, Bogar, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Chetkow, DeMyer, Garner, Gifford, Hackney, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Mamlin, Meiere, Nagy, Norins, Ross, Sagraves, Schreiber, Simmons, Tennant, Wagener, Weber, J. White.

Members Absent: Deans Holmquist, B. Taylor; Professors Behnke, Dalphin, Daly, Forney, Friedman, Glover, Hopper, Levitt, Mandelbaum, Ochs, A. White, Wisner.

Visitors: D. Allen, G. Forget, N. Kellum, V. Hunt, R. Neel, J. Williams

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of October 8, 1970.
2. Memorial Resolution for Dr. Grace Kilsheimer.
3. Report of Calendar Committee.
4. Report of Athletic Affairs Committee.
5. Agenda Committee Business:
 - a. Report on Election to the Agenda Committee.
 - b. Report of Representative to All-University Council

Chancellor Hine called the meeting to order. The minutes of the October 8, 1970 meeting were approved as distributed.

Memorial Resolution.

Professor Ashmore moved that a memorial resolution for Dr. Grace Kilsheimer be entered into the minutes of the meeting. Professor Wagener seconded. The Council unanimously approved the memorial resolution. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked that the records also show that this same resolution will be presented to the All-University Faculty Council.

Interim Report of Resources and Planning Committee.

The Chancellor informed the Council that the Secretary had informed him this topic was to be deferred.

Report from the Calendar Committee.

Mr. John G. Williams, chairman of this committee and Registrar at the 38th St. Campus, reported to the Council. He said that the Calendar Committee report had been distributed to the Council members and he would be only too willing to answer questions regarding the report. He explained the basic consideration for the construction of this calendar was to as nearly as possible maintain a freedom of movement of students between the Lafayette campus, Bloomington campus, and IUPUI. The calendar that has been presented here is fundamentally the Bloomington calendar adjusted to include a final examination week. So, in effect, it is the Bloomington calendar that has been moved back to have the starting point of the semester in mid-August. The finals week reflects the wishes of the faculty of IUPUI. A basic difference between the Bloomington and IUPUI calendar is that the latter is constructed referencing fixed days as opposed to fixed dates. The Bloomington calendar refers to "on or about the 22nd of the month" for the ending of a semester, in such a manner as to be reasonably close to the beginning of Christmas vacation. The committee felt that this was not exact enough. For this reason then, they referenced the starting point of the calendar as a definite fixed period of days from a fixed date, in this case, Labor Day. They then went on that basis, working in a series of fixed days.

"Lame Duck" Session.

The prime desire expressed to the committee was that the "lame duck" session be eliminated. This was one of the reasons for moving the calendar in such a way that it would terminate before Christmas vacation. Interestingly enough, while we lose the "lame duck" session in the fall, we have created a "lame duck" situation in the spring semester, if we lock into the Indianapolis public school calendar for determination of spring recess. So to say that the "lame duck" is dead is not necessarily so. The general reason for locking into the Indianapolis public school calendar was that a great bulk of students at the undergraduate level are part-time students and at the 38th St. Campus the ratio is approximately 2 to 1. This being the case, the committee felt it would be most convenient for the student if he was on vacation at the same time as his family. Also, since we have a rather large undergraduate and graduate education program, we would be serving this large segment of student population if we would be in line with the Indianapolis public school calendar. This fact, coupled with the fact that primarily in our undergraduate units we draw approximately 65 to 75 percent of our population from Marion County and surrounding counties, we have to serve

these people with the least amount of inconvenience for them. Next he explained how they arbitrarily arrived at spring recess time on the Bloomington campus. In Bloomington they have time set aside for exams, but this time is stolen from instructional time. He went on to say that since our campus wants a separate final examination period, it will not cut across instructional time. This then prompted the committee to set up a fixed period of time at the end of the semester for final exams. Mr. Williams explained that the proposed calendar has an even number of Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, 15 to be exact, set up as instructional periods both for spring and fall semester. So in the event that somebody has a class that meets one day a week, he will still have 15 class meetings.

Summer Session Calendar.

The committee discussed two possibilities regarding the summer session. One would be two equal length six weeks summer session and the other alternative is an eight weeks session. After polling the faculty and students, the committee decided the eight weeks summer session recommendation was perhaps the soundest. Professor Langsam asked if Mr. Williams could give the Council indication of a starting date for an eight weeks session. Mr. Williams responded that the starting date was determined as the Monday of the first full week of June. Professor Langsam thought this date comes prior to the completion of the public school term and would cause many on the undergraduate level and graduate level some problems for either people who are teaching on a temporary license or for permanent teachers who want to take courses. Mr. Williams felt that if this was pushed farther into the summer, we would run an overlap with the early starting date for classes in mid-August. There is a serious problem as the calendar stands now since the eight week calendar restricts the availability of time for faculty vacations with their families. Professor Langsam asked if there would be any possibility of running both an eight week and a six week session that would provide the extra two weeks so that we could provide adequate services. Because if not only we go on this calendar and Bloomington goes to this calendar, then she thought we are doing a disservice to some of the people we are most interested in serving.

Flexibility of Calendar.

Mr. Williams responded that the action of the Chancellor's Deans Council was to make the starting date of the summer session optional with the individual school units. Chancellor Hine then thanked the committee for their work and pointed out that we do have a complex problem that might be simplified if we were to say that we think it is essential that classes begin and a semester ends at a certain time, but the dates in between are more or less flexible as far as some units are concerned. In the summer there would be many people who would not want to have a gap between the 15th of May until the 5th of June. The students are here, and in some of the professional schools, they like to start either the 16th or 17th, for some kinds of activities. He asked if the committee had time to consider recommending the adoption of certain dates which everybody would try to follow while leaving flexibility to the different units. If this was to be done, it would simplify the calendar of instruction appreciably. We may have some difficulty in finding a complete calendar schedule that will suit all of the various units. Professor Jarboe said if the records of the Downtown and 38th St. campuses for both last summer or any summer were checked, the vast majority of graduate students are education students and teachers and could not come under

these circumstances. Mr. Williams answered the Chancellor's inquiry as to why they did not recommend that certain fixed dates be followed. The committee felt they could recommend certain dates be flexible, but it was up to the faculty to really determine this.

Summer Session at other Universities.

Vice Chancellor Buhner said this subject came up at the Association of Urban Universities meeting last week which he attended for the Chancellor. An informal poll was taken of the chancellors and vice presidents who were there and over half of about 40 reported that they are using the two session summer session concept. These representatives said that their faculty generally had initially resisted the two session summer concept, of which some were six and six, some four and four, and a few five and five. Now, however, they would not go back to the one unit summer session. He further said that the net effect was to generate more use of facilities and provide more opportunities for students. Professor Meiere asked if the schools mentioned have any provision for a longer, one session, or for an eight weeks session or a flexible session. Vice Chancellor Buhner replied that all the schools are flexible and thought flexibility was one of the big components. They felt students get more flexibility out of a split session than they do out of a single session. Mr. Williams felt that two equal length sessions does present some interesting possibilities. This is not to disregard the need for particular problems where we have laboratory courses, problem solving courses, and where different concentration and a longer instructional period is needed. He added that in those courses where it is not essential that you have a longer session there is the possibility for (1) total immersion, and (2) an excellent opportunity to provide remedial type of instruction. Here you might, if you wanted to, consider the possibilities of working with deprived students, those who need tutoring to meet admissions levels, or those who might be admitted on probation, or those that might have to take remedial work. This does present the opportunity for two intensive remedial sessions to prepare someone to go to the regular schedule.

Disadvantages of Split Summer Session.

Some of the disadvantages that were brought to the committee's attention by Mr. Williams were mainly the problems of pay structure and how to get up paying faculty members under the split session circumstances. From a long range standpoint, it presents a very heavy administrative load in terms of staffing because you would be in a situation of almost continual registration, continual giving of finals, continual counseling. Given enough funds and personnel you could probably work around some of these problems. He felt it would be a problem that could not be easily or inexpensively circumvented.

Cost of Continual Operation.

Mr. Williams went on to say Chancellor Hine had asked him to investigate the expenses as far as facilities were concerned if we were going to run on a year round basis. He contacted the chief of the buildings and grounds for the Medical Center who said it really did not make much difference in terms of additional expense as to whether they ran year round or ran nine months out of the year. The difference in cost between the two was not significant. So, in terms of maintaining heating, cooling and so forth, it does not present a problem. Looking at it from the position of registrar, it presents him with a rather awesome task to get people registered, final grade reports out, and other things done, because he would no sooner shut off one operation only to start another.

Even with the eight weeks summer session backing up the beginning of the first semester starting in August, it is going to present problems because we do not have a large break between summer session and the beginning dates for registration for the fall semester. Professor Kelso asked if two, six week summer sessions produce more revenue for schools. Mr. Williams said he could not answer that because he was not that conversant with the revenue mechanism. He said he would question whether additional revenue produced would be lowered by the additional staffing required to administer it. We still have the business office to consider, data processing, and such things in this area. Chancellor Hine told the Council that we would not let the income modify our idea of what is best for the teaching procedures.

Bloomington Calendar.

Professor Kelso raised the question of why there is such a long space in time between the end of the first semester and the beginning of the second semester. Mr. Williams said this goes back to the basic premise of locking in or attempting to provide some flow of student traffic between the two campuses, and added that the basis for the starting point for the development of this calendar was the calendar that is now adopted for the Bloomington campus. Professor Wagener replied that if we were talking about Bloomington, they have a longer spring vacation. Mr. Williams agreed, because if you cut off instruction before Christmas, you have to bring back the students before the beginning of New Years. If you are going to let students out before Christmas, then you are going to have to let them stay out from Christmas and New Years and give them enough time to get back. If you give them a certain number of days to get back from the beginning of the new year, then you are going to have to back up and provide the time for orientation, counseling and registration. He added that there also must be time to record grades and take care of many administrative procedures. Professor Jarboe commented that the committee's principle of taking care of the interplay between here and Bloomington is good, but it seemed to him it could be exactly the opposite in the summer. For example, in every major school in the country the biggest graduate increment to their summer school is always teachers. Now you are making it completely impossible for them to enroll here. Around 3,000 teachers in Marion County have to get master's degrees, within five years under state law, and beginning last summer IUPUI began to get many of those coming here rather than going to Bloomington. They would rather be serviced in Indianapolis. But with this proposed schedule, it is impossible, and they will have to go to Bloomington where they will find themselves in a bind also. Professor Wagener said the 38th St. Campus had considered the report. Their general feeling was that because of the inconvenience of the dates advocated for the eight weeks session, this session should be pushed a little further into the summer for the teaching staff returning to the Indianapolis public schools. He offered a motion changing Item #17 on the proposed eight week document and asked that Item #17 be changed as follows to read "Classes for the summer session shall begin the first Monday following the closing date of the Indianapolis Public School System, provided that this is after 1 June." Chancellor Hine commented that there are many representatives here from different units that see some problems in this schedule themselves. He has talked to some of them and thought there might be a few things that can be done. One of them can be to approve the report with the understanding that there could be some modification according to

individual units for the summer. The other possibility would be to refer this to the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration and bring it back to Council. He added he would prefer not to delay too long.

Motion to Refer

Professor Wagener asked to withdraw his original motion. He moved that this report be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee for study and for input in these various units and to report back to the Council no later than the next Council meeting. The motion was seconded by Professor Kelso. Professor Byrne suggested a substitute motion. It was his impression that the discussion and disagreement centered around the schedule of the summer session. He wondered if the Council might consider approving the first and second semester basic academic calendar, leaving the matter of the summer session to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Professional School Calendar:

Professor Ashmore responded that it is much more than just the beginning of the summer session he disagreed with and he could see many problems that result from the adoption of this schedule. The School of Medicine operates on a twelve month basis and cannot change their schedule and must remain pretty well fixed where they are now. Dean Irwin said the School of Medicine has a peculiar situation where the first two years are on a semester basis and thereafter on a twelve month basis. He thought it is very important that certain units like medicine and dentistry be together on such things as spring vacation. He felt he did not know if there is a major conflict so far as ending early in May, but he was told they still have essentially the same number of teaching days and teaching hours in this calendar as before. Chancellor Hine commented that in the professional schools it probably would be difficult to justify this long a spring vacation for the upper classes at least. He added they have fought this battle many years at the Dental School and that is why he is suggesting consideration of a flexible unit kind of a calendar.

Midterm Reports.

Mr. Williams mentioned he did want to call to the attention of the Council the action of the Chancellor's Deans Council regarding the first and second semester and some provisions that the Council of Deans felt necessary that the committee add to the calendar. One was the option of mid-term reports in both semesters. This would be optional with an individual school unit. In the first semester Thanksgiving vacation would be optional with an individual school unit, as would dates for spring vacation in spring be optional in individual units. The fixed dates, and this relates to final exams for both semesters, would be considered optional because there are many units who would prefer many more days of final examinations than are provided for in the calendar. These should be considered optional, thereby giving a chance for an individual school unit to increase the length of time for finals or get rid of them completely if they so desire. The only firm fixed date would be the ending date of the semester and the registrar's deadline for the turn in of grades. These were the basic provisions that were tacked on to this calendar by the Dean's Council.

Vice Chancellor Ryder added that he had talked with Dean Holmquist and while she liked the idea of some flexibility between different units, she felt that these things should be set and that medicine and dentistry should set them together so we will not have differences between units. He thought we also would run into problems when a particular unit is requiring classes from another unit and they set a different calendar. Professor Chetkow asked if it is essential that our calendar interlock with the Bloomington calendar. Chancellor Hine responded that essential was not the correct word, but it seemed desirable. Professor Chetkow said he raised this for consideration only because we are not a love-in campus and we have the problems of part-time students who are in an urban setting. Mr. Hunt mentioned one point relative to the two, six weeks summer sessions that had not been mentioned, and that was the break between them is the same time as the break between the six and eight weeks session in Bloomington. He asked if the Council was aware that Bloomington will have a six weeks intersession and an eight weeks summer session, fourteen weeks starting in the summer of 1972. In order to have some flexibility in moving from one unit back to another, the committee thought the breakpoint should be the same here if we have two, six week sessions. None of the committee favored a six and an eight weeks session here, so they boiled it down to six and six. Professor Langsam asked why the committee was not in favor of a six and eight week session. Mr. Hunt answered there would not be enough time for final examinations. He felt the six and eight does not really make any sense. The only reason they came up with six and eight in Bloomington is that they took a postsession and added to it an intersession. Chancellor Hine thought each school might be able to take a look at the complications that would vary from this schedule and probably work it out. He repeated the motion to refer this matter to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Council for further consideration, giving each unit an opportunity to talk to the Academic Affairs Committee, if they wish. The motion was seconded by Professor Byrne. The motion passed unanimously.

Report of Athletic Affairs Committee.

Professor Neel summarized the three recommendations the committee made. The Athletic Affairs Committee recommended: (1) that IUPUI engage in inter-collegiate sports; (2) that the University join NCAA as a regular member of the University Division as soon as possible; (3) that inter-collegiate athletics be instituted by the beginning of the fall semester of 1971. He said the committee is aware that this is a short deadline. They made recommendations as to certain sports on the basis of what they thought would be the best to engage in and on the basis of NCAA rules that you must engage in four sports covering three seasons. They tried to choose those that were popular and did not require facilities that IUPUI did not have. There was no other winter sport, except gymnastics, for which we had facilities. We do have facilities for practice for basketball, and we do have the facilities for the other sports on the campuses of this University. The committee also recommended that a basketball coach be employed as soon as possible and recommended the coach be on the teaching staff of one of the schools in our institutions and that his salary be paid out of tax funds. This coach could also teach cross country. The committee also recommended there be no special athletic scholarships, but that athletes have the opportunity to compete for student aid funds on the same basis as other students. He added an athletic director must be appointed, at least on a part-time basis at first. This person must be someone with administrative ability.

Motion to Accept.

Professor Neel moved this report be accepted (as opposed to approve). Professor Kelso seconded. Chancellor Hine asked the committee why they did not consider swimming, since IUPUI does have facilities. Professor Neel said there are problems of competition available which was much beyond the caliber we could meet. Professor DeMyer said that he was not aware that any formal motion had been made that we engage in inter-collegiate athletics. He suggested deferring this report until the Council makes a general decision about the desirability of inter-collegiate athletics. Chancellor Hine felt the report itself was in a sense the first time the Faculty Council had considered it and the first recommendation on the report is that we do engage in inter-collegiate sports. Professor DeMyer again suggested that before the report be accepted the Council discuss the desirability and poll the Council as to their feelings about this.

Deficiency of Athletic Programs.

Professor Neel said the acceptance does not approve this report. Professor Norins responded that it was his personal opinion that university athletic programs around the country are greatly deficient in their goal of supplying the type of things that adults need in their future life, preparing young people for adult life. He thought if there is any program that has really failed, it is the athletic program. They make excellent venture in making money for the school, provide spectacles, and have done well for the alumni association, but not for the people. He questioned the idea of getting into NCAA type of competition and favored directing ourselves to intramural types of work which would pertain to all the students, rather than to a few athletes. Chancellor Hine commented that some of the Big Ten schools are having serious financial problems with their athletic programs and added this would not be a money making situation, particularly if we do not have the major sports. Professor Schreiber answered that he did not think the primary objective for athletics is to prepare students for after college participation and we do now have intermural programs. The sports we now have chosen to start out with certainly are not money makers.

Athletic Fees.

Professor Langsam was a bit concerned about the statement "student athletic fees to be charged to each student on the basis of hours enrolled." Presently at the Downtown Campus there is an activities fee for students and the students themselves are primarily responsible for the spending of those funds. She was not sure this decision should be allowed unless the students have some say so or until we get some real feeling from the students as to their sympathy with this program. Professor Neel said this was only one suggestion. The funds do have to come from some place, but if students do not want to support it, then this should be their decision.

Public Image.

Professor Nagy thought the most effective way in which the University can project some sort of identity or image to the general public is to engage in inter-collegiate athletics. Professor DeMyer questioned the type of image we are projecting with our athletics to the general public and whether this is the

image a university ought to project, particularly with the general knowledge of the hypocrisy and dual standards that apply to athletics. He felt we would project a poor image with the public with the way athletics are currently conducted. He felt everyone knows the athletic program is a group of people apart from the main flow of a university and that athletes are paid and are encouraged to play when they are injured. Professor Langsam felt it would be rather foolish of us to assume that without paying our basketball players, or perhaps in the future football players, that we are going to have a winning team and how many students who have the possibility of going into a school with a full scholarship are going to come down and be on a work-study program instead. Once we get involved in this problem the temptation to improve our team will develop rather rapidly. On the other hand, if we have a basketball team that constantly loses, what kind of image are we going to create in a community. Professor Neel felt from both of the previous comments they were thinking of big time athletics. Professor Neel said the committee report stated that inter-collegiate athletic sports are necessary to complete the university relationship to the community at large and to its alumni. The committee also felt it is a positive morale factor for the students and can help develop an identification with the institution. Professor Neel said publicity can be good or bad about athletic sports and the committee's feeling was the right kind of sports program would identify the university with the community and with the students of the university. Now there is not a great identification of students with the university. This is true of many urban universities and unless you have something to tie them up and sports programs have been used for this. Now it is not the only way, but it is a common way of identifying university students and the university.

Intramural Sports.

Professor Boyd added the University of Chicago cut out big time athletics years ago. He wondered if they still are a member in NCAA and if they participate in other sports in NCAA in basketball and football. He wondered if it would be possible we could develop something along the lines they adopted. He asked if they are all intramural, with no competition with other universities or colleges. The Chancellor said he had heard they are considering reentering the football arena, but he did not know if they have other sports or not. Professor Kellum said several former big-time football powers did go to sports club concept of athletics without giving up their NCAA affiliation. He cited Fordham as an example, but said they are now back into regular competition. Chancellor Hine asked if anyone knew what it would cost to join the NCAA. Professor Kellum informed the Council it would cost \$200 a year for membership in NCAA, and it is based on male undergraduate enrollment which is greater than 1250 students. Professor Gifford said the program will be at a much lower level than most people feel it will be when we start out. He felt it probably would not be a very high power program and doubted it would endanger the character of anyone. Professor Kellum informed the Council that presently we do have an intramural program being conducted and we are expanding this all the time and felt that inter-collegiate athletics is just a further expansion and growth of athletic programs. Chancellor Hine asked Professor Kellum to give a brief report at the next Council meeting about the intramural program on campus. He felt it should be publicized a little more than it is. The Chancellor said the motion made that this report be received, not adopted, had been seconded and asked for a vote. The motion was carried unanimously.

Implementation of Report.

The Chancellor thanked the committee for their report and asked them just what the Council should do by way of implementation now that they have received the report. He asked if the committee recommended a next step. Professor Neel responded negatively and said that decision was up to the Council. Professor Kelso felt we ought to have a trial run on the Faculty Council on the question of suggesting what efforts should be made to implement the report. A number of people have spoken both ways, and yet some have remained silent. He wondered if we are really divided or if there is a vast majority in one way or another. Chancellor Hine said the question was raised earlier, but the Council had not faced the basic issue of do we or do we not want to get into this. Professor Kelso moved that the Council not only receive but accept this report. Professor DeMyer felt he did not make his first statement clear enough for he felt that the Council should take a vote of whether we should or should not engage in inter-collegiate athletics. He thought that in accepting the report, the Council was not approving of it. He suggested the Council make a statement as to whether we do or do not approve of this next step, which would be to implement the report. He would like to see personally a vote by member as to whether we feel we should or should not have an inter-collegiate program. Chancellor Hine said the motion was made that we accept the report and that the report states that we enter NCAA competition. Professor DeMyer said he would like to have an explicit vote on the desirability of this from the Council before changing it to approve. Professor Kelso suggested that perhaps Professor DeMyer wanted to split the three recommendations. If we do or do not engage in inter-collegiate sports we could be in favor of, and yet not be in favor of joining NCAA as soon as possible. Perhaps it would be a more precise way of approaching it to break up the recommendations and have a vote first on whether or not we approve recommendation #1 of the report.

Modification of Motion to Approve.

Professor Kelso said he would be happy to change his motion to the Faculty Council approve recommendation #1 of the report. Professor Ashmore agreed to change his second. Professor Byrne said that insofar as this is the first time the matter has come before the Council, it seemed to him desirable to determine the opinion of those he represents in Council. He had no objection to receiving the document, but thought it would be a little bit premature to approve it. Professor Weber agreed, adding that she felt there was a need to find out how the students feel, if they can participate in athletics, whether they are full or part-time, and if they approve of the athletic fee. Professor Neel responded that part-time students are not eligible to participate in athletics and a student must carry at least twelve hours a semester to participate. Again, he said the athletic fee is only a suggested possibility of financing the program.

Motion to Table.

Professor Meiere moved that the motion be tabled for the next two meetings. The motion was seconded by Professor Langsam. Professor Wagener felt postponing this for two meetings seemed to leave it too much up in the air and he preferred to have some kind of an indication from the Council, possibly by a straw vote,

as to how Council feels. Professor White spoke in favor of the motion to postpone this for two meetings. One reason was he would like to see the report on the intramural program first. Professor Weber asked if there was any reason an informal vote could not be taken. Chancellor Hine called for a vote on the consideration to table the question for two meetings. The motion passed: 25 ayes, 8 naves. The Chancellor then asked for a show of hands to help the committee in their deliberations. The unofficial vote showed 18 in favor of inter-collegiate sports, 12 not in favor, and 8 abstained from the vote.

Agenda Committee Business.

Professor Bogar notified Council on the results of the election of the Agenda Committee. Elected to the Agenda Committee were: James White, School of Law, Bruce Wagener, Speech, and Arthur Norins, School of Medicine. The Secretary serves as ex officio and Chancellor Hine also serves by his office as the Chancellor.

Report on Indiana University All-University Council.

Professor Edmund Byrne reported on the All-University Council. This All-University Council will meet in Indianapolis on Tuesday, December 1 at 2:30 in the Roof Lounge, Student Union Building, and any interested faculty member may attend the meeting. The All-University Council meets regularly in Bloomington and already has met in September and October. He said he would speak (1) about actions taken by this council; (2) about nominations and elections to committees of this council, and (3) about the structure of the faculty constitution as it presently exists. Items of importance already considered were ROTC, a code of conduct, and the ~~non-reappointment~~ of nontenured faculty. The code of conduct is for students and for faculty. Regarding the nontenured faculty, whatever decisions are made he feels will be binding for faculty at IU. Regarding nominations and elections to committees (committees which are similar to IUPUI Faculty Council committees) as a result of the voting, two committees were given representatives from Indianapolis. Miriam Langsam and John Barlow are on the Student Affairs Committee and one new person, in addition to Dr. Arthur Norins, is on the educational policies committee.

General Membership.

He explained further that the present members of the All-University Council are mostly from Bloomington campus and they have a working majority. There is a total of five from the regional campuses and three from IUPUI, making a total of eight representatives from outside Bloomington dealing with matters which are thought to be binding upon all units. Additionally on this Council there are Bloomington student government representatives, with an absence of any other student representatives on the council. There are a number of ex officio deans, vice chancellors and the chancellor from the Bloomington campus, with no such representation from Indianapolis or the regional campuses. The ROTC program has been of some interest to faculties around the country. It has been proposed that in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of Defense that a Faculty Board of Review for ROTC be established and that such a Board have jurisdiction of all present and future ROTC programs at Indiana University.

Structure of Indiana University.

Section 21 of the Constitution, which includes IUPUI into the All-University Council and says that this procedure will continue until such time as the University has been restructured. Professor Byrne said he did not know who decides when the University has been restructured and what constitutes the restructuring. He further said a faculty member from the South Bend regional campus directed a letter to the Secretary of the All-University Council and in that letter raised questions such as when will the situation, regarding representation on an All-University Council, be modified. He was told informally that he had raised some very interesting questions and that these questions might indeed be brought to the appropriate committee. Therefore, Professor Byrne recommended it might be a matter of some interest to the Council to attend the All-University Council meeting on December 1 in order to determine if your interests are adequately represented at the Indiana University All-University Council and whether such a canopy organization is detrimental to the development of IUPUI. Chancellor Hine replied he believed it would be of interest to the IUPUI Faculty Council to have later some discussion of the type of decisions that are made and the kind of business that comes to the Indiana University All-University Council. Professor Kelso inquired whether it would be possible to pull out of the All-University Council and what the legal implications would be. The Chancellor could not give an answer to the question and said he would have this investigated.

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
January 14, 1971
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Vice Chancellor Buhner; Dean Holmquist; Director Lohse; Professors Ashmore, Behnke, Berkshire, Bixler, Bogar, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Chetkow, Forney, Friedman, Garner, Gifford, Hackney, Higgins, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Kinzer, Kirch, Mandelbaum, Meiere, Nagy, Ross, Sagraves, Schreiber, Sehlinger, Simmons, Tennant, Wagener, Wisner.

Members Absent: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellor Ryder; Deans Foust, Irwin, Lawrence, McDonald, B. Taylor, J. Taylor; Professors Dalphin, Daly, DeMyer, Glover, Hopper, Hutton, Langsam, Mamlin, Norins, Ochs, Weber, A. White, J. White.

Visitors: J. East, G. Forgit, N. Kellum, N. Kestner, A. Lautzenheiser, G. Lukemeyer, R. Neel, C. Rothe, H. Wolf.

Agenda:

1. Approval of minutes of December 10, 1970
2. Report of Athletic Affairs Committee (Neel & Kellum)
(Faculty Council Document #2)
3. Discussion of draft report of the Committee for the Study of
Regional Campus Autonomy (Meiere)
4. Interim Report of Student Affairs Committee (White)
5. Presiding Officer's Business
 - a. Interim Report of Educational Policies Curriculum Development
Committee
 - b. Report on Campus Security (Lautzenheiser)
6. Agenda Committee Business
7. New Business

Vice Chancellor Buhner called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. In the absence of Professor White, Professor Wagener was appointed parliamentary pro-tem. Professor Meiere thought that in the Report of the Academic Affairs Committee on IUPUI Calendar, there was confusion about when the summer session has to end. Professor Kinzer explained that as far as the Academic Affairs Committee is concerned, the only requirement is that all sessions shall have been completed by the final date of the second session of the summer session. In other words, every program has to be completed by the end date of the second session, regardless of where it starts and where it ends. Professor Lohse added she thought this was spelled out very clearly further in the minutes under the section entitled Summer Session. Professor Kinzer went on to say he felt Council attention should be directed to the rules for calendar construction which they would receive at the meeting. With this clarification, the minutes of December 10, 1970 were approved as distributed.

Report of Athletic Affairs Committee

Professor Kellum reported on the intramural program at IUPUI. Mr. Kellum is Director of Intramural Activities and Coordinator for Sports Clubs for IUPUI. He stated facilities available at IUPUI for intramural activities include the gym at the Normal College, 1010 W. 64th St., the Athenaeum at 1415 E. Michigan, and the Marott Building, 902 N. Meridian. Most of these facilities are available on weekends and evenings. For example, the Marott Building is available only at those times classes are not being held in the basement. The Normal College gym is used from 8 to 5 in the major program in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

The first year program in 1969 consisted of two activities: men's basketball and men's and women's tennis. Supervision for the intramural basketball program is provided by major students from the Normal College who receive compensation to supervise the program. The intent is to progressively add activities to the program. The program growth will be dictated by the growth of IUPUI's physical facilities.

In basketball, 387 men, representing 31 teams, participated in the program in undergraduate and graduate leagues. Anyone enrolled for any number of hours is eligible for competition. Eligibility was opened up to faculty and staff members and several faculty and staff do participate. Officials for basketball were hired through the Indianapolis amateur officials association. They worked as agent for booking officials. This has been changed this year and Professor Kellum said he now hires officials directly.

The Normal College budget includes funds for the payment of officials and supervisors. Entry fees of \$40 per team was charged for basketball last year and this helped to offset cost of awards and janitorial supervision for the Marott Building. This was not covered in the budget. These fees are placed in the student activities account.

In tennis, tournaments were drawn in men's and women's singles and doubles for both undergraduate and graduate students. There were no administrative or supervisory expenses involved with the tennis tournament. The matches were scheduled, played, and results were sent back to Professor Kellum. An entry fee of \$1.00 per person was charged for the tennis tournament and this covered the expense of awards. There were 49 entries in tennis.

Recommendations Made to Chancellor

Professor Kellum next gave the recommendations he made in a report to the Chancellor for the intramural program.

1. Continued financial support of the University through budget requests of the Normal College so that the intramural program will be completely financed by the University and the need for entry fees eliminated.
2. A complete investigation into the feasibility of IUPUI engaging in intercollegiate athletic competition as an expansion of the intramural program.
3. Administrative support for the earliest possible realization of the Normal College Student Services Building to provide facilities for a rapidly expanding program.
4. Provision for land on the University Quarter to be used for athletic fields.
5. A change in the method of hiring officials.

Plans for This Year

Professor Kellum stated briefly the plans for this year are to add programs in volleyball, softball and touch football. Professor Bogar asked if the undergraduate basketball league of the Downtown Campus was included in Professor Kellum's program. Professor Kellum answered they have 12 teams in the Downtown Campus league. It was decided the Downtown Campus could continue operating their own until they moved and left their facility at 902 N. Meridian. They will probably be allowed to continue on their own this year, but next year the program will be all-inclusive. Professor Bogar asked if there had been objection on the part of the students involved and Professor Kellum felt their biggest objection was that the activities he coordinates in basketball run from November to the end of March. The Downtown Campus students start their program in September and run it until the end of May. Professor Neel asked how many teams are now enrolled in the Downtown league. Professor Kellum replied there are 12 teams in the Downtown league. There are 21 in the graduate league and 7 in the undergraduate league. Professor Kelso asked if Mr. Kellum has observed those participating in basketball and tennis. Professor Kellum said he coaches the Normal College team and plays on a graduate team with some faculty members.

Intercollegiate Athletics

Professor Kelso asked what kind of talent could be drawn in basketball or tennis, since we are thinking of intercollegiate sports. Professor Kellum replied that the largest number of participants in the tennis tournament were from the Medical Center and were graduate students or faculty and staff. Therefore, they would be ineligible for intercollegiate competition. As far as basketball is concerned, he felt we have outstanding talent. He added there is enough talent in Indianapolis to draw from to give good representation in most sports, particularly the ones recommended in the original report. Professor Byrne asked what Professor Kellum meant by "most sports" and Professor Kellum replied that in Document #2 of the Faculty Council, the Athletic Affairs Committee recommended we engage in

the sports of cross country, tennis, basketball and gymnastics beginning next year. This is in order that we qualify for NCAA affiliation by competing in four sports.

Funding of Intercollegiate Athletics

Professor Byrne asked if any cost accounting study had been done on how this will be financed and what particular problems can be anticipated in terms of budgeting. Professor Kellum said at IU-PU in Ft. Wayne they have a student activity fee of \$15, of which \$5 goes into the athletic fund and this finances intramurals and intercollegiate athletics. Another example he cited was at IU at Jeffersonville. There the student activity fee is \$12 and \$3 goes into the athletic budget. Professor Byrne asked how they arrived at this athletic fee or what procedures were followed to determine a particular amount that would be assessed to students. Professor Kellum did not have this definite information, but he thought the fee was arbitrarily set and that amount of money was worked into budgeting their programs.

Student Response

Professor Friedman asked if anyone sounded out student opinion on what they felt about this question. Professor Kellum replied quite often he gets inquiries about why IUPUI does not engage in intercollegiate athletics and he thinks there is an interest. They have not, however, taken a survey or poll as such. Professor Lohse added she talked with a student from the Downtown Campus and he said the students had done a survey there. He told her those students who do want it, want it very badly. Vice Chancellor Buhner referenced a clipping from the New York Times given to him by Professor Chetkow. One comment was the rising cost of college athletics is being subjected to intense analysis as never before throughout the country. The other quote was that a survey by the University of Missouri has shown that athletic income matches athletic costs only at colleges with large scale football programs and that expenditures tended to increase faster than income for colleges as a whole. Professor Kellum said the cost of intramural is budgeted in the Normal College budget and it covers everything except equipment. Professor Gifford asked if Professor Kellum planned to enter any of the teams in so-called city leagues of softball or basketball. Professor Kellum replied that some people, because they do play together in the league, do go to Dearborn Gym and play in semi-professional or amateur leagues there. They do this on their own. He felt he would prefer not to get involved with the independent basketball or softball leagues in the city.

Athletic Facilities

Professor Bogar asked if comment could be made to what kind of facilities are being planned in terms of a gymnasium or fieldhouse, something which would enhance the whole intramural program. Director Lohse replied extensive plans have been worked out and these will go to the next legislature with a request for bonding authority. They have planned facilities for a very extensive intramural program and a skimpy athletic program. Vice Chancellor Buhner said these plans are for a student services building in which Normal College would have academic facilities and then there would be recreational athletic facilities. Professor Lohse added that the gymnasium planned is of the size that can be divided into two separate gyms with basketball courts going sideways, which can be opened up for a competitive floor with plenty of seating. Professor Kelso inquired if the Resources and Planning Committee of the Faculty Council had any input into the plans discussed with regard to the student services building. Vice Chancellor Buhner was under the impression that the Faculty Council has appointed

representatives to this building committee, the Humanities and Social Service Building, and the Science, Engineering and Technology Building. He then asked for any other comments on this agenda item.

Action on the Report of the Athletic Affairs Committee

Professor Neel felt the next thing was to take the formal report of the Athletic Affairs Committee off the table. The parliamentarian replied that any member of the Council could move to have it brought back from the table for consideration. Professor Byrne commented that he had talked with Professor Curtis at the 38th St. Campus and he has a discussion or debate planned on the question of intercollegiate athletics. He thought Professor Curtis was under the assumption that the Faculty Council would not meet on this matter until after these discussions or debate was completed. Professor Neel replied that he had informed Professor Curtis that this topic was to come up before Council in January. Professor Curtis tried to schedule his debate before our meeting, but was unable to do so. The parliamentarian advised the Council it was his opinion that a motion could carry this matter over on the agenda and keep it on the agenda until a later date.

Motion to Continue to Table Report

Professor Jarboe moved that Document #2 of the Faculty Council be carried over on the agenda until after Professor Curtis' debate. Professor Kirch seconded the motion. Professor Neel said that what Professor Curtis is doing is nothing more than sponsoring a debate for the benefit of the students and it has nothing to do with the report of the Athletic Affairs Committee. Professor Friedman pointed out that the recommendation here is to put into effect for next year an intercollegiate athletic program. If we continue to postpone a decision on that recommendation, we will be making it impossible for that decision to take effect next year. Professor Schreiber felt he did not know if Professor Curtis' debate would give any more information than we are prepared to present at this time. He felt that if we are thinking of putting it into effect next fall, it is going to make it impossible for scheduling purposes and financing. He felt we should come to some decision here to postpone it indefinitely or to get on with it. Professor Kelso added that when this first came up, Council needed certain information. Now the information is provided and now the question is that some want to hear the results of the debate. After that debate is held, it probably will be something else. The motion to continue to table the report of the Athletic Affairs Committee was voted on and was defeated.

Discussion of Motion of Athletic Affairs Committee Report

It was decided the motion now on the floor was to accept recommendation #1 of the Report of the Athletic Affairs Committee that IUPUI engage in intercollegiate sports as moved by Professor Kelso in his tabeling motion. Professor Byrne said he was opposed to voting in favor of such a general motion of entering into intercollegiate athletics. He was in favor of a more specific motion be proposed to develop a program of intercollegiate athletics in one sport, particularly if he was informed on how this would be financed and supported. He asked if anyone could provide him with information on laws of the State of Indiana on whether University funds may be appropriated for intercollegiate athletics or whether such funds must be acquired through floating a bond. Professor Friedman pointed out that all other state institutions in this state seemed to be getting along alright, but where they get their money from, he did not know. Professor Byrne commented that when the new basketball arena in Bloomington was erected, a considerable number of people opposed it. It was the

ruling of the President of the University that nothing could be done about it anyway, since it was a matter of bonding and had nothing to do with state appropriations to the University. Professor Friedman felt we were creating a problem that really does not exist. We already have been told there has been a request for bonding authorities to build athletic facilities. That request is already in the makings and now it is a matter of how we are going to use the facilities more than if we are going to get them or not. He added he felt that presently we should not concern ourselves with problems of the Big Ten. For the moment, though, he said he was in favor of an intercollegiate athletic program to give students some sense of identity to the institution. We need that kind of image badly, not only for our students, but for the community at large. As for money, it will cost, but at this stage of the game, it will be money worth spending.

Financing of Intercollegiate Athletics

Vice Chancellor Buhner reminded Council that Document #2 did give some information on expenses and says that the coaches and faculty salaries are the only athletic expense payable from tax funds allowed by the NCAA. Professor Kirch felt we always come back to the same answer that we do not have enough funds. He was concerned about getting into this in terms of transportation costs, equipment and coaching, and all the other things that go with it. He went on to say that at the Downtown Campus they are very short on secretarial staff, both for administration and faculty, the deans are short on assistants, and students have indicated an interest in a shuttle bus system. All of this will cost quite a bit of money and he felt he was just not interested in intercollegiate aspects as against some things which he feels are more important in terms of IUPUI's educational mission. He was not against athletics, but just does not think we need to do this. Professor Friedman replied he thought that by denying ourselves intercollegiate athletics will not make any difference in terms of funds available for other purposes. Professor Gifford suggested restating the motion subject to availability of funds and subject to approval of Council at which times certain areas of sports shall be entered. This would take care of whether or not we have funds and also give us control of what sports we enter and when. Professor Byrne pointed out that the bonding issue is involved with intercollegiate athletics and now we were talking about the student services building which is an issue of intramural sports. He also believed that by simply having an intercollegiate team does not augment the image of the University, unless it is a winning team. If it is not a winning team, it has to be pumped up. You use money to pump up a losing team. Professor Kelso wanted to recount the reason for the form of the motion. He said Professor DeMyer said at the meeting on December 10, 1970, that he would like to have an explicit vote on the desirability of our participating in intercollegiate sports before the Council acted on a motion to approve the entire report. He believed that unless the general principle was understood, it would be premature to act on the report. Professor Kelso said that if the motion that we approve recommendation #1 that IUPUI engage in intercollegiate sports is passed, he would then move that the Council accept the report, which would add all of the limiting factors that have been mentioned previously. He agreed that by denying ourselves intercollegiate athletics will not get us more funds for other purposes. Professor Chetkow was appalled at the amount of time spent on the issue, particularly since we are a new urban university. He did not feel this was a high priority item.

Vote on the Report

Vice Chancellor Buhner asked for a vote on the proposition that IUPUI engage in intercollegiate sports as moved by Professor Kelso. The motion carried with a vote of 20 for and 13 against. Professor Kelso next moved that the Council

receive and approve the report of the Athletic Affairs Committee. Professor Kirch seconded the motion. The motion was carried. Professor Byrne asked that the record show he abstained from the voting. Professor Neel asked that either the Chancellor appoint an appropriate committee or instruct the present athletic committee to continue with the operation.

Discussion of Draft Report of the Committee for the Study of Regional Campus Autonomy

Professor Meiere said he wanted to solicit opinions to this discussion draft. He briefly summarized the history and intent of the document. The Committee for the Study of Regional Campus Faculty Autonomy is trying to initiate a mechanism whereby this faculty, in conjunction with Purdue faculty across the state, can recommend that the Board of Trustees of Purdue initiate a mechanism to request the Board of Trustees of Purdue delegate academic authority in the Purdue mission areas to the faculty of IUPUI. At present the academic authority in Purdue mission areas is invested in state-wide Purdue schools, of which Purdue faculty members in Indianapolis are a part. For those not familiar with the set up, he explained Purdue faculty members are all part of one department, no matter what their physical location is. He went on to say that the one question that ordinarily comes up at this stage is why bother IU people with Purdue problems. He thought the answer to this is that matters which concern people in Purdue mission areas will be problems of concern of the University in Indianapolis as a whole. The second question, as very amply stated by Professor Byrne's inquiry, concerns the meaning of the report. He said he was not prepared to answer that question completely, but that even if the document is approved by the Purdue Board of Trustees, it is not going to make IUPUI completely autonomous across the board. But in his interpretation it would make certain Purdue mission areas autonomous. So in practice as far as Indianapolis is concerned, the document will have the effect of transferring academic authority which is presently vested essentially to Lafayette to Indianapolis.

Key Portions of Report

Professor Meiere next asked to try to summarize what he considered the key portions of the document from the Committee for the Study of Regional Campus Faculty Autonomy. On page 2, a very liberal translation would be that on November 28, 1968, each of the four regional campus facilities was recognized by the Board of Trustees as a separate entity and certain school faculty calendars were extended to them. An extension of this authority by the Board of Trustees will transfer to each campus faculty effective on the designated date all of those remaining powers presently vested in the total University faculty. He added he presumed that anything that Purdue is not allowed to talk about concerning IUPUI is not in effect. Then on page 5 of the committee's document, the same statement is essentially repeated in the form of a resolution and says it is resolved that effective with the 1973 academic year, the Lafayette campus faculty and each regional campus faculty are hereby granted all the powers and authority currently enjoyed and exercised by the University faculty, such powers and authorities to be exercised solely on its own campus. He further said that logically speaking these two statements seem to make the rest of the document redundant. The committee has decided in the middle of the document to actually list certain powers and responsibilities which it considers essential to help spell out the intent of transferring academic autonomy to regional campuses in particular. In conclusion, he again said he wished to solicit the Council members thoughts on the intent of the document and the specific wording of the document.

Professor Bogar asked Professor Meiere just what kind of action he was asking for from the Council. Professor Meiere said at the moment nothing, but he would come back with something to the effect that the Council approve the document and recommend it to the school faculties at Purdue University and Purdue's Board of Trustees. That is the only legal action we can take at our campus, and it would certainly help if the Council would go on record of approving a final version.

The Academic Calendar

Vice Chancellor Buhner asked the Secretary of the Council to bring the Council up to date regarding the situation with effect to the calendar. Professor Bogar said initially Mr. Williams, chairman of the Calendar Committee, submitted a report to the Faculty Council which was distributed three meetings ago. Council in turn asked the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council to comment on that report and this they did during the December meeting. The revisions and recommendations by the Academic Affairs Committee were accepted by this Council at our December meeting. These revisions and recommendations were then transmitted to Mr. Williams and he formed a calendar based upon those recommendations and revisions. It was the Secretary's opinion that the Council's approval or disapproval of the calendar was next in order. Professor Kinzer said that Mr. Williams had done what Council had asked him to do and had applied the recommendations they made to the existing statements which the original Calendar Committee had worked out. They have put these together and worked out a sample application of the rules for a sample calendar. As far as Professor Kinzer could see, their intent is written into the rules and the application of those rules. There was one point, however, at which Mr. Williams followed the wording of their recommendation of their committee and there might be some discrepancy between their recommendation and the discussion which took place before that. This has to do with the summer sessions. Their committee report specifically says 1,2,3,4,6,8, 9 and 12 week sessions or two six-week sessions starting in the summer time. In discussions, the committee talked about the possibility of any length session in the summer time, and Mr. Williams' sample calendar does not include any length session. As far as he could see, this is not a major point and could be approved as it stands.

Revisions to the Calendar

Professor Jarboe said he had a proposed change on the summer session calendar and asked if this was the proper time to present it to Council. Being given an affirmative answer, he went on to say the reason for his proposal was he thought was clear in previous discussions that the summer session dates, at least for the Division of Education, are very vital. He said he was talking about hundreds of potential intercampus transfers from Indianapolis to Bloomington and from Bloomington to Indianapolis. The way the present calendar is proposed for the year of 1972, Summer Session I will end their classes on June 26 and Summer Session II classes begin on June 26 at Bloomington. Students cannot be taking final exams up here and then attend the first class in Bloomington. In making the changes he recommended, it will give faculty two weeks vacation between the end of Session II and the beginning of the fall session in 1973. Professor Kinzer objected to the proposal of Professor Jarboe's because he could not feature hundreds of students taking examinations on one day when classes are beginning somewhere else on the same day. If they are, then professors will just have to accommodate the way they do now and students will come in a day later. The Calendar Committee, when they made their proposal, was aware of institutional differences in beginning and ending dates. However, these kinds of problems we will just have to live with and work out by experience rather than trying to

anticipate by legislation. The virtue of the proposed calendar as it is worked out is that it sets up a set rule which can be applied for x number of years into the future. If we adjust it every year to accommodate particular differences that show up, we could get into a terminal problem.

Submission of Final Grades

Professor Kelso said he would like to make this caveat that the rules for calendar construction actually go beyond mere construction of a calendar. For example, Rule #8 in proposing that first semester final grades shall be due in the Registrar's Office the Wednesday following the beginning of the semester. In legal education they are expected by their crediting agency to examine students at least in part in essay format. Under the present situation at the Law School, a number of professors are examining as many as 200-300 students for three and four hours of essay work. It is simply humanly impossible to carry out the requirements of their accrediting agencies to submit grades by that date. The caveat he wanted to draw is, therefore, on page 2 of the committee's report they indicate the Law School may be exempted from adhering to the established because they have already done it for one year. They could not satisfy their crediting agencies by handing in grades two days after an essay exam has been given to 200-300 students. He hoped that in passing this calendar they mean to continue the principle of the professional schools and others who may have to meet such requirements. Vice Chancellor Buhner assumed that where professional commitments indicate, the recommendations certainly are intended to allow that kind of flexibility. Professor Kinzer said the committee was aware of the fact that they were setting up beginning and ending dates and they may be stated as beginning of classes and closing of classes. Within those dates classes could begin and end and it seemed to him that exams could be incorporated within that period by the various units. Professor Kelso replied they certainly would do their best to meet the requirements and such things as mid-terms can be given, adjustments can be made, and they will attempt to do so. He felt they should be protected by the caveat so their Dean does not have to violate something the Council has done.

Motion on the Calendar Report

Vice Chancellor Buhner asked for a motion so this would be put in the proper form. The motion should be whether Council accept or not accept the calendar as presented. Professor Higgins moved to accept the report. Professor Friedman seconded the motion. Professor Meiere commented that whenever possible, it would seem to be a good idea to have a document of the importance of this one in the Council's hands before they are expected to vote on it. He wondered if it was possible to have distributed the committee's report by mail before the Council meeting. Professor Bogar replied it was not possible because he received the material only a few days before the Council meeting. Professor Bogar replied it was not possible because he received the material only a few days before the Council meeting. Therefore, there was not enough time to send it out to Council members. Professor Jarboe stated that he liked the calendar proposed and thought the work the committee had done was beautifully done. He did have one concern though. He said he could document with figures that the people involved (nursing, allied health sciences, education) have by far the biggest percentage of summer students in IUPUI during the summer. So when we are thinking about student concerns, we are ignoring completely this particular item. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked Professor Jarboe if he could conceive of a schedule for his division which could live within the recommended constraints of the summer session policy. He replied that since there is no exam week in summer session set up as such, he could arbitrarily administratively dictate the exam. But as he understood this, it is a regular week and that means classes will meet as scheduled that last week and that classes will be scheduled on June 26. In the summer on a six week

session you do not schedule a class meeting once a week or twice a week. You schedule classes to meet at least four times, usually five times. If it was one that meets once a week, then he could see lots of ways around it. In the past it has been a habit in most places in running an eight weeks summer session to give students permission to miss the first day of summer session, but on a six weeks summer session that gets a little bit more ticklish.

Commencement Dates

Vice Chancellor Buhner said Mr. Kestner was present at the meeting to represent the interest of the Alumni Office regarding the date of commencement. Mr. Kestner said that holding commencement on the Sunday immediately following the end of the semester is almost impossible. It would be hard to provide diplomas the way we presently are doing. They would have to give people letters and eliminate recognizing students for honors. He felt there were several things they could do if they are forced to hold commencement on that particular day, provided they can get a facility in the city of Indianapolis. By not having our own facility, you have to negotiate with other people, including commercial enterprises, for facilities in which to hold commencement. Presently we have a little over a week and they work almost day and night that week trying to get grades in, get accumes processed for honors, and get diplomas reprinted to receive honors with high distinction. Under this new procedure we would have less than 48 hours to do what is almost impossible to do in a week's time now. In order to follow this new calendar, they will have to eliminate a number of things to guarantee diplomas to all students attending commencement. Professor Kinzer said in the report attached to the minutes, the committee said they recognized that this would likely involve early reporting of graduating student records. Mr. Kestner said in the past they have run into problems in getting grades in the 48 hour period now set. They have had to call people at home to get grades in order to process them for commencement. Professor Kinzer said as far as he could see there is no reason in the proposal why the registrar could not ask for grades for people graduating be turned in one week earlier than grades for any other student. This is done at many universities. Vice Chancellor Buhner asked if there were any further reactions to Mr. Kestner's observations. Professor Kelso asked if not acting at this time on the commencement issue would create difficulties. He wondered if it was important that the commencement matter be settled now so that the calendars can be published.

Motion to Amend Calendar Report

Professor Kelso moved to amend the motion to receive and approve the recommendation by deleting the report's reference to commencement. The motion was seconded by Professor Wagener. The motion carried.

Vote on Amended Calendar

The motion to accept the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee with the amendment that the reference to commencement be deleted was next voted on. The motion carried. One vote was recorded against the motion.

Campus Security

Vice Chancellor Buhner said that Chancellor Hine was anxious that the Faculty Council receive a preliminary report on the subject of campus security. Mr. Lautzenheiser gave that report. He said that for a long time people in the

Safety-Security Department and administration felt the need for expanding and upgrading that department. They have interviewed several people for the position of chief of the department and up to now have not appointed one. They do have four prospects and will be interviewing them. Hopefully they will be able to appoint somebody soon. This will fit in with upgrading requirements for the man, the upgrading of training and expanded program, and permit the amalgamation of various units. The Safety Department is Medical Center oriented. There is a separate department at the 38th St. Campus. Professor Friedman asked what Mr. Lautzenheiser meant when he referred to upgrading the caliber of men in the Safety Department. Mr. Lautzenheiser said they would be upgrading their background and their training. He mentioned that the President of Indiana University now has on his staff a new man for safety and security state-wide operation and they are working closely with him in this effort. Professor Jarboe asked if the Safety Department operation covers M and C Building of the Downtown Campus.. Mr. Lautzenheiser said this would bring the coverage of those units and Herron also into the central operation. At the present time the only thing Downtown is the city police and merchant police patrol operation. Professor Forney asked if there would be any funds available to increase salaries for some of the police officers now on campus. He added he felt security here was somewhat inefficient, for there was over \$10,000 worth of equipment stolen from the Medical Science Building. Mr. Lautzenheiser said he hoped the salary ranges would be improved and hoped that with this will come improved people with a good age bracket and good background. This is a field where there are not qualified people seeking employment. Professor Ashmore asked if it would be possible to keep the security office open seven days a week, because occasionally one needs to get a hold security on a Saturday or Sunday. Mr. Lautzenheiser thought this could be possible if the funds are provided. They also hope to have more radios for better coverage.

The Use of Side Arms

Professor Bogar asked if Mr. Lautzenheiser envisioned part of the upgrading to be what one might call "demonstration control." He also inquired if security officers would continue to bear side arms. Mr. Lautzenheiser said there had been much discussion on that and they have not changed the practice here. The city did decide to remove special police powers from our men and the sheriff is helping them some. They have had a bit of in-service training recently on human relations and on safety of carrying guns. IUPUI is very fortunate to have excellent cooperation with the city and state police. As far as demonstrations are concerned, we would never have enough men to even start to control a demonstration. The city and state police are on hand and can be called upon. The National Guard can be alerted very fast in Indianapolis also. Professor Bogar asked if there were any guidelines for calling in a city or state or army patrols on campus. He wondered if this was up to the Chancellor's discretion. Mr. Lautzenheiser said this would go through the Chancellor before they would call for a large group. He added they do have a new man who arrived in December, primarily in safety. He felt this person would add a great deal of stature to this work. Some of the recommendations he has made will be presented in the budget. He added there was a report of our Indianapolis operations made by an outside consulting firm. It has been received and we are slowly implementing a few of the inexpensive items in that report.

Student Affairs

Vice Chancellor Buhner said the secretary had informed him to say that the material which would have been handed out at the meeting under Item #4 on the Agenda, the Interim Report of the Student Affairs Committee by Professor White, will be mailed. The chair noted that Dean Hugh Wolf was present at the meeting

and that he wanted to make a comment. Dean Wolf commented that after receiving this document through the mail, what they were interested in was the reaction or comment from faculty members. Those comments should be directed to Professor White. This is a proposal, or a model, for a way to organize student services for IUPUI. It has been presented already to the Chancellor's Council of Non-Medical Deans, presented to his student Student Services Advisory Committee, to the non-student Student Services Advisory Committee, and has been presented to the Council's Student Affairs Committee. Therefore, any comments regarding this should be sent to Professor James White of the Law School.

SET Building

Professor Garner said he had given two copies of a report on the SET building to Professor Bogar and that Professor Bogar could have these run off and distributed to the Council membership. He had a picture of the building at the meeting which had to be returned to the architects, so he said that anyone who was interested in seeing what the SET building is like, could look at it after the meeting. If anyone had any questions about it, he said he would be happy to discuss it with them after the meeting.

University Relations

Vice Chancellor Buhner said he had planned to report to the Council on the progress made in reorganizing the University relations program. Mr. Spencer noted that copies of his report on background information regarding IUPUI was available from his office.

Resolution on University and State Relationships

Professor Wagener asked for a resolution concerning University and State relationships be put on the agenda for the next meeting. Vice Chancellor Buhner so ordered.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernard Bogar

Bernard Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
February 11, 1971
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, Lawrence, McDonald, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Berkshire, Bogar, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Chetkow, Friedman, Garner, Gifford, Glover, Hackney, Higgins, Hutton, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Meiere, Nagy, Norins, Ochs, Ross, Segraves, Schreiber, Sehlinger, Simmons, Tennant, Wagener, Weber, J. White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Dean B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Behnke, Bixler, Dalphin, Daly, DeMyer, Forney, Hopper, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, A. White.

Visitors: President Ryan; Professor Hobbs.

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of January 14, 1971
2. Memorial for Alice Miles Eagle
3. Introduction of President John W. Ryan
4. Discussion of Resolution Concerning University and State Relationships (Faculty Council Document #7)
5. Interim Report of Student Affairs Committee
6. Presiding Officer's Business
7. Agenda Committee Business
8. New Business

Chancellor Hine called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Minutes of the January 14, 1971 meeting were accepted as distributed.

Memorial Resolution for Alice Miles Eagle

Professor Bogar moved that the Council show their acceptance of the memorial for Alice Miles Eagle by a moment of silent standing meditation.

Introduction of President John W. Ryan

Chancellor Hine felt Council was very fortunate to have at the meeting the new President of Indiana University, John W. Ryan. The Chancellor commented that in the short time the President has been serving, he has shown a great willingness to attend meetings and he is quite eager to get to work and to know the faculty better. Chancellor Hine next gave the Council some background information on President Ryan. President Ryan was born in Chicago and attended grade and high school there. Then he went to Utah where he got his baccalaureate degree in 1951. He received his master's and doctorate degree in political science from Indiana University in 1959. In between his baccalaureate degree and experience at IU, he worked as research analyst for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Then for two years he was research associate for the IU program in public administration in Thailand. From 1958 to 1962 he was assistant and associate professor of political science for the Bureau of Government at the University of Wisconsin. He then went to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst where he was executive assistant to the President. In 1963 he went to Arizona State University where he served a two year term as Vice President for Academic Affairs. From 1965 to 1968 he was Chancellor at the University of Massachusetts. He came to IU as Vice President and Director of Regional Campuses throughout the state. The Chancellor added he thought the President has a good understanding of the problems associated with the state programs, as well as those in Bloomington, and he has represented the regional campuses very well. The night before the Council meeting President Ryan spoke before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and Senate defending the request of Indiana University for funds. The Chancellor was pleased to note the President started out his presentation discussing the need for the regional campuses, next IUPUI, and then Bloomington.

President Ryan

President Ryan said he was grateful for the invitation to be at the Council meeting. He knew it was not possible in a University this size for him to know on an intimate basis a very large percentage of the faculty members or the student body, but he would work as hard as he could in making that as large a fraction as it could be. He added he would try to stay out of the faculty's business, so that they can get it done, and then he will go out and try to get done what they decide is needed. He felt fifteen days in office did not give him a complete grasp of the conditions, circumstances and problems of a complex institution like IU, or a complex institution like IUPUI. He knows there are problems and from his own experience knows about the problems of organization, the problems of shortage of resources, and the problems of impatience in getting on with the business of developing academic programs and reorienting the University to its late 20th and 21st century mission. He said he promised nothing except to try to comprehend the complex institution, try to understand

its problems, and try to serve as President in the way a President should serve to help obtain the resources needed to move in chosen directions. He felt the best he could hope for was to come to an understanding and a mutual identification of the problems to be worked on. He added everyone will not always see those problems the same way, for if we did, we would have the kind of totalitarian institution that would not be a university. He hoped he would prove to be one who listens and one who is helpful. He also hoped to make himself visible enough to the faculties, individual faculty members, student bodies, and individual students to be able to respond in some measure to their problems. He said his lesson for the day was that in the short run and in the long run, the problems we face can be dressed more satisfactorily while we maintain ourselves as a system. He does not mean to obligate us to a system that is already formed, because it is yet to be completely formed. He added he may be wrong about that lesson for the day, but he would always try to listen. He believed we have a system that should be useful and functional. This system is currently undergoing modification and will continue to do so. Chancellor Hine thanked President Ryan and told him he was welcome to stay as long as he wished for the meeting.

Discussion of Resolution Concerning University and State Relationships

Professor Norins said in going over the minutes he did not find that it shows that the Council has really considered the question of how to handle this resolution. He felt it is an important resolution and thought it might be wise for this resolution to go through a committee action. He moved that the resolution be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. Professor Gifford seconded the motion. Professor Wagener said he realized this particular matter is one that involves all the faculty in a deep fashion and he was sure they all have very strong feelings about it. He thought it appropriate to get the fullest discussion possible. Since the state legislature is now meeting, he wanted to speak against the idea of sending the whole resolution to committee. He asked that lines numbered through 27 be considered at this particular time. Lines through 27 ask that all Indiana and Purdue faculty members now teaching in Indianapolis commit themselves and go on record with the idea of working toward the establishment of a new and independent university. Lines 18 through 27 ask that a committee be established in order to articulate the ideas that we have to the legislature. He felt if we omitted items 28 through 40 at this point, the committee could then be empowered to collect the necessary information to act as it sees fit in trying to transmit to the legislature some of our ideas. He said it seemed to him that moving this to a committee puts it in a situation where it can no longer be considered for the intent that it has, which is to express ourselves to the legislature. Therefore, he requested that this particular motion to send the resolution to committee be voted down. Professor White said the deadline for introducing new legislation to the General Assembly was not past.

Interrelations of IU Components

Professor Friedman commented he thought it rather appropriate to discuss this resolution now with the new President at hand. It would give him some indication of their concerns and might be useful to him if he were told why the faculty wishes to move in this direction. He also wanted to defer vote on the sending of the resolution to a committee for the benefit of President Ryan. Professor Byrne added he thought President Ryan would appreciate whatever input might come from the various units of the IU system, since he referred to the need to articulate the interrelationships between the three units of Indiana University system--Bloomington, Indianapolis, and the regional campuses.

Input of Total Faculty

Professor Meiere said he represented a large number of faculty members and would not want to consider committing them to a sweeping statement without discussing it with them. He had not had a chance to discuss this resolution with the faculty members he represents. Professor Wagener said this resolution was submitted at the last Council meeting and he hoped that many had already looked at it and talked with people about it. He felt it does not commit us in that sense. It is a resolution that asks other faculty members to join in working toward this. It does not say that we all agree that this is the direction that we should go, but instead, it is a call to move in this direction. He added he would feel no hesitation in terms of his representativeness of other faculty members in voting yes for this in the sense that he would be asking them to join in this kind of a direction. Professor Kinzer responded that as chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, to which this would be referred, he wanted to have some guidance or some indication what the Faculty Council would like the committee to do with it.

Actions of State Legislature

Professor Kelso added he did not know how the legislature would know what to do with it. We essentially would be going on record as saying we would like them to consider the fact that we would like to be autonomous, but we do not know how, when, why, where. He felt that until such a time that we can go to them with more specific guidelines and requests, that this really would be putting ourselves in jeopardy of some decision we might not even like. Professor Wagener asked Professor White if there had been a bill introduced in the legislature dealing with this matter. Professor White said it was his understanding that there have been several bills introduced dealing with this area.

Structural Changes in IU

Professor Langsam understood that for about three or four years a structural committee has been working on the all-university level. She asked President Ryan if he cared to share with the Council some of the recommendations or feelings that are presently existing down at Bloomington with regard to this matter. Chancellor Rine commented that the discussion was getting away from the motion at hand. Professor Langsam thought that if urgency is the question, and if the feelings of Bloomington on this all-university structural committee are such that there are other people who agree with it and would direct us to do one thing, she thought no action or just more delay would put a different mood or tone to the question of what action is necessary.

Comments of President Ryan

President Ryan said it would be unfortunate for him in any way to condition the discussion of this or any matter before the Council. He hoped not to do that and that his remarks would not be construed as such, but he did want to respond to the question in a way that might be useful to Council. He said we do have a university structures committee which is part of the University Faculty Council apparatus. He pleaded ignorance to any detail of its work, but he doubted that it has had this kind of matter before it at all. It is his intention that this structures committee, or an ad hoc committee, would deal with such a question. He added that one of the pieces of legislation that has passed the House already is a resolution requiring the trustees of the universities with more than one campus to report by next January to the legislature. This report would be concerning the status of the several campuses in the system with recommendations for changes, if any, in status,

which might include recommending a complete separation, a different type of relationship, autonomy, or independence. He thought it was common feeling that this resolution will pass. Since it only required a report, he did not want to overemphasize that particular point. Professor Meiere commented that information on legislation is available to the faculty members at the 38th St. Campus through the Dean's office.

Purpose of Motion

Professor Nagy asked the initiator of the motion on the floor to explain the purpose of it. Professor Norins responded he felt this is a serious resolution and one that his committee has tried to learn of other feelings from various parts of the University, to firm these up, and to try to see where the disagreements and agreements are. He felt it is appropriate to get the feeling of the Council itself.

Vote on Motion to Refer to Committee

The motion to refer Professor Wagener's resolution (Document #7) to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council was carried.

Interim Report of Student Affairs Committee

Professor White said that at the last meeting of Council, a proposed outline for an organization for student services on this campus was distributed. He asked that Council members wishing to comment on this to communicate with him so their comments might be considered by the Student Affairs Committee. The second part of his report, he said, had to do with the code of student conduct which will be a code drafted specifically for IUPUI, encompassing the best of IU and PU codes. The Student Affairs Committee will report on this code at the March meeting of the Faculty Council. The third segment of his report had to do with a visit from a team of representatives of the United States Department of Justice. They have begun a program whereby they will visit sixty very important college campuses throughout the country in an attempt to meet with the students and discuss matters of national interest with them. There is going to be such a meeting on the Bloomington campus on Tuesday, February 16. One of IUPUI's recent graduates of the Law School is with the U.S. Department of Justice and he suggested this team visit to IUPUI. The team from the Justice Department will meet for a panel discussion at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 1971 at the Law School. He added all interested persons should be notified of this meeting and any interested faculty members were invited to attend.

Student Code of Conduct

Professor Langsam said she serves on the All-University Student Affairs Committee and thought there has been a student code waiting for the structure committee to make some decisions. She wondered what the status of an IUPUI student code of conduct would be in relationship to that code. Professor White replied he had discussed this matter with Professor Pratter, chairman of the Bloomington Code of Student Conduct Committee, and he gave reasons for not taking further action. Professor White felt that we are perfectly proper in finishing the IUPUI code, in presenting it to Council, and then in presenting it for approval to the Chancellor for his presentation to the University administration and Board of Trustees. He added we really have been given a great deal of autonomy regarding this code. The committee has tried to combine both Purdue and IU tradition and come up with a code which is uniquely IUPUI.

Organization of Student Services

Professor Byrne commented he felt that this document suggests the need for faculty organization concerned predominantly with undergraduate education, insofar as the structure proposed here draws authoritative lines of control for those units that are concerned with undergraduate education, but only lines of liaison with the various student bodies and professional schools, at which point we have something referred to as an IUPUI student affairs operation. Professor White replied that last year a student who was President of the Student Union Board and a senior in the Law School did a study on all university student organizations. Essentially he consulted with students, faculty and administrators and it was the consensus at that particular time that we would not have a total unified student organization for IUPUI. This would come about, and should properly come about, but it had to be an evolutionary occurrence with development of the campus units. This report has pointed out, along with discussions in this committee, the need to have some merger of undergraduate activities from 38th St. and the Downtown Campus, and to have a good student service program for undergraduate activities. Ultimately you would have some sort of greater unity of all between student bodies of all the the constituent units of IUPUI. Vice Chancellor Ryder said this is not really only undergraduate because there are graduate programs at the 38th St. Campus and Downtown Campus. So wherever there was an undergraduate program as well as graduate, it was included in one segment of this plan. Where there was a graduate program, in Medicine, Law and Dentistry, that already has an ongoing student services program, they left them alone for the moment. Dean Holmquist said she did not understand this explanation because within the School of Medicine there are undergraduate students in Allied Health Science. This is also true of Dentistry and Nursing. Nursing has had a very active student services program for many years and now has a student government operating. Vice Chancellor Ryder said there might be the possibility of the breaking out of Allied Health as a separate unit which would come under this program, but whether Dentistry, Law or Medicine would or not, he did not know. It may be that those programs within Dentistry and Medicine should not be included. They need to study this further.

Dean of Student Services

Professor Friedman asked what was meant when talking about a Dean for Student Services. He asked if this should be Dean of Students. Vice Chancellor Ryder said that the Dean of Students title traditionally included the disciplinarian kind of role. It did not include things now included under the Dean of Student Services, such as placement, financial aids, student housing, student activities, as well as the disciplinary role. Professor Friedman asked if there would be no Dean of Students as such. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied that he would not be called that because this traditional role does not fit in their judgment in this mechanism. Professor Friedman felt having a Dean of Student Services was a new concept to him, because some of that responsibility seems to be of a technical sort and not attached to the academic side of the University. One then wonders whether the title of Dean was appropriate. Chancellor Hine responded that they had discussed the matter of whether to call the position Director of Student Services or Dean of Student Services and they might still be convinced that Director is a better term.

Student Health Facilities

Professor Byrne noted that under the Dean of Student Services, one area is student health. At the present time, the undergraduate and non-medical center students do not have any medical services or medical facilities. He asked in what way could a program of student health facilities be provided under the structure as it is now envisioned. Chancellor Hine said they do have an active committee studying the point of student health. It is a very complex, very costly, and very important problem. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied that they are considering in the future running a very substantial student survey to determine what student needs are, since this is different than a residential campus. The committee felt an immediate need for a comprehensive plan for emergency care. Dean Irwin replied that there has been a committee formed to deal with student and employee health requests. They are in the process of doubling the space that now exists in the clinical building and are doubling professional health staff to a person and a half position. They are adding a variety of other people in the clinic and are in the process of trying to go to all schools and find out their needs so that eventually all of IUPUI can be included in an effective, meaningful student health service. He added that when you start from ground zero, as they did about six months ago, it does take awhile to put together the facilities and the staff. He added he would welcome input from any of the Deans or members of the Council about what they should be doing and asked that comments be referred to the Chancellor. Chancellor Hine commented he had received a letter from one of the private colleges in the area wanting to know if IUPUI would take on the health services of their student body. He said there is a national organization that meets quite frequently to discuss how to take care of student health problems. He thought this was not a simple problem, but they are facing it and hope to have some progress to report soon.

Administration of Student Services

Professor Langsam noted that on the committee's report it talks about centralization and unification, but on the diagram on the final page it seems to be nothing but proliferation. There is more than one student activities office. One is for the Blake Street Campus, one for the 38th St. Campus, and several for Herron, Normal, Nursing and Social Service. It seemed to her to be a proliferation of administrators. She wondered ultimately how many people this is going to require and suggested it might be more important to put more people into student health programs. A diagram like this gives no idea of the actual numbers of people involved. Chancellor Hine commented that so often when people see a chart, they think there is someone supposed to be in a specified position. This is really a function, not necessarily a person. Professor White said this is someone who may have eighteen other administrative functions, who teaches 9 hours, and is somebody who is currently identified with students in each of their respective units. They simply gave them this title. Professor Friedman asked if the Council was being asked to pass on this report or was it just for information purposes. Professor White said it was for information purposes only. Chancellor Hine said if there were no further comments, he assumed Council has received the informational report.

Presiding Officer's Business

The Chancellor thought the Council might be interested in a brief discussion of the technique that was used to select the new President. The Board of Trustees faced a serious problem in naming a new President. They met for several hours and had telephone conversations after their meeting in trying to decide what to do. They felt that if they appointed a search and screen committee, they faced a delay of perhaps six months. When the search and screen committee was appointed for the identification of President Sutton, they labored a long time and had a long list of people to interview. The Board felt the University had now been without a continuous kind of leadership for two years, due to President Sutton's illnesses and the illness of his wife. It was their concern that if this would be continued another year, it would be really damaging to the University. The Board knew the legislature was in session and that it was important to have strong University leadership at this time. So the Board of Trustees faced a dilemma of breaking with tradition and moving rapidly, or going through the throws of a search and screen committee. After talking with representative Deans from campuses and faculty members in Bloomington, they finally decided to make an appointment. They decided the logical man for the position was John W. Ryan, who had experience from outside of the University and who had been here long enough to be completely familiar with the IU system. He had further advantage of being familiar with the regional campuses and Indianapolis. President Ryan himself recognized that he was being appointed under conditions that might result in some resentment on the part of the faculty, so he specifically asked that this be a three year appointment with faculty and student committees reviewing his performance. Chancellor Hine felt sure the Board of Trustees has no intention of following this procedure in the future. They have been very positive in saying they felt compelled to act under the emergency situation the way they did. Professor Nagy asked if the degree of urgency was such that the Board had to act with such speed. He asked if some formal structure or committee could have been appointed and given a deadline or if the Board could not have talked in terms of a week or two weeks, if the crisis was to that degree. Chancellor Hine felt that could have been possible, but the Board felt they would not have time to make a search and screen kind of an operation. Chancellor Hine thought the Board would want him to express the feeling that they acted with much reluctance, but with the feeling they had to appoint a President because of the situation. Professor Nagy asked if Deans were consulted from the Indianapolis campus. Chancellor Hine said he was unable to get any Deans to accompany him to the meeting in Bloomington because they all had previous commitments. However, in Bloomington there were Deans from Business, Music, Arts and Sciences, HPER, and the Secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council consulted.

Agenda Committee Business

Professor Bogar reported the Agenda Committee was requesting the Council to approve a special meeting on February 25, 1971. He said two items they felt should be considered at that meeting were: (1) report of the Committee on Committees, chaired by Professor Wagener; and (2) a report from the Student Affairs Committee on the student code. Professor White said that at the time of the Agenda Committee meeting, it was his committee's thought they would have a report ready by February 25. However, now they will not have it available until the March meeting. Professor Langsam asked to have the reason why we needed this special meeting. Professor Wagener replied that at the Agenda

Committee meeting they had an agenda that simply would not have been able to have been covered by the totality of this present meeting. At that time there were other items that could not be included on this agenda. There has been too much in the past year that we have operated a tendency to let everything pile up to the end and this was an attempt to see if we could keep it from piling up at the end of the semester, when everyone is so busy. Professor White apologized to Professor Bogar for his committee assumed they would have the document on student code completed. He felt that the code will take some time to read through and there might be a substantial portion of one meeting devoted to it. He added he thought it might be wise to take some normal items that might be on the March agenda and take care of them at a special meeting so they can have more time to discuss the code at the meeting. Professor Bogar added that at the March meeting there are such things pending as a report on academic affairs from the Academic Affairs Committee, that was charged with bringing together all of the knowledge available on restructuring the undergraduate program of IUPUI. In addition to that, the Faculty Affairs Committee has a resolution from the Gary Northwest Campus concerning academic fringe benefits, specifically referring to the Blue Cross-Blue Shield increase which occurred last year. The Faculty Affairs Committee also has in its deliberations the problem of staff and faculty transportation locally here to the new westside campus. Therefore, it is not a lack of items, but he felt that April and May meetings might not be enough to do the job. Professor Bogar moved to have a special meeting of the Council. Professor Friedman seconded the motion. Professor Higgins suggested that we try and see what can be done at the March 11 meeting and if it does seem like we cannot finish the agenda, then he thought a special meeting might be called for. The motion was defeated, 16 to 10.

Faculty Benefits

Chancellor Hine asked to comment briefly on the Blue Cross-Blue Shield issue. He asked the Faculty Affairs Committee to check with Mr. Lautzenheiser because a study was made at the time this increase was made and he has some interesting information about it. Professor Meiere asked if the Council calls a special meeting if agenda items can be presented in the normal course of events or is the agenda fixed. Professor Bogar replied the Agenda Committee fixes the agenda and will consider all things presented to them. Aside from that, however, the Agenda Committee can request any committee report on matters presented to it by the Agenda Committee. Professor Meiere said it was his understanding that the committee was going to present a synopsis at some future date on what happened before they acted and they are not going to present that particular issue to the Faculty Council. In other words, a letter came that requested action of the Council and it was referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee. They felt they took care of it and would present their action and whatever actions they took all at once, but not a specific item dealing with the letter that was sent from Northwest.

New Business

Professor Langsam asked to go back to the resolution passed earlier with regard to Professor Wagener's resolution. It seemed to her it might be appropriate to have some kind of cut-off point at which time they could have the committee report to the Council. She thought that at least some word about the progress

the committee is having or making might be a very useful kind of guideline. Chancellor Hine asked her if she was suggesting the committee report at the next meeting. Professor Langsam thought a progress report within two months with some definitive statement would be appropriate. Chancellor Hine asked the committee to give a progress report at the next meeting. He felt this was a very complex document, has many legal implications, and is not something that can be handled in a short time.

Procedure Concerning Professor Wagener's Resolution

Professor Kinzer asked about the matter of the proposal referred to the Academic Affairs Committee. He said all he had been able to pick up, as to a course of action which his committee might take, would be to poll the faculty and see what they thought on the subject. If this is done, he wanted the Faculty Council to note that the committee does not have any resources to conduct such an operation. His committee had done this once before and the paper work, typing, reproduction of ballots, were done in a very haphazard fashion with part of it charged against departmental teaching budgets. He wondered where one could get secretarial help to conduct such a poll. Chancellor Hine felt the committee might read the resolution with care, for it breaks down into several different divisions, some legal and some not legal. He suggested the committee to come back at the next meeting with a report of how to approach the various problems. If the committee needs secretarial help, he suggested the committee call upon him and he would see what he could get. He did not feel the committee would immediately want to take a poll of the faculty until they get down to the issues involved. Professor Kinzer replied he did not intend to take a poll of the faculty, but he referred to this because it had come out of comments made as a course of action. Professor Weber suggested that polling the faculty would be polling ignorance because they do not yet know the money issues, legal issues, accreditation issues, or faculty-student issues. Chancellor Hine thought if the committee would focus in on this, these would be some of the questions that would arise when they consider the resolution. Professor Langsam asked the Chancellor for a point of clarification. Earlier the Chancellor mentioned the fact that a resolution should be sent to an appropriate committee. She wanted to know if a resolution can appear without having gone through a committee. Chancellor Hine felt it should have the benefit of careful scrutiny by a group of the Faculty Council. He felt it is not fair to ask the Faculty Council to act upon a complex motion without having a chance to have it studied and some of the implications called to their attention.

Athletic Affairs

Professor Friedman commented that a number of weeks ago Council had passed an important resolution with respect to the athletic program. He had been looking for some notice of it in the local newspapers, and it seemed to him that when Council comes to a conclusion to have a basketball team, it ought to get some kind of publicity. Chancellor Hine commented that there was nothing in that action that told the Chancellor where to find the money for that. Professor Friedman said he thought it might not be a bad idea if some of the items dealt with in Council meeting be advertised.

University Relations

Vice Chancellor Ryder commented on a report on University relations development. The University Relations at IUPUI has been reorganized. A leaflet has already been given to all the Deans and representatives of each unit. The University relations group now consists of Harrison Ullman, Director of News Bureau; Charles Hardy, Director of Community Relations; and Noel Duerden, Director of Publications. These positions are IUPUI wide. They have also established a University Relations Council which includes representation from each unit. These people are: Paul Barton, Dentistry; Alvin Bynum, Downtown; Raymond Kane, Graduate School of Social Service; Bennie Keller, 38th St.; Charles Kelso, Law School; Nick Kestner, Alumni Association; Sheila Lawrence, Herron; George Lukemeyer, Medical School; Elton Ridley, Hospitals; Rudolph Schreiber, Normal; Helen Weber, Nursing. The Council has met twice now and he believed they are beginning to focus in on some of the problems of communication, both internal and external. He cautioned putting people together does not give us all the resources that we need, and various schools and departments are still going to have to contribute a great deal to this. Each faculty member is a public relations agent for the total University.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
March 11, 1971
Roof Lounge

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Foust, Lawrence, McDonald, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Bogar, Bixler, Boyd, Byrne, Challoner, Friedman, Gifford, Hackney, Hutton, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Mandelbaum, Meiere, Nagy, Norins, Ross, Schreiber, Sehlinger, Tennant, Wagener, Weber, J. White.

Members Absent: Deans Holmquist, Irwin, B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Berkshire, Behnke, Chetkow, Dalphin, Daly, DeMyer, Forney, Garner, Glover, Hopper, Higgins, Jarboe, Johnston, Kelso, Mamlin, Ochs, Sagraves, Simmons, A. White, Wisner.

Visitors: Robert Marks, E. W. Shrigley, Ronald Bryant, William Spencer.

Agenda

1. Approval of minutes of February 11, 1971.
2. Interim Report of Academic Affairs Committee on Resolution Concerning State and University Relations.
3. Interim Report of Student Affairs Committee on Student Code.
4. Interim Report of Faculty Affairs Committee.
5. Interim Report of Committee on Committees.
6. Agenda Committee Business
 - a. Election of Faculty Board of Review
 - b. Election of Election-Appportionment Committee
 - c. Report on All-University Constitution
 - d. Notice of General Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, May 18, 1971, 4:00 p.m.
7. Presiding Officer's Business.
8. New Business.

Vice Chancellor Buhner called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Minutes of the February 11, 1971 meeting of the Council were approved as distributed.

Interim Report of Academic Affairs Committee on the
Resolution Concerning State and University Relations.

Professor Kinzer reported there was no interim report and he was surprised to find it on the agenda. He added his committee had met twice since the last Council meeting and they are very busy on the question of university structure and organization. Professor Bogar pointed out that it was the Council's request, made at the January meeting, that the Academic Affairs Committee give an interim report on the resolution concerning state and university relations.

Interim Report of Student Affairs Committee on Student Code of Conduct.

Professor White reported that members of the Council should have received a draft copy of the proposed student code. He explained that this was a draft copy and not a finished product. He indicated that his committee wished to have substantial student consultation on this code, and by the time they formally present the completed document for Council action, they will have this consultation. He felt it might not be proper to have a discussion of the code in full at the present Council meeting since Council members had just received the code, because there are some additional changes, and also they wish to get some further student input.

Identifying Students.

Professor Byrne asked if there was any distinction between statements that begin 'students,' the 'student,' or 'student body.' In one case he noted that the student body has certain rights and then the next page says 'students' have a certain right. Professor White replied the student body is collectively the body or its representatives. He added that the section Professor Byrne was referring to needs substantial changes to make it consistent throughout. His committee was trying to get substance down, rather than form. When the draft is completed, this should be noted and resolved. Professor Lohse asked about the term 'fiscal-legal' concerning student organizations being recognized by the University. She wanted to know if this meant that if the University supplies any financial resources, it therefore has a legal affiliation. Also, she asked if you can have a fiscal relationship or a legal relationship, or must it be the two together. Professor White responded that as it is used in the code, in a hyphenated form, it means the two together. He added this was something he was not certain on and that this particular phrase came to the committee through Dean Wolf. He added he thought the committee should explore this a bit more.

Student Input.

Professor Nagy asked to what degree and what type of input the committee had received from students in drafting the code. Professor White responded that last April the committee began a series of meetings with students who were the elected heads of their student bodies of each campus, school or division of the university. Next the committee decided to have a subcommittee made to draft the code. This committee consisted of Dean Wolf, a student, and Professor White. Now they are having meetings with two groups, a representative of the president of each of the student assemblies of each of the schools of IUPUI, plus the members of the Student Advisory Committee of IUPUI. They have all received a copy of the code

and have been asked to circulate this among their officers and bring back comments to the committee.

Student Rights.

Professor Gifford said he was impressed with the number of times student rights were mentioned and asked if the committee had considered that some of these rights might be privileges. Professor White responded that the specificity they use has been due to a series of cases over the past two years dealing with students' rights; cases in which the courts have detailed students' rights. This is why there is much greater detail than student codes formerly had. Professor Kinzer thought in one aspect it has much less specificity than it might have in that here they are specifying the action which constitutes misconduct such as dishonesty, cheating and plagiarism, knowingly furnishing false information, forging, alteration and unauthorized use of university documents, records and personal property. He asked if that was all inclusive for all cases for plagiarism, all cases of cheating, etc. Professor White responded that this could mean any sort of dishonesty. Professor Kinzer asked if then a case can be instituted by the Dean of Student Affairs. Professor White said the case would be instituted by the Dean of Student Affairs. The committee tried to draft a general document and noted the policy taken by the Dean of Student Affairs and the Faculty Council as one of allowing each school to essentially handle most of its disciplinary problems. He did not believe Dean Wolf plans to substantially change this, but we do have to have some official office to channel all of these actions through.

Identifying Students.

Professor Weber said she did not find any definition in the code of who is a student. She felt we are all aware of the fact that there are some professional students who go from campus to campus, take one course, never attend class, and who use this as a stepping stone to all sorts of undesirable activities. Professor White said that in 2-1C, it states a university student means any person who is admitted and enrolled in any course at the university. It does not attempt to define full-time or part-time. Professor Friedman said in connection with specificity, he was puzzled about the last clause in 2-5N which says "conduct which threatens or interferes with maintenance or appropriate order and discipline of the operation of the University." It seemed to him to be a very elastic clause and allows a great deal of discretion to administrators who are in a position to take action. Professor White said Dean Foust and he had discussed this clause. He thought it was drafted vaguely and the committee is going to work with this clause before the document is finally considered.

Review Board.

Professor Friedman asked if there was any consideration given to changing the ratio of students to the faculty on the two review boards from a 2 to 1 ratio and a 3 to 2 ratio. He said that because students are being tried for alleged offenses, it might be more desirable to have a majority of students on these boards. Professor White replied this is something that will be again considered by his committee. Professor White thought one might make the argument that the evolution of a purely student court or something of this sort makes good sense. He added the ratio we have in here is the ratio that is spelled out in Bloomington, which the Board of Trustees have accepted. He further said that now Bloomington

does have one significant difference in this respect than we do. They permit a hearing officer, a faculty member, without any student. We provide a hearing commission at all times. We have a three man commission which guarantees some student involvement in the judication process at all times.

Chancellor Hine assumed the chairmanship at 3:45 p.m.

Approval Procedure of Code.

Professor Meiere asked if this proposed code would have to be approved by the Purdue Board of Trustees. Professor White thought that when this code was approved by this Faculty Council, it would go for approval to the administrative council of Deans of IUPUI, next to the Chancellor for approval, and then to the administration in Bloomington. Lastly they would forward it to the IU Board of Trustees. But insofar as there will be Purdue people as part of IUPUI coming in under this document, it would then have to be approved by the Purdue Board of Trustees. Chancellor Hine commented he did not believe it is technically required that the Purdue Board approve this document, but he has taken the attitude that he wants to keep them well informed. He said he would see that they understand it, and if they have any questions to raise, they would consider them very carefully. In other words, he thought we do not have to have their approval, but thought it would be desirable. Professor Byrne asked in what way does the code, once approved, relate to or possibly supersede the student code adopted by the All-University Council of Indiana University. He also wanted to know how one might submit questions, objections, or comments to the committee. Professor White said that if any members of the Council had comments regarding the code to send them to him for consideration by the committee. Chancellor Hine suggested that since this will come up at a subsequent meeting, it can be considered in detail then. Professor Wagener asked the Chancellor to inform the Council what is the relationship between this code and the code which was passed by the All-University Council. Chancellor Hine said it was his understanding that IUPUI has the right to pass its own code. He added he would, of course, make certain that there are no great differences between the two. If there are, they will be reconciled.

Introduction of New Head of Safety Division.

Chancellor Hine said for sometime now they have felt it desirable to reorganize IUPUI's Safety Division. They have selected a new man to be director of the Safety Division and Chancellor Hine introduced him to the Council. His name is Ronald F. Bryant. Mr. Bryant comes to IUPUI from the Marion County Sheriff's Office. He has been associated twelve years with the Sheriff's Office here in Indianapolis and has been the principal executive officer and Deputy Chief of this department since 1966. Mr. Bryant has worked with Allison Division in their Personnel Department, has been in the Fire Department in Wayne County, commander of the Traffic Division of Indianapolis for three years, and commander of the Personnel and Training Division of the Sheriff's Office here. Mr. Bryant is also a student in the IUPUI School of Law. His responsibility will be to coordinate all the safety activities for 38th St., Medical Center, and the Downtown Campus. Mr. Bryant said it was his pleasure to be associated with the University. It has been his belief that any safety division deals with only one specialty and that is service. He added he hopes to meet personally with department heads to see if there are any particular problems and to offer his services in any way possible.

Interim Report of Faculty Affairs Committee.

Professor Bixler said the first item he wanted to bring to the attention of Council for their consideration was a recommended procedure for promotion. (See attached Faculty Council Document #9.) The Faculty Affairs Committee recognized that IU and PU were different in many ways and that the schools themselves had many different procedures within them. They hoped they could come up with a document which would be a recommendation for a uniform procedure. What the committee now wants to do is give Council an opportunity to study in some detail their recommendations and then come back at another meeting of Council to discuss this matter in a little more depth.

Reimbursement of Travel Cost.

The second item Professor Bixler wanted to bring up concerned a letter received by Professor Bogar from Professor Peter Sehlinger, the Secretary of the Downtown Campus Faculty Assembly. He summarized the letter by saying the Faculty Assembly of the Downtown Campus has proposed that the Faculty Council of IUPUI be asked to form a committee to investigate the policy of departmental financial support of faculty for the conduct of professional activities. Specifically items of reimbursement of travel costs and per diem are to be considered. The Faculty Affairs Committee has considered this problem and asked to submit a resolution to the Faculty Council for action. The resolution would read as follows: "It is hereby requested that the Faculty Council of IUPUI appoint a committee for the purpose of establishing a policy concerning reimbursement of expenses incurred for various professional activities in which the faculty participates."

Motion to Adopt Resolution.

Professor Bixler moved that this resolution be adopted. Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Byrne asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee, by making this motion, was excluding themselves. Professor Bixler replied that they had decided it was not within their domain to appoint a subcommittee or to even assume the job themselves as a committee. They thought it best to bring it to the Council and then let the Council assign this problem to whatever committee they wished.

Motion to Amend Main Motion.

Professor Byrne moved to amend the motion specifically referring the resolution to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Professor Langsam seconded. Professor Meiere commented that it was felt by a good number of people on the Faculty Affairs Committee that there would be a number of items like this that come to the attention of the Council and would be referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee. But if they try to handle all the factual gathering of data necessary to answer all of these questions, the Faculty Affairs Committee would not only be swamped with work, it would not be able to discharge its function to consider faculty affairs at large. He felt they have done essentially all the work on the promotion procedure document, but it was their opinion that in order to serve the Council's needs better, they should serve as a clearing house for the majority of matters and not actually attempt to gather information to make a recommendation themselves. Professor Wagener said it seemed to him that originally the Council passed a document dealing with committee structure and one of the recommendations was that each committee be allowed to function with as many subcommittees as it felt necessary. Professor Bogar replied that this was in the final report of the

Committee on Committees. Professor Bixler said that if the Council decides to delegate this problem to them, they will form a subcommittee to handle it. The motion to amend the main motion to refer this matter to the Faculty Affairs Committee was carried. The main motion to refer the resolution to a special committee was passed unanimously. The Chancellor then asked Professor Bixler if he had any further comments to make to Council. Given a negative response, he said the Agenda Committee would place the document on the May agenda for discussion.

Introduction of New Council Representative.

Chancellor Hine introduced Mr. Robert Marks who was elected as a unit representative from John Herron School of Art for a two-year term beginning fall, 1971.

Interim Report of the Committee on Committees.

Professor Wagener reported that one recommendation his Committee is making has to do with the problem of communication and continuity of committees. (The Committee's recommendations are contained in Faculty Council Document #10 attached.) Professor Wagener moved that these recommendations be received and be implemented. Professor Nagy seconded. Chancellor Hine commented he felt there should be a date included after recommendation A. He asked if December 1 would be acceptable. Professor Wagener felt that would be satisfactory.

Chairmanship of Committees.

Professor Gifford asked Professor Wagener to elaborate on recommendation B, in view of the fact that somewhere it says a chairman of a committee must be a Faculty Council member. Professor Wagener replied we essentially have two sets of committees, some that are administratively appointed and others that come out of the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council does have this kind of liaison because there is at least one member on every committee. One problem has been establishing liaison between administrative committees and other relevant groups, particularly the Faculty Council. He added he felt the more communication and liaison established, the better off we could be in terms of keeping informed. Chancellor Hine then suggested that in recommendation B it probably should read "that where an administrative committee does not include a Faculty Council member, that a Council member be included where deemed necessary to function as a liaison for the Faculty Council." Chancellor Hine said he has found it desirable to appoint many committees and he usually asks various Deans to suggest someone to place on the committee. The person they pick is knowledgeable in the field and may or may not be a member of the Faculty Council. He asked Professor Wagener if all administrative committees should be structured in such a way that a Faculty Council member would be on that committee. Professor Wagener replied that the reason they included "where we deemed necessary" was that it is felt that there would be cases where the Chancellor's discretion would apply to a committee that was not relevant or that liaison did not need to be established. Chancellor Hine asked, if under recommendation D, minutes of all administrative committees were to be included. Professor Wagener said the committee was referring here to Faculty Council committees.

Vote on Motion.

Chancellor Hine suggested the motion to approve this report be changed to be approved as edited. The editorial changes will add "by December 1" after recommendation A, the word "administrative" before the word committee in recommendation B, and the word "Faculty Council" ahead of committee in recommendation D. The motion carried.

Agenda Committee Business.

The Agenda Committee circulated the names of five nominees for the Faculty Board of Review. All five men listed had agreed to serve on the Board if elected. These men were: Edwin Casebeer, Paul Galanti, Isidore Mandelbaum, Robert Neel, Glen Sagraves. Professor Bogar moved these nominees be elected to the Board of Review. Motion seconded by Professor Friedman. Professor Byrne asked what was the function of the Faculty Board of Review. Professor Bogar replied that the Faculty Board of Review is an appeal board from administrative decision. It functions as an appeal board for an individual faculty member concerning administrative decisions regarding tenure, promotions, and conditions of work.

Jurisdiction of Board of Review.

Professor Byrne asked if the Agenda Committee saw any particular complication arising from the fact that promotion and tenure with regard to part of the IUPUI faculty is not within the authority of this body. Professor Byrne added that according to the agreement of the Boards of Trustees of December 1970, it was his understanding that all questions of appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure with regard to 38th St. personnel shall be referred to Purdue University. Therefore, he saw a certain problem arising with regard to the function of the Board of Review, as Professor Bogar described its functions. Chancellor Hine replied he thought that if someone wanted to object, they would go to the Board of Review. The Board of Review could not correct the grievance, but they could rule on it. Then the ruling would be referred to the Board of Trustees of IU or Purdue. Professor Byrne said that as he understood the agreement, the faculty of IUPUI associated with an IU mission have no voice whatsoever in questions of appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure with regard to faculty associated with a Purdue mission. Therefore, there would seem to be a problem associated with having a member of a department that has a Purdue mission acting as a member of an IUPUI Board of Review.

Role of Purdue Trustees.

Chancellor Hine replied that as he understood it, the Purdue Board of Trustees has legal power on recommendations that are made by IUPUI. In saying it another way, he said IUPUI faculty do have something to say about Purdue, but the final voice comes from the Purdue Board of Trustees. Vice Chancellor Ryder said that on promotion that is true. He did not see, however, the review procedure as being something which would be objectionable at all by Purdue University. In other words, the same procedures can be used for both cases. He did not see any problem with this mechanism as long as it is system wide, by having a Board of Review and having their recommendations forwarded to the Board of Trustees at Purdue. Vice Chancellor Ryder added that he saw the promotion procedure working in the future, if we adopt some uniform system so that everything would at least work up through the same system. The Chancellor basically would be recommending a group of people for Purdue rank to the Board of Trustees of Purdue and to the IU Board of Trustees for IU rank. Professor Friedman asked if this meant that Purdue faculty could avail themselves of this procedure. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied affirmatively.

Vote on the Motion.

The motion to elect the nominated faculty to the Faculty Board of Review was carried unanimously.

Election Apportionment Committee.

Professor Bogar circulated names of nominees to the Election-Apportionment committee. The primary job of this committee would be to conduct the at-large elections this spring to replace those persons whose at-large term expires at the end of this semester. Nominees for this committee are: David Challoner, Charles Hutton, Robert Kirch, Shirley Ross, Howard Wisner. Motion to elect these nominees to the Election-Apportionment committee was made by Professor Bogar, seconded by Professor Weber, and carried unanimously.

All University Council Representative Report.

Professor Bogar next asked Professor White, representative on the All-University Council, if he wished to comment on a draft of their Constitution that had been circulated from the Academic Affairs Office in Bloomington. Professor White replied that the copy circulated was not a draft copy of the entire document, but only a draft form which deals with the membership and elections process. The total Constitution has not been completed yet, and if we are to implement it, the existing All-University Constitution has to be amended in spring and elections must be held at all units of IU for a new representative body next fall. This is why this section has been circulated from the existing All-University Faculty Council with the suggestion from the chairman of the Faculty Constitution Committee that this be discussed on campuses at IU.

Part-time Faculty Representation.

Professor White went on to say we are concerned here because we have a great many part-time people at IUPUI, particularly at the Medical and Dental School, and in the overall recognition of the Constitution, there should be proper recognition given to these people. Chancellor Hine said he wanted to be sure the wording was clear enough so people know what 'faculty' refers to. Professor White replied that 'faculty' means university faculty as a whole. He mentioned there has been concern about this by a number of people and the final document will spell this out a bit more explicitly. But when faculty is used with a capital F, it means faculty of the University as a whole. We are not giving up some autonomy that has been granted to each unit or school within each unit to the All-University Faculty Council. Professor Nagy asked if there was any discussion given to why part-time people, and full-time people without full faculty rank, were excluded. Professor White replied this is essentially the tradition of the current campuses in voting of faculty as voting members are designed as full-time faculty members. Chancellor Hine commented he has long felt that some part-time teachers contribute much to our teaching program and that our campus is somewhat different than the Bloomington campus in this regard. He added he would like to have part-time people represented on the Faculty Council. He felt they have a little different point of view in many cases and they have much to contribute. He thought there is some reason to consider full-time equivalent as the basis for appointment of voting members rather than full-time. This would be advantageous because we would get more votes. But at the moment it is on the basis of full-time appointees. According to the figures Bloomington is using, Bloomington has 1535 and IUPUI has 690 votes. You can get two different sets of figures on full-time faculty depending upon where you draw the line. These figures include lecturers and above and do not include research associates, associate instructors, graduate assistants, or research associates. This is the

basis they have always used and that is the basis they are using now. His question was does the Council think we ought to continue this or should we recommend consideration of use of full-time equivalents for deciding votes. Professor Wagener asked if this would be only in terms of the All-University Council. Chancellor Hine replied it was only for this document.

Voting Members of Faculty.

Professor Byrne said as he understood the distinction between section 21A, 1, 2 and 3, number 1 is indicating who of our members may serve as representatives on this Council. Number 3 seems to indicate what group of people will be counted in determining how many of those representatives we may have. Under number 2, it seems to be a matter of immediate urgency for it is telling us it is up to the individual campus to determine who of its members may vote for those representatives. He asked if we have any procedure for doing this at this time. Professor White replied that he was correct. Chancellor Hine said that some campuses do not have a Faculty Council, so they will have to have a general election. Others have a Faculty Council, so each campus can determine how they want to proceed. Professor Byrne said that how we want to proceed was his question. Chancellor Hine replied we could not proceed in implementing this until this is adopted by the existing All-University Faculty Council. Professor Byrne replied that lecturers, to take one group, are excluded from the group of those who may actually serve on the All-University Council by virtue of 21A-1. Full-time lecturers will be included in that total number which would be used to determine apportionment, but the question remains open as to who of our members of the IUPUI faculty will vote for representatives. It seems to be left open by 21A-2. Professor Bogar said Council has defined voting members before in terms of our own Constitution. Professor Langsam asked if resident lecturers vote for Faculty Council. Professor Bogar replied they do not vote.

Representation on All-University Council.

Professor Byrne said that at the present time the All-University Faculty Council Constitution says only that the Chancellor may appoint members. Professor Bogar answered that our present membership on the All-University Council is selected by the Faculty Council, not the Chancellor. Professor White asked Professor Byrne if he was suggesting an amendment to the IUPUI Faculty Constitution and if so, this might properly be studied at the time that the Constitution is reviewed at the end of the year and the Bylaws are considered. Professor Bogar pointed out he felt they were talking about two things. One is we do not have a procedure for electing representatives to the All-University Council on a campus-wide basis. Secondly, we have already defined what is a voting faculty membership. He felt these are two different things. Professor Langsam said when we do consider these matters, she thought we should consider the strangeness of counting resident lecturers to determine our total membership on the All-University Faculty Council and having the Faculty Council vote for those members. She said it seemed to her that given the nature of the regional campuses and IUPUI, the large number of part-time people that we do use should be reflected because these people are part of our strength as well as our full-time faculty. It does not seem to her that in the future this situation is going to change radically. She added she would have hesitations about the whole document because a good percentage of the faculty here and at other regional campuses in essence are being excluded in terms of numbers or having a voice in the activities of the All-University Faculty Council. Professor White said the Chancellor has figures that show there are substantially greater numbers of lecturers on the Bloomington campus than there are here and that he assumed they are resident lecturers because they are included in the full-time figures. Professor Langsam said she was not speaking about resident

lecturers, only part-time or associate faculty. Chancellor Hine replied that her first point made was an inconsistency and they will try to straighten that out. Her second point on part-time is true and in many fields the part-time people do have a contribution to make and he would like to see it recognized. He said he wanted to reopen the question of counting at least the half-time people who are part-time or more on a basis of full-time equivalents, if no one on Council objects.

Motion on the Method of Apportionment.

Professor Langsam moved that the Council instruct its representative on the All-University Council to try to get the determination of apportionment of votes on the basis of full-time equivalents. Professor Byrne seconded. Professor Meiere asked if this figure for the campus included people in Purdue mission areas. Chancellor Hine said he did not know, for he has two sets of figures. He has asked them to send him in detail how they collected the figures, but he has not yet received that information. Professor Meiere asked if Purdue faculty members are eligible to serve on the All-University Council. Professor White replied he assumed they were. Chancellor Hine thought this would be true, but he said he would check the figures when they are verified. The motion was voted on and carried.

General Faculty Meeting.

Professor Bogar reported that the Constitution calls for the Chancellor to hold a general faculty meeting each fall and spring. Tentatively the date for this is Tuesday, May 18, 1971 at 4:00 p.m.

Nominations Committee.

Professor Bogar reported that the Nominations Committee must be elected at the April meeting. The Nominations Committee is concerned with nominating to the Council faculty members for the positions of Secretary and Parliamentarian for next year.

Presiding Officer's Business.

Chancellor Hine reported the legislature is in session and it does appear that we will have some difficulty in adding to our budget. There have been attempts made to increase our operating budget, but until something is decided on the tax bill, we may not have much success. He added he had noticed in the student publication from the Downtown Campus the comment made that the University in Bloomington got a higher percentage of their request recommended by the budget agency than did the regional campuses and IUPUI. This is correct, but if it is checked, the increase that is recommended for IUPUI is one and one-half percent larger than the increase recommended for Bloomington.

New Business.

Professor White moved there be a special meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Council on Thursday, March 25, 1971 to discuss the IUPUI Student Code of Conduct. The motion was seconded by Professor Friedman and carried. Professor Wagener asked if the meeting would be limited to just the code. Professor Bogar assured the Council that this meeting would be limited to the student code business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL
April 15, 1971
Roof Lounge, Student Union Building

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellor Ryder; Deans Lawrence, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Bixler, Bogar, Challoner, Garner, Gifford, Hackney, Higgins, Kelso, Meiere, Nagy, Norins, Ross, Segraves, Simmons, Tennant, Weber, J. White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Vice Chancellor Buhner; Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, McDonald, B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Berkshire, Behnke, Boyd, Byrne, Chetkow, Dalphin, Daly, DeMyer, Forney, Friedman, Glover, Hopper, Hutton, Kinzer, Kirch, Langsam, Jarboe, Johnston, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Ochs, Schreiber, Sehlinger, Wagener, A. White.

Visitors: R. Fredland, N. Kestner, R. Marks, F. Nash, D. Neal, R. Paradise.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of March 11, 1971.
2. Interim Report of Committee on Committees (Wagener).
3. Interim Report of Staff Affairs Committee (Gifford).
4. Interim Report of Resources and Planning Committee (Friedman).
5. Report on Commencement (Kestner).
6. Agenda Committee Business
 - a. Election of Nominations Committee
7. Presiding Officer's Business.
8. New Business.

Chancellor Hine called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. He informed the Council he would not be able to stay for the entire meeting, but had a few items he wished to place on the agenda.

Retirees Dinner.

Chancellor Hine said each year units have been asked to have a dinner for their faculty members who are retiring. This year the dinner will be only for IUI and will be on May 3. He hoped there would be good attendance.

Dedication of New Wing of Riley Hospital.

The Chancellor said on April 27 and 28 they would be dedicating the new wing of the Riley Hospital and he encouraged faculty to attend.

ROTC.

Chancellor Hine said he had received a call from a faculty member who said he was surprised to notice in the newspaper that IUPUI has an Air Force ROTC unit and wanted to know why this had not come to the attention of the Faculty Council. The Chancellor explained that IUPUI does not have an agreement with the Air Force ROTC or any other military group for ROTC training. He added we might discuss that at some time, if there is enough interest shown. Eventually there might be interest among our students to consider this. At the present time, however, some students at 38th St. wanted to take ROTC and were allowed to do so at Butler. It was suggested this year it might be good to have a clearer understanding about this, so an agreement was worked out between Butler and IUPUI stating that it would be possible, for any student who wished, to take Air Force ROTC. They already had ROTC training and wanted to take advanced training. The Chancellor said they felt that it would be a handicap if IUPUI said they could not. Later, Butler made a public announcement. The Chancellor did want to assure the Faculty Council that the Council was not being bypassed in setting up a new program, for we do not have an ROTC program with the Air Force at this time.

Legislature Report.

Chancellor Hine reported that the legislature was about to close and we are disappointed in the provisions that have been made for public higher education in Indianapolis for the next biennium. He hoped everyone would not be too unsatisfied with the budget as it is finally prepared. We will see only a limited amount of increase for the budget bill carries with it the statement that there will be no tuition fee increase without permission of the Commission on Higher Education in the next biennium. He said he just wanted to report that in spite of hopes and efforts, we do not have an appreciably larger budget than last year. We did not lose any ground and that is, in itself, to be considered a moral victory. He said we have many programs we wanted to expand and to initiate and now we will not be able to begin as many of them as we would like. We have the responsibility, therefore, of looking everywhere we can for funds, not only to the state appropriation, but to other areas as well. We must be innovative and see if we can come up with new sources of money.

Approval of Minutes.

Chancellor Hine turned the chair over to Vice Chancellor Ryder. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked for any corrections of the minutes for the last Council meeting. Since there were no corrections, the minutes were approved as distributed.

Interim Report of Staff Affairs Committee.

Professor Gifford reported for the Staff Affairs Committee. He handed out a resolution and asked Council to read it. (See Faculty Council Document #11, attached.) He said we ought to have some concern about the staff in the University. He was interested in the Chancellor's comment about the retirement dinner for faculty, and was also interested in the awards meeting for staff members who received 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25 year recognition. His committee feels there ought to be more done about people during their tenure. They also felt there ought to be more awards, incentives, and social activities for people. He stated his resolution suggested creating a review panel, similar to the faculty review panel, for the staff members. He said many people on the Downtown Campus and 38th St. Campus are ill at ease because of this consolidation. He felt everyone, from the Chancellor on down, has undoubtedly tried to make everyone feel at ease in this consolidation, but he was not sure it had been done very well. So he felt it should be the concern of the faculty to make everyone feel that they are a part of the whole scheme. Professor Higgins asked if there is any implied intent of the committee to have a second resolution on equal representation of all the various schools to make sure every school has some representative on such a review panel. Professor Gifford felt each Dean could appoint the best person. Professor Higgins asked if that would make an unwieldy panel. Professor Gifford felt it would not for we do not have many units and they would not meet very often. Professor Nagy asked to what extent had the staff itself been consulted on the resolution. Professor Gifford replied he and his committee had spent much time talking to interested staff members. He next introduced Mr. Duane, Director of Personnel at IUPUI.

Comments by IUPUI Personnel Director.

Mr. Duane said he appreciated the opportunity to speak to the Council. He informed the Council he has been here for five years as Personnel Director. The first month he was here there were 2,387 employees on the non-academic roster as full-time appointments. As of July 1, there will be a little over 3,600 people on non-academic full-time appointments. This does not include student employment, employees on a part-time basis, work study, or other miscellaneous hourly jobs that we have. There is tremendous responsibility in screening, referring, helping with training, administering the retirement program, the benefit insurance program, life and health insurance, as well as workmen's compensation claim program. A few years ago some articles, described as conditions for cooperation, were approved by the Board of Trustees. The conditions were written from an abstract from a presidential executive order which related to the right of public employees to organize for their own benefit. These conditions recognized and provided an avenue for the employees to organize on their own into groups or representative units to talk to management to present grievances, talk about working conditions, and resolve seniority questions. Presently we have an American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees, a local on this campus which represents service, maintenance and food service employees. He felt one of the biggest reasons they represent the employees is the word 'talk.' It creates an avenue of communication. It is amazing how much more cooperation we have been able to get once this avenue of communication was opened. He said he felt strongly that IUPUI should open this avenue rather than have someone else open it. We should take pride in our relationships with staff or faculty members. Since we are coming to the end of the legislative session, we may get a law which allows and provides for collective bargaining in the public sector. It would be bargaining

for salaries, negotiating for something, and then striving to get it from the wage and salary standpoint. He thought we need to work on our own public relations. The wage and hour law came into effect in 1967 and made specific rules about 40 hours a week and overtime. On January 1, 1972, we will come under the scope of the unemployment compensation law. Also, a federal law was passed last spring that states that those participating in federal unemployment compensation programs must rewrite their laws at the next opportunity.

Personnel Training.

We need to train our people so we can make our staff employees more effective not only to our uses as management, but more beneficial to themselves, resulting in better pay, better working conditions, and greater opportunity for advancement. He felt it is easier to keep someone by retraining them. He added he would be very appreciative of any affirmative action Council would take on this resolution. His office is willing to talk to anyone at any time about developing this program. He added he felt the staff personnel are very much in awe of faculty because of the aspect of the medical school and hospitals. There are people who have not walked the two blocks from Lockfield Garden to come over here because they did not think they were capable of being hired, but thought this place would not hire anyone who is not in the higher echelons of technical ability.

Personnel Retraining.

Dean Taylor said he appreciated what was being said, but was concerned about Mr. Duane's comment about it being easier or better to keep people by retraining them. Yet in the committee's third paragraph there is a suggestion about retraining. He wondered how you handle the kind of problem that he mentioned when a person is unproductive for a variety of reasons and then you decide to retrain him as a means of keeping him. He asked what is the means of transmitting to him your evaluation of his need for retraining and making him more productive. Mr. Duane said they were discussing this in relation to the apprentice program. The apprentice program is drawn out where an individual can be hired as an apprentice over a five year span, each serving a year at different craft levels and then come up for his class journey. Because it is set up on a five year program, it does not mean that the apprentice is going to reach that pinnacle in five years. His degree of ability may stop at first class apprentice or second class journeyman. Or, in the plumbing shop he may not be at all adaptable to the skills that are required in the plumbing shop. Within departments, promotions are determined by the craftsmen in that department. Retraining is more adaptable in skill craft areas than anywhere else. Dean Taylor replied he hoped that in the craft area policy is well interpreted and there is insistence that this is the policy so that on the spot evaluation will not be encouraged. One may well go from an early apprentice program and never become a journeyman in five years, with the changing technology. He may well go from being an alert apprentice to one who can do a fairly good journeyman's job in much less than the required time. There has to be this kind of understanding, particularly when you think of an area, such as Lockfield. Where this institution is concerned, there is a pretty big backlog of tradition both lore, legend and truth about what we have not done, and it is going to take quite a selling job. This selling job needs to take place within the supervisory structure of the institution and it may well be a blanket indictment is not in order. Mr. Duane said in speaking of training, that each department knows the technique required and their technology. We can provide in the area of training and are trying at this moment to get human relations training at the supervisory level. He added he had discussed the possibility of

a faculty interest in the staff program with the president of the union local. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked if the committee was proposing to move to consider the resolution.

Motion to Approve Resolution.

Professor Gifford moved to appoint a staff personnel review panel. Professor Kelso seconded. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked for discussion. Professor Kelso said he felt the entire resolution was so well drafted that he would like to see the Faculty Council accept and approve the report and the resolution as it stands in its entirety. Vice Chancellor Ryder said in effect, then, we are adopting the total report and resolution that this be established. The only problem he saw was it does not say how or who will do it. Professor Gifford responded that first he wanted to be sure we are reflecting faculty concern for this and that the Faculty Council ought to go on record they are interested in this. If the Chancellor will accept this, then he thought it should come out of the Chancellor's office. Motion to adopt the total report and resolution was carried.

Interim Report of Resources and Planning Committee.

David Neal presented the report for Bernard Friedman. Professor Neal said that in talking with Bill McLees before he left, they found out a lot of loose ends in planning and thought they would like to find out some answers. Therefore, they are requesting them in writing to obtain an authoritative response to the queries. (See Faculty Council Document #12, attached.) They realize that many of the questions could very well be discussed verbally, but they want to find out position rather than exact information. They wish to find the administration's formal position. They may want to further question that position or suggest changes, but first they need to know what the official position of the University is in regard to these items. This recommendation would lead to a motion to request the Council to present these requests to the Chancellor's office. Professor Nagy moved that the questions of the Resources and Planning Committee be officially forwarded to the administration. Professor Higgins seconded. Professor Meiere felt that several similar things have come before the Council before and the Council has said to these various committees to go ahead and do it on their own. He wondered why this committee did not just go ahead and ask for these things in writing. Professor Neal responded the reason they want a formal request and formal response in writing is to try to identify what the current position of the administration is with regard to planning. They found it very difficult to find out who is responsible for the planning of things. They feel that this will go on and on until they find out where we are at one point in time. Once they identify what the planning mechanism really is, they can go from there. He felt the formality was warranted in this case. Professor Kelso suggested, in fairness to the Chancellor, there might be some reasons why he might be in favor of answering this in writing; it could be done informally or he might have reasons to feel some of these questions might better be rephrased. He suggested this request be tabled until the Chancellor has an opportunity to look at this. Professor Tennant felt question #6 was the kind of question which would be handled by the newly formed parking committee which the Chancellor has appointed.

Planning for Parking.

Vice Chancellor Ryder responded he felt the Chancellor should be the one to respond to these questions. The Chancellor has established a system-wide parking committee

to establish policy with respect to the total parking system. Professor Neal said what the Vice Chancellor was doing then was what his committee wanted to defeat. Responding at a Faculty Council meeting to a question they felt might have been made aware of in the normal course of events was what he felt the Vice Chancellor was doing. His committee wants to try to stimulate normal interaction between the administration and the committee and not have questions answered on the spot. They want a routine for communications. Professor Nash said that in speaking with Bill McLees, the committee became aware that his office had no control over planning the parking and traffic problems. They felt it is impossible to do an adequate job of planning the physical aspects of this campus unless the planning division has the responsibility of parking and traffic flow. He could not see where appointing a separate committee to investigate the problems of parking would satisfy the overall problem of proper planning, coordination and growth of this University. Vice Chancellor Ryder agreed and said the parking committee is only to look at policy, not determine traffic flow. This should rightly be a part of planning. Planning also should be involved in discussing any policies that might be established. He added that planning has been inconsistent in the past and this needs to be changed. Contacts have been made for the employment of an individual to assume that role.

The Need of Formal Lines of Communication.

Professor Neal again stated his committee feels its responsibility is to bridge the Faculty Council and the formal planning procedures of the University. Right now they cannot find out what those formal procedures are, where they reside, or who is responsible. Vice Chancellor Ryder said there are none right now. Professor Neal said then what he wanted was answers to the questions so that the administration will go on record saying there are none, or that there are. He added that when they get the answers to these questions, then they can give some recommendations as to what that division might be like. Dean Lawrence felt the problem here is not so much question as to procedures to be followed to get answers to questions. He wondered again why the committee simply did not go to the Chancellor's office and present these questions. The way this document is phrased, it makes it sound as if pressure has to be brought on an office in order to get a response. Professor Neal felt they did not have a single route into the administration to find out planning at this time. We have a division and that division would be controlled and run by the Chancellor's office. They could go to the division of planning to deal with these questions, but right now they do not know where to go in the Chancellor's office. Vice Chancellor Ryder told Professor Neal they did not want to announce anything until they get a man to head the division. He said the whole thing will be explained and the relationships of how we can relate to the Faculty Council. They will explain what it is, what its function is, and its system-wide responsibilities.

Motion to Table.

Professor Kelso said the purpose of these questions was to stimulate a normal interaction between the Chancellor and the committee. He said he was convinced, and asked to move, this be tabled because he did not think normal interaction between the Chancellor and the committee should commence with this report. He thought normal interaction should be of a much different process, and if the committee really reports that information is not available in what should be normal interaction, then it would be time for the Council to take it off the table and work with it. He moved this be tabled. Professor Gifford seconded. Motion carried. Professor Nash asked if it was the intent then that the committee

go directly to the Chancellor's office with these questions. Dean Taylor hoped the committee does not feel it is incapacitated to go ahead and get information if this is imperative, if they have certain assumptions about the existence of this information.

Commencement Report.

Mr. Kestner reported for the Commencement Committee. He handed out a sheet which contained a listing of the up-to-date number of graduates by various schools that make up the IUPUI campus. (See Faculty Council Document #13, attached.) He also handed out a sheet which gives the members of the Committee on Commencement and Special Ceremonies. (See Faculty Council Document #14, attached.) He reported he felt the Commencement Committee was moving along with what they think is on schedule. They are doing several things that are new this year. Last year they received their script from the two mother campuses, but this year they are originating their own script. The committee has asked to have the program shortened and they are trying to do this. The committee has also asked to put more emphasis on students, which they have tried to do in writing the script. Another new item this year is that they plan at least two honorary degree recipients to be awarded. He asked if anyone had questions or recommendations they would like to see incorporated for commencement, and if so, to please submit them to their committee representative. He also mentioned that they have arranged for faculty that plan to participate in commencement to be provided with their cap and gown with no cost to the individual faculty member. They will still have to provide their own hood. They wish to encourage more faculty to attend the academic ceremony. He mentioned that for the Commencement planned for 1972, they hope to use the new convention center, provided it is finished. If it is not, they have arranged for the State Fair Colliseum to back them up. Mr. Kestner added that Commencement will be June 11 at 2:30 p.m. at the State Fair Colliseum. Professor Tennant asked if there was some way to alternate and not have schools in the same position each year. They were the last ones to come in last year and were very far back. It was very difficult to feel related to it. She thought it would help, if we are going to keep to a large graduation, to have some change in procedure so that simply because an initial starts with the last of the alphabet, they are not always at the end. Mr. Kestner said he would bring this to the attention of his committee.

Agenda Committee Business.

Professor Bogar circulated names of nominees to the Nominations Committee. The Nominations Committee is to nominate faculty for the positions of Secretary and Parliamentarian at the May meeting of the Council. With the stipulation that nominations were open from the floor, he moved that the nominees be elected to the Nominations Committee. Professor Nagy seconded the motion. Professors Robert Berkshire, Bernard Friedman, LaForrest Garner, James Higgins and James White were elected to the Nominating Committee. Professor Bogar added that the Nominations Committee would entertain suggestions from both the Faculty Council and the general faculty for these positions.

General Faculty Meeting.

Professor Bogar said the Agenda Committee has scheduled a general faculty meeting for Tuesday, May 18, 1971. This will be announced as soon as the complete agenda has been scheduled. He said he would accept suggestions for that agenda from the Faculty Council as well as from the general faculty. Dean Lawrence asked if this

would include a summary report by the Chancellor. Professor Bogar replied that any report of the Chancellor at this meeting will be at his discretion. There will be no specific request by the Agenda Committee that he make any kind of report. Dean Lawrence wondered if it might not be in order to make this known to the Chancellor. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked Professor Bogar why he was saying the faculty should let him know or contact him about the agenda. Professor Bogar replied that the Agenda Committee had not requested any particular kind of report from the Chancellor. They have discussed with him several state of the University messages by him, but they have not specified any particular form that those should take, or even if there should be any of that type of report at all. If other faculty wish to suggest things to the Chancellor, or if the Council wishes to go on record to suggest this to the Chancellor, it would be perfectly appropriate.

Purpose of Meeting.

Professor Higgins asked what the purpose of the meeting was and what was it to accomplish. Professor Bogar stated that the meeting is constitutionally required. What the Agenda Committee has suggested to the Chancellor as part of the agenda for this May 18 meeting is that several of the members of the Board of Trustees of either IU or PU and the local advisory group to the Chancellor be present at this meeting. Dean Lawrence said he was simply raising the question of calling the full faculty together. Vice Chancellor Ryder thought this would be a sort of progress and future report, but that if the faculty would raise questions and submit them to the Agenda Committee, these could be given to the Chancellor to weld into his response. If the Chancellor can get a sense of some of the problems and questions people have that are unanswered, perhaps he can answer them at this time. Professor Bogar replied any kind of input was what he was soliciting.

June Meeting of Faculty Council.

Professor Bogar said perhaps there might be a June meeting of Council, but that would have to be determined by the Council. The Agenda Committee has requested that chairmen who have not reported to Council as yet this year to make a report of their activities to the Council. This includes certain committees, such as the Faculty Board of Review, for example. They are required to report annually to the Council on what, if any, of their activities have taken place through the year. Professor Bogar will inform all committee chairmen of this fact.

Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Professor White passed out redraft copies of the Code for Student Rights and Responsibilities as discussed in Council's special meeting. This should encompass all the changes suggested by members of the Council at the meeting, as well as those changes communicated to the committee in the interim. In the document there was one additional change Professor White wanted to make. After making the change, Professor White asked members of the Council to look through the document and if they have any additional changes of the editorial nature, he asked them to communicate with him for they want to give the completed document to the Chancellor as soon as possible.

Law Day.

Professor White said the School of Law is involved in planning a Law Day program which will involve the entire University. They tried to pick a topic and program that would involve the entire University. They are having a panel discussion of the Law, the Draft, and You. They will have a student moderator, the chairman

of the State Selective Service Board, a Roman Catholic priest who is active in draft counseling, and two law professors discussing legal implications of the draft. This will be Wednesday, May 5 at 7:30 p.m. in the new auditorium building of the Downtown Campus. He hoped that members of the Council would come and encourage students who are interested to come.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

MINUTES OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL

May 13, 1971

Roof Lounge, Student Union Building

Members Present: Chancellor Hine; Vice Chancellors Buhner, Ryder; Deans Lawrence, J. Taylor; Director Lohse; Professors Behnke, Berkshire, Bixler, Bogar, Boyd, Byrne, Friedman, Gifford, Hackney, Higgins, Hutton, Jarboe, Johnston, Kinzer, Kirch, Meiere, Nagy, Norins, Ross, Schreiber, Sehlinger, Simmons, Wagener, Weber, J. White, Wisner.

Members Absent: Deans Foust, Holmquist, Irwin, McDonald, B. Taylor; Professors Ashmore, Challoner, Chetkow, Dalphin, Daly, DeMyer, Forney, Garner, Glover, Hopper, Kelso, Langsam, Mamlin, Mandelbaum, Ochs, Sagraves, Tennant, A. White.

Visitors: W. Spencer.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of minutes of April 15, 1971.
2. Report of Nominations Committee for Secretary and Parliamentarian (White).
3. Report of Elections Committee (Wisner).
4. Report of Board of Review (Behnke).
5. Report of Faculty Affairs Committee (Bixler).
6. Report on Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (White).
7. Agenda Committee Business
 - a. Report on All-University Council (Norins)
 - b. Summer meetings
8. Presiding Officer's Business
 - a. Budget report
9. New Business

Chancellor Hine called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. The minutes of the April 15, 1971 meeting were approved as distributed. Professor Kirch asked if it would be possible to list substitutes or alternates in the minutes in some other way than listing them as visitors. Professor Bogar replied there was no provision in the Constitution for listing alternates for members who are absent. Professor White replied that it was the intent of the Constitution that there be no alternates on Council. So, while certain people may come as alternates, they are simply listed as visitors. He added that he thought when the Constitution was drafted, it was the intent of the committee to encourage members of the Council to attend rather than pick a permanent alternate in their stead. Chancellor Hine commented he thought this policy might be reviewed.

Nominations Committee Report:

Professor Higgins read the report from the Nominations Committee (see Faculty Council Document #16, attached). Professor Friedman recommended that the Council vote a commendation to Professor Bogar for the excellent work he has done for the past two years in serving as Council Secretary. Professor Friedman said the Nominations Committee wanted to make it very clear that the comments included in their report in no way had to do with the worthiness of Professor Bogar's service. Professor Weber disagreed with one statement the committee was making in Document #16. The report stated "in every instance," and she felt this statement should be changed. She was contacted to serve on one of these positions, but for reasons different than those listed in the Document, she declined. Chancellor Hine asked Professor Weber if she was suggesting an amendment to the report. Professor Weber felt a change would be best. Professor Higgins suggested the Document be changed to read "in every instance the faculty member refused nomination, and many expressed the feeling" Professor Kirch moved the report be adopted as amended and Professor Weber seconded. Chancellor Hine said the passing of the motion would mean the present officers would continue for one more year with a recommendation that the By-Laws Committee amend the By-Laws to limit tenure of office to a maximum of three consecutive years. The motion was passed unanimously.

Report of Elections Committee:

Professor Wisner said the Election-Appportionment committee had met and carried out their primary duties to get the election of at-large members to the Council. He distributed the complete list of membership for the 1971-72 Council and moved the Council accept and approve the list of Faculty Council members for 1971-72 (see Faculty Council Document #17, attached). Professor Wagener seconded the motion. Professor Wisner added that the listing of titles on the Document was correct as of February. They do not reflect the promotions for this year. The motion to accept the report passed unanimously.

Report of Board of Review:

Professor Behnke read the report from the Board of Review (see Faculty Council Document #18, attached), and moved the adoption of the report. The motion was seconded by Professor Friedman. There being no discussion, the vote was taken and carried.

Report on Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities:

Professor White informed the Council the copy of the Code, distributed under separate cover to members of the Council, encompasses all of the changes as suggested by the Council at its special meeting, as well as some editorial and typographical corrections. This Code has been forwarded to Chancellor Hine for further presentation to the Trustees. He added his committee is working on some commentary that explains a bit of the Code. They hope to have this completed some time in the early part of the summer and ready for distribution to members of the Council. Chancellor Hine said he transmitted the report to the administrative committee of the University, consisting of the President, Vice President and Chancellors. The Code should be considered at the June board meeting.

Agenda Committee Business:

Professor Bogar asked Professor Jarboe to introduce a memorial resolution for Dr. Donald B. Rice. Professor Jarboe read the resolution and moved it be incorporated into the minutes of the meeting. The motion was seconded by Professor Friedman and adopted.

All-University Council:

Professor Norins indicated concern regarding the All-University Council. He thought we are probably getting over-organized, with unit councils, the IUPUI Faculty Council, and an All-University Council. Since he felt that most things that would come up before or presented to an all university council would be far better handled in our own Council, he was not sure he could support the concept of an all-university council. He did not feel there is a need for one. He added he was not willing to make a motion for us not to join the All-University Council, and felt he would like to have the feeling of other Council members to this, especially those who have served on the previous All-University Council.

Representation on All-University Council:

Professor Byrne thought it might be useful to introduce information about the All-University Faculty Council as it appeared to him. He said the Constitution for that particular Council had been distributed to various members of the Constitution committee and there is general consensus on the part of the members of the committee that the committee has done outstanding work. There is nothing left to be done except to get it approved and in operation. Regarding Sections 20 and 21 of the present Bloomington Constitution, which are broader and somewhat more representative of the Constitution, this came up for consideration before the March 30th meeting of the All-University Council. It came up in a rather awkward fashion. The full report of the committee was not submitted to the All-University Council. What was submitted was a document referred to as a minority report. This was then distributed throughout the IU system. It is in no way self-explanatory, but it has some interesting ramifications. The majority report includes student representation. Once the question of having students represented on a system-wide level was introduced, questions were raised as to whether staff should be represented on a system-wide basis. At that point, people realized they were no longer talking about one student and one staff member, but a minimum of 7, since there are 7 campuses involved. When

people began to contemplate the numbers involved in such an organization, it was suggested to send an airplane around the state to pick up all the people who would be meeting to discuss system-wide questions. When this minority report came up before the All-University Council, it came as a minority report, which people were asked to respond to in lieu of seeing the majority report. Considerable discussion ensued about whether students should or should not be represented. Professor Byrne went on to say at that point he suggested this was not the major question between the majority and minority report, in so far as one could judge the content of the majority report in its absence. What you would find, he felt, if you would study the All-University Faculty Circular #35-1971, is that the minority report provides for a majority of representatives from non-Bloomington campuses, where the majority report calls for a majority of representatives from the Bloomington campus. Professor Byrne said he moved then at the meeting that student representation be added in the minority report. The motion was seconded and considerable discussion followed. Next the parliamentarian ruled the motion out of order and the Council was not advised as to the basis for the ruling. In the minutes of the March 30, 1971 meeting, it included one very brief paragraph referencing the fact that Professor Byrne expressed sympathy with students. Professor Byrne read part of the minutes of that meeting: "He considered the important issue to be whether we want system questions to be discussed and presumably decided upon by a group, the majority of which represented Bloomington, or by a group, the majority of which represented non-Bloomington campuses." He added what the minutes did not mention was that he suggested it would be more feasible to have various campuses represented by a single delegate, the Chancellor or whatever, who would come with the opinion of his local campus constituents. He felt all of these matters were amply discussed, but none of this was to be found in the minutes. Therefore, he asked the Secretary, Professor Otteson, why the minutes were not a little more expansive on what he felt was an important question. Professor Otteson replied he was not sure himself, so he checked with the parliamentarian and he said it was the custom where motions are ruled out of order to not include them in the minutes. Professor Byrne said this is just an indication of how things can take place with the Council as presently constituted.

Jurisdiction of All-University Council:

Professor Byrne assumed the Constitution will be submitted for approval during the summer, including one section that could establish the relationship between the All-University Council and the various campus councils. That section says no campus council shall adopt a policy that conflicts with policy adopted by the All-University Council. He added he thought the Constitution should not be asked to spell out in more detail what that means, but perhaps the By-Laws should. It would become a matter of considerable urgency as to who would decide what policies are in conflict and whether such decisions could be made after the fact, or whether it should be done only before the fact so that local campuses would indeed know. It seemed to him to be a matter of considerable importance and one, in his judgment, that has not been gone into by the Constitution as it exists in its present form. Professor Kelso asked Professor Byrne who would decide whether or not the other constitutions were in conflict with the All-University Council Constitution. Professor Byrne replied the Constitution is silent on that point. Vice Chancellor Ryder noted that if the Constitution would go to the Board of Trustees and if they adopted it, then that Council would decide, unless you spelled out the powers of the Council within the Constitution. That seemed to him to be a way of determining whether

we could support it or not. Professor Byrne replied that on all matters of system-wide importance or significance, it has been the experience of previous All-University Council meetings that wherever the President of the University is in any way involved, then it is a matter of all-university significance. He added one of the practical consequences has been that the Bloomington Faculty Council has had exceptionally little business to conduct in the past year. Most of their business has been conducted by adding a five minute session after the All-University Council meetings. It seems the agenda committee, with or without the advice from others, determines that the President is interested in a wide variety of matters. It seemed to him if one is going to talk about a university as a system, there might be need to have a little clearer idea as to what the components are, how they are interrelated, and what sort of feedback there is. Professor White said there will be another meeting of the All-University Faculty Council Constitution committee later in the month. He felt this would be something our representatives should bring up, along with the matter concerning our desire to have some recognition of our part-time faculty being counted in the total number of faculty for the basis of allocation of seats. He added he felt at an earlier meeting there was a fairly strong consensus of the committee that they would view the All-University Faculty Council as being substantially weaker than the existing All-University Faculty Council.

Local Jurisdiction:

Professor Wagener said he questioned seriously the need for any kind of relationship as proposed between the All-University Council and this faculty at Indianapolis. He thought we might express our feeling by either ignoring and finding ourselves in a situation where we are subservient, or take an active stand and request our representatives say no. He added he did feel we should have some input as a unit and make definite requests about the powers and responsibilities that exist here rather than at such an All-University Council.

Scope of All-University Council Decisions:

Professor Simmons asked if an All-University Faculty Council would act in an advisory capacity to the President and what kind of authority would it have. Professor Byrne replied that a good example would be the last item of business before the present All-University Council. That was the question of establishing the procedures upon the non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty. He felt it is the understanding of the vast majority of members of the All-University Council that decisions made will be binding on all parts of the system.

Areas of Common Policy-Making:

Chancellor Hine believed it was obvious to all who have studied this that there has been no clearcut description of how the All-University Faculty Council does fit into the picture, but it is generally assumed that any decision which might have state-wide implication, as far as the faculty is concerned, would go to the All-University Council. They would be the voice for all, for it would not be desirable to have each division of IU speaking independently of the others in certain types of decisions, such as matters of appointment, tenure and so forth. He added he was a little uncertain himself as to what is the

best way to go for the University and the Indianapolis Division. He shared with Professor Norins concern about how this is going to develop. He said he could envision the need for some state-wide uniformity in procedures of the type that would ordinarily go to a faculty council. If the All-University Faculty Council does develop as a representative organization, it should realize each unit has its own strengths and its own special problems. On the other hand, if they attempt to set rules which are state-wide without regard for some of the special problems, we would be concerned for many reasons. He added it is difficult to know at this point in time what is the best thing to do. Chancellor Hine thought one possible approach might be to request the committee to describe the kinds of actions that would normally be handled by the All-University Council and how guarantees could be made that the actions of the All-University Council would not interfere with the development of the individual units. Professor Simmons added that what concerned him was the cumbersome nature and the complicating of communication processes. He thought that on questions before the All-University Council, the Faculty Council should be considering them and should send a delegate with instructions on how to vote, instead of forming entirely another group of people who may or may not have a good liaison with this Council and who would go to Bloomington and perhaps deciding something without realizing the implications that these would have at the local level. He asked if we could make a direct recommendation for a system, such as a board of directors, who are truly representative of each of the campuses and who would come not to consider issues, but with instructions on how they should vote on issues that do concern them.

Motion on Method of All-University Representation:

Professor Norins moved that the IUPUI Faculty Council express that its opinion would be for the preference of having a representative of its council meet with the representatives of the other councils rather than having a whole new university council and that this intent be expressed to the current Council. Professor Friedman seconded. Professor White asked if Professor Norins would like included in the motion to make this known to the existing All-University Faculty Council as well as the existing faculty All-University Constitution committee. Professor Norins agreed. Professor Gifford felt we should not act on this until we learn more about it. Professor Simmons suggested we act on this while the Constitution is being formulated, for when it is done, it will be hard to get anything passed.

Action of Indianapolis Faculty:

Professor Kelso asked what we would do if this request is ignored, as it probably will be, particularly in light of Professor Byrne's experiences in Bloomington. If the proposed Constitution is circulated to our faculty without their knowing our concerns about it, he thought they would either abstain or vote for it. He thought there is a pretty good chance that we will have a Constitution we do not like. Chancellor Hine responded it would not be ignored, but it might be defeated. They will consider this, but they may overrule it. Professor Kelso asked if it would be appropriate, assuming this request is defeated, for this Faculty Council to endeavor to inform our faculty here that we do not approve and suggest they vote against such a Constitution. Vice

Chancellor Ryder felt if we passed a resolution to not support this, then the resolution could be distributed to the faculty indicating what this Council has done. He asked Professor Norins if he would want to put in his motion to spell out the powers that the All-University Council would have. He added that kind of body does need some powers to decide on such things as faculty tenure, and if you had to go back to each council, you would never get a final decision. He felt that the All-University Council could reach a conclusion on the tenure question and recommend that to the Board of Trustees, and that it should be representative of each council. In other words, somebody elected by this Council to be on that council, would in effect represent us and vote on those things which are spelled out as the powers of that particular council. Professor Norins felt if something of this nature came up in the different councils, he thought this is the place where those things can be discussed. We would be duplicating efforts, if we have two or three councils to discuss it. So he felt we could accomplish the same thing here and if there would be a split in the way the councils would think, then that kind of thing would go before the Board of Trustees.

Equality of Interest:

Professor Nagy asked if Professor Norins was suggesting a conference or federation of councils in which differences could be reconciled with respect to common interests and problems. Professor Norins agreed and said he was trying to get away from setting up a whole new council again. Professor Nagy felt he favored that idea for it seemed to him that we in Indianapolis have more to lose than any other division of the University with a hasty creation of an umbrella council. We have our work here to do at this campus and we must find our way as a faculty council here. There seemed to him no reason why an umbrella council has to be formed in the immediate future. Professor Friedman favored Professor Norins proposition on the grounds it incorporates the principle of the equality of interest, which he thought vitally important to us. Our interests are going to be overwhelmed by the principle of proportional representation as it now stands. That principle sounds very democratic in name, but in practice it is going to guarantee a permanent minority position. There ought to be an equality of interest which takes precedence on the numbers and this would give us that. He added he thought it would tend to force the committee working on this Constitution to reconsider the functions of that higher body in light of this equality of interest that would follow. Professor Simmons felt that incorporating the powers of this group did not belong in the motion. He added he would like to see a whole new concept, such as a house of delegates. Then as part of the work on the Constitution their powers would have to be defined as would their relationships with the Board of Trustees, the President, and each of the regional campuses. Vice Chancellor Ryder replied he was suggesting in the motion that we would want to know what the powers of the body would be. Professor Simmons responded then the "house of delegates" and their powers would be part of the Constitution.

Wording of Motion:

Professor Kirch expressed concern about the original motion which he felt was haphazard, incomplete and unsatisfactory. He thought everyone was adding and adding to the motion and he felt it extremely important the motion be stated lucidly. Professor Norins said his original motion, which he wanted to keep

broad, indicated that it is the preference of this Council to have a confederation or representative from each of the councils to be representative in this confederation. Chancellor Hine thought we ought to express first concern or doubt that the present plan is best and we would like to have a study made to see if there could be some better one, and that we are recommending that it be considered as a house of delegates or confederation of councils with a representative from each council meeting on a state-wide basis. Professor Byrne added that the All-University Council presently would be constituted on a proportional basis which would be determined by full-time faculty only and according to the ad hoc calculations of the minority report document, which came out with majority representation from Bloomington. Vice Chancellor Ryder asked if they have an election in the system and if we put forward anyone here at IUPUI, how is the local faculty council involved. Professor Byrne replied that as he understood it, IUPUI would be informed of how many representatives we are entitled to and we would decide in our own fashion how those representatives were to be elected. Professor White said the draft document was kept deliberately vague because it is not the same organization at each campus. So the All-University Council would be made up of the Chancellor of each campus, a selected student from each campus, and a proportional faculty representation from each campus. Chancellor Hine asked if they only counted full-time faculty for IUPUI and Professor White answered they counted just the total full-time faculty. Vice Chancellor Ryder suggested if it is the Chancellor's decision, then he would decide that the representation would be from the Faculty Council. Chancellor Hine said he was not sure about that, but he thought he could select students, not faculty. Professor White thought it would be a matter for the Chancellor and his faculty body to work out on each campus. Vice Chancellor Ryder said if that was the case, he was saying the Chancellor could decide how our representatives are elected. Therefore, you would have the same thing, except you do not have a spelling out of the powers of the group.

Review of All-University Council Action:

Professor Byrne asked to introduce into discussion a section from the minutes of the All-University Council at which this question was discussed under a motion that was defeated by a voice vote and which relates directly to the notion of a confederation or house of delegates. He read:

"Professor Henderson moved and Dean Clark seconded that the last sentence of Section 20-A-1 be amended to read each campus shall be entitled to equal faculty representation."

He added the sentence that was being amended reads to the effect "each campus shall be entitled to at least one representative" and the amended version is "each campus shall be entitled to equal faculty representation, be that one or two or whatever."

"Vice Chancellor Remak asked what he meant by equal representation. Would Kokomo have the same number of elected representatives as Bloomington? President Ryan said that was what he meant. Dean Clark thought this was a perfectly reasonable proposal. He said the unreasonableness of attempting to form a representative group to serve in this capacity had been very well illustrated by the discussion that had gone on here today. He had every confidence that if, as Professor Henderson suggested earlier, two or three representatives were selected from each of the component campuses to form such an all-university group, that group would act responsibly and would act in the best interest of the various campuses within the system. Professor Rayles said this seemed based on the idea of bicameral representation, except that it was not bicameral. It was unicameral in terms of purview. The question was called for on Professor Henderson's motion. It failed by a voice vote."

Vote on Motion:

Professor Kelso called for the question on the motion. The motion is 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 Weber asked if we could circularize to other councils our proposal and the reason why we are making it. Professor Norins replied they would find out at the meeting where this is made known. Professor White asked the Secretary to give him a copy so he might circulate it to members of the Constitution committee prior to their next meeting. Dean Lawrence said the suggestion was made that any such statement might be preceded by a statement why we are requesting this. The motion was passed.

Agenda Business:

Professor Bogar reported this was the last meeting of the semester and he asked if Council wished to have summer meetings in June and July. Also, he suggested that since the fall semester starts August 25, there should be a meeting scheduled during the first part of August. Dean Lawrence asked if there were any definite items of business projected that should be handled during the summer. If there are no items, it seemed to him meetings could be on an "on call" basis. Professor Bogar replied he did not have any specific items at this time. Professor Wagener asked the parliamentarian if there is any provision for calling special meetings over the summer or having some group that functions in summer in lieu of the Council. Professor White replied there is a provision for calling a special meeting, but no provision for any special groups meeting in lieu of the Council. Chancellor Hine said we do not have an executive committee in the usual sense of the word that would have interim ad hoc authority. He said he had used the Agenda Committee occasionally and he thought perhaps this might be considered as a method of calling a special meeting. If any member wants to call a meeting, they could contact the Agenda Committee. Dean Lawrence moved that only special meetings, if necessary, be called for this summer. Professor Kelso seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Professor Bogar said there was still the question of when to have the August meeting. Chancellor Hine said this probably should go under advisement. The date will be set, but it will probably not be the second Thursday in August.

Faculty Affairs Committee:

Professor Bixler reported his committee met concerning the report they made to the Council in April, recommending uniform procedures for faculty promotion. He said they had some feedback from faculty, representing less than 5%, in response to the questionnaire sent out. As a result of some very cogent comments made by several people, it was the committee's recommendation that the Faculty Council not consider this document from the standpoint of passing or rejecting it, but that they take it under further advisement and study to some of the possibilities that have been raised. He asked Council if they would prefer the committee distribute additional copies for consideration or should they seek further comments at a meeting or from actual written reports. He did say that from those that responded, the favorable responses were running about 2 to 1 for approval. However, a number of very important comments have been made about the problems of adopting a uniform procedure, some of which may in fact be in direct conflict with the present system. Professor Bixler said

if it was acceptable, they would circulate more information to the faculty to get additional comments or feedback and bring it up again in the fall. Professor Wagener asked if the committee had made any major changes at all since the original document was distributed. Professor Bixler said no, but they were in the process of discussing some recommended changes that have been given to them. They could discuss these changes for further consideration. Professor Weber asked when the document was redistributed that some of the suggestions be added so the faculty would have a notion of the kinds of changes being recommended. Professor Bixler said his committee could comply with that request. He added there is still the question left before the Council whether or not we should even consider such a thing. The original document was raised by the committee as a point of discussion but not that we should necessarily adopt it. He had the feeling that a number of faculty feel we should have nothing to do with this kind of procedure. Dean Lawrence suggested Professor Bixler actively solicit responses from each representative of the Council, even prior to circulation for further information. Professor Weber thought it would be very helpful if something came out on an overall basis in terms of guidelines rather than requirements. Chancellor Hine said hearing no objection, they would expect to hear from the committee early fall. The committee must report by early fall because the promotions committee will have to start their work then and they cannot wait too long to get any changes recommended considered administratively and put into effect.

Presiding Officer's Business:

Chancellor Hine informed Council that Dr. Roy Behnke received one of the University's distinguished teaching awards and he thought it an honor that was justly deserved. He added they were very pleased that the committee saw fit to honor someone from Indianapolis.

Comments on Budget:

Chancellor Hine commented on the budget. He said we did get about a 9% increase in state appropriations over last year. But when you consider the added costs of supporting services, such as utilities, postal rates, and maintenance, that keep rising, this increase is not much. As a result of these built in expenses, the amount of money we have for new programs is discouragingly small. He apologized for not being able to give Council a definitive report, since there is no budget finally approved. He said he has spent many days trying to come into an equitable balance between supporting services, academics, and the various units of IUPUI. He will try to get things in balance so that we can make some progress and keep our current programs going forward in every possible way. He added one reason he was a little reluctant to have no meeting in the summer was that we face some hard decisions in the matter of capital expenditures. Our capital appropriation for Indianapolis request is 31.5 million. The entire list was approved, but the budget is only for 10.5 million. It is appreciably less than we need for our many problems here. He thought he might wish to have a special meeting of the Council to discuss this matter some time before the fall. He added at least he would want to talk to some of the Faculty Council committees on this problem.

New Business:

Professor Bogar said the general faculty meeting will be held Tuesday, May 18 in the Lecture Hall Building of the Downtown Campus. The President of the IU Board of Trustees, Mr. Danielson, and Mr. Early will attend. Also attending will be Mr. McKinney and Mr. Dustman of the Chancellor's Advisory Board. Chancellor Hine said they would be prepared to answer questions that anyone in the audience wished to present to them.

Self-Study of Faculty Council:

Professor Weber asked to comment about the apparent ineffectiveness of the Council. She said we are only a year and a half old and she wondered if the Council would be interested in some sort of an evaluation and recommendations of what we can do in the future, which might be looked at by an ad hoc committee. Chancellor Hine said he believed many of us have felt somewhat frustrated with the agenda of the Faculty Council and with getting things going. He thought it might be worthwhile to have a self-study made as to how this Council could be made more effective and how it could be used better. He added he thought this suggestion might well be taken by the chairman of the Council and he might charge one of our existing committees to come in next fall with an evaluation of our Faculty Council. Professor Nagy asked if the Council could receive some sort of a year end report on the basis of the committee reports that are submitted. Professor Bogar replied it is mandatory there be an annual report to the total faculty.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Bernerd Bogar, Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

BB:mn