

# INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting  
September 5, 1991  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, J. Herman Blake, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, R Bruce Renda, William Voos. Elected Faculty: Thomas Ambrose, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Sally Bowman, Linda Brothers, Janice Bruckner, Walter Buchanan, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Carol Deets, John Emhardt, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Dean Hawley, Linda Kasper, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Linda Marler, Steven Mazzuca, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, B Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Richard Peterson, Eric Pumroy, Terry Reed, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, William Schneider, P Kent Sharp, Jan Shipp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Richard Turner, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Yu. Ex Officio Members: Henry Karlson (IUPUI Executive Committee), Juanita Keck (IUPUI Executive Committee), Maxine Tutterrow (IUPUI Staff Council), Jeffery Vessely (IUPUI Executive Committee).

**Members Absent:** Deans: A James Barnes, James Brown, Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein, David Stocum, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Margaret Applegate, Lucinda Carr, Philip Coons, Anne Donchin, William Engle, Mary Fisher, Janice Froehlich, Michael Gleeson, Debra Helper, Raymond Koleski, John Lappas, James McAteer, Gerald Paar, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Sherry Ricchiardi, Gregory Sutton, Henry Wellman.

**Visitors:** Erv Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Kay Carl (School of Allied Health Sciences), Mark Grove (Registrar), Natale Hart (Office of Scholarship & Financial Aid), Carol Nathan (Dean of the Faculties Office), John E. Pless (Medicine), Jane Rooksby (Bookmarks), William Spencer (External Affairs), L. Woodley (Sagamore).

## AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolutions

**BEPKO:** Maybe we could begin the meeting now. We have as our first order of business four memorial resolutions. They are for Dr. Toichiro Kuwabara, Dr. Lois C. Meier, Dr. Ralph W. Phillips, and Dr. Robert D. Shupe from the schools that are listed in the agenda for today's meeting. Consistent with our relatively new tradition, we will not read memorial resolutions although they are available. We will take it that these memorial resolutions are adopted and they will be communicated to the appropriate parties. We do still observe the tradition of standing for a moment of silence in memory of fallen colleagues. I would like to ask you to do that now. [A moment of silence was observed.]

## AGENDA ITEM II - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko

**BEPKO:** There is much to catch up on from the last academic year but in the interest of time I will only take up a couple of items under the heading of Presiding Officer's Business. The first is to recall at least one happy event that was a part of the 1991 legislative session in Indiana. That is, that the most important capital project on the list of projects that Indiana University submitted, at least the most important from our perspective at Indianapolis and the number one capital priority for the entire IU system, was approved and funded. It is a \$37 million addition and renovation of the Van Nuys Medical Science Building. We hope the beginning phase of that will start in the not

too distant future, although as you may have read in the newspaper over the summer, we are frightened that there may be some delays in getting the final approval from the State Budget Committee for the actual sale of the bonds and the construction work to begin. We are going to press ahead and hope that in the not too distant future this project will begin with the addition which will be a new building in front of the existing Van Nuys building, and then the renovation work will follow quickly on the heels of that new building. We believe that this will continue to be Indiana University's number one capital priority, now in the final stages of getting State Budget approval, as it was in the legislative process itself.

The rest of the news wasn't as good. You probably have heard much about it and will hear more. We hope that 1992 will be a session in which the budget can be reconsidered and where cost of living increases can be provided to the universities, but we are not sure about that and we will have to keep you posted on the developments. We can't anticipate that now.

For this new year, we begin a new initiative that is part of our ongoing effort to develop the best collegial atmosphere and the best relations between faculty and people who hold administrative appointments. As you will recall, last year we suggested and then you recommended and adopted a policy for the review of academic administrators. We are about ready to begin those reviews this year. To refresh your recollection, there will be two vice chancellors who will have reviews -- William Plater as Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties and Robert Martin, as Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs. Dean Wendell McBurney who is the dean of Research and Sponsored Programs, will have a review. Kris Froehlke, who is the director of Computing Services, will have a review. Then, three school deans including P. Nicholas Kellum, dean of the School of Physical Education, will have a review. Those five who I have mentioned so far -- Bill Plater, Bob Martin, Wendell McBurney, Kris Froehlke, and Nick Kellum -- have their review committees about ready to begin their work. We have yet to talk to a couple of people who are our rosters for those committees to make sure that they are going to be able to serve before we are ready to release the names on those committees. That should come within the next couple of days. All five of those committees should be functioning before the end of the month and certainly before our October meeting of the Council.

The other two school deans may take a little longer because they involve the Bloomington campus. James Weigand is one of the other deans that will be reviewed. Of course, his home office is on the Bloomington campus, and we must coordinate the review process with Bloomington campus faculty and administration. That may take a little longer to establish.

Also, and finally, the seventh person to have a review will be Hugh Wolf, who is the Executive Associate Dean in the School of Education and the head of Education programs for the Indianapolis campus. That is consistent with the policy we adopted last year and is going to actually be conducted by the School of Education with our participation. Again, that is something that, since it involves the Bloomington campus, will take a little longer to establish but in both those cases we hope to have those committees established and working in the very near future.

Finally, with respect to items of personnel and collegiality, we have a brand new colleague that we are very proud to introduce into our IUPUI and Indiana University family. Herman Blake is going to introduce her.

**BLAKE:** Good afternoon. We have been making every effort to increase the effectiveness of our enrollment program and toward the end of last year I had the privilege of introducing to you Dr. Alan Crist who joined us as Director of Admissions. This afternoon I am pleased to introduce Natala K. Hart, who completes that grouping. She has joined us effective July 1, 1991, as Director of Student Financial Aid.

Natala K. Hart is known across the country to friends and professional colleagues as "Tally" Hart. A native of Ohio, she has baccalaureate and master's degrees from the Ohio University and since then has had a distinguished career in financial aid and student assistance. She started out at the University of California at San Diego and rose through ranks there, moved on to national service in the College Student Scholarship Service, and then to the College Board where she served as Vice President for Student Assistance. From the College Board she went to Purdue University as Director of Financial Aid and from Purdue went to the state level where she served the State of Indiana as Executive Director of the State Student Assistance Commission. We were able to, along with the support of a number of good people, recruit her away from the State of Indiana and, as I indicated, on July 1, 1991, she joined us as Director of Financial Aid. I am pleased to present to you Natala "Tally" Hart.

**HART:** It is with great pleasure that I come to return the warm greetings that I have enjoyed during my few weeks here at IUPUI, and to tell you how sincerely I look forward to close exchanges with those of you who are our direct contacts with the faculty in the important issue of financing their education at IUPUI. My two years of state service brought me geographically closer to the campus but also enabled me to get to know IUPUI better from a different vantage point. This institution grew greatly in my respect and admiration. When I was approached about joining IUPUI, it was my real pleasure to accept the offer. I come to you with a very specific agenda. Our goal in the Office of Scholarship financial aid is to make the administration as efficient as possible. To put it simply, students should be in a classroom, not in our office. Applications, procedures and particularly my own area of special entry the application of technology wish to insure that students are well served. I am interested in hearing from you directly and will be in contact with all of the schools to discuss the ways in which our operations support students' academic achievements in the broadest sense. It is also very important that students are enrolled in our classes and attending the institution with regard to financial circumstances. Streamlining procedures, getting all of the financial aid that we are eligible to receive, and insuring academic pursuits of our students are what I hope to accomplish. I really appreciate the welcome. I look forward to years service and active discussion about the way in which our operation support the academic pursuits of our students. Thank you very much.

**BEPKO:** As Herman mentioned, Tally completes our student enrollment team that we think is as fine as exists anywhere in the United States today. We think that they will do a great deal to help us establish IUPUI as the new national model of excellence in urban universities. We also think that Tally represents an intriguing career pattern that we think may be increasingly prevalent and that is to learn one's professional field at Purdue West Lafayette before coming here to the big time.

The next item is something that fits into a larger frame of reference of faculty development activities that Bill Plater and Erv Boschmann have done such a good job of creating -- faculty development activities that have attracted a great deal of attention around the Indiana University system. So much so that faculty members from other campuses, from other sites, have asked to be able to participate in the IUPUI faculty development programs. There is one in particular that Bill is going to mention today.

**PLATER:** Thank you, Jerry. Through the Faculty Development office we have initiated a series of workshops on special topics that should be of broad interest to all of the faculty. These workshops were highlighted at the new faculty orientation. We are afraid that many of our continuing faculty may not be aware of the series that is under way for the fall semester. There are ten workshops planned for the fall and probably an equal number for the spring semester. They are all described, at least the fall semester ones, in a brochure that looks like this [showing a sample]. If you have not received a copy, you should call Erv Boschmann's office and he will be glad to send it to you. One that is coming up a week from Friday, on September 13, addresses a brand new area of

interest for us as a campus, at least we have not offered a workshop in this area before. It has to do with the notion that more and more of our faculty are cooperating with private industry or are developing products that they have either a proprietary or personal interest in, particularly financial interest. We would like to ensure that faculty who have such initiatives under way understand what the University's policies and regulations are that affect such joint ventures or cooperative ventures and that you have the benefit of advice on how to market products, how to secure them, how to obtain patents and copyrights. This workshop will take place on Friday at 1 p.m. in the Roof Lounge here on campus. If you have an interest in this or are aware of colleagues in your department who may be working on a product or a project that has some commercial application, or are alternatively working on a product that they may be concerned about protecting in some way, this would be an excellent opportunity to find out what resources the University has available to help faculty.

**BEPKO:** Thanks, Bill. Finally, earlier today we were speculating about why Faculty Council meetings over the years have been held in the Law School. I offered that it might be that people wanted to be close to the intellectual citadel of the University. That was quickly dismissed and the better explanation was that in the old days parking was better here than it was anywhere else. That leads to the last point that I would like to focus on and that is the state of parking. We want to answer the questions before they come. Bob Martin and John Mulvey are here to give you an up-to-the-minute live eye traffic copter report of what is going on.

**MARTIN:** Thank you, Jerry. Parking is tight, obviously. But, we do believe that we see light at the end of the tunnel. We actually started enhancing and improving our parking lot inventory well over two years ago in anticipation of the high level of construction that was planned for IUPUI. So, this is not something that we just did yesterday. What we started with was the paving and the renovation of all of the parking lots north of North Street, north of Michigan, which were gravel up until that time. That really began the process of our taking a look at gravel lots, paving them where we know we get greater efficiencies and bigger numbers in the parking lots. We then began the process of anticipating the losses due to construction for SET II, III, and the new University Library.

Also, in addition to that, were the anticipated visitor parking lots for the addition to University Hospital for the outpatient clinic area. I think we have done a pretty good job. Obviously, we are not perfect and we are running out of land. But, in preparation for this fall semester, you will notice that we installed several temporary lots around campus, again taking out some green areas beginning with the large lot south of the AO Building that we had last year as an overflow that ended up being a large mud hole. We have leveled that, put stone down and also began to move on to the eastern perimeter of our campus and also north of Michigan Street with some additional temporary lots.

Looking at today's activity and the fall semester, which we think will shape down in another couple of weeks, we are at maximum. There are certain times of the day, basically between 11:00 and 2:00, where we are out of spaces. What we have to rely on are the turnover that begins to occur as faculty and staff leave the campus and as students come out of classes and begin to leave. That is what we are relying on. But the good news is that we have several projects under construction that will, in fact, bring us relief. We have two right now that are on the books. One is completed. We have accepted it conditionally, waiting for some minor corrections to the facility. That is the garage that was built in conjunction with the ambulatory care center or the outpatient clinic area. That is approximately a 700-car garage intended to provide for the patient/visitor services that are going to be required when all of the various clinic locations spread out through the Medical Center are relocated to the new outpatient clinic area.



We also have a much needed renovation project that needs to go on with our oldest parking garage, which is the Wilson Street Garage. We are looking at utilizing a window of time. That, hopefully, will be concluded today. We are waiting on approval from the State Budget Agency. In fact, they are meeting today to approve our renovation project at Wilson Street, which begins at the top floor and goes all the way down repairing basically the flooring. What we would like to do is to be able to shift parkers from the Wilson Street Garage to the new outpatient clinic garage for a window of 60 to possibly 90 days while we go in and give the contractors the freedom of working within Wilson Street and not be encumbered with the cars parking there, plus it saves damages on the automobiles because of the kind of work that needs to go on. This window of opportunity will probably never come again to us, and we are going to take advantage of it so that we can, in fact, complete the Wilson Street Garage.

The other one, of course, is just west of the Law School. We put together another bonding issue this past year and floated that bond to construct a little over 1,000-car garage in that location. The bids were very favorable. The construction climate in Indianapolis, with what is going on at IUPUI, really became an advantage because we came in well underneath what our earlier estimates were on the construction costs. So, we were very pleased with that to the extent that the renovation costs for the Wilson Street Garage will be covered underneath the overall umbrella of that bonding. That garage we bid was over 1,000 cars, and we bid, more importantly, for it to be constructed in a very tight time frame. We gave them January 1 of 1992 to be the completion date. Typically, that is a very fast track in construction of parking garages. But, nevertheless, that is our need. So, we bid it that way. We wanted to see how that would come out. Well, again, we were way underbid and they did that with the completion date of January in mind. If you watch that, if you are over in this area, they have moved incredibly fast. They are on time and we have every expectation that we will have that garage open by the spring semester of 1991. That will add to our inventory at IUPUI overall roughly about 1,700 spaces. We have been able to keep up with the lost spaces due to the construction of our new facilities by adding temporary lots and by enhancing some of the existing paved lots. When January of 1992 rolls around, we will be on the plus side by a total of a 700-car garage next to the outpatient clinic and now this 1,000-car garage. So, I learned a long time ago not to promise anything but I will tell you that relief is in sight.

If I may explain the parking operation, we have pretty much reached the limit in our bonding ability. That is based upon how much debt service we can absorb within our revenue stream. We have carried that just about to the maximum. So, we are now going to wait a little until we can probably float additional bonds to build additional garages unless we, in fact, have a large infusion of money from the revenue stream. What we are looking at doing now is examining our existing gravel lots, matching them up with the master plan for IUPUI and where those do not interfere with the building plans, we would like to be making proposals to pave those lots. Again, we get better efficiency and better utilization out of a paved lot than we do a gravel lot, and it certainly is liked more by the parkers than the gravel lots. So, our job between now and the next window of paving opportunity, which will be next spring, is to begin to examine our current gravel lots and pick out those that we can go ahead and pave and add to our inventory.

As a part of this as well, I thought I would give just a quick snapshot of special event parking that has gone on. For 1990-91 special event parking has primarily focused south of New York Street with the various sports facilities, most of which are within the Natatorium and the Track and Field area. The tennis facilities, the National Institute for Fitness and Sport also have special events that draw community people onto our campus. For 1990-91, I did a quick count and we had, utilizing the Natatorium and the Track and Field stadium, some 68 special events last year. Those ranged from some intercollegiate athletic events to national championships that are held for either the Big Ten or regional areas. In addition, what I call a different category, we had some other special

events like the GTE tennis tournament. We had some ten of those in addition to the 68 that were held on our campus. Also, many runs, walks, fund raisers that are used to benefit, in many cases our own operations like Riley Hospital, either start, end, or go through our campus. Last year we had 14 runs or walks that in some way affected our campus. Of the 14 runs, and I know this has been an issue before in front of the Faculty Council, roughly about seven of those in the early part of 1990 resulted in the closure of New York Street. That is all four lanes. Of those seven, all of the seven began around 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning. So, if they started on our campus there is a large grouping that start to filter out and then they will either come through or end up on our campus. As was suggested last year with a memorandum that came out of campus administration outlining what our posture and policy would be with respect to runs on our campus, we have followed up both verbally and in writing with the city, with the Department of Public Safety for the city, expressing that for IUPUI that we are strongly urging, we cannot insist because they are not our streets, but we are strongly urging that anytime a run or a walk begins, goes through, or concludes on our campus, that New York Street or Michigan Street would not be totally closed. In other words, we would at least maintain traffic on New York Street and on Michigan Street for a minimum for two of those lanes. We have sent the same instruction of policy for IUPUI, to organizers of these events. That seems to focus into about three or four groups in Indianapolis that are always called upon to organize these kinds of events. We have done the same thing with them, indicating that for IUPUI we don't necessarily mind having those come through our campus, but what we do mind is closing off all of those four lanes of New York Street or Michigan Street and really, in effect, shutting the major east/west arteries off. We will continue to monitor that. We will continue to insist upon that. We are looking forward in this next year to not having any additional difficulties in that arena. Jerry, I think other than that and to the Faculty Council, again, that is the quickest overview I can give of parking. We have a lot of things in the mill. Most of it will culminate by January, and then we begin another process of looking at what we are going to do in our parking operations for the next year.

**QUESTION:** I was wondering if the figures for additional space would take into account the number of people moving here from the 38th Street campus?

**MARTIN:** Our new figures or what we anticipate to happen?

**QUESTION:** You were talking about how you had counted the spaces taken away by construction. Have you also figured in the fact that 38th Street people will be moving here?

**MARTIN:** We still carry those in our inventory because they are part of our operation. We have factored into what we anticipate we need and what we are able to accommodate, the initial move of the 38th Street campus was into SET II, and we will try to accommodate that as best we could. Part of that was the installation of our gravel lots in anticipation that we would be having increased traffic down here. We have to keep in mind as well that many of the students who were parking at 38th Street have always been down here any way for many of the courses they were taking. I think, given those certain time frames, we are able to handle right now everything that is coming our way. I am not saying that parking is where everybody wants it or how you get to it is the easiest way, but we feel that we are able to handle it or at least be able to limp through this fall semester. Ultimately, of course, we lose that. We will have replaced that with our parking garages.

**YOKOMOTO:** In regard to the special events that you mentioned at the Natatorium and the Track and Field, do you generate income for the University or are they cost effective?

**MARTIN:** They generate income. That is an income revenue to the parking operation. Last year that brought us roughly \$100,000 in gross. We have to take out of that what our operating expenses would be. Of all of the events, we either charged spectators directly or it is a percentage of the rent that is charged to a unit that might be using, let's say the Natatorium, for the state high school swimming championship. One way or the other, we are receiving revenue off these events.

**BEPKO:** Bob has mentioned the parking revenue but there is also revenue, in many instances, either direct or indirect, to the units that are sponsoring the activity. For example, when the Natatorium is used, people pay for the Natatorium. It may be that a department at the University, other than the Natatorium, is inviting a group here for something that is a special event for the goodwill it creates. That is a form of income.

**MARTIN:** I can give you one example of an event that we did not collect money for and that would have been the WENS fireworks. I wouldn't send anybody out there to try to collect money for that.

**QUESTION:** Most of the garages are being used by either patients coming on campus or faculty and staff. Are there any long range plans to develop garages strictly for student use with pricing for students?

**MARTIN:** Absolutely. In fact, what is in front of the Parking Advisory Committee right now is a recommendation to be reviewed, and I believe that it will be reviewed this fall semester, starting with the garage west of the Law School. We want to begin to expose and open that up to student parking.

**QUESTION:** Has anyone made the effort to reduce the number of cars that actually get here by car pooling?

**MARTIN:** We approached car pooling through the parking operation. We have had discussions and are in discussion right now with Metro on how to encourage mass transportation from a busing standpoint. I just left another task force that I have been appointed to by the city which is looking at how to possibly enhance taxi service. Taxis have never been looked at as necessarily a means of mass transportation. There are some interesting concepts coming out of the Commission for Downtown, the Mile Square area, and the regional area around the Mile Square which would be inclusive of us. That just got started today. There are some nice ideas involving all three owners of the cab companies who are participating in this. To that extent, that has been our effort in terms of encouraging the use of mass transportation. But, I keep saying that those are nice things but until we are able to fundamentally change behavior, I am not quite sure if all of them are going to be that effective. I always state as an example, it becomes extremely difficult to try to convince an athlete who is driving out here that he must park three blocks away so that he can run five. They all want to park two minutes away from the building. That is behavior and it is going to be hard to change that.

**BEPKO:** One more comment from Jeff Vessely and then, if you don't mind, Bob, could you stay a little while for questions after the meeting? There are a number of other agenda items. We could take up further questions after the meeting.

**VESSELY:** I wanted to reiterate the fact that the Parking Advisory Committee is looking at the notion that we have a parking lot on level and not charge the garage rates. But probably a more important point that I want to make is can you refer to that garage as being immediately east of the School of Physical Education as opposed to west of the Law School? [laughter]

**MARTIN:** As chairman of the Parking Advisory Committee, I would be more than happy to accommodate you.

**BEPKO:** The people who are planning signs for the campus wish to call it the "Sports Garage."  
[laughter]

**MARTIN:** Thank you for pointing out that oversight. One final comment if I may. I just would like to publicly thank John Nolte and John Mulvey. Even though it may not seem like much was done, those two gentlemen have done a great job this fall semester. We started back in August with a lot of special events where we spread our staff very thin and also tried to monitor traffic. I would at least like to note that they should be congratulated because even though we have pockets of problems, we have gotten through the first part of this fall semester and we are optimistic that we will make it until our next garage gets opened. I would like to congratulate them.

**BEPKO:** Absolutely. I hope that everyone understands what an effort was put into opening this semester with parking problems and how we went to extremes to try to accommodate new students coming onto the campus, even serving soft drinks again this year to try to ease the burdens of walking a couple of blocks from the parking places to their assigned rooms.

#### AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson

**BEPKO:** Our next item is a report from the leadership of the Council with Dick Peterson.

**PETERSON:** I have a number of different points that I would like to make today. First of all, I wanted to mention a handout that I have on the table and that is an application form for the Faculty Club. I would like to encourage you to consider that. As one of the many many ex-officio opportunities that I have had over the last past year and will be continuing this year, I have been an ex officio member of the Board of Directors of the Faculty Club. I have enjoyed that and I have also enjoyed eating the lunches over there as a result of that. I would encourage you to join the Faculty Club. We are considering, as a Board of Directors, getting a soup-and-sandwich menu over there, which would be a lighter lunch and hopefully a little less expensive. We will see how that works out. That will require us to have more attendees in order to make the same kind of income, and we would also like to have more members. So, we are encouraging membership at this point and would encourage you to join and fill out that application form.

I want to mention two primary activities that we want to be involved with in the Council this year. One of those is something that we voted on last spring. We have voted on some ideas related to changes in the Constitution with relationship to the officers of the Council. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee, headed by Hitwant Sidhu, will be looking at that and bringing those changes to us, hopefully, within a couple of months. I would like to encourage that to happen.

The second thing has been worked on over several years, but last year some significant work was done through a subcommittee and then by sending this to the Faculty Affairs Committee, involved some changes in the Constitution and Bylaws related to Boards of Review. There have been some misunderstandings, unclear statements, and incomplete statements in our Constitution and Bylaws related to the functions of Boards of Review, and thus there has been a draft manual for Boards of Review to help them in their functioning. We would like to consider how to best handle this: either officially approve of a Board of Review manual or have the Constitution and Bylaws written in such a way that it would be clear on how these Boards of Review should function.

The next point that I would like to mention is that during the summer some things happened with responsibilities of Indiana University officials. You may have picked this up in the University newspapers or in the regular daily newspapers. I am not going to go into detail but I have handed out a news release. I don't know if there were enough copies for everyone to pick up but this was a news release that came out of the President's office that is related to this. As John Hackett left us on July 1 of last year, the President did not want to replace him as such and he essentially made a number of different changes in the responsibilities of University officials to accommodate for that. I don't want to go into the details, as I said, but I did want to mention that that has happened. That was done in consultation with University administrators. It was done in consultation with the University Faculty Council Agenda Committee and, as an IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee, we also were able to discuss that. Since there were not any Faculty Council meetings for IUPUI, that was not an item that was discussed and this is being presented to you as information. As this was discussed we felt that this would lead to greater efficiency at that level of the University in the reorganization of these responsibilities that people were carrying. I would also like to mention, in relationship to this, in this same announcement that the President set up two cabinets. One is the University Academic Cabinet and the other is the University Operations Cabinet. The Academic Cabinet is headed by Ken Gros Louis and has a number of individuals on this all the way down to faculty members or all the way up to faculty members depending upon whether you are talking to Jerry Bepko or not because he thinks faculty members are on the top. At least that is what he tells me.

The University Operations Cabinet is headed by Jerry Bepko. The co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council will be serving on both of those cabinets. I don't know the exact list of all the members but there are deans, other officials across the University, and other faculty members on those cabinets. This is the first time that there has been an advisory group at this level in the University directly advising the President who have not just been the top cabinet officers of the University -- the Vice Presidents of the University. So, we think that this is a step forward in that there is direct advice from people who are lower in the University than at the vice president's level. Jerry Bepko may have a few comments on this.

**BEPKO:** Very briefly I think the whole purpose was to provide a leaner in a sense full-time administration. In other words, not replace the person who has historically been the Vice President for Administration and Finance but to increase academic participation in decision making and policy development and to create an atmosphere of teamwork and collaboration across the University through these two cabinets in order to advance three goals. One is the continuing pursuit of academic distinction. Second is the continuing pursuit of efficiency cost management and making Indiana University the leanest and most effective University in terms of these critically important management issues. And, finally, making Indiana University the national model for the public multi-campus University. In order to achieve those things, it is going to require great teamwork and great collaboration in the sense of team spirit across the institution. These cabinets, along with the administrative changes that have been made, are designed to achieve that.

**PETERSON:** We can answer some questions related to this in the question and answer time, if you would like later on, but let's go on with my report. Another thing that we have worked on recently is to lean down the committee structure of the University particularly at IUPUI. The administration has decided to eliminate three of the administrative committees that have typically functioned on campus. Those committees are the Athletic Advisory Committee, the Library Advisory Committee, and the Student Affairs Advisory Committee. [Correction Note: There will be an Athletic Advisory Committee but it will essentially be the same composition as the Athletic Affairs Committee.] This means that the our Faculty Council committees will need to take on some of the responsibilities that those committees had. The Faculty Council committees will have more responsibilities in that area. I think that is a very positive thing that we would be able to take on those responsibilities.

We are going to have to work on the charges for those committees and perhaps have some Constitutional changes related to that as we work through the issues. The Executive Committee has really not even totally dealt with those although it started when the Athletic Affairs Committee felt that they didn't have any function last spring and they had no suggestions for membership this upcoming year. We will have to change that now because we have a necessity to have this committee and have it a functioning committee that will have activities related to it.

I have one last comment. I have taken a lot of time today with a fairly long report but one comment related to some of the actions that this Council and the University Faculty Council had made last year is related to our fringe benefits and the way some of our fringe benefits are handled. We voted and elected that we would have more flexibility in our TIAA/CREF accounts. This has led to some potential legal difficulties. There is a case of a faculty member from Purdue who had some difficulty with this. Raymond Mortor, a faculty member at Purdue University, filed a voluntary petition for bankruptcy. Mr. Mortor requested that his TIAA/CREF account balance be exempt from the bankruptcy estate, but the court ruled that his retirement plan was the property of the bankruptcy estate. That was a bit of a difficulty but that decision was fortunately overturned by a higher court. A recent judgment by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit reversed the above ruling and holds that creditors cannot access these accounts in the case of bankruptcy. But, as we achieve more and more flexibility and the availability into these funds, bankruptcy and other financial liens can be put on our retirement accounts. We need to be cautious. This item will be sent to our Fringe Benefits Committee and they will be asked to look our fringe benefits and the way we handle our money so that this can be handled more appropriately.

#### AGENDA ITEM IV - Bookmarks Report - Jane Rooksby

**BEPKO:** Next, we have a report on the wonderful Bookmarks project that is going forward on campus this year. Jane Rooksby, a new member of the IUPUI family, is here to talk about it.

**ROOKSBY:** I hope you all have seen some of these items around campus. This is the poster that we have displayed on various bulletin boards, in the bookstores and various locations. Then the really "hot" item is the pencils which we are using as bookmarks. There is one for each of the books with the other four being mentioned on the backs. We had an initial printing of 10,000 and those are gone. I am on my second 10,000 and I have most of those left. So, if you have a desire for some of those I have plenty. I have all of this material in my office so if you need any, please get in contact with me.

Let me start by telling you where I came from because I am not your traditional higher education person. Therefore, I feel I need to explain myself. "Where have I been?" I started as a teacher in high school. I left that after about four years. I have had a very diverse background. I went into politics and worked there doing speech writing in this state and also in the state of Georgia. I returned to Indiana after a short time in Georgia and went into my own business. I had retail stores for a while. I had my own public relations firm. I have continually raised funds for causes for both political and community causes. I was in a period of time where I was trying to decide my next endeavor when I happened to hear that IUPUI had a lot of exciting things going on and maybe I should look there. It has been a decision that I have been extremely pleased with. What I am doing utilizes a lot of my prior experience. I am enthused about the program that I am in charge of. I also want to start by giving you a disclaimer. I did not choose the books. I only came on board in mid-July. I work part-time, approximately 20+ hours a week. The books were selected when I came to my job. They were selected by three individuals -- Dean Barlow, Dean Plater, and Dean Lenz. They composed the selection committee, probably using suggestions that you had made last year as well as those from students and staff members. So, that is how the decision was made. I

think the program is an excellent one. I hope that you have heard by now that the books are Selected Poems by Gwendolyn Brooks, Silent Spring by Rachel Carson, In Search of the Double Helix by John Gribbin, The Federalist Papers by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, and One Hundred Years of Solitude by Gabriel Garcia Marquez. Those are the five books selected. We are not saying that they are the best books but they are a representative group of political and historical significance. We have selected these five this year and next year it will be different books based, perhaps, on another criteria than what was used this year and hopefully with more participation from all of you once you are aware what the program is and what our intention is.

We are trying to set up a format where we have faculty, students, staff, and community involved in discussions. It simply will create an atmosphere where, instead of talking to someone about the weather outside or the Pacers or the Hoosiers or whatever, those general things are that we discuss when we meet someone and we are trying to break the ice, that we can now approach them based upon a book. Have they read a Bookmarks book? Which one? Perhaps engage in a conversation along those lines. It can be done informally but there will also be formal situations where books can be discussed and that is what I am in charge of working on. I have been trying to get around the campus. I have been trying to understand this network that exists here which is fairly overwhelming for a person who has not had any prior dealings at IUPUI. You all have titles. You all have so many councils and committee that it is really overwhelming. I am trying and I have met with probably about 50 or 60 people here at the University, trying to pick brains and brainstorm with them as to what will make this program work. I have gone to a variety of groups asking for your assistance. I can't make it happen alone. I can cheerlead for the idea, but I don't have the expertise to totally make it work. I need the support of all of you. I guess that is the reason I am here today to tell you a little bit about the program and also what I would like to accomplish and see if you have any ideas. As I talk to people I constantly find out things. Last week I was in the Student Activities Fair and I talked to a young man who is a student here and I mentioned my search for a film that I understand exists -- In Search of the Double Helix. He said it was quite exciting and had been put out by the BBC and he had seen it on television in March or April. I have been trying to research this and find out how I can get my hands on this. When I ran into this young man at the Student Activities Fair he said, "Oh Yeah! I am in Dr. Schneider's history class and he showed us that to us last year." Well, I don't know Dr. Schneider but I am going to soon. These are the kinds of leads that I need to put together an effective program.

On The Silent Spring, which I am most enthusiastic about because I think it deals with a topic that we are all concerned about in the '90s. Everyone is talking about the environment and the ecology. So, I think it crosses all lines. It can have greater interest to more people perhaps than some of the other books. I really want to do something special with that event. I would like to get a very major speaker in, which means that I need to also find money to sponsor this very major speaker. I am going to work on that, too. I think that we can put together experts from here, from the federal government and the state government representatives of all aspects. Rachel Carson started it all but according to what we read in the Indianapolis Star a couple of weeks ago, the State of Indiana sure hasn't come very far in air quality. What have we been doing for the last 30 years? Those are the kinds of things that we start with the book, we talk about the book, what she said, what she did, but where are we now and what has happened in between and what are some of the things that we are looking at in the future? So, I would like to do something major with that book.

The Federalist Papers. I am not particularly a historian and I did not know that this was the bicentennial celebration of the Bill of Rights. I found that out a couple of days ago simply through discussions. I understand that that is happening in December of 1991. So, I am hopeful that we are going to be able to tie in, and I understand that in our state we have some celebrations already

planned. The Bicentennial Commission is working on a celebration, and I also found that it is the 175th anniversary of the State of Indiana for statehood. The Philip Morris Company also has a major exhibit that they are sending around the country that deals with the Bill of Rights that I am hoping that we can also be a part of. I understand that the Humanities Council is doing some functions and we want to tie in with them. We want to put on a major function that can incorporate a lot of these things and make it special so that people will see that there is a pertinence. I was talking to Gene Tempel this morning about some of the ideas and he said that he had heard on television last night that, with everything that is going on in the Soviet Union right now, that they had asked for a copy of the Federalist Papers including the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. So, it is very pertinent today certainly with what is going on in the world of how we structured our country is very important in world issues, too. Perhaps you know individuals who are authorities in Russian history and government right now who would be interested in feeding in some information to a discussion group that we might put together on the Federalist Papers.

I understand that Gwendolyn Brooks with her poetry has some strong contacts here on campus and has actually been here before. We would love to try to bring her in for a situation where she might be reading some of her poetry, and we might put on a reception as well as some poetry writing seminars in connection with her appearance here. That is something that we need to work on and I need any additional input that you might have.

I would say that right now I am in the reading and distribution stages. The books are out. They are available and on reserve in the library. They are in the bookstores. They called me yesterday and said that the Cavanaugh bookstore has sold out of all of their copies but they were replacing them today. They are available. You do get a better price if you buy five of them together, but you don't have to. I am not even asking you to read all five. If you prefer to read one or two, then that is to the benefit of increasing our knowledge and general experiences together. But, of course, five would be nice. We also have a one-page analysis written by members of the faculty on each of the books. So, if you look at the book, you're not familiar with it, and you're not sure you want to read it, you can have a one-page analysis telling you what it is about and maybe then you will be excited enough about what you read to go ahead and purchase the book or spend your time reading it.

Some other things that I need discussion leaders and volunteers who will go out and speak to groups. We are hoping to put brown-bag lunches on frequently here on campus and I would like to know those of you who can say, "Yes, I am comfortable with being a discussion leader." Or, if you aren't, if you know someone that is. Give me the names of the experts and I don't mean just on the books. Having knowledge on subjects that relate to the books is also important. For instance, I'll have to admit that a couple of the books I am having a little difficulty thoroughly understanding and getting through myself. So, if you know experts that you think would be pertinent on the books, I would love to know their names. If there are films that exist, please tell me. I have been trying to research those. I have found three. I have the list of the three that are presently available at the library in Bloomington. Copies of the names of those are on the table here. If you have an interest for your classes, please pick those up. I am also trying to find audio cassette tapes because some of the people have indicated to me they don't have the time to read but they would like to have the experience of reading the book. As you are going to and from IUPUI perhaps an audio cassette would be helpful. I have only found the poetry to be presently on a cassette. I am also soliciting, through the student organizations, perhaps a reader or someone who would be willing to put a couple or all of the books on tape. I would love to ask you to include these in your classes. I know your curricula is set and I know that is unrealistic. But, I would like for you to keep me in mind for next semester as you are deciding what might be read in your classes if it is pertinent to what you are studying. I would also like for you to think of it in terms of maybe supplemental reading that could be assigned or used as an option. Also, extra



credit is always a favorite of my son who is in college. So, you might think of the books in those terms. If you would just encourage your students to attend the events that are planned on campus, that would certainly be a big plus also. I will answer any questions that you have about the program. As I said, I really believe that the program depends not as much on my success but upon your believing that it is a good program, that it will be helpful to the University and to all of us ultimately. We can't do everything this year. I am just trying to lay the groundwork so that this can be built upon and improved upon in future years. The things that we do I would like to do a very good job at but I definitely need your help. Are there any questions?

**BALDWIN:** I don't have a question but I would like to say that we do have multiple copies of these in the library and all of them are on reserve. So, if people don't want to invest money in these, we do have up to 20 copies of these books. They are on the second floor, Reserve Desk, in the University Library.

#### AGENDA ITEM V - Constitution & Bylaws Committee Report - Hitwant Sidhu

**BEPKO:** Next we have a Constitution & Bylaws report from Hitwant Sidhu.

**SIDHU:** If you will open to the second page of your agenda, you will find these amendments listed there. These amendments to the Bylaws were distributed and discussed in the IUPUI Faculty Council meeting held on May 2, 1991. In that discussion only one minor change was made in the amendments distributed to the Council members. If you will look in the first section of these amendments, (b) part in parentheses both lines, which reads, "In case of a tie, the *entire* Executive Committee shall vote." The word "entire" was deleted in the discussion in the last meeting. That was the only change which was made in the original document, therefore, at this time, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee brings the same amendments to you as a motion for your approval.

**BEPKO:** Coming from a committee the motion needs no second. So, is there any discussion on that motion? Are you ready for the question?

**MEISS:** Which is new and which is old?

**PETERSON:** The ones in parentheses are the new ones. The last one is an added, Article II, Section D5.

**BEPKO:** Is there any other discussion?

**BESCH:** This is the second article. What do you anticipate for the schools that don't elect faculty? For example, the School of Business? Does that have any impact on this change?

**SIDHU:** Not really, as far as we assumed that these nominations will be approved and given by the faculty of each school. That is the assumption. If that assumption is not correct or if we find that assumption is not met indirectly, we will try to request that those schools follow that procedure. That is what we are trying to do. Although the nominations will be sent by the dean, for the most part the nominations will come from the faculty organizations rather than from the dean.

**BEPKO:** Someone has called for the question. All in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, Hitwant.

AGENDA ITEM VI - Question-and-Answer Period

**BEPKO:** Next we have the question-and-answer period. There has already been an opportunity to ask some questions about parking but we may use this time for further questions about parking or anything else. We had no written questions in advance.

**BALDWIN:** Regarding these two cabinets, the academic cabinet and the operations cabinet, are the members of those listed somewhere?

**BEPKO:** There will be a news release shortly on the membership of those two cabinets. One reason for not publishing the list as of this time is that there is representation from each campus on each of the cabinets and it was left up to the chancellors of the campuses to decide which cabinet the Chancellor should be on and which cabinet someone else from the campus should be on. Also, there was some discussion about adding to the membership. I can give you an idea of what they will look like by telling you the offices that will be represented on the cabinets.

On the Academic Cabinet:

- Both co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council will serve. Dick Peterson and Norm Overly will serve on the Academic Cabinet.
- There will be three chancellors of the smaller campuses, three other representatives of smaller campuses, so that will mean that all six smaller campuses will be represented.
- The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Dean of the School of Medicine.
- Two additional deans and I think those will be the Dean of SPEA (James Barnes) and the Dean of Science here in Indianapolis (David Stocum).
- The Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties at IUPUI (William Plater).
- The Vice President for Planning and Financial Management (Judy Palmer).
- Vice President for Research (George Walker)
- Special Counsel for the President (Dottie Frapwell)

I think that is a total of 16 with Ken Gros Louis as chair comes to 17.

On the Operations Cabinet:

- Two co-secretaries of the University Faculty Council - Dick Peterson and Norm Overly
- Three chancellors from smaller campuses
- Two other representatives from smaller campuses. The reason for having just two other representatives is because Fort Wayne, which is a part of the IU system academically, is not a part of the IU system in terms of operations. Operationally, Fort Wayne reports through the Purdue system. Their paychecks come from West Lafayette and their construction projects and other things go through the Purdue University administration. They don't need someone from Fort Wayne on the Operations Cabinet.
- Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
- Dean of the School of Medicine
- Dean of the School of Business
- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at Indiana University - Bloomington (Anya Royce)
- Vice President for Administration (Terry Clepacs)
- Vice President for External Affairs (Doug Wilson)
- Vice President for Research (George Walker)
- Director of the University Budget Office (James Perin)

- Associate Vice President for Information Resources (Polley McClure)
- Director Human Resources (Margaret Mitchell)

I chair the Operations Cabinet making a total of 18 people on the Operations Cabinet.

**SIDHU:** The parking on the north side of Michigan has created another problem and that is that Michigan Street has become hazardous. It is a very dangerous place to drive. The other day I saw a gentlemen crossing one car at a time from one lane to the other. Is there any possibility you could provide police safety or patrol during the peak hours?.

**BEPKO:** I am not sure that we haven't had patrols of some kind in that area during the peak hours up until now. We do have, of course, the new lights there. They don't use the above ground gerbil tube which is available. I think you are right. We have to be very concerned about crossing there. We do have campus police on New York Street during peak hours, especially at the exit from the parking lots just west of University Boulevard. John, do you have anything to add to that?

**NOLTE:** We have tried a number of things to urge people to cross at the designated crossings but that is one of those things that we are never going to be able to persuade people to do entirely on their own. I think we are relying primarily on the signals to give us the breaks in the traffic so that it is not a long stretch without a signal or other reasonable stops to provide some margin of safety at this point.

**BEPKO:** It is a real concern. We will look at that. It is especially troublesome for law students because law students must cross Michigan Street and New York and it has been my experience that law students are the favorite targets of motorists. [laughter]

**GALANTI:** I am not sure that people on campus realize that we do now have traffic lights on Blackford at New York and Michigan and that rules pertaining to turns on red lights apply. I have seen people go through red lights at both New York and Michigan as we used to do when there were stop signs. I have seen people turn left onto Michigan and left onto New York from Blackford which is not permitted anymore. People are driving as if they had the old stop signs. That is not the case. I am not talking as a law faculty member but as a runner. I think we need to point out that the old rules that applied to stop signs do not apply with the traffic lights.

**BEPKO:** I think that may be a good suggestion for enforcement patterns. We may want to make sure that we have given some indication that we will provide deterrence at those points to the campus police.

**PETERSON:** If I am not mistaken, most states have a law where a vehicle is supposed to stop when a pedestrian is in a crosswalk. It might be good to have some police out there enforcing that law because crossing right in front of University Hospital where there is a well marked pedestrian crosswalk, if you don't run across there, you will get hit. I think we need to start enforcing that law on campus.

**SIDHU:** You can have two or three points on Michigan where they can cross. If you enforce that, the cars will never move on that street.

**BEPKO:** What you are suggesting is that we need school crossing guards. [laughter]

**YOKOMOTO:** I received something from Bloomington that looks like a page out of a Bloomington faculty handbook. Does anyone know whether they still have a faculty handbook or did they lose

theirs as we lost ours? We now use the red IU faculty handbook. That was what we were told two years ago but I received something in print that could have been from an old handbook.

**PLATER:** It is my understanding that they do not. What they do is issue, every year, a set of campus policies that pertain to the Bloomington campus which includes information about, for example, Promotion and Tenure. We do that though not as a packet. Dick may want to comment on this. We still intend to prepare an IUPUI specific document that will be attached to the "red book," and we hope that by next year we will be able to issue that to all new faculty and, of course, the continuing faculty as well.

**PETERSON:** That is a specific charge that we will giving to the Faculty Affairs Committee to work on. I have an appointment set up to talk to Kathleen Warfel tomorrow about that issue.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other questions?

AGENDA ITEM VII - Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

AGENDA ITEM VIII - New Business

There was no new business.

AGENDA ITEM IX - Adjournment

**BEPKO:** If there are no other business, we are adjourned. Thank you.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
Faculty Council Meeting  
October 3, 1991  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko. Deans: John Barlow, R Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Thomas Ambrose, Margaret Applegate, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Linda Brothers, Janice Bruckner, Walter Buchanan, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Carol Deets, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Linda Marler, Steven Mazzuca, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, B Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Eric Pumroy, Terry Reed, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Richard Turner, Henry Wellman, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Yu.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake, William Plater. Deans: A James Barnes, A. James Brown, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, David Stocum, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Darrell Bailey, Sally Bowman, Lucinda Carr, Anne Donchin, John Emhardt, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Mary Fisher, Janice Froehlich, LaForrest Garner, Philip Gibbs, Dean Hawley, Debra Helper, John Lappas, James McAteer, Gerald Paar, Richard Peterson, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Sherry Ricchiardi, P Kent Sharp, Jan Shipps, Gregory Sutton, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Catherine Palmer for Walter Daly, Shirley Yegerlehner for Barbara Fischler, Shirley A. Ross for Angela McBride, Rita Fordyce for William Voos, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Julie Su for James Baldwin, Ngoan V Hoang for Patricia Blake.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Henry Karlson, Jeffery Vessely.

**Ex Officio Members Absent:** Juanita Keck, Maxine Tutterrow.

**Visitors:** Karen Black (Registrar's Office), Mark Grove (Registrar Office), Robert E. Martin (Administrative Affairs), William Spencer (Chancellor's Office).

**AGENDA ITEM I - Approval of Minutes - March 14, 1991 and May 2, 1991**

**BEPKO:** Our first agenda item is the approval of minutes which I think have been distributed. They are the minutes for the March 14 and May 2 meetings of the Council. Are you prepared to approve those minutes? All in favor of approval, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? The minutes are approved as distributed.

**AGENDA ITEM II - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Bepko**

I have a couple of announcements. The first one I mentioned at the last meeting We are embarking this year on a new program of collegial reviews of academic administrative positions on campus. Previously, the only office that was regularly reviewed was the office of Chancellor and

now we are going to review all senior administrative positions including deans over a period of time. We will work with the five-year cycle but it will probably take us a while until we get to the place where we are actually doing reviews every five years. We have a little catching up to do. We are doing seven reviews this year. We announced those reviews, if not at the end of the last academic year, then at the beginning of this year at the last meeting. I said then that we would not have the committees appointed so that we could announce them at that meeting but that they would be announced at this meeting. For your information, we have lists of the memberships of six of those committees on the front table. You are welcome to take a copy and see who is the chair of each committee and see what the membership is. That is for six of the reviews. The one review for which we have not yet appointed a committee for is the review of Dean Jim Weigand of the School of Continuing Studies. That is, as I mentioned last time, one of those schools that operates across campuses and the process of appointment will take a little longer as a result. It involves the Office of Campus Administration in Bloomington as well as the heads of the faculty councils in both Indianapolis and Bloomington. So, it will take a little longer. We will have that for your later in the year. All of the campus committees for IUPUI are now appointed and will be functioning, if they are not already. One met this morning and the membership is on the sheets which you will find on the front table. We will welcome your suggestions and comments along the way. You will recall that that process is designed to develop open lines of communication across the campus and help all of us do our jobs better, to clear the arteries, and make sure that we don't have any blockages that prevent us from doing the work to advance the institution that we would all would like to do.

Another item that was mentioned at the last meeting was the creation of and the functioning of two cabinets that have been appointed by the President. There is an Academic Cabinet, chaired by Ken Gros Louis in Bloomington, and an Operations Cabinet that I chair. Both cabinets met last week in connection with the Trustees' meeting. The Academic Cabinet took up the issue of measuring our success. All of us across the University have a sense that the institution is getting better, that academic quality is increasing but we ask ourselves, "How do we know that? What are the standards by which we measure our progress as an institution?" That is the first subject that was taken up by the Academic Cabinet. The result of the discussion was a short paper that is being distributed to all deans and chancellors which in turn will be distributed through the academic units for discussion to all faculty. We hope that by January or February there will be enough feedback so that some recommendations can be made about the measurements that we use for determining if we really are getting better. Recognizing that measurements will be different for different academic units, not all academic units will be measurable by the same instruments.

The Operations Cabinet took up questions of future agenda as well as issues of Responsibility Center Management. With respect to the future agenda of the Operations Cabinet we thought immediately, even before the meeting, that in our client-oriented, service-oriented institution like Indiana University that the first client that should be considered is the faculty, as well as the students, but the faculty with the knowledge base that may be greater than the students should be consulted about ways in which we can improve the operations of the University to make the University more responsive and to make the University more efficient. To serve the faculty interest better we would like to know and we would like to hear from you about ways that you think the operations of the University could be improved, recognizing that not every suggestion, not every comment can be immediately translated into an agenda item but recognizing also that we have to hear from the most important clients about how we can improve operations. I offer that invitation to you today as a way of stimulating discussion but also a way of getting good ideas. Feedback on ways that we can improve the work that we do.

On the subject of topics for the future, a variety of subjects were considered, not only Responsibility Center Management, which was the subject of considerable discussion, but employee compensation issues, including fringe benefits and total quality management issues. Total quality management, for those of you who aren't familiar with the jargon, is sort of a brand name for one of the many new age management philosophies that have been brought into the workplace that involves decentralization, customer orientation, teams of people working together to try to figure ways of doing decentralized tasks more effectively and that involve statistical measurements that can measure quality of output. This was a subject of considerable discussion at the Operations Cabinet and will be probably a subject of discussion in the future. I suspect this is going to be confined, at the outset at least and maybe forever, to the operations of the University, not to the academic programs but it is something that has generated a good deal of interest. Other topics include reduction in the use of paper (how we can save money and be better by using our electronic communications media more and paper less), technology development across the University and privatization (using private companies to supply services rather than doing them ourselves). There has been a major movement in the business world to refocus companies so that they do the few things that they were established to do and do best and not try to do everything. Universities have experimented with that. We have done a good deal of that ourselves at IUPUI. In fact, I think we have done more of that at IUPUI than other campuses have and we think that is another topic for future discussion. Also noted were indirect cost recoveries (their generation and use have general human resources issues), were questions about escalating health care costs, the layered administration of Indiana University with apparent duplication of records and of record keeping at various levels in the University, and the recurring topic of research disincentives (the various obstacles that faculty members see in their paths to achieving research objectives).

In addition to some reaffirmation of the idea of Responsibility Center Management, there was a discussion about longer planning horizons for budgeting, and a recommendation will come to the President at the budget discussions of the units throughout the University and the budgetmaking that takes place as a result of those discussions, taking on a longer planning horizon than is currently the case. The idea being that we have become wedded to short-range, short-cycle thinking because we have always worked on a one-year budget pattern. People should be thinking about longer terms and we are likely to go to a three or four year budget cycle so that people can think more expansively about the use of resources. One of the opportunities that we may have missed by thinking in too short a term assumptions is the financing of big projects with the use of amortization concepts over a longer period of time. In any event, whether people choose to do that or not, I think that the units will be asked to plan a little further into the future than has been our custom in the past. If you have any comments about either the Academic or the Operations cabinets, particularly the work of the Operations Cabinet on improving operations, I hope you will let us know.

Finally, with respect to announcements, we have a program that you probably have read about or heard on the radio or seen on television called Help Wanted: Crisis in the Work Force. This is a project that was begun nationally. It comes from an organization called The Business Higher Education Forum and in partnership with something called the Business Round Table, two national organizations that wish to focus public attention on the relationship between education and the work force, on education and increased economic growth, and on education as one of the most important ingredients in success in a community. While people who are in leadership positions in government and in industry have been talking about education a great deal over the last few years, the public at large has not focused enough attention on that problem. Maybe it doesn't understand the problem well enough or maybe it doesn't understand education well enough and has been reluctant to be involved in that public debate. I think some of the best evidence of the lack of public attention to education has come in some of the disappointing results of referenda in this

area. When educational issues were on the ballot and people voted in a way that suggested that they hadn't paid sufficient attention to the educational issues that are in front of all of us. To focus public attention, Indiana University joined with the Indianapolis News and the Indianapolis Star, Channel 13, WTHR, and Arvin Industries to create this campaign called Help Wanted to focus public attention on education. The Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News and Channel 13, as well as some other media outlets have run a lot of stories and features, all using the logo Help Wanted. This is going to culminate 45 days after it began on August 22 with the request of the public to fill out a questionnaire. It will be in the News on the 6th of October, in the Star on the 7th of October. These questionnaires are being administered by our External Affairs office here at IUPUI. We hope to get a broad public participation in this program of emphasis on education. We want to get people to fill out these forms and to use the data that will result from the returned questionnaires in an effort to show members of the General Assembly public attitudes about education. We hope that attitudes are supportive and that advanced education is a part of the community's activities. We hope that you will speak well of this and get involved if you see an opportunity and that it results in some, not only some increased attention but some successes for those who want to make education a more important priority for state and local government. I have some copies of the questionnaire that will be in the Star and News, if anyone is interested. There are some copies here for your use.

Finally, today is the day that historically we have introduced new members of the Faculty Council. In previous years we asked deans to rise and give an elaborate introduction of new Faculty Council members. We found that consumed the entire agenda for the meeting. Not only that, but some people had trouble staying for the entire meeting while the introductions were being made. We also have the continuing debate on who went first. Some years, the largest school went first. Actually, I think that it was the most years the smallest went first and we went from small to large. But, the faculty from the largest school, I think, led by the person on my left, argued that it should be reversed from time to time so that the largest school went first. We tried that and the sum total of all of our efforts were that people thought that we could do the introductions better on a personal basis than we could by asking each dean to introduce all of the new members of the Faculty Council, recognizing that a lot of the new members couldn't be here on a particular day when they were to be introduced. What we have settled for by the recommendation of the Executive Committee is a general introduction of new members of the Faculty Council. So, what I would like to do at this time is ask all new members of the Faculty Council, both those who are new and here for the first time and those who may be coming back to join us, to stand and let us give you an appropriate recognition. [applause] Welcome and I hope you have a satisfying experience in your work with the Faculty Council. Faculty governance and the collegial atmosphere that we hope we create through Faculty Council activities are a very important parts of University life and we are delighted that you are now a part of that. With that I would like to formally introduce the person on my left that I alluded to before. That is someone you all know, Henry Besch, a distinguished professor of pharmacology and the person who is sitting in today for Dick Peterson who is in England on a richly deserved trip. Henry Besch will give the Executive Committee Report. Henry is very familiar with this, of course, because those of you who are not new members know that Henry served as head of the Faculty Council with great distinction a number of years ago.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - Executive Committee Report - Henry Besch**

**BESCH:** Thank you, Chancellor Bepko. I will start by telling you a little different evolution of the reason we introduced ourselves to each other in October for the years since 1985. That is because during many of the years before 1985, the October meeting was much like this one where



a few people would show up but with this kind of last bit of good weather I think most people would forego the pleasure of coming to this room or even to the room in the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. So, over the years we did have, with this other format, a much fuller room and in fact a full agenda. We had occasion, as faculty, to laugh at some deans stumbling doing some introductions. Other deans had occasion to laugh at us for some of our stumbling blocks. In any case, it took between 1984 and 1990 until we finally got it right. Once we got it right, we decided that we shouldn't do it that way anymore. So, we are back to not doing it.

I was serving on the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee, as you know, meets at least once and very often two or three times a month to carry on the business of the Faculty Council and of the faculty. In September all of us are preparing ourselves for classes, getting things started again and doing a variety of other things and a number of items sort of sit on the back burner. That was another reason why this meeting had traditionally been ultra slimfast. It will be fast again from the standpoint of the Executive Committee report today.

I have only one item to bring to you from the Executive Committee and that touches on one of the items that Chancellor Bepko mentioned -- administrative reviews. I think most of you will remember that the Chancellor did have an administrative review this year. There was an administrative review of the performance of the Chancellor's office and the Chancellor's performance which was reported to the President and ultimately the University Faculty Council earlier this year. One of the decisions that needs to be made after the end of such reviews is how widely the review will be shared. The Executive Committee in consultation with Chancellor Bepko agreed that the results of the review should be shared with the Faculty Council. That process will be coming about. We are not sure exactly how to do that. The report is not a report to the faculty, it is a report to the "boss" of the boss here. It is important, I think, that there be feedback to the faculty and I think Chancellor Bepko agrees wholeheartedly with that. I won't say very much more about the contents of the report at the moment. I happened to have served on the committee. Jeff Vessely was the chairman of the committee. The Executive Committee asked me to bring to your attention that we will be attempting to share the review committee's report with the members of the Faculty Council. That is the extent of my report today.

**BEPKO:** You may wish to report on the fact that one person who participated in the review process and filled out a questionnaire was a close relative of mine. The mailing list that was used to send out the questionnaire to the people in the community was taken from the excerpts from the mailing list that we use for a newsletter. I send that newsletter to lots of people and I used to send it in an individually stamped envelope but because I forgot every now and then I had it put on the mailing list to send it to my mother. My mother's name is not Bepko. She is re-married. They sent her a questionnaire. She filled it out as she thought she should but, being a very honest person, she put down at the bottom, "Of course, you may wish to know that my favorable responses could have been influenced by the fact that I am his mother." So, I had at least one good review.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - President's Review Committee - Frederick F. Eichhorn, Jr.**

**BEPKO:** Next we have something to make up in our agenda. I mentioned that we might have a visit on a subsequent occasion from the chairman of the review committee for the President. We have talked about our own campus review committees but the most important review of all is taking place within the eight campus system right now and that is the review of the Office of the President. The chair of that review committee is a member of the Board of Trustees, a person who is a friend of ours here in the Law School especially because he is a practicing lawyer in northwest

Indiana. He is a very good, well known attorney who has been President of the Indiana State Bar Association and has won all sorts of other laurels for excellence of law practice. I am pleased to introduce him to say a few words about the Presidential Review, Trustee Frederick Eichhorn.

**EICHHORN:** I am very happy to be here this afternoon. As Chancellor Bepko has told you, I am a member of the Board of Trustees. I am just beginning my second year. It is astonishing to think that a year has passed already, but it has. My current endeavor and what I am here to speak to you about this afternoon relates to the review committee for the office of the President of the University. At the time that President Ehrlich came to the IU system he had requested that his performance be reviewed during the fifth year of service. That is his fifth academic year, so we are at that point. The Faculty Council and the Board of Trustees agreed on the composition of the committee, which consists of 15 members. I am the only Trustee. There are administrators, faculty members, staff members, student members, and alumni members. We have had two meetings, mostly formative, preliminary types of meetings where we are trying to get our structure and our plans together. We had developed a mass mailing that will go to all faculty and staff. That will go out hopefully today or tomorrow and we have asked that it be returned by October 18. This is sort of a short time frame but we felt that if someone was going to return it and make comments that they could do it within that time frame and if they weren't going to do it, they certainly had plenty of time and no excuse for not doing it. The letter will also go to 1,000 randomly selected alumni and those also will go out this week, returnable on or about the 18th of October. The time frame for this effort is compressed. We hope to be finished by the end of the year. Therefore, we are trying to move things along.

Student leaders will be contacted and notices of the existence of the committee published in the various student publications. There will also be excerpts or perhaps the entire letter inviting comments published in the Alumni magazine which will go out around the first of November. We are dealing with personnel matters, so our deliberations will be confidential up until the time that we arrive at a final report. The final report will be a public document. Our next meeting is tomorrow at 1:30 at which time we will meet with the President to receive his thoughts as to what he expects this review to cover and what areas of his performance he would like to see examined. His opinions will be respected. They will not be controlling. We will have our own ideas about how we go about the review process.

Our next task, as I see it, and we have not agreed on this and we will talk about it tomorrow, will be to identify specific people whom we will interview. It is our intention to develop an interview questionnaire that we will utilize during the course of the interviews. We intend to interview administrators, faculty, staff, alumni, governmental officials, students, and other educators. It is a tall task. It is going to take a lot of time. Fortunately, we have a dedicated committee that is willing to devote the time and the effort to accomplishing the review and we, as I said earlier, hope to conclude by December.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Fred. Will you take a question or two if there are any?

**EICHHORN:** Yes.

**SIDHU:** As for the information from the staff, faculty, and others, will that be collected only through the questionnaire? Is there a possibility on some occasion you can have an open meeting so if the faculty members want to come, they can?

**EICHHORN:** With the mass mailing, we think we are reaching everybody. We are going to reach every faculty member, every staff member, and a substantial sample of alumni. The information

we receive will be kept confidential. Of course, there are some people who might have some reservations about their comments, if they weren't assured that the information would be kept confidential. But, it is our intention to keep it confidential. How that objective would be preserved in a public meeting, I am not sure. We are just developing our procedure and the things that we have agreed on is the mass mailing and then we will contact specific people within the various groups that I mentioned.

**SIDHU:** The information you get person-to-person and face-to-face is a little different feedback from what you may be getting in the mail. That is the only reason I asked that. Whether it is feasible or not, I don't know. That was just a suggestion.

**EICHHORN:** We will talk about that tomorrow. Thank you.

**BESCH:** I take it that the two representatives from this campus are Victoria Champion and Jim Smith. Is that right?

**EICHHORN:** I am sorry I didn't mention that. I didn't have the names of all the faculty members but you are right.

**BESCH:** Victoria Champion is a professor of nursing and Jim Smith is a professor of pathology in the School of Medicine.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other questions? Thank you, Fred.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - United Way Presentation**

**BEPKO:** That will take us to a presentation on the United Way and Karen Black is here to make that presentation. Karen not only is one of the co-chairs of the United Way and has done really superb work in leading the United Way campaign previously and again this year but those members of this special club. You also should know that she is a Cub fan.

**BLACK:** I want to thank all of you. I am here on behalf of all the co-chairs -- Barbara Cambridge, Richard Schnutte and John Short. I won't take up much of your time. I just want to give you some information about the United Way this year. Our goal is \$270,000 which is \$20,000 more than last year. We don't think we have set our sights too high to achieve that goal. The theme of the campaign this year is Something to Believe In. One of the things I did want to say to you today that on this campus there were a little over 300 faculty, staff, and students who took advantage last year of United Way agencies. There are 71 agencies with over 244 service programs offered. Ninety-two cents of every dollar that is donated goes directly to the service so that is the largest percentage of any campaign. The only other thing that I would like to say is that Vice Chancellor Tempel has talked about the kickoff. He used the definition of philanthropy that Barb and I liked to quote -- "the alleviation of human suffering and the advancement of human potential." Thank you.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Karen. We know that this has not been a good year in terms of compensation increases for any of us. Those of us who work in the University administration asked and were granted the opportunity to have no compensation increase. So, I guess all of us are not in as good a position to think about United Way as we may have been in other years. But, I hope that doesn't stand in the way of your participation. I hope you will participate as you can and that you will talk to others about it as well.

**AGENDA ITEM VI - Campus Safety - John Mulvey**

**BEPKO:** Our next agenda item is a report on campus safety by John Mulvey who is the Associate Director of Administrative Affairs in charge of this area of the University's operations. John has done splendid work over the last eleven years. I have served on a lot of search committees and have chaired a number of search committees. One of those that I look upon as being among the best was the search committee I chaired when there was a vacancy in the position that John occupies. The process led to the appointment of John Mulvey and I am very pleased about that.

**MULVEY:** I was asked to give an overview on crime on campus. I brought a couple of handouts which I hope you picked up on your way in today. I would like to refer to the first one, which has the Crime Clock on the cover. This was taken from the FBI's uniform crime report. It shows nationally what is reported by the police to the FBI and how many crimes occur in the United States that are reported again to the police. Attached to that I have put our figures for the same crimes for the IUPUI campuses and our off-campus properties. This covers all the properties that are owned and controlled by IUPUI in Indianapolis. I used the same categories that the uniform crime report uses. We broke that down on the next page into smaller categories because theft is, on this campus, our single biggest problem. The last page is for comparative purposes and it the Uniform Crime Report information from the Indianapolis Police Department. You can look at that at your leisure but I thought it probably would be appropriate to give you some facts and figures so that you would have a better knowledge of what we have. There is a disclaimer I want to make up front. Under the category of "Assault" we show all assaults -- simple and aggravated. The FBI crime report and the IPD report just show aggravated assaults.

Our number there is quite a bit higher than it would be if we just showed aggravated assaults. You can look at that and see that we have a small problem (although it is never a small problem when you are the victim) but we have a small problem with violent crime and we have a somewhat larger problem with property crime -- theft, in particular. We find that most often that the theft problem is caused by people who help the thieves. We leave offices unlocked. I don't know how many of our reports start with, "I left my backpack or my purse and went to the restroom and came back and my wallet was gone." Or, "I went to the cafeteria and I left my purse or wallet in the tray line and when I came back two and one-half hours later it was gone." Or, "I took off my ring in the restroom and washed my hands at 1 p.m. and when I went back at 4 p.m. it was gone." Too many of our reports start that way. In a lot of cases it is just carelessness. We are trying to work on that with our Campus Watch Program which I will talk about a little later. What has happened in the United States in the last couple of years has been a very focused look at crime on campuses. That look came about primarily because of one incident. It was a rape/murder of a coed on the LeHigh University campus several years ago. The young lady was in her dormitory room in bed when an intruder came in, raped her, and brutally murdered her. Her family had a lot of problems with the way the university handled the case and ended up suing the university and received a large settlement. The family used that settlement to set up the Cleary Foundation the purpose of which was to focus on the problem of crime on campus. They started in Pennsylvania and worked diligently and got a law passed requiring crimes to be reported on campuses in Pennsylvania. They then went out to other states. Several other states have enacted legislation. They went to the federal government and, with the help of others who were as equally concerned, got the Campus Crime Act of 1990 passed. The Campus Crime Act requires the reporting of certain categories of crime. It requires campus administration to give timely warnings to the university community in certain criminal cases, among them would be rape, murder, robbery and violent crimes. It requires an annual report that would include the crime prevention efforts that go forth on the campus -- the security policies on campus, the statistical reports on the same kind of UCR crimes that I mentioned before on the Crime Clock. This information is to be made available to students and

employees on an annual basis. We have already started the gathering of information. The first report is due next August. To make sure that we comply, we have formed a campus committee which, I chair, and we are now working on uncovering all of the policies, making sure that we are in compliance with aspects of the act. We feel that by the time that the first report is due that we will be more than ready to report. As an aside to that, we, as a campus, have always reported our crimes, at least for the last 16 years, because we have taken part in a voluntary program called The Uniform Crime Report (UCR). It is information which is compiled by the FBI and once a year they put out this book on crime in the United States. In 1988 when crime on campus became such a focus problem, there were only 300 universities in the country that were reporting in this. In Indiana, there were only four campuses that were reporting crimes to the FBI. They were IU Bloomington, Indianapolis, Gary, and Southeast campuses. This year I have noticed that a couple of other Indiana campuses are in here, but we have always made our statistics available.

Maybe I should give you a quick history of the UCR. In 1920s the International Association of Chiefs of Police decided that they needed something to find out what kind of crime rates we had in this country and were they going up or were they going down as well as were the police doing a good job. They developed this report and they included the crimes of murder, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, vehicle theft, and larceny. The reason they picked those crimes is that they had them enough to be significant statistically and the definitions of them are close enough that from state to state and community to community they can be used. A couple of years later the FBI took over the compilation and the reporting of the information. It is probably the most known and most used document when people work with crime in the United States. It has a couple of drawbacks. It is voluntary. You don't have to report to the UCR. Most major jurisdictions don't; a lot of them do but a lot of smaller ones don't. It is crimes that are reported or discovered by the police. In the event of murder or things like that, it is probably a crime that is 99 percent accurate. If you go to rape, you are probably talking about less than 50 percent accurate. Less than 50 percent of the rapes are reported. So, there are a lot fallacies with it but it is the only system we have had and it is a system that the universities have picked up and are going to have to use for their crime reporting.

We have always felt that our best allies are the public and we have tried to cooperate and give out as much information on any criminal case that we have as we can. We compile a daily morning report of all activity that happens on campus. If a school or department has a crime, we send a copy of that report to that school so they know what is happening. We sent copies to the campus administration. We are now moving into trying to be more proactive and that leads to the second handout which is the Campus Watch Program. Campus Watch is our biggest attempt to date to consolidate all the kinds of things that we do in crime prevention programs. I won't go over them all, but a quick example is one of the programs that we note is the COPS Radio Network. The COPS Radio Network is all the people on campus -- physical facilities, housing, or hospital or anybody who has a radio system. What we have tried to do is link everybody together so that they can help us be eyes and ears on campus. In the last two weeks, we had a report from a supervisor in housekeeping of a theft that was going on. We were able to apprehend the person. We then got a craft supervisor who was on his way home and had his radio in his hand and saw somebody in a construction site loading construction material on the back of his pickup truck. He called and we were able to go over and apprehend that person. So, some of these programs are more in place than others. Some are still in the formative stages, but we are finding that they do work and they are working for us. If you would like to be part of Campus Watch or would like to help us with Campus Watch, we would be more than happy to have you. Lieutenant Bob True of our department can be reached at 4-7971. Bob is coordinating the program for us and would really look forward to having some help. I think I would like to spend about two minutes going over our department and what we do and then let you ask any questions that you may have.

Our department is a fully certified police department in the state of Indiana. All of our police officers are certified by the state. We have 39 sworn, as we call them or commissioned, police officers on the department. To hire, we go through a battery of testing. We do physical agility testing, medical testing, aptitude testing, and intelligence testing and then we interview and then we do a thorough background investigation before we hire an officer. As soon as they are hired, we send them to the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy in Plainfield where every other municipal police officer in the state of Indiana and every sheriff's deputy in the state of Indiana goes. They attend a 12-week training there and when they come back we then put them on the on-the-job training program. They ride with a more experienced officer and are trained then for another 12 to 16 weeks. At the end of that period of time, they are put on their own but they are still considered probationary police offices until they finish their first year. When they finish their first year, if we are satisfied with their performance, we continue them. If we are not satisfied, we start the process over again. Once an officer is working within the department as a third, second, or first class police officer he undergoes continually training. We aim for at least 40 hours of training per officer per year. It covers the gamut from firearms and CPR and first aid training to stress training to dealing with violent offenders training. Whatever we think we need and whatever we can fit into our program we try to get for the officers. I know most of you think our officers write tickets. They do a little bit of that but that they do a whole of other things. They direct and control traffic as well as ticket traffic offenders, patrol all of our lots and all of our buildings, apprehend people who are committing crimes, and take reports on crimes that have happened. They do initial investigations. Probably the single biggest thing they do on this campus is give directions. You would be amazed at how many people on this campus everyday ask us for directions. We get in the office over 100 calls a day and generally the first question we ask is "Where are you?" because the first question they say is, "How do I get to the Law School or whatever?" It depends on where you are starting from. They normally don't tell us that. We just pick up the phone and they say, "How do we get to so and so?" We tell them that if they will tell us where they are, we will tell you how to get there. That happens hundreds of times a day. Another activity that we get involved in is letting people into their own cars. Daily we have a dozen to 15 people. We have probably about 14,000 parking spaces and when people park in them three or four times a day you are bound to have a dozen or so people who lock their cars with the keys inside. One of the other things that we do is help drivers find their own cars. It sounds funny but if you go in in the daylight and you park under a sodium vapor lamp, sometimes you don't even recognize your own car that evening. If you go into a building and you get turned around and you come out the wrong door, you don't know where your car is. So, we spend a lot of time driving people around helping them find their cars. We have a lot of people who tend to leave their lights on, so we do jump starting. Our calls for service that we get from the general public run about five for "help me" to one where something bad has happened. We would rather that be ten "help me" to one "bad has happened" but it runs about five to one where people are asking us to do something for them. The other thing is, "Unlock my office so I can get my keys to find my car." We also internally have several other divisions. I won't really bore you with them but I think if you would take a few minutes to come over and talk to our folks you would be surprised about how much activity we have and what we do. We have a detective section that naturally investigates crimes. We maintain an evidence room. We process all our own evidence. We have our own evidence technicians who are trained through the Marion County Evidence Laboratory. We have done some things that we were told we couldn't do. We have police agencies come in and ask us to help because they heard, for example, we had found a way to take fingerprints off a plastic bag which we were told we couldn't do. One of my folks got with somebody who got with somebody else and found out that there is way to do it using a super glue fuming technique. That ability allowed us two years ago to apprehend one of our employees who had robbed patrons of the library in Riley Hospital. The fingerprint evidence was needed because we didn't know who it was, he had a plastic bag over his head. Fortunately, he threw the bag down with fingerprints on it. We got the

fingerprints. He had a prior offense. We were able to find him, and he was sentenced to 48 years in prison, I believe, for the robbery. So, we can do those kinds of things. We do a lot of training. We go to the Police Academy and train people. Our officers go out and are used to train rookie recruits of other departments. We do inhouse training for our own people. We also have a police cadet program. We take students and send through a police academy and use them as student police officers. It is really neat to see these people when they go out and succeed. I have a problem because we have a lot of police turnover, but I am kind of happy at the same time. When I look around and see that the Chief of Police at Danville, Indiana, used to work for us. The Chief of Police at Brownsburg, Indiana, used to work for us. The Deputy Chief of Carmel, Indiana, used to work at Bloomington. The Chief of Police in Speedway was a former IU cadet. The Finance Officer for the Sheriff's department of Marion County was a former IU police officer. We have had great success with our people. We continue to have great success with our people. We are really happy with those folks.

We also do some things for you that you might not know. For example, if you move in from out of state and you need your car checked by a police agency, we will check it and validate it so that you can get a plate for Indiana. If you need certification and need fingerprints, come over to us and we will take your fingerprints and help you get that certification. On new employees of the university we run a limited criminal history check to make sure that we aren't hiring, for example, child molesters to work in Riley Hospital. There are a whole host of other things that we do. I said I would do two minutes and I have done five minutes.

**BEPKO:** Let's leave time for questions.

**MULVEY:** I will break there and ask if there are any questions.

**COONEY:** This isn't a question but a compliment. I have used your escort service many times and have found that the officers were extremely polite and very willing to drive across the street to my car and I appreciate that.

**MULVEY:** Probably the sorest point that I have is our escort service. I think it is a valuable service and I don't know if all of you know, but 24 hours a day, seven days a week if you feel unsafe on this campus, if you will call us, we will have someone come and escort you. Unfortunately, if it is a warm, calm, pretty day, very few people feel unsafe. If it is cold, snowy and rainy, everyone feels unsafe. We have a little problem because we get taken advantage of when people use us for taxi service. While we don't mind doing it, it really ties us up.

**APPLEGATE:** What is balance theft?

**MULVEY:** That is theft of balance, primarily from the medical center. It is great stuff if you are a drug dealer.

**QUESTION:** Regarding the shuttle service, how late do they run?

**MULVEY:** I don't know but you can call 4-7971. The escort service will take care of that whether or not the shuttle service is running.

**WELLMAN:** I don't want my comments to take away from all the good things you do, but I personally think you have a serious problem with your police and rapport particularly with faculty and students. They border on being rude. The morning that classes opened, for example, there was a patrolman, I have the names, etc., who was standing on the corner of Vermont and

University Boulevard. He would not let people turn right from Vermont so we could go into the parking garage. I then had to drive around to try to find a parking space. I found a parking place and then I went to the office and talked to an officer. He was extremely rude to me. He investigated and he pointed out to me that the officer totally misunderstood his instructions and was not doing a good job and then admonished me for bringing it to his attention. He was extremely rude. This is not the first occasion. A number of my employees were late to work because they couldn't get into the garage. It was a total disaster. I had my parking permit on my mirror and when I pointed to it to the officer, he pounded his hand on the hood of my car, etc. I think this is totally out of line. I think you need to work on the rapport.

**MULVEY:** We are aware of what happened that morning and it was an absolute disaster. We don't know where his brain went but it left.

**WELLMAN:** I was the faculty person who took the brunt of your officer and I thought he could have at least been courteous and said we are sorry. There was no apology. I was 20 to 25 minutes late for people who came from out of town that were talking to me about \$150,000 grant. That is the most serious and most recent case and I would like to call it to your attention. The hospital patrols who are coming around to our offices. We have never had any problems with them. It is primarily the people who are on the traffic patrol.

**MULVEY:** We are working on it. If we have a problem, it is with that portion. I will apologize to you in this public forum. We did have, for some reason, we don't why, he decided not to let anyone turn into the garage. For about two hours it was a disaster. What had happened is the student lots had filled up and there was no student parking in that direction. We were saying, "Force everyone back to the east end of campus where parking is available." He was forcing everyone back to the east end of the campus, not allowing the people who have reserved parking spaces in the garage to enter the garage. There is no excuse for rudeness and I will not tolerate rudeness. Again, I apologize. I will have to say one of the things that happens to our traffic officers when they get in an extended situation like that is they don't really have the time to stand and discuss because they are trying to move a lot of traffic through. It doesn't excuse rudeness. It never will excuse rudeness. But, they don't have the time and they get upset when they don't get the people to do what they are trying to get them to do. If anyone else has a problem, please bring it to my attention and we will straighten it out. If I have a final comment, my feeling is how we should interact out here is somewhat like a referee at a basketball game. If you go to a basketball game and the referee continually blows the whistle and calls every little foul that happens, you get so annoyed that you forget that you are at a basketball game and you really think about the official. On the other hand, if you go to a basketball game and the official doesn't call anything, it quickly becomes a brawl and nothing ever happens and you are really upset again. But, if you go to a basketball game and the official does a decent job at calling what is a foul and letting slide what is a minor infraction, you go home, you talk about the game and you don't talk about the officials, then you have been to a good game. That is what we want to do. We want to run a good game. We want to do what we have to do but we don't want to be intrusive while we do it. Sometimes we know we fail. Again, I apologize for that.

**QUESTION:** Approximately how many parking meters do we have on campus? My question is how much revenue do we gain by having those parking meters on our campus?

**MULVEY:** I really don't exactly how many we have. The Parking department reports to me but I really don't have those figures handy. I think the revenue is significant and I will have John Nolte get the figures to you. I don't have the figures and anything that I would give you would be an absolute wild guess. But I will have John Nolte get the information to you.



**BEPKO:** John, isn't it also the case that it is not just a revenue measure but it is a way of regulating visitor parking.

**QUESTION:** One of the things that I have noticed is at Radiation Therapy facility which is close to a street. Oftentimes I see patrons who are being treated and would like to park as close as possible. I see them being very disgruntled if we have a patient who is receiving therapy obviously for cancer or a rather nasty disease and then they come out and they have somebody ticketing their car. I don't think it is good community relations to have parking meters in front of a place where treatment is being given such that we are trying to generate revenues.

**MULVEY:** The reason those are there is to turn over traffic so parking spaces for patients will be available. What happens is that people will pull in with a permit, take their permit down and drop a quarter in the meter. What they are doing is taking away from that patient parking, especially those meters are there especially to help the oncology patients. Parking Services has worked out arrangements with the Department of oncology on extended stay for some of those people and other things like that. That has been taken into account. The reason they are there is to provide that close parking because the other option is to take away the meter parking and tell them to park in the garage. That is really unfair for those people who are coming in for that treatment to go that far. So, the meters are there particularly because they want them there for the patients.

**BEPKO:** I think if the people who are doing the Oncology treatment wanted to remove the meters I think we would probably be happy to do it. I don't think it is a revenue issue at all.

**MULVEY:** Absolutely not. It is there for the convenience of the patients.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, John. I might add one other point that is noteworthy and that is that I think the safety and security programs of the campus are quite good and they are done on a shoestring. We don't have the kind of funding that some universities have for this and we have not increased funding. In fact, we have asked John to make some sacrifices in recent years to reallocate funding to academic programs. He has done a very good job of providing the services and has done it on smaller budgets rather than larger budgets. So, thank you, John.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII - Environmental Concerns Committee - Richard Strong**

**BEPKO:** Next we have a report from a committee that was appointed a little more than one year ago on environmental concerns and Richard Strong is here to give the report of the committee.

**STRONG:** There was also a handout that basically summarized the report that was submitted to the Faculty Council committee last year. (See end of minutes for a copy of the report). I have been asked to brief you on the committee's report. Last year our ad hoc committee was charged with preparing a report that describes the present programs, plans for future programs, and ways in which individuals may contribute in errors related to the environment. The committee consisted of 14 members. I co-chair the committee with David McSwane of SPEA. We met six times and had numerous issues discussed. The items listed on the handout are those which were discussed in some detail. I won't talk about all of them but I will discuss some of the main issues that you may have interest in and then if there is anything that I leave out, I will be glad to discuss those.

Recycling was probably the issue we discussed most. You read about that in bulletins around campus and in newsletters. I'll just give you a brief summary on where we stand with recycling, there was an independent committee formed over a year ago that investigated recycling on

campus, looked at the waste that is being generated, and came up with several different options on how to implement recycling on campus. That committee report was submitted to Bob Martin of Administration. Currently, we have a very limited recycling program for paper. We also are recycling cans across campus. The standing committee is the Environmental Safety Committee, which is charged basically with looking at policies and recommending policies and procedures that the University can follow to comply with different environmental regulations. We also looked at the departments on campus that relate to the environment. The department of Environmental Health and Safety, which I manage, has a responsibility for insuring compliance with all environmental and safety regulations for the campus, aside from radiation safety. There is a separate department that manages radiation concerns.

Some of our responsibilities are hazardous waste pickup, insuring proper disposal, monitoring personnel exposure to hazardous materials, and cleaning up hazardous waste spills. We have a fairly broad background of individuals and also fairly broad areas of responsibilities which I won't go into too much detail unless people have some specific questions. One of the things that we spent quite a bit of time on was trying to develop a questionnaire to get feedback from other faculty, staff, and students. Finally, toward the end of the semester, we decided we did not have enough time to send out a questionnaire. We had questions about the actual format, so we decided not to send out a questionnaire.

One of the recommendations we came up with was that we should add student/faculty representation to the Environmental Safety Committee. That has been done to a limited extent. David McSwane, who is a faculty member in SPEA, has been added to that committee. He is also chairman of that committee for the next two years, which takes care of #2 which was also the recommendation that chairmanship be rotated.

We also decided that the Environmental Safety Committee should focus on their current role of review and recommendations for safety and environmental policies.

Number 4 is fairly self-explanatory. There was a need to inform staff, faculty, and students regarding environmental issues and how we needed some mechanism to get some facts across. These are suggestions that could help solve that problem. I think that the main things that you need to address are the recommendations that ask for some action on your part. The first was, and this was felt strongly by committee members, the main members wanted to continue on the committee but it was an ad hoc committee last year. We recommend that a permanent Environmental Concerns Committee should be formed and should serve as a high profile resource on problem solving group for issues of community interest. What we have determined is that the Environmental Safety Committee is more geared toward looking at specific issues and policies and adopting policies and procedures. What we want to have is an open forum where you can address general issues, have some research done by committee members, and then come up with recommendations. If that is formed, we recommend that the committee concentrate on recycling, mass transit, ride sharing, and other types of transportation issues to try to reduce the number of automobiles coming on campus which affects us in numerous ways.

We also recommend that each year this committee's final report will end on the anniversary of Earth Day, and that there will be some type of event established to celebrate Earth Day and talk about the issues and the policies that they had come up with during that year.

The one last issue that we are asking for some input on is very important from my point of view and that is the smoking issue. There was a policy adopted in 1987 by the Faculty Council. From what I can find out, it has never been revised. There is a lot of new information out concerning

smoking and the adverse health affects on people exposed to environmental tobacco smoke. I attached a recent page out of a newsletter we received that I think summarizes very well the hazards of environmental tobacco smoke. There has been another committee that evaluated the smoking issue on campus and submitted a separate committee report to Bob Martin of Administration. That committee recommended the campus go to "no smoking" as a policy. Those are the two items the committee came up with that need your action and I will leave that up to you to decide what you want to do on those two issues. If there is time, I will take questions.

**BEPKO:** Are you proposing that we take action on this today?

**STRONG:** I don't know about your time frame. Those are things that we felt needed your action and whether it is today or the next meeting, there isn't any real time frame established for implementation of either one of those. To establish a permanent Environmental Concerns Committee, I don't know how often it would meet, but to get one started, we would like timely action.

**BEPKO:** Would it be a good idea to offer that as a proposal today for a vote of this body, although this wasn't announced as an action item on the agenda? I am not sure that will prevent us from taking a sense of the house poll on whether the Constitution and Bylaws Committee should take this up. Henry, is that a good approach?

**KARLSON:** The resolution to amend should be sent to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. We can't take a vote on it today because we didn't have prior notice and without prior notice it takes a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the Faculty Council, including parties who are not here.

**BEPKO:** We could do a sense-of-the-house poll. How many think that this is a good idea, just to get a sense of the body without formally adopting the resolution? Those who think it is a good idea, please raise your hands. I think that on that basis a recommendation should come from the head of the Faculty Council to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to consider this. However, the Executive Committee would take it up first.

**WELLMAN:** Could I make comment in support of the Faculty Club? The Board of Directors voted that the Faculty Club would be posted as a "no smoking" area.

**SCHERLE:** May I ask what recourse we have when the members of offices have posted "No Smoking" signs in the main entrance of the buildings and repeatedly it is ignored? Also, in the CA Building apparently the main room that is designated for smoking is the room for food service and the vending machines. Many students have told me that they detest going in there. I know I avoid it when I can because it really is unhealthy. What can be done about that?

**STRONG:** That contradicts your current policy that you have in force now. The building coordinator is the designated person to enforce the smoking policy at this point. It is a misdemeanor, so the ultimate recourse is to have the police department come in and inform the person that if he/she doesn't quit smoking, that it is a misdemeanor and they will arrest them. That hasn't happened but that is the policy. So, it is up to the building coordinator to enforce this. Vending areas were designated as "non-smoking" areas, as far as I can recall from your original policy. Your policy is being violated consistently across campus.

**ALIPRANTIS:** What about offices where people smoke?

**STRONG:** If the building is "non-smoking," they shouldn't be smoking in the building. You should contact their supervisor. If you want to contact me, I will look into it personally. I get a lot of "no smoking" or smoking problems called in and I will look into them. Building Services personnel will respond or they should.

**RICHWINE:** You said you had limited programs for paper recycling. We would like to recycle our paper. We started doing it. They started taking away the paper and then they stopped.

**STRONG:** Are you in the SPEA building?

**RICHWINE:** No. We are in the Coleman Hall.

**STRONG:** There were some pilot programs implemented to see how best to recycle. I wasn't aware that Coleman was one of those. Some of those programs did not work out due to vendor problems or other associated problems. Recycling is really fairly difficult to get implemented on a campus wide basis. The recommendations we have is that they can be phased in. The problem is we have to meet fire codes so it is not as easy to recycle as it is at home and also we need funding to buy new equipment because we are changing from a current disposal method to a totally different method. It is going to require different supplies to do that with. I don't know why you got started because it wasn't one that I was involved with. Probably, the reason it got stopped is because of logistic problems. There are two ways: One way is Printing and Duplicating has indicated they will pick up recycled paper. If everyone calls them, I don't know how they are going to do it. We have a program over in the new Medical Research library building. We are taking the money that is generated from that, which is very small, buying new waste containers and implementing programs as necessary. Building Services or Campus Facilities Services are the ones who are implementing the program and they are the ones who haul the paper away. They are the ones who are buying the waste containers.

**MCGEEVER:** This is on another topic. Is asbestos one of your environmental concerns? it is not mentioned under recommendations. Why is that?

**STRONG:** Asbestos was discussed because it is a concern of a lot of people. During our discussions I explained what our program was. We have personnel and staff that remove asbestos and monitor the removal of asbestos. The main concern of the committee was that that be done in a proper manner and that some thought be given to what is being removed versus just saying remove everything. It was an issue that was discussed but there was no real recommendations that came out of the committee to address it.

**BEPKO:** I will try to restate where we are. There was a sense of the house that a permanent committee be created. Would you restate the other proposal?

**STRONG:** There is a proposal that you re-evaluate your smoking policy and establish a new policy that makes all buildings no smoking.

**REED:** It doesn't make any difference if you change the policy, whatever it is, the majority agrees. Why even bother to change it because if you don't enforce it, there is no use?

**STRONG:** I think that is a good point and it is harder to enforce when you have one building no smoking and another building that allows smoking. If the whole campus goes to no smoking and it is publicized and enforced across the board, I think we will have a better environment. At the Union Building it took six months. Most of the people there now don't smoke. There is a transition

stage.

**BEPKO:** Can we get a sense of the body on this issue. The question would be, I suppose, would you recommend that this be taken up by the Executive Committee and referred to the appropriate standing committee if the Executive Committee determines that this is a good time to reconsider current smoking policy and to consider adopting a totally "smoke free" environment on the campus? All in favor, raise their hands. Any opposed?

**QUESTION:** Point of information. If we move it to the Executive Committee, will it come back here?

**BEPKO:** Do you mean before anybody studied it? Any change in policy has to come back to the whole body. In fact, many of us recall vividly the last experience we had with this it was very intricate and a fairly long, drawn out process to reach the position we are at now. I think it would be absolutely necessary for the whole Faculty Council to be involved in the reconsideration of this issue, but it should be reconsidered on the recommendation made formally by one of the standing committees of the Faculty Council as it was last time when we took this up.

**QUESTION:** I presume that the Environmental Concerns Committee has already done some study.

**STRONG:** The Environmental Concerns Committee did very little investigation. There is a substantial report that was done by another committee that is mentioned in our final report to this committee and that is available. Bob Martin has that report.

**BUCHANAN:** I seem to recall reading that IU East campus is smoke free. Is that the only IU campus that is at the present time?

**STRONG:** That is the only one I am aware of.

**BUCHANAN:** What about any of the Purdue campuses?

**STRONG:** I don't know. This other committee investigated smoking policies at other universities but I don't know if Purdue was one of them.

**BEPKO:** For your information, the Administration Office building, if you haven't been there in the last year or so, has been smoke free for the last year which has caused the person who has the administrative responsibility for the building, Bob Martin, Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, no end of grief because he smokes heavily and he has to sit on a bench out in front of the building in order to do so. Thank you, Richard.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII - Question-And-Answer Period**

**BEPKO:** We didn't have any previous time for questions. We did not have any written questions in advance but if you have any questions now, I would be happy to try to respond.

**REED:** I don't know whether you want to put this in the environmental concerns or the question category, but there was uncertainty involving the minutes at the beginning. I received the March minutes after the May minutes and we had already had Faculty Council where we approved the April minutes. That is a six month period. Did that mailing go out to the general faculty? Did every faculty member get the March minutes? It seems to me that that is a waste of money and

paper. I don't care what the reasons are but if that happens, can we restrict it to just current Faculty Council members for archival purposes? It seems that most of them went into the waste can. Most of it was stale news and had already been taken care of.

**BESCH:** The Faculty Council over the years has, as I am sure you know, Terry, has wrestled with the distribution of the minutes and the impact the distribution has. Various solutions have been proposed short term which don't seem to have worked out. For example, a couple of years ago the University Faculty Council proposed to distribute the minutes by computer. There were a number of problems with that. Many people couldn't get them and there were a variety of other problems. Then there were some substantial concerns at the UFC level which may reflect some things that happened here. That was that the minutes were not widely enough distributed. Also, you may remember the Secretary of this body a couple of terms ago tried to make shorter minutes by giving summaries of the minutes and saving some time, space, and ink. That didn't work to the satisfaction of the body as a whole. I think it is unique, though, that we decide that if it is just plain old we ought to, instead of throwing it away by cycling it everybody, we ought to just not cycle it.

**REED:** I haven't been on the Council for a few years and I usually read them but I certainly won't go back six months.

**BEPKO:** I think that is a good comment. Maybe the Executive Committee ought to consider that.

**MCDONALD:** We recently received a mailing of the IUPUI administrative committees. I noticed that there were seven, I believe, concerned with technology of one kind or another and I understand that those are pretty much prior committees with new names and new directions. The question I have is concerning the seventh committee which is the Technology Coordinating Council, which is chaired by a senior official based in Bloomington. I believe I am correct in that the new Associate Vice President for Information Resources is a Bloomington appointee. I wonder at our campus committee being chaired by someone from another campus.

**BEPKO:** Well, it is true that her principal office is in Bloomington but she is creating an office here and she reports to me.

**MCDONALD:** So, there will be responsibility for activity here?

**BEPKO:** We thought that it would be a good idea to bring, Miss Polley McClure in case you don't know the person to whom Dana is referring, who has been the head of University Computing Services in Bloomington has been Associate Vice President for Information Resources. She is referred to informally within the University as the University Chief Information Officer and the reason that is informal is because there are a number of points of confusion if you make that the official title. That is, she is a Chief Information Officer in capital letters. Does that mean when the media want to contact someone at the University about the flat fee in Bloomington, do they call here? No. So, it is an informal designation. Given that she is going to have overall coordination for the University's information resources and she is very talented and a very knowledgeable person, we thought it would be good to bring her into the campus' technology planning and to engage her and the vision that we have developed for technology on this campus. Our concern over having someone from another campus be involved has been minimized by the fact she does report to my office as well as to Ken Gros Louis in Bloomington, but she is in the direct reporting line to my office. We thought that the opportunities presented by having her involved in our creation of a vision for this campus were greater than any disadvantages associated with having someone from another campus be involved. In fact, we consciously wanted to make her active in

our planning.

**MCDONALD:** So, it was diabolical strategy.

**BEPKO:** I wouldn't characterize it exactly that way but we think this is an opportunity rather than a risk. More opportunity than risk. There is always some risk with every opportunity. Opportunity and risk go hand in hand. This is a good opportunity in our view to bring in somebody of great talent who will have a significant amount to say about the University's overall technology development into our own planning efforts.

**BROTHERS:** Given the budget constraints for 91-92 debate, what is the justification for the expenses for the Bookmarks Program?

**BEPKO:** That is a good question. This was not an expensive program, for one thing. I think that the costs are minimal. I don't have a report for you on the exact costs but I think we probably should make a report to you on that. I think that one response is that the costs are minimum. The second response is that this program had been planned long before the budget problems came to our attention and was sort of in the works and went forward. I have the same sense, and others have mentioned the same point, especially last month when we had a report on Bookmarks. It came right after our conversation about the serious financial problems that we have and it did look like a new program highly visible in the face of budget constraints. I can only say that it was planned before it is in the nature of a diminutive expenditure and it is truly a wonderful program. You are right. The point is well taken. We will report back to you on the costs of the program if that is something that you would be interested in.

**KOLESKI:** What is the selection process for the Administrative Review Committees?

**BEPKO:** The membership of the Review Committees reflects recommendations that were made to us by the Executive Committee and by the recommendations that were made to us by the Office of Student Affairs that recommended the names of students. We also discussed the makeup of the committees with the incumbents and, in a couple of cases, recommendations came from them. We thought that, as an important dimension of forming the review committee, to let the person being reviewed identify an area that they were particularly concerned about. For example, in the case of the review of the Vice Chancellor for Administration, we talked about specific constituencies and there were some recommendations made by Bob Martin that we thought were excellent and that they were incorporated into the makeup of the committee. A vast majority of appointees to all of these committees came to us from one of the duly constituted groups, either the Executive Committee of the IUPUI Faculty Council, the school-based faculty groups, or the Student Affairs office. We would, however, urge you to make known your views, if you have suggestions especially about any of this, I think we should hear your suggestions because this is the first year we are doing this. We are bound to make mistakes and we would like to constantly make the process better. In fact, in the spirit of the review process, we should be thinking as a group, all of us, how we can do this better and we would like to hear from you.

**SIDHU:** As far as the minutes are concerned, I would recommend that minutes should be made available to those faculty members who are interested in having them even though they are not members of the Faculty Council. Some of us feel that we have lost touch. We don't know what is happening even though it is on the computer and may not have the opportunity to look at it.

**BESCH:** I would say that we should direct our attention to the fact that we don't again have minutes that are six months old.

**BEPKO:** I think that is a good point. Ever since I have been in this room for 20 years, occasionally people ask me about whether they might be wise to have themselves be put in the race to be the Secretary or if things go well, the position will finally, maybe someday be called "President of the Faculty." My counsel is not very strongly positive and in large part the worse part of this job, no question about it, is the minutes. Various secretaries have devised various means to try to diminish that job and none, I think, have been successful. I think someday we will have somebody who will. In the meantime, it looks like we are stuck with doing it the way we are doing it because it is important information.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IX - Unfinished Business**

**BEPKO:** Is there any other business?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Last year we discussed and approved several criteria for promotion and tenure for the whole Indiana University system. It is time now to take a look at the implementation of the promotion and tenure criteria on our campus. It seems to me that it is appropriate to combine both components of IUPUI -- the IU and Purdue -- into one as far as promotion and tenure are concerned. Presently, we have two committees at the university level; the Panel E (Purdue) and the IUPUI Campus Committee. Those two committees should be combined into one -- which I would like to refer to as the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee -- that will recommend promotion and tenure of the IUPUI faculty to our administrators.

Accordingly, I propose that the Executive Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee (and any other IUPUI committee with authority on these matters) discuss the legalities for the formation of such a committee. Any recommendation from these committees should be reported to the IUPUI Faculty Council which, in turn, should decide about the final details of the formation of the IUPUI Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**BEPKO:** IUPUI does have a campus committee that is meeting like any other university committee. It is just that it does not apply to the Purdue faculty. The Purdue faculty have their own campus committee and it is a different process. It is by and large a campus committee and it is a different process. It is part of the agreement that IU and Purdue entered into 20 years ago, but it may be that that system should be reviewed. I think it is something worth talking about. I am not sure of the correct way of approaching it, the best way to develop the discussion so that it could be of some impact at the appropriate time. The relationship between Indiana and Purdue is very complex. The interests of Purdue University and the campus are equally complex and it may not be as easy as saying, "We are big enough and mature enough to be on our own." It may not be that easy. I am not sure that I know the best way to take it up. But, it certainly is something that we should talk about. It has been discussed. It may be that some changes are appropriate or will be at the right time. There are faculty members from Science who are eligible to be elected to the Tenure Committee. I don't know that the School of Science has a representative on the Promotion Committee. There is a separate Promotion Committee for the campus and a separate Tenure Committee. We think there should be one committee -- Promotion and Tenure -- but we haven't worked that out. I am not sure that Science has a representative on the Promotion Committee. There is an elected Tenure Committee and people from the schools of Science and Engineering are eligible for election to that Tenure Committee. If somebody is elected to that committee, is it sensible to have someone from Science sit in judgment of others but that others don't have a right to sit in judgment for the people in Science?



**SIDHU:** Henry, can the faculty take action on that?

**KARLSON:** It has not been sent to any committee and there is no motion on it.

**SIDHU:** It has to go to the Executive Committee for discussion.

**KARLSON:** The Executive Committee creates its own agenda, unless there is a specific referral to it by motion of the assembly.

**BEPKO:** Dr. Besch might indicate his willingness to pass this along to Dick Peterson who, I am sure, would be happy to put it on the agenda.

**BESCH:** We have an Executive Committee member here and Walt Buchanan is also an Executive Committee member.

**BUCHANAN:** This is a point of information regarding the IU schools here. They are equivalent to Panel E. Do they have IU Bloomington faculty on those committees?

**BEPKO:** There is no Panel E for IU appointees. There is no committee beyond the campus recommendation, but there is a review of every tenure and promotion case at the University level. The question isn't whether you have such a review, it is what the procedure is. I think there will continue to be review of every promotion and tenure case after it leaves the campus as long as we have one University and one University Board of Trustees. I don't think that is likely to change. So, the question becomes what is the best procedure to make a recommendation from the campus to the University administration for the transmittal to and either approval of or a disagreement with and then transmittal to the Board of Trustees? In the case of IU, the matter goes from my desk to the President's desk and issues, if any, might arise at that point. In the case of Panel E, the recommendations go to the President at Purdue University from Panel E. I thought the more serious issue that was raised this year, one to be worked out yet, was that there was no formal opportunity for the campus administration to record its views in the procedure. The matter goes from Panel E directly to the President of Purdue University. We thought that was wrong because in the case of Indiana University, the last recommendation comes from the campus administration. But, inevitably, the recommendations will have to go to IU or Purdue Trustees and I think it just the question of what the process is here on the campus. That is something that is good subject matter for discussion by the faculties, certainly of the affected schools. But, if the affected schools would like to talk on a broader plane about it, I see no reason not to do that.

**MCDONALD:** Chancellor, I move that we adjourn because the law students are waiting to get into this room for their class.

#### **AGENDA ITEM X - New Business**

There was no new business.

#### **AGENDA ITEM XI - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** If there is no further business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
Faculty Council Meeting  
November 7, 1991  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** **ADMINISTRATIVE:** Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. **DEANS:** John Barlow, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. **ELECTED FACULTY:** Margaret Applegate, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Sally Bowman, Linda Brothers, Janice Bruckner, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Mary Fisher, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Jean Gnat, Dean Hawley, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Linda Marler, Steven Mazzuca, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, B. Keith Moore, Richard Peterson, Terry Reed, Sherry Ricchiardi, Norris Richmond, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Philip Scarpino, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, William Schneider, P. Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto. **Ex Officio Member:** Henry Karlson. **VISITORS:** Erwin Boschmann, T. Kay Carl, James Carter, Jack Hudson, Chris Keeley.

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** **DEANS:** Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** **ADMINISTRATIVE:** J. Herman Blake. **DEANS:** A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, David Stocum, Jack Wentworth. **ELECTED FACULTY:** Veda Ackerman, C. D. Aliprantis, Thomas Ambrose, Walter Buchanan, Lucinda Carr, Carol Deets, Anne Donchin, John Emhardt, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Janice Froehlich, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Melvin Glick, Debra Helper, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Steven Leapman, James McAteer, Richard Meiss, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Gerald Paar, Eric Pumroy, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Margaret Richwine, Gregory Sutton, Richard Turner, Henry Wellman, Donald Wong, Lei Yu. **EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Juanita Keck, Maxine Tutterrow, Jeffrey Vessely.

**AGENDA ITEM I - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**BEPKO:** The first item consists of some reports from the administration. We have two topics. The first one has to do with the School of Medicine and is for your information. As you may know, when the state communicated its fiscal problems to the universities in the early stages of the 1990-91 session of the General Assembly, we began a process of examining programs to determine the best places from which to draw funds for reallocation. We went through a series of examinations, both in the schools and in the university in general, and one of those was an examination of what is called the Indiana University Statewide System for Medical Education. It was a system created about 20 years ago by which we offer the first two years of medical school at eight different sites around the state. The thought was that we could consolidate some of the basic science programs at those medical centers, not by bringing all of that activity to Indianapolis, but by having fewer of those regional centers and having them be larger and thus save a considerable amount because of economies of scale. You should know that only about 15 or so students are admitted each year at each of those regional centers. This was discussed with people in the political community and it got to be rather controversial. At the very end of the legislative session, as the controversy reached its peak, the General Assembly, as a part of its budget enactment, instructed Indiana University to not reconfigure or refocus any of those regional medical centers and to spend the 1991-92 academic year studying the situation. The budget enactment called specifically for a report on the status of those centers by November 1, 1991. The School of Medicine and the campus joined together in appointing a council to study the future of the statewide medical education system. It was chaired by Jeff Segar, a retired lawyer with one of the major firms who specialized in health care practice. The principal staff person

from the University side for the Council is here today. That is Doris Merritt, an associate dean from the School of Medicine. The Council conducted a series of hearings and studied the functions and the success of the regional medical centers in the statewide system over the past 20 years. They concluded at the end of the study, sometime in October after the last meeting of the Faculty Council, that the regional centers should be continued in their current form and no consolidation or reconfiguration should take place and that, in addition to continuing the programs as they are now constituted, additional funds be provided for medical education to make up for some of the losses that have occurred through state funding cuts. The Council also recommended adding some funding for medical education to create a primary care network to address the problem of distribution of physicians among medical specialties. There are too few family physicians, especially in rural areas. So, the recommendation of this Council was to add \$2.5 million to the medical school's budget to make up for losses that had been incurred, with almost \$7 million over a two-year period being withdrawn from the base of the Medical School budget, and an additional \$1 million for the creation of a primary care network to be layered on top of the existing regional medical centers.

Finally, we recommended, although the Council didn't specifically deal with this, we, meaning the medical school, recommended that some additional funding be provided for a model rural health care center to address not only the need for additional primary care physicians but also to change the distribution of physicians within the state, which is skewed in favor of urban areas and against rural areas. Some 30 percent of the state's physicians in rural areas serve 45 or so percent of the state's population, and 70 percent of the physicians in urban areas serve 55 percent of the state's population. The idea was to try to attract more physicians into rural practice. Those recommendations were transmitted by us to the University administration and the Trustees. Last Friday the Trustees adopted the recommendations and, in turn, transmitted the whole package to the State Budget Agency on November 1, which was the date that we were obligated to make our report. I offer that mostly because there have been a lot of rumors about the closing of regional medical centers and the impact that might have on medical education. The University's position is that this should not be done, that there should be no closing, consolidation, or refocusing at this time and that there should be additional funding added for the purposes that I described. This, of course, now is in the hands of the State Budget Committee and the General Assembly. Our guess is that they will thank us for the council's study. They will agree that the regional medical centers should not be closed or reconfigured, but they will say that there is no money for any new programming or any make up of losses in the previous year. I would be happy to answer any questions and Doris Merritt is here, who, not only may be available to answer questions, but may have a comment to make to embellish what I have said.

**WILSON:** Aren't the consequence of this that the Medical School has a worse problem than other schools in reallocation and that money might have to come from somewhere else and have to be reallocated within Indiana University? My question is, is that money going to come from just IUPUI or is it going to come from the entire IU system? How is it going to be spread out?

**BEPKO:** The answer to your last two questions first. No and no. The reallocation will not come from outside of the School of Medicine. The School of Medicine will face a more difficult challenge, in this one sense, and that is that one of the primary and most readily thought of sources for reallocatable funds was this statewide system. If you assume that the most likely candidate for reallocation has been eliminated, in part for political reasons, then it is more difficult for the School of Medicine than it is for other units that are facing the same kinds of financial problems. Apart from that, it is the same problem that all schools face. Each school has had to absorb the proportionate amount of the cuts that were made by the General Assembly, and each academic unit has been asked to provide reallocatable funds to give compensation increases for continuing personnel in their units. That is true for every

school. The difficulty that the School of Medicine has is that one of the best, I think some would argue the best, sources of reallocatable funds has now been taken out of the analysis for a variety of reasons, some of which are political.

If there are no other questions or comments, we have one other item to report on and that is some changes that have been made in the organization chart for the University. We publish this organization chart once a year in the fall and it is just about ready to be published again. If it isn't out already, it is in the process of being distributed and we noted at that time that some shifting and some refocusing of the operations of the campus have taken place. Bill Plater is going to describe those things today.

**PLATER:** One of the major changes that we would like to talk about is not actually a change in the organizational chart, but a further development of the three offices that provide most of the technological support services on campus, called Integrated Technologies. About two years ago, we began to ask these offices to work more closely with each other in the development of facilities and services and especially in planning. As a consequence of their joint efforts, they began publishing a joint newsletter about a year ago called Integrated Technologies, which described the services and support activities that were available to faculty and schools. As a result of that interaction, we asked them to take the further step of determining how they could achieve greater efficiencies for the support of the academic mission of the campus by combining some of their activities, for example, their respective budget offices, engineering staff, and other functions so that we could, hopefully, redirect some of the funds that may have been, in part, duplicated, into more academic-oriented services. After several months of planning, we have taken the step now of actually integrating the staffs of these three separate organizations.

Effective in January, there will be a unit known, at least provisionally for the short run, as "Integrated Technologies." The interim director for this will be Garland Elmore, who is currently the director of the Office of Learning Technologies. The staffs of the separate organizations are going through a process of deciding how they can realign themselves, not only to maintain and provide all of the current services, but to reorchestrate themselves for better and more effective services in the months and years ahead. I think the important point to make right now is that there will be no real change in the short run in the ways in which individual faculty or school offices relate to the separate services. There will be changes over a period of months. The respective offices and the persons with whom you relate are taking it upon themselves to inform you of the changes well in advance, so by this time next year, we should have made a truly effective integration without any disruption in service whatsoever.

At the same time, we are going to incorporate into this organization our University Computing Services as it applies to all of the support and customer liaison on this campus. So, effective again with January, you should not have to worry about which office you call for computing. It will be one office to serve both administrative and academic computing. These changes will be fully described in the next issue of the Integrated Technologies newsletter. Between now and the beginning of January, there will be various announcements made to all of the different user groups, beginning with the deans and the directors of administrative units, through the various committees and individual faculty who are primary customers of the respective services.

The other change is actually a change in the organizational chart. But, it continues a process that we also began over a year ago, and that is to build and develop the emphasis of this campus on undergraduate education. About two years ago we created the office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education headed by Herman Blake. This year we have taken the additional step of

changing the reporting line of Student Affairs from my office to that of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education. In so doing, we have taken two of the units that used to report to the Dean for Student Affairs and asked them to report directly now to the Vice Chancellor, these being the offices of Undergraduate Admissions and of Financial Aid and Scholarships. This is a part of a continuing effort to strengthen and build the infrastructure and support services for undergraduate education. When we made the change with Student Affairs, we also decided that it made more sense to have the portion of the housing division that is responsible for the physical plant - for the residence facilities that we have on campus - to report to the Vice Chancellor for Administration, and that change has been made effective this fall as well.

One other change occurred as a consequence, and that is asking the Child Care Center to report to the Vice Chancellor for Administration, largely because the service that is being provided is almost equally divided (in fact, a little more heavily weighted toward employees rather than students.) As I think you all know from reports last year, we are in the process of developing the Child Care Center into what we hope will be a much expanded and different facility, and it seemed as though this should occur under the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs, where many of the other human services departments and divisions are located. I would be happy to answer any questions about these changes.

**BEPKO:** If there are no questions, we will move on to our next agenda item.

## **AGENDA ITEM II - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT - RICHARD PETERSON**

**BEPKO:** Our next item is the Executive Committee report with Richard Peterson, which includes, as I understand it, one of the most exciting things that we do every year and that is the vote on N.

**PETERSON:** Since we are all anticipating the vote on N, the expert on the vote of N is Henry Besch, of course. He will attempt to explain this and explain our current position on N.

**BESCH:** According to Article IV of the Constitution, actually it is every odd numbered year that we select the number N, which affects election of unit representatives. The Executive Committee is charged with attempting to find the value of N which is, in fact, the subject of a handout which was on the table as you came in.

The suggestion is that N remain at  $N = 46$ , which means that one elected person in this Council represents 46 persons on the faculty. That is a simple interpretation of N. This table lists the number of faculty in each unit, what value you get by dividing that number of N of 46, and rounding off that number to the next highest number and that gives you the number of unit representatives a unit is entitled to for the next service period. We have bolded the section, which is changed each year, which lists unit by unit how many unit representatives each unit may elect. That information is conveyed to each dean and to the faculty governance of the unit and we have an election. The Executive Committee recommends that N be set as 46, which will give us a Council of 102. Since we acted on recommendations in this body about changes of the number of officers, etc., it is not possible to specify the exact number of people but it is somewhere between 102 and 104.

**PETERSON:** Do we have a vote for approval on the acceptance of that? Is there a motion?

**P. BLAKE:** I move that we accept that.

**PETERSON:** The motion has been made. Is there a second?

**BESCH:** Since it comes from the Executive Committee, it needs no second.

**PETERSON:** All in favor of this, say "Aye." Any opposed? [none] There are several other items that I want to cover with you today. I think, since we have two visitors with us representing our fringe benefits, I would first like to cover an issue related to changes in fringe benefits.

As you may or may not have noticed through the communications that have come to you, there have been three changes in our insurance plans this year. The first of those is in the accidental death policy that we have held. The change in the accidental death policy, which is something that you pay for personally, is a reduction in its cost. There are no other changes in that plan as far as we could detect at the University Faculty Council. Chris Keeley and Jack Hudson are here to answer additional questions on all of these if you want to ask them questions about that.

The second thing that I would like to mention is that there is a change, as usual, in the premiums for health insurance. That is something that seems to come along every year. This year there was almost a 30 percent increase in the costs to our health care plan that is administered through Blue Cross/Blue Shield -- a 30 percent increase in the claims that were made against that, which means that our insurance costs some way or another have to go up 30 percent. The University ended up putting in quite a bit more from their perspective, which will be the subject of some additional comments that I will have a little bit later. Then there were certain adjustments in the individual plans that are available. The group that suffered the most, if you want to put it that way, are those people who are on the \$150 deductible level. That group, as a group, was really not paying its way because they were getting paid for almost everything. That \$150 is a very small. So, they were getting the greatest benefits. Those who were on the higher level were suffering as a result of that. So, there have been some other minor adjustments in the \$400 deductible and the \$800 deductible range. The greatest difference is in the \$150 deductible range. You may consider that fair or unfair, but that is the way that the system was worked out and we didn't exactly approve it at the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits level, but we did have an opportunity to look at it and make our comments on those rate changes.

The last thing that there has been a change in, which is probably the greatest change and probably the most beneficial change in our insurance this year, as I see it personally, and that is in our long-term disability plan. In looking around and checking into it, Margaret Mitchell and her group found that TIAA/CREF was willing to bid and be competitive on a long-term disability plan. That plan now includes several variables, including our ability to choose a plan which will pay our TIAA/CREF contributions if we become disabled which was not available under the old policy. So, you can choose the plan that would make those contributions. You must sign up for the TIAA/CREF plan by January 1. Actually, during the window that is open during December in order to get that without a health check. I have two questions that have been brought to me related to the long-term disability plan, and that is why I have left that until the last discussion of these three insurance plans. I would like to see if we can get some answers to these because they have been raised by faculty members and then when I have answers to those I will open up discussion to the rest of the group if you want to ask questions.

The first question that I have for Chris and Jack is, does this plan in any way alter the current disability plan that is held by the University; that is the one that was approved by the Board of Trustees some years back where part of our TIAA/CREF and other benefits are reduced by that disability plan? Is that

still intact?

**HUDSON:** That is still intact. That plan has not been changed in any way.

**PETERSON:** So, if someone doesn't have this they are still covered with that disability plan and it has not been altered in any way?

**HUDSON:** That is correct.

**PETERSON:** That is what I thought I heard earlier but there were some people who had that question and I thought I might as well ask it here when the experts are here. The second question that has been raised by somebody to me is, has the definition of disability in any way been changed in this new long-term disability plan as opposed to the one that we had earlier that was a purchasable plan?

**HUDSON:** The wording is a little different but the administrative interpretation is the same. Basically, the TIAA plan is as good as, if not better than, the old plan.

**PETERSON:** So, there is some change in wording which was noted by this individual but that does not change the administrative interpretation of disability?

**HUDSON:** That is correct.

**PETERSON:** I will open it up for other questions related to this.

**SIDHU:** If there is no change in the interpretation, could we hear what the reason was for changing that benefit?

**PETERSON:** (Repeating Sidhu's question) What was the reason for the change in the wording itself? Was it because that was the preference of the insurance company or was there some other reason for that interpretation?

**HUDSON:** There is standard language which they always use. We addressed that. The only difference is the wording in it. That is all that it is.

**PETERSON:** Are there any other questions related to this?

**BESCH:** It seems me to that one way we could look at whether we should opt for the change is to consider what incentive there is for us to take this new plan. Are there any other major incentives besides protecting our TIAA/CREF funds?

**HUDSON:** The Board of Trustee Long Term Disability policy for TIAA participants is still in force. One of the problems with that policy is that faculty are not covered until they have five years of service and have tenure. Others without tenure are not covered until after seven years of service. Another problem is that the University payment is reduced by the TIAA income "available" when disability starts. Once TIAA income is started it can't be stopped. If you come back to work, you can't shut it off. Employees who have been here for quite a while, 15 or 20 years or more, may feel very comfortable with the plan we have not. Others may want to purchase the insured plan, basically, to protect their TIAA/CREF account balances. And, if they have opted for the "Annuity Premium Benefit" option TIAA would be adding new contributions to their contracts at the rate of 12 percent of their

salary.

**KEELEY:** This plan does extend to biweekly paid employees.

**PETERSON:** I was going to mention that but thank you for mentioning it.

**ROBBINS:** I know that the exception to the 18/20 eligibility age of 64 was never intended to be a disability plan but it is clearly my impression that the rights now for most exceptions is some kind of disabling condition. Could you characterize for us where that exceptions process is now in terms of whether it is presently functioning to provide exceptions for those who otherwise qualify for 18/20 and will continue to do that?

**HUDSON:** The committee is still active, Jim Perin is the chairperson. Exceptions have been made, but under the Board of Trustee guidelines only if there are medical impairments or hardships. Exceptions are not intended to replace the disability plan. In fact, most of the exceptions have been made to those who were qualified on their length of service, but were a year or two short on the age requirement.

**ROBBINS:** Do you know if there has been any change in that?

**HUDSON:** Not really.

**PETERSON:** I hope that this is clear to all of you. I hope that we all understand what our options are related to this. I will get to further discussion of fringe benefits later in my discussion.

**KEELEY:** I just wanted to remind the group that November is the open enrollment period. If you have questions, our office is available to you. You may come in or you may call us. We also have information sessions. We will be glad to come to any unit that would like to have a more geographically pleasant environment. We will be pleased to come and outline what your options are and bring the forms. If you do nothing with the health care, you don't have to re-enroll. If you do nothing, you will continue with your current plan. The only thing that will happen is that the rate change will be automatic. So, if you want to change your level of deductible, you have to fill out a form to tell us that.

**PETERSON:** If people are on the long-term disability plan that they purchase at this point, they will automatically fold over into one of the new plans?

**KEELEY:** That is correct.

**ROTHMAN:** Is the rule the same for the coverage that we have now?

**PETERSON:** Yes, without the coverage for TIAA/CREF payments. If you want to have those TIAA/CREF payments, you need to at least make that change.

**ROTHMAN:** What has happened with the prescription plan through Hooks? Has it changed at all?

**PETERSON:** It is still the same. I would like to move on with my agenda and then the other items that we have on the agenda today. The next thing that I would like to call to your attention is really not on the published agenda, but it is something that has been brought up from the Affirmative Action



Committee at the University Faculty Council, and it has been included along with your minutes today. This is a reporting item to you that this is being considered. I think we can take a small period of time today to discuss this, but the comments that are made today in our discussion and any other comments that I receive or that any members of the Affirmative Action Committee receive will be taken into account in revising this plan, so that it eventually can be brought to University Faculty Council for a vote. The President and the committee and other people didn't feel that what we had in the current Academic Handbook adequately defined things. What that has more definitively pointed out exactly is what we mean in this area of relations with students. Any comments that you have on this, we will be willing to have a short discussion, but I think I want to limit that to about five minutes so that we don't get out of line on the timing of this meeting today. Have you all read this? Have you looked at it? Do you see any major problems with it? It will certainly come back here probably at our December or January meeting in perhaps refined form.

**WILSON:** I guess my main question is what kind of legal clout does a document like this have? If you have a faculty member and a student who are deeply in love with each other, if they don't stay apart, how are you going to stop it? How can you do that legally even though professionally it is unethical?

**PETERSON:** That I think is probably one of the major questions that come up with this. You have defined it, you have told people what it is but what are you going to do about it?

**BEPKO:** There is a section in the Code of Academic Ethics specifying remedies and I take it that those remedies would be available to for a violation of this standard. It says in here, "... therefore the University will view it as a violation of this Code of Academic Ethics if faculty members engage in amorous relations with students for whom they have any professional responsibility." If it is a violation of the Code of Academic Ethics, that opens up the potential for all of the remedies and penalties that are provided generally. That is not to say that they would be involved but it opens up that whole potential.

**PETERSON:** In this document there is a definition of relationships with individuals who you do not have a specific instructional or other relationship to. If you are a faculty member and find yourself in such a relationship, all of those other ties should be immediately severed. That student should no longer be in your classes; they should drop out of your classes. They should no longer be a graduate student in your department or, maybe, at least in your laboratory. You should not be on that student's committee. All of those kinds of things. No professional relationship of that sort should be continued. That would be one way for you to try to avoid potential complications.

**SIDHU:** Is it feasible that you are teaching a course and you have that kind of relationship with a student, what are the possibilities? Either you are not going to teach when that student has to take that course or the student moves to some other school? Those are realities. Rights must be protected. We can unintentionally crucify some faculty member.

**WARFEL:** Could you clarify whether or not post graduate residents taking exams at the Medical School are students?

**PETERSON:** I would have to define them in that relationship personally looking at this and the relationship that a professor or a physician on staff would have to that person who has a reporting relationship to that individual for a grade or for whatever.

**MOORE:** In reading this rather quickly, I see no exceptions contained in this for individuals who are

actually related like husband and wife. Am I wrong?

**PETERSON:** There are none here at this point.

**MOORE:** That could pose an interesting dilemma. I think it needs further consideration.

**PETERSON:** I think there are some issues and problems with this. Next week, when we discuss it at the University Faculty Council, I am sure similar types of things will be brought out. I think I have some of the sense of your sensitivity on this and hopefully we can get something that is acceptable to everybody eventually.

**BRUCKNER:** I would like to say that sexual harassment has the possibility of going both ways. It need not necessarily be from a faculty member to a student. It can actually go the other way. There is a possibility of that. There is a vulnerability that I guess I see as a female faculty member to male students, that I don't feel that is adequately represented. The way this is organized there can be false accusations of sexual harassment that puts us in a very vulnerable situation. I don't know how sensitive people are to that as an issue, but I would like to at least raise it as an issue.

**PETERSON:** I think what I would like to encourage you all to do so that your specific words and concerns get to the body that will be doing the final editing on this, which is the University Faculty Council Fringe Benefits Committee, is to address those letters and memos to Dolores Schroeder who is in the Medical Science Program in Bloomington. Hopefully, that will address the problems that we are thinking about here. I don't think there is ever any way to get totally around all of the problems. We do want some better definitions and hopefully we can eliminate most of the difficulties.

**KARLSON:** Actually, this is an attempt to address two separate problems. One is conflict of interest. In fact, the conflict of interest is strictest when you are married to the individual concerned. The conflict of interest is one issue. The other is the issue which you have raised here, is the issue of sexual harassment and the appearance of evil because of the superior subordinate relationship that student/faculty create. These are two separate problems both of which are addressed and intertwined in this. Unfortunately, as to that second one, any time that you create a prohibition false claims of violation of that prohibition can be brought forward. That is the nature of creating a prohibition. I think Justice Thomas would write an excellent article on that topic. The mere point which I am trying to make is, I don't how you could define any circumstance that false accusations could not be made.

**PETERSON:** I would like to terminate the discussion on this because of lack of time. I think there is a lot of interest in this topic. The last thing that I would like to cover are some of the activities that have taken place in the University cabinets. I wasn't able to be here last month and there are two meetings of each of the cabinets that have taken place. I would first like to cover some of the things that have happened in the Academic Cabinet and in the process that we are going through to alert you to what we are discussing to allow for your input in the process at as early a date as possible.

The first meeting of the Academic Cabinet covered the issue of measures of academic progress. A document came out of that first meeting, which was distributed to the deans of all of the schools, and I think those deans have mostly distributed that to you. You should be looking at that in your individual schools to see if you can fit within those definitions and how you might, as a school, look at this. Certainly, one of the things that we were sensitive to, and that I have been sensitive to, is the mission of the specific unit that you are talking about. Therefore, it would be difficult for somebody else to define how a unit is making progress when you may have a mission that is very different than

another unit who may be judging you. So, it is best if that is looked at, at the lowest possible level. This relates to progress of students, it relates to distinguishment of faculty and it also relates to the research of the individuals. As you look at this document, if you don't have copies of it and you wish copies of it, they certainly can be made available to you. This is a public document that was distributed by Chancellor Gros Louis at the termination of that meeting. Please request copies if you don't have it. I have distributed it to all of the standing committees and also to the Executive Committee. Any of those people should have it available.

In a second meeting of the Academic Cabinet we discussed educational attainment at Indiana University. That was in the context of minorities, of the new majority, and retention of people within the University. Four points were brought up by the individual who was discussing this. I will read those four points to you from the document that he prepared for us.

1. What are our campus university goals for undergraduate attainment and do these fit into our undergraduate mission?
2. How do our institutional goals fit the students we accept and match up with their academic expectations?
3. What strategies and programs do we need to develop, change, or discard to enhance our students' progress in meeting their educational attainment goals?
4. How will we measure our progress in enhancing undergraduate attainment?

These are some issues that have been on our minds and have been on the President's mind. One of the things that is particularly troublesome to him and other people is that in some of the "regional campuses", and that includes IUPUI with relationship to some of the numbers, there is a very low graduation rate for those people who start off in the University and say that they want to get a degree. On some of the other campuses in other areas it is down to about 25 percent of those people continuing to be in a degree program or who have obtained a degree at the end of six years which seems extremely low. Those numbers are being looked at again to find out what is happening to those people. They all say they want to get a degree when they come in, but for some reason we lose an awful lot of them. So it is a problem; it will make our University much more efficient if we can keep those people here. It would make it a much more efficient operation. It is of concern. I don't want to discuss it in great detail here but you, as individuals, will certainly be involved in discussing that.

Next, I will report on the meeting of the first Operations Cabinet, which primarily related to Responsibility Center Management. I don't want to go into any detail on that. We certainly are in the process of evaluating that and looking at the whole budget process as a longer term process than just a one-or two-year process. Looking at it more from a three-and four-year process, we will have better planning to go into the future. The last meeting which was just this past week, of the University Operations Cabinet involved a presentation by Margaret Mitchell on fringe benefits. We now return to the fringe benefits area.

As you look at a 30 percent increase in our health insurance costs this year and if we take that out into the future, and we don't do something to cap our overall fringe benefits, we could be paying a much greater percentage of our compensation package to fringe benefits in the very near future. We already are fairly high in the percentage of our compensation package that goes to fringe benefits.

That is in comparison with industry in this area and the majority of other universities throughout the world. We have also, by this body and by the University Faculty Council body and by the Bloomington Council, looked at other issues including such things as TIAA/CREF benefits for summer employees. That certainly is something that could increase that percentage. The family leave policy, which we approved and that was approved by University Faculty Council, also would have to be included in this whole fringe benefit package. I want to bring this issue to your attention. There are no predetermined ways in which this will be done. A number of things are being looked at by the Operations Cabinet but we also want you to look at that and take a proactive relationship to this. The Fringe Benefits Committee certainly can be involved in this. Budgetary Affairs Committee may be involved in this, and other committees may want to be involved in this also to look at this. How can we proactive in trying to not get that fringe benefit percentage any further out of line, yet provide us with those things that we need as faculty members? It is extremely difficult because immediately when we start talking about this, we as faculty members, get our hair up on our back and the University is going to take one more thing away from us. In reality, Jerry Bepko reminds me that we, as faculty members, are members of the University. We are the University. We need to deal with this as faculty members and see how we can work with it. That is a serious issue and it will have to be dealt with by us all, and I want you to be involved in that as much as I am involved in this Operations Cabinet. I can't defend my position unless I have feedback from you.

**SIDHU:** May I make a comment? You mentioned that there is a concern about graduating our students and their mission. What I am saying is these issues are being discussed at the higher level, but those issues are directly related to faculty in general. I think faculty participation is very important and I will urge the Executive Committee to bring one item from that Council at our discretion so that you raise the question of how we can help them to graduate? We never go into details as to how we admit them. How we admit them is a much larger problem, and I think input of the faculty is needed. The same thing happened last year when undergraduate admissions was created at the student level. I don't know how much input we had as a faculty. This is my personal request that the Executive Committee should pay attention more closely and bring these items to the Faculty Council for discussion rather than spending some of their time on informational items which may not be of much use.

**PETERSON:** I certainly would like to be able to open this up for discussion. I think we need to have something that is developed by a smaller faculty group to react to, because if we try to discuss something of this magnitude in a group of this size, we could get wrapped up in multiple hours of discussion with no output. So, the Executive Committee should take note of your comments, maybe appoint a specific committee or assign some specific tasks to a standing committee that could deal with these issues. I appreciate your comments.

**PLATER:** If I could just comment on this, I think the Faculty Council has been involved in many of these issues. At least once a year for the last three years we have brought to the Council a full discussion of the undergraduate education center and the policies that have gone into shaping the creation of that unit from existing units and the policies that have governed the students admissions and retention of students within that unit. We do have very good committees at work on overseeing the process made up predominantly of faculty. That structure has been explained to the Faculty Council body as well. The Academic Affairs Committee of this Council works very closely with an administrative committee to insure that the policies established by the faculty are, in fact, being carried out by the administrative units. I think we do have an effective mechanism that we should be using. If there are any concerns about it, I think they should be addressed to those committees.

**PETERSON:** It would be my intent to address at least the committee that we as a Council can have an effect on and that is our Academic Affairs Committee to address some of these issues to them for their study and for input.

**KOLESKI:** Is there any analysis using the feedback to students to find out why they drop out?

**PETERSON:** That is a study that is being done. Judy Palmer is working on this and she is trying to follow students consecutively and then do exit interviews essentially or send them questionnaires when we find out that they have left the University to find out what the reasons are. She has made quite a large study out of this. If you have specific questions as to what she is doing or want to have some input into how this is working, she would be probably the best individual to contact.

**KOLESKI:** Is there any "impartial analysis" that could be done in relation to our health insurance at the University? When we compare our costs rising at 30 percent per year versus the average rise in the nation of 10 to 15 percent per year, it would seem to me that it would help us understand what factors are driving our costs in our own organizational plan.

**PETERSON:** Are you talking about the health care costs?

**KOLESKI:** That is right.

**PETERSON:** It is a nationwide problem. I don't have any independent analysis of that. I don't know whether the numbers we are getting are true. I only can trust those people at this point. If there are serious questions about whom we can trust, then we need to be proactive in that. I have no reason to doubt the numbers that we are being given.

**KOLESKI:** I don't either. The question, it seems to me, turns out to be around the issue of somebody perhaps the administrative body that handles the University's and the Faculty health insurance premiums and reimbursements to provide to us an analysis of what parts of our health costs are going up and what parts are remaining constant.

**PETERSON:** We have asked for a breakdown in the whole fringe benefits package to see what percentages of fringe benefits are going into what category. That is one thing that we requested. Also, this further breakdown in the health care area is very important. We have gotten some information and some input into which category of deductible is spending the most money and other similar things can certainly be done and we will ask Margaret Mitchell to deal into those data in a greater detail so we can be better informed. Some of that has already been requested of her and it should be distributed shortly and then distributed to the appropriate faculty bodies to look at that as part of the process.

**BEPKO:** I think we are better off than most big organizations in that we have had smaller increases in our costs than is true of a lot of companies. I don't know whether anyone can explain in a nutshell why health care costs are going up so dramatically. It is easy to see that there are more services available, there are more expensive services available all the time and all of us want them. We don't want to be without good health care. That causes the price of this to go up faster than the price of anything else.

**KOLESKI:** When we compare our costs to other institutions and companies, it would seem to me that we understand what we are paying for and what we are getting back.

**PETERSON:** I appreciate all of those comments and from whatever level I can work on those, I certainly will.

**WILSON:** I would like to go back to the first thing that we talked about where we discussed academic progress. What are we supposed to do with this document? Is this meant to be a policy? It doesn't look like a policy. It looks like an inquiry.

**PETERSON:** It is an inquiry for your school. How would you look at these things if you were to look at these things as a school, as a unit.

**WILSON:** Are we supposed to answer these questions as a school?

**PETERSON:** I think that is one of the feedback mechanisms that the Academic Cabinet would want to have from you. That is the way I look at it.

**BALDWIN:** On the other issue of the retention, I was just thinking it through. I figure "six years, 25 percent" doesn't seem to surprise me because I have a feeling a lot of full-time students these days take five years to earn a bachelor's degree.

**PETERSON:** The 25 percent figure is combined students who are still in school and those who have received degrees. So, the other 75 percent are not in school and they have not received degrees, as I understand it the data in some of the regional campuses. At Bloomington it is like 60 some percent and here it is 45 percent.

**BALDWIN:** Aside from part-time students, a lot of students are in degree programs for two years, they are out for a semester and then out for a year and then come back. I think whenever you start cutting this thing in very precise terms like this, you are not quite sure what you have. I don't read this statistic as an alarm to me.

**PETERSON:** Maybe it isn't an alarm. It is something that has raised some antennae and people are looking at it and studying it. Judy Palmer is the primary person who is putting together some data. Maybe we will come to the conclusion that this is what we should be expecting from campuses where we are providing part-time programs.

**BALDWIN:** I have heard some alarm from people in the local community about why it takes full-time students five years to get through.

**PETERSON:** That is another issue.

**BEPKO:** I think the one thing you can say that makes me and others feel better about these data is that, if you look around the country in other urban universities, the data are almost the same. We are about the same as everyone else. That doesn't make it good. It just means that we are in the same syndrome together.

**PETERSON:** There is one other issue related to the discussions of the Operations Cabinet and that is the issue of access to institutional data. A policy on institutional data has been developed and was presented to that cabinet by Polley McClure. That is a working document on access to data, including your personal data. It includes the numbers that are put into the University computer for a whole variety of reasons including student numbers, etc. There are data stewards who have been assigned

to various tasks in this area. The policy itself doesn't address which data should be maintained as confidential and which should not be maintained as confidential and what levels of confidentiality should be maintained on each of these pieces of data. Certainly some people need to have access to a great degree of this information. Faculty Records needs to have access to all of your records as a faculty member. But, do you want everybody in the University to have access to everything about your personal records that are in the University computer? That is where we are right now. That is some of the information that we would want to study to make recommendations to the data stewards as to what we would like to have available to various levels within the University. Again, this is a process. It is not something that is determined and done. Certainly, as we go through time, additional changes can be made in this. Again, it is difficult to discuss this issue in great detail now. We are in the process of accumulating more information on exactly what data are in the computers and which of those data are important to us as to whether we want to have some comments on it. Anya Royce and Polley McClure want to work with us in maintaining the confidentiality of the data that can be made confidential and what we would like to have maintained as confidential about our own records.

**BEPKO:** If you would like a copy of the policy statement, I would be happy to provide one. Also, I think it is important to recognize that the motivation for this is to make data available more freely, to try to open up the institution. I don't know anyone who has worked here for any length of time who hasn't run into a barrier trying to gain access to information that probably ought to be available to the inquirer, if not to everyone, having somebody who is in charge of the data who thought of their relationship to that data as being proprietary and refused to give access. It was as if people who had responsibility for data had to guard it against its use by anyone. I think that this is an effort to try to open up the process, to make data available more freely but to try to be very careful to protect privacy interests and other interests through the administration's program by data stewards so that we won't have any awkward situations. The overall effort is to make the institution more open and access to data much easier than it has been before.

**PETERSON:** If you do have interest in this issue, please call or write to either Jerry Bepko or myself and we will be more than willing to share this policy with you. It is a draft policy which will probably be modified as we find out where there are problems with the policy. That completes my report. Do you want me to announce the next one?

**BEPKO:** Sure.

**PETERSON:** Today we have the opportunity to have a report on the Chancellor Bepko's review that took place over last year. This has been presented to the Executive Committee. We have discussed it in quite some detail. It has been presented to the University Faculty Council and we now want to share a report on that with you and make available to you those parts of this report that you would like to have made available. Henry Besch will make that report.

**BESCH:** This is a report abstract of Gerald L. Bepko, Vice President/Chancellor-IUPUI Review. In accord with policies adopted by the Indiana University Faculty Council, President Thomas Ehrlich appointed in August, 1990, a committee representing the various constituencies of Indiana University to review the performance of Gerald L. Bepko, Vice President, Indiana University, and Chancellor, IUPUI, in his fifth year of service.

The committee received information from a variety of sources. The committee consisted of Frank Acito, Roko Aliprantis, Henry Besch, David Benz, Percy Clark, Jr., Erika Criss, Gayle Cox, Carlyn Johnson, Angela McBride, Cornelius W. Pettinga, Katsuyuki Sakamoto, Jack Shaw, Donald Tharp,

Maxine Tutterrow, and Jeffery Vessely (appointed chair of the committee). The committee sent a survey to all IUPUI faculty (1,300), selected IUPUI staff (100), and numerous members of the Indianapolis community (2,400). The survey cover letter solicited additional input in the form of letters. Approximately 300 letters were received by the committee. Finally, about 30 personal interviews were scheduled with students, staff, faculty, and community persons. The information from these three sources, as well as committee input provided the basis for this report.

The consistent theme of letters and interviews reflects a thoughtful, sensitive, capable administrator whose effectiveness in working with the community is certainly praiseworthy. The "growth" of the campus is pointed to as a sign of success. There are numerous signposts that indicate IUPUI is rapidly becoming an urban university model and Chancellor Bepko has championed this development.

Among the areas of concern were lack of "ownership" by the faculty in program development, the perceived power and size of the vice-chancellor level of administration, lack of "ownership" by the students in areas of student life, and the confusion over whether IUPUI can provide equal access for all and still follow a "direction of excellence."

Chancellor Bepko is viewed by the vast majority of his constituents as a person of vision with all the tools necessary to be a leader. The community sees him as just that. The faculty and staff are desirous of more leadership and less administration. It was expressed that administrative appointments with stronger academic ties might provide "vision" with more reliance on faculty, staff and student input and less reliance on consultant input. There is also a strong desire for a spirit of collaboration that would allow staff and faculty an even more integral role in IUPUI's future. Summarizing the period during which Gerald Bepko has served as Indiana University Vice President and IUPUI Chancellor might include the following comments:

He has certainly increased the prestige of IUPUI.

He has done a superior job for IUPUI. He is very bright and articulate and obviously cares deeply about IUPUI.

He has pushed hard to improve IUPUI and has made progress in developing IUPUI's identity as a model of urban universities.

The Chancellor needs to share the effectiveness of his ever-present collegial style with his administrative staff.

The impressive growth of IUPUI should be accompanied by a parallel growth in student leadership opportunities and improvement in the quality of student life.

While staff recognize that this is a recessionary period, more evidence that there are efforts being put forth on behalf of an improved working environment and better compensation is desired. Stress is high and morale is low.

This abstract has attempted to grasp a flavor of the reflections by the various constituents. In review, the one word which appeared most often is "outstanding." I would be happy to respond to any questions.

**PETERSON:** We certainly appreciate the hard work of this committee and the voluminous data that



they have looked over and for the reporting process that have they gone through in making these reports available to the levels that they have been made available. Jerry Bepko has told me that he has no problem with distributing any portion of this report to anybody who wishes to have a copy of it, if you are that curious about the report, at least the report that was read to you and was abstracted from. If that is something that you would wish to see, it is a public document at this point. Is that correct?

**BEPKO:** That is correct.

**PETERSON:** Are there any questions or any comments or anything that Henry might be able to answer with relationship to this report?

**MCDONALD:** I don't know if this is to the Chancellor or to the committee, but the report seems to ask for more strokes to the faculty. People with whom I work were vocal last year because they seem to feel that things are too hard and too unpleasant. The last few years there has been an increase in requirements for everyone. Certainly, for administrators and faculty. The campus is growing and the pressure is on. Now we have to be measured and you need six letters for tenure and now the money is short. So, it seems to me that the faculty are asking for some kind of emotional support, not only in this review possibly but everywhere.

**BEPKO:** I think that is a good point. I think that all of us who work in any kind of academic administrative appointment in the University have to redouble our efforts to not only provide support in the direct ways that we try to do, which is to provide compensation, to provide infrastructure so that the faculty members can do their work, but also to provide moral support and encouragement to faculty. We also have to have more and more open lines of communication so that people can understand what is happening and why it is happening and have an opportunity to participate in the decision making. One of the things, of course, that we started this year, although we resolved to do it last year in partnership, Dick Peterson worked very hard on this on your behalf and we brought this issue to you for a discussion and vote, was the notion of having collegial reviews of a much larger group of academic administrators than had been true before. The only people who were reviewed under the old system were the campus chancellors. We think it is very important that we have a regular, reliable feedback mechanism so that there can be a greater sense of participation on the part of everyone in the University community. We will not be able to print money, but we will be able to use the resources we have as wisely as possible and wisdom in this sense means using resources based on broad consensus in the academic community on what is the most important priority and the second most important priority and that is what we intend to do. I think it is what we have done, though we always need to work to improve and we will do even better in the future.

**PETERSON:** This doesn't reflect directly on Jerry, but it reflects on the same comment that Dana is making here. Some of the things were hard for me to talk about today in a positive way because we are talking about how are we getting better and how are we retaining students at the same time as we have these drastic budget cuts. Our classes are larger, we have less time with these students and certainly relationships with students are important when we want to retain them within our University. As we look at the heavier workloads that we all have to carry and then look at productivity, grant money that we are bringing in, our national reputation, and all of those other issues there are a number of conflicts and there are a number of tensions that we have. I continually try to bring those up and we have to say "that is enough" at times. We cannot work that much harder and get that much more productivity out of us without a little bit more support, both moral support and financial support. That certainly is a message that I bring to the Foundation, the Trustees, the President, the Chancellor and

everybody else. I don't know how else we can bring that message. Certainly the legislature is aware of this and the economy of the state really has driven our financial situation today, at least for this biennial period. It is a shame that we have to be in this kind of a position but I think we really do have some financial problems at this point. We have some tensions that result from that. Hopefully, we can work together to make that better. That is my message on this and hopefully that will happen.

**SIDHU:** I apologize if I cannot express my emotional feelings in proper words. When you were appointed to your present position, we thought that Jerry Bepko is our man. He is one of us. Somehow or the other things started changing. We do not know the reasons or internal circumstances, but we are not having open communication with you. Somehow the morale of the faculty has been going down constantly. We cannot pinpoint the exact reasons for this. We are requesting you as our "boss," or as our "leader", to do something to raise the morale of the faculty. On many faculty-related issues faculty members do not get an opportunity to express their views. We would like to minimize the gap of communication between the faculty and the administration. We want to stay close to you in our hearts. We respect you very highly.

**BEPKO:** I think it is important for us to hear that type of comment. You can rest assured that we will work hard to try to change that. I think we have in some ways but we should redouble our efforts. I happen to believe, though, that even if there are dark clouds on the horizon, in terms of state finances, that we still have all of the ingredients to be the best of the new age, urban public universities of the new century. I am sure that it won't make it any easier for all of us. We have had cuts too. We have encountered in the campus administration, on a percentage base, larger cuts than the schools have. I think that, while we may be distracted from time to time by temporary inconveniences based on the state's fiscal situation, overall, and I will talk more about this next month when the State of the Campus Address is the agenda item, we have the most extraordinary opportunity to make this campus into a real national model. The spotlight of higher education in the United States should shine here over the next decade.

**BESCH:** I will remain seated so as to symbolize that it will be me speaking rather than my speaking for the committee. I have no charge to speak for the committee. It seems to me that I need to say something because there is a nebulance of spirit in the report abstract that I read. It does reflect the entire input that it got. That spirit has occurred before, at least the latest, go around of cuts, stretches and thinning out, etc. I think that one might say that the spirit of this report, might well have been slightly less wonderful, having been done this winter instead of last winter. I do want you to know that it is the spirit which was intended to be very positive. It didn't take into account that after that time when money and resources were being stretcher thinner and thinner, that mood is not going to change. We did specifically attempt to assess morale in our survey instrument and, again, I can report that morale, at the end of the five years of Jerry's review, is substantially better than it was the last time that a chancellor from this campus was reviewed. We asked the same questions ten years apart and morale is reported much higher this time around than it was the last time. On many of the items that we asked the two times, there was a substantial change. Some were considerably improved, some were lower. But, with respect to morale, the data show that it was better last year than it had been previously.

**KARLSON:** I would like to make one comment after having listened to Hitwant. A number of faculty have contacted me from various schools over the last few years and the most common complaint which I have heard is that they perceive that collegiality as a form of governance in their schools is dead, that we have changed to a business management as opposed to collegial structure and this has been characterized by a drastic increase in non-academic assistants and associate deans who are now

functioning in many of the capacities that previously had been a faculty prerogative. This problem has been called to my attention at a number of schools and I think this has probably been the main malaise in faculty confidence and faculty anger are upset that I have had called to my attention.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

### **AGENDA ITEM IV - NEW BUSINESS**

**PETERSON:** I have one item under New Business that will be coming before us and we could call it a new business item. I should have reported it to you under my Executive Committee Report. The comment is that we do have constitutional changes which we voted for in principle last spring. Those are currently being incorporated into a document along with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and along with Henry Besch's great computer. We will hopefully be distributing those to you as a draft document in the near future. It will include both some constitutional changes and some bylaw changes related to the governance of this body as far as the officials of this body are concerned. It also will contain some comments related to the Boards of Review in an attempt to clarify some of the ways that Boards of Reviews operate. Those are the things that are coming along to you. Please read those, consider those carefully as they come through. Hopefully, we will be able to come up with a consensus from this Council at the next meeting related to those if they are distributed at an early enough time. Indeed, if we want to make a change in the governance of this body and constitutional changes, they will have to be considered in December or it will be too late for the window and we won't be able to elect the new officers under the new Constitution for next year. It has to come to this body. On the constitutional changes, we have to approve those constitutional changes by a two-thirds vote, and then they have to go out for the faculty for comment to see if there are any significant difficulties there. If there are no significant difficulties, then they can go out for a faculty body as a whole vote. So, it is a fairly long, complicated process for these constitutional changes. When you get them, consider them carefully. Get your comments back to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee so that we can have a document that can be adequately considered during the December meeting. Various committees are looking at this including the Faculty Affairs Committee as one of the major committees that is looking at the preliminary changes already. The Executive Committee will certainly look at this carefully and you will get a copy hopefully within the next two weeks.

### **AGENDA ITEM V - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** Is there any other business? If not, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
 Faculty Council Meeting  
 December 5, 1991  
 Law School, Room 116  
 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Walter Daly, Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P, Nicholas Kellum, Angela McBride, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. Elected Faculty: Thomas Ambrose, Margaret Applegate, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Sally Bowman, Walter Buchanan, Lucinda Carr, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Carol Deets, John Emhardt, Mary Fisher, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Melvin Glick, Jean Gnat, Dean Hawley, Debra Helper, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Linda Marler, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, B. Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Richard Peterson, Eric Pumroy, Terry Reed, Frederick Rescorla, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Phyllis Scherle, Philip Scarpino, William Schneider, P Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Richard Turner, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Yu. Ex Officio Members: Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Barbara Jackson for John Barlow, Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren. Elected Faculty: Elaine Avila for Janice Bruckner, Catherine Rhoades for Janice Froehlich, James Wallihan for Gerald Paar.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A. James Brown, Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein, R. Bruce Renda, David Stocum, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, C D Aliprantis, Linda Brothers, Anne Donchin, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Philip Gibbs, John Lappas, Steven Leapman, Steven Mazzuca, James McAteer, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Sherry Ricchiardi, Edmund Schilling, Gregory Sutton, Vernon Vix. Ex Officio Members: Maxine Tutterrow, Jeffery Vessely.

**Visitors Present:** Peter Fraenkel (Retired), Mark Grove (Registrar), Carol Nathan (Dean of the Faculties Office), Carl Rothe (Constitution and Bylaws Committee), William Spencer.

**AGENDA ITEM I - MEMORIAL RESOLUTION - ROBERT E. WEAVER, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ART, HERRON SCHOOL OF ART**

**BEPKO:** I would like to acknowledge the memorial resolution that is included and consistent with our current practice, not ask that it be read but ask that you all rise for a moment of silence in memory of Professor Emeritus Robert Weaver.

**AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 5, 1991 AND OCTOBER 3, 1991**

**BEPKO:** The minutes for September 5 and October 3 have been distributed. Do we have a motion for approval? [Changes in these minutes are as follows.]: Walter Buchanan should be shown as present at the October 3 meeting, Juanita Keck should have been shown as present at the October meeting, Sherry Ricchiardi was present at both of these meetings. On page 17 of the October minutes, the last line should read: **REED:** I *have not* been... Also page 15 of the October minutes, bottom of the page, where **RICHWINE** is shown it should be **BRUCKNER**. With these changes the minutes were approved.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS - CHANCELLOR GERALD L. BEPKO**

**BEPKO:** At this time I would like to go directly to the Executive Committee Report.

### **AGENDA ITEM IV - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**PETERSON:** I have two very short things that I want to mention. One is that I have been asked on behalf of the Irwin Recognition Awards Committee to announce that nomination forms for the 1992 Irwin Recognition Awards will be distributed in the December issue of Life at IUPUI. The deadline for submitting nominations for the award is January 31, 1992. I would also like to announce that the Nominations Committee is going to be making its final selections for the positions of President and Vice President, if we so approve of that today, on their Monday meeting. They would like to have as much input as possible as far as nominations for these two positions are concerned so we get off to the very best start with these two positions. Sent your comments to Kathleen Warfel as far as your nominations for those two positions are concerned. That concludes my report.

### **AGENDA ITEM V - PRESENTATION: CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE - ACTION ITEM**

**BEPKO:** Next is the Constitution and Bylaws Committee with an action item and Hitwant Sidhu and Carl Rothe are here. Hitwant will give the presentation.

**PETERSON:** We have also invited other members of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. I think it would be appropriate, if necessary and if the right time comes up, that they would make comments even though they may not all be members of Council.

**SIDHU:** The document which we are going to discuss has been already circulated to you. I hope you have a copy of that with you. I will give you a little bit of background of what we are going to discuss today. On December 12, 1990 a task force was appointed to look into the matter of revising the mode of operation of the Faculty Council meetings. The members of that task force were: Dean William Plater, Richard Fredland, Kathleen Warfel, James Wallihan, and Henry Karlson. In response to that report of the task force the Constitution and Bylaws Committee proposed to the IUPUI Faculty Council that the officers of the Faculty Council should be a chief executive officer, the president, and the vice president of the faculty and a parliamentarian of the Faculty Council. The proposal was approved by the Faculty Council at its May meeting 1991 in principle.

It was also approved that the duties of the president shall include the present duties of the Faculty Council's secretary with the exception of reviewing, editing, and distributing the minutes of the Council which would be handled by the vice president. The vice president shall also preside over the meetings of IUPUI Faculty Council. The rationale behind that was that the secretary's job has become so time consuming that the secretary needs another person to help him or her.

The parliamentarian's duties will remain the same as described in the Bylaws of the Council. Those are in the minutes of the May meeting and that is what I am reading from. In the May meeting the Constitution and Bylaws Committee promised to bring the exact amendments to the Faculty Council for the Council's approval. Today, we are bringing the Constitution amendments to you in one part and the Bylaw amendments related only to the Faculty Boards of Review in the second part. To conduct the various elections on time the Constitution amendments need to be approved in this meeting. We have not made any major changes in the Constitution except as approved by the Council substituting the word *secretary* with the words *president, vice present, etc.* at the appropriate places. We have made one major change and that is we have changed the title of executive officer as the

Chancellor of IUPUI because that is a more appropriate title. Although I didn't talk to Chancellor Bepko directly, I think that is the major change if you ask for a major change.

There are a few other minor changes but not a concept of the Constitution. After you have approved the amendments in the Constitution, then I will request to my friend and a member of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Carl Rothe, to explain to you the changes in the Bylaws of the Boards of Review. Both of these documents have been circulated to you. The Constitutional amendments will be circulated, if you approve, to every member of the faculty after 30 days of waiting period. If no major changes are suggested, then the present secretary, if you approve, of the Council will get approval of those amendments in the form of a mail ballot. If you need any clarification of any changes, I will be glad to answer your questions to the best of my ability.

**MANNAN:** I have a question. Is it the "president of the faculty" or the "president of the Faculty Council?" And, it the "vice president of the faculty" or the "vice president of the Faculty Council?"

**SIDHU:** This is the way we have discussed in the Constitution and Bylaws Committee because he is the Executive Officer, it looks like he is representing the faculty. He is performing the duties of faculty presiding. The vice president will preside over the Faculty Council meetings but really both of them are representing the faculty. The parliamentarian is only responsible for the Council.

**MANNAN:** Are you calling this person the "president of the Faculty Council" or the president of the faculty?"

**SIDHU:** We are using the words "faculty" not the Faculty Council.

**MANNAN:** It is inconsistent in the document. Sometimes it is "Faculty Council" and other times it is "faculty."

**SIDHU:** We might have made that mistake, Dr. Mannan. We will be consistent and my friend, Henry Besch, has done an excellent job on his computer. If he made a mistake, we apologize and we will make the corrections. We will be consistent in that area.

**DEETS:** It has been experience that there usually is a article either in the Constitution and Bylaws where the officers are named and the role that they play specified. If there is all there is, we don't have that and I was wondering why.

**SIDHU:** This is the reason. We have the copies of the Bylaws ready. Those were not ready for circulation because, again, the man was busy so we had to depend on him. We were in a hurry to get this done in this meeting, but those are ready and you can have a copy. Those will be discussed in the next meeting as far as duties and other related bylaws are concerned. But, this is not the end of it.

**DEETS:** Why is the vice president going to be the one who leads the meeting? It seems to me appropriate that the president leads and divvy up the responsibilities some other way.

**SIDHU:** As far as that is concerned we have tried, and that is the general concept that we have received from the Executive Committee and Faculty Affairs Committee, etc., it has been discussed at a very broad base. The reason is that the secretary is really very busy with other affairs so we wanted to give him a relief. The relief was called in the terms of the various officers and the various organizations. Let the vice president handle the editing and circulation of the minutes. That is a large part of the responsibilities. Then, the second part is he is going to preside over the meetings. That

will be take away some responsibility from the secretary. The vice president is going to help the president in sharing other duties if there are any other duties and wherever he is needed.

DEETS: I understand that. What I don't understand is why you made the decision that the vice president would chair when in reality that is usually a president's responsibility.

SIDHU: We are taking the president and the Chancellor away in a way that they should bring the information from the administration and from the Executive Committee but let them present the information to the Council and not have a "handle" on the meeting.

UNKNOWN: Call for the question.

BEPKO: Are you ready to vote? All in favor, say "Aye." Opposed? [none]

SIDHU: The second part is not complicated by Dr. Rothe knows more about it than I do. There is one change in the Constitution and he will explain it.

ROTHE: Thank you, Hitwant. About a year ago Secretary Peterson appointed Henry Besch, Henry Karlson, and I to a committee to review the manual for members of the IUPUI Faculty Boards of Review. That manual, our bylaws, and the IU Constitution were not consistent. After looking at these carefully, we felt that a proper revision of the bylaws concerning the Faculty Boards of Review would be sufficient and that we would not require then a separate manual. Therefore, we put ourselves to the task of putting together this bylaws changes to be consistent with the Constitution and, in general, with the practices that are going on currently.

Our report was submitted to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and to the Faculty Affairs Committee early this fall. They had many suggestions. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee incorporated virtually all those. We had a document together and submitted that to the Executive Committee and we got some more changes. We have some changes incorporated also from the Chancellor. What you have before is a composite, we hope for many people, a revision that presents a consistent pattern for you.

What are the major changes? First of all, a Constitutional change in Article V. I don't understand, was that Article V of the Constitution now approved, Dick?

PETERSON: I think we should rediscuss that particular item. However, by fiat they have approved of that because it was already in the copy of the Constitution that they approved.

ROTHE: It was in there?

PETERSON: It was in there. The sheet explaining it was distributed.

ROTHE: On that sheet you will see at the top our current Constitution, Article V. You will see what appears in the IU Handbook for the IU Constitution and then at the bottom you will see what our suggestion was. Now, you will notice that in that Article V has now two parts. The first part is related to what was almost identical to the previous Article in the Constitution whereby the faculty, in general as a whole, and expresses judgment concerning administrative actions. Separate from that is the article concerning the Faculty Boards of Review. You will notice that Faculty Boards of Review now grievances of faculty, broad and general, in contrast to just looking at procedures. That is the major change that we made in terms of the Constitution.

Secondly, on the first part of the bylaws you will see a section on purposes. That is one page one. This was taken from the handout manual in large measure. Here is clarified in the sense that the Boards are a peer group to faculty members who meet to hear complaints and advise both the grievant and administration as to what we hope would be a fair and reasonable solution. It is a grievance committee.

Another major change was that we tried to make the emphasis now on deviation, conciliation rather than leading to possible confrontation.

Another change was to have an initial investigatory conference as the first step. In the past the grievant had to choose either an informal hearing or a formal hearing. We felt that the initial conference could be informal and give a chance for some mediation and agreement and possibly then not have to have a formal hearing. Certainly this gives the grievants a chance, if they want a formal hearing, to have it.

Another rather major change and the last major change is that the members of the Board would be elected for a two-year term on a staggered basis. This provides then two people or maybe three who would be on the Board with one year's experience. This presents much more opportunity for people coming on and know what is going on. I remind you that the power of the Board of Review is in terms of gathering information, is in terms of rendering a judgment, making these recommendations, but not a decision. They are not a trial or court and they do not render a binding decision. Just primarily recommendations. A point that maybe is obvious but at least is in there now is the grievant at any time can withdraw. Mr. Secretary or Mr. President I suggest that this is a report from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and therefore is placed before the Council for their further consideration and, we hope, adoption.

**WARFEL:** Could you clarify something about the staggering of the terms? The three boards of review, each of those have five members. Is it your intention to have a given five-person board serve for two years in a staggered way? No, that is not what you intend.

**ROTHE:** Three people one year would be elected and another year two persons would be elected with the realization that sometimes people leave. So, there are at least two people who are carried over from the previous year. Part of that is because we originally had said six but the Executive Committee had said, "No, we don't want that and we think it should be five so there is never a tie vote." So, they won. But, it does lead to the confusion of two one year and three the other.

**BEPKO:** In view of our changes that are taking place and especially because the discussions of bylaws changes may be very complicated, I say with tongue-in-cheek this is a good time to pass the gavel to Dick Peterson.

**KECK:** Just to clarify the potential procedure. We thought that if we decided that two members would be elected in every even year and three members in every odd year would help keep it straight as to which members of the Boards of Review would be elected in which years.

**ROTHE:** I agree with you. This will lead to some problems for the Nominating Committee because this coming year what they probably need to is to nominate two people from this current series of three boards two or three people and then go on with nominating two or three.

**KECK:** Those people presently serving agreed to serve for one year.



**ROTHE:** True. Therefore, they need to be asked so that the Nominating Committee can know how many they have to nominate.

**KECK:** It does allow for 1992 is going to be an easy year to elect two members to serve two year terms and three members to finish out a one-year term.

**ROTHE:** This is a real possibility. It seems to me though that because people leave because they can't serve two years, sometimes naturally there would have to be three people elected.

**MANNAN:** Article V has two sections -- A and B. Am I reading it right that the proposed Article V.A. is not covered in the Indiana University Faculty Board of Review section?

**ROTHE:** In the IU Constitution this is specifically Faculty Boards of Review. In our current, up until a few minutes ago, Constitution it said "the faculty shall express its judgment." This left it quite broad which means that the Faculty Council itself could or the could appoint a group to look at some administrative action in general terms. The Executive Committee particularly felt being able to maintain that right of the faculty was important to maintain. Therefore, we, in effect, combined previous IUPUI review function through the faculty in general and this IU Constitution. Now, we have both.

**MANNAN:** In trying to conform with IU, Article IX. B., is our proposed Article V.A. going to take it out of conformity?

**PETERSON:** It is my opinion that Article V. B. is one mechanism by which Article V.A. is expressed. There may be other mechanisms by which Article V.A. is expressed, but Article V. B. is just one of those mechanisms by which Article V. A. can be expressed.

**SIDHU:** Dr. Mannan, as far as Article V.A. is concerned, it is very unique to the IUPUI Faculty Council's Constitution describing the general function of the faculty. We have kept this statement intact. We have added Article V.B. to describe the function of the Boards of Review, which is not included in the IUPUI Constitution anywhere else.

**ROTHE:** Our Constitution Article V.B. and the IU Constitution, Article V.B. are very very close. The only difference is complaints instead of grievances and a couple of words about campus specific.

**MANNAN:** We are adding Article V.B. which is not in the IU Bylaws.

**ROTHE:** That is not in the IU Constitution.

**MANNAN:** Is that identical to the IU Constitution?

**PETERSON:** We don't have to be identical to the IU Constitution. I don't think there is any substantive difference. It is some minor word differences. I think we have the authority as campuses to go into more detail in our Constitution than the IU Constitution would.

**ROTHMAN:** Can we be specific that this applies to the Boards of Review starting in February?

**ROTHE:** I don't see any alternative to that.

**ROTHMAN:** I mean the whole thing. The Bylaws. I don't want them to take effect until new Boards of Review...

**ROTHE:** It seems to me that it has to. It cannot be retroactive.

**REED:** I tried to compare the old and the new sections. There are, in general, vast improvements. But, there was one section that I had a little bit of problem with. It almost seems like that you are trying to insert a gag rule without any enforcement possibilities. In the old section under Publicity, it generally refers to not making any statements during the hearing. In the current version, it tries to put an extra phrase on the end stating "or after the hearing is over." How is that ever going to be enforced because someone feels they are wrong? It seems like it is a philosophical statement thrown in there. It is a different intent than what the current bylaws are.

**PETERSON:** I think one of the intents, if I might express it, is that these are confidential hearings and those people who attend those hearings, even though they might want to say something, those people who attend, who testify, and those people who are part of that hearing should not make this public information once the hearing is over. That is, I think, the intent of that is so that no one would go talking about this as a routine matter across campus.

**ROTHE:** It does state to the extent practical.

**REED:** It also includes the grievant.

**PETERSON:** He has the option of taking his case to other levels. It is not a "gag" rule that he cannot ever take this to a court of law or whatever. He has the option to talk to individuals that might be able to help him deal further with what he still considers to be an injustice. I don't think it is right that he spread garbage all over campus. That does happen. I think the intent is to try to keep these things as civil as possible. I do have a couple of other comments since we have no further comments ready from the floor at this time. Jerry Bepko and Bill Plater looked this over extensively and one thing that was mentioned in our Executive Committee meeting and did not get changed here, and Bill Plater brought this to my attention, under Section B. Composition. The Executive Committee and actually the Constitution and Bylaws Committee initial proposal said four members of each board of review shall be tenured and here it says three members. It was suggested again that we return that number to four for a couple of reasons. Number one, tenured faculty members are put in a certain jeopardous position for two reasons: one because they are asking to be judges in a case like this which could potentially effect him in other ways, although that shouldn't happen. Secondly, it does take a lot of time to do these boards of review right and that puts an additional jeopardy on a non-tenured faculty member. So, the Executive Committee had made a comment and Bill Plater reminded me of that that we had recommended that there still be four members that were tenured.

**ROTHE:** Let's back up a moment on that. Part of that four was when we had suggested six members. So, we went back from six to five. I had assumed, as I heard it, we were going back to what you see on the right hand side what we have had in the past. It says, of course, "at least three members shall be tenured." So, it could be much more than that.

**PETERSON:** It was just a comment. You can deal with that as you wish. It can be changed at this point if there is a suggestion that that be changed. I was suggesting that it be changed from the Executive Committee level because I think that was our intent. But, if anyone else has comments on that issue, we can discuss that. I do have another comment but we can discuss this issue first.

**SIDHU:** Is this suggestion a friendly amendment?

**PETERSON:** It is a friendly amendment.

**SIDHU:** I think the Council members should have the opportunity to express their opinion because it doesn't make any difference.

**PETERSON:** It doesn't make any difference to me either, in reality, but it was something that I thought might be positive. Any problems with that particular issue?

**KECK:** I particularly supported the term "four members" in Executive Committee even though considering only five members on the board because I have served on a board of review as a non-tenured faculty member and strongly believe that four members should be tenured out of five.

**SCHNEIDER:** Is it possible for all members be tenured and just one or two be non-tenured in case it is necessary or is the three there to insure representation of the non-tenured member for whatever purpose?

**PETERSON:** I think that part of it is to have the representation from this group. That is part of the issue that some non-tenured people be represented. We also have difficulty getting a full field of people that are willing to participate in these things because they are time consuming and they are difficult. I think it is rewarding to know that you might have had some effect in this area. I think it is a worthwhile thing to do. Those people who have participated in that feel like they have done something good for this University.

**ROTHER:** Am I right in assuming that we will talk to H. R. Besch to get his computer to do the right thing here?

**PETERSON:** That is fine. The other comment that I wanted to make related to something that Jerry had mentioned to me. It has been traditional in these bylaws to have the wording, if you will look on page 7, under Electronic Record, Item F "The electronic record of the hearings shall be prepared at the Faculty Council's expense." It really is not at the Faculty Council's expense. You don't ever end up paying for that. It comes out of a University budget in reality. Jerry's comment was simply that this be said to be at the University's expense. Again, that is a friendly amendment. It essentially means the same thing but I think it may say it a little more clearly.

**MOORE:** The section that I am questioning is the section that states, "the board may consult at anytime with members of the Law School faculty concerning clarification of legal matters." This strikes me as a rather informal relationship. In fact, since this board is strictly advisory and goes no further, it seems to me unnecessary to have a legal representation but if you do have legal representation, such an informal arrangement doesn't strike me as a very sound kind of thing to do. Matter of fact, if I were a Law School faculty member, I am not sure I would want to get involved in this kind of relationship. I didn't find any reference in the old version and I was wondering why this was put in here and how much consultation occurred.

**PETERSON:** It was the requirement in previous boards of review that a faculty member from the Law School be appointed as the legal advisor to each and every board of review.

**ROTHER:** That is on page 2, item 2.

**PETERSON:** That did not always happen unfortunately. Under some secretaries they had difficulty getting people from the Law School to participate in that. Since it was such a difficulty it was partially Jeff Vessely who suggested that that may not be a necessary item to have in there. That we always have that representative to be the legal advisor to the board of review. It depends upon who you ask and when you ask them and how you ask them. I personally, when setting up boards of review, have

not had any difficulty finding people in the Law School who were willing to be advisors to these committees. But, I don't know why my experience is different than Jeff Vessely's. That was the rationale for doing it this way and if the board felt like they needed some advice, they felt that these people should be contacted. In fact, many of our boards of review do include somebody who does have a law degree or who is a member of our Law School. Maybe have law degrees in some other department someplace else across campus.

**WELLMAN:** Is section G dropped or is it just not there because it is not needed? There is no section G in the proposed portion.

**ROTHE:** That was covered earlier.

**DEETS:** On page 9, item A, I would like to suggest that we make it clear who would do the appealing. Is the appeal by the complainant or the grievant?

**ROTHE:** By the grievant.

**DEETS:** I think adding that...

**BESCH:** That addition is already in the computer.

**DEETS:** I am glad to know that I think like a computer.

**JACKSON [Alternate]:** Earlier sections indicate there may be multiple parties, but part C specifically implies that there are only two parties. All parties may require a spokesperson. I would suggest changing that to allow for all named parties to have a representative if they desire.

**PETERSON:** We discussed that particular item at the Executive Committee level and I think it was our intent that people be represented. It is on page 4, item 4c.

**JACKSON [Alternate]:** That is right. That includes all possibility for multiple parties to have a spokesperson.

**PETERSON:** I think we intended to say that shall be open to parties. Parties may be accompanied by an advisor or spokesperson. I think that was the intent of what the Executive Committee discussed. Do you remember that, Henry?

**BESCH:** I know we spent substantial time on it. There was some concern that any given sitting, formal, informal, or otherwise might be contentious, so the Executive Committee intended to say both indicating that there are only a two people who might specifically need counsel.

**PETERSON:** But, if they are indeed principles who are named by the grievant, it would seem that they should be able to be represented. That was, I think, her comment. I don't know whether we want to detail that any further than this at this point.

**BALDWIN:** Isn't the grievant always against the University?

**ROTHE:** No. This is part of the problem. This is why it says in 4A, "administer concerning or other party involved..." In the middle of that 4A section. Because if two faculty members get into a squabble, and I think this is part of the rationale for opening it to the other parties. It is not to limit it only to a faculty member with the administration.

**GNAT:** Why do we use the term "principles" then instead of parties?

**ROTHER:** Both principles?

**GNAT:** Why don't we use the term "principles" instead of "parties." That puts the convocation on the people involved in it rather than on anyone interested.

**ROTHER:** So, change parties to principles in the two places?

**GNAT:** Yes.

**WELLMAN:** You don't need to have both.

**ROTHER:** No. We would say "principles may be accompanied by..." Or, "the principles may be accompanied by..."

**PETERSON:** The comment is "each principle may be accompanied by..."

**BEPKO:** Could you give an example of where the University would not be the party against the grievant?

**ROTHER:** This is the Executive Committee's wording. This is not coming from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

**KARLSON:** He has asked for an example. I will be able to give one. Where the real party in interest is not the University, where faculty member A has a grievance with faculty member B. Faculty member A asked the University to take action against faculty member B which the University does not do. Then, faculty member A brings the grievance for the University's refusal to bring some disciplinary action against faculty member B. Well, faculty member B is a real party in interest here. His reputation or other conducts may be called for the question and yet, technically, they wouldn't have a right to be present if the University was the individual against, which would be technically the view of the chairperson who didn't take action. He would not have the right to question witnesses. He would not have the right to hear the things against him.

**BEPKO:** Henry, I understand that but I don't know how would get to that stage. If a faculty member is accused by another of misconduct, that is a separate procedure that is already specified in the Academic Handbook. If that procedure is utilized, there is an appeal process of faculty involvement. It has its own routes of appeal. Are you suggesting that, if somebody is unhappy with what happens, a complaining witness is unhappy with that, they can ask for a board of review?

**KARLSON:** Yes, I am. In fact, boards of review has always been superimposed over various other remedies. We have, for example, the denial with tenure which clearly goes up through a...

**BEPKO:** That is an administrative action that deprives... It is adverse to the individual.

**KARLSON:** An administrative action is also a refusal to do something as it much as it the agreement to do something.

**BEPKO:** In other words, if you are a complaining witness and you don't get all of the penalty you want against another faculty member, you can file for a board of review?

**KARLSON:** My understanding is that there are faculties that have, in fact, claimed that right.

**BEPKO:** Has that ever been recognized?

**KARLSON:** My understanding is that it has been.

**BEPKO:** Not that I know of. I don't mind this.

**KARLSON:** I am not saying that this is going to happen but I am saying that there are circumstances in which the real party in interest is not necessarily the University.

**BEPKO:** I can't envision a situation given the example. It strikes me that that example, it would assume that a board of review was appropriate for a complaining witness who complained about misconduct of another faculty member and that misconduct was reevaluated by other system, our system which is spelled out very carefully in the Code of Academic Responsibility. If you don't get what you want with that procedure, then you can ask for a board of review to impose a greater penalty on the faculty member who was not penalized sufficiently.

**KARLSON:** Let me turn it around. Let's assume that the grievance results in some penalty being inflicted upon that person and his defense really is an attack upon the character and behavior of the other party. Now, he appeals that and wants to attack the character and behavior of the other party as his defense before the board of review. That other party, I think, is a real party in interest at that time. I do think that a faculty member has the right to appeal to a board of review the imposition even if the vote has gone through those procedures which you have described.

**WALLIHAN for PAAR:** Putting aside questions of parties-at-interest, does not the language of Article V preclude such actions as one faculty member charging another faculty member? Article V, Section A (of the revised Constitution) refers to the faculty expressing its judgment on "administrative action". Section B states that Boards of Review are open to faculty members desiring a review of "University action." While the complainant may view another faculty member as part of the problem, it is the involvement of the University administration that makes it a principal and gives rise to the complaint or grievance.

**PETERSON:** I think I would like to try to find some order to this and see if Carl has any comments as to where we might go with this further.

**ROTHE:** I guess my comment is, as we worked through this we tried to make it general and not get into all the fine detail. We tried to make it rather open. I don't think we expect this to happen very often at all, but it was felt it is a value to put "other party involved" in here at least to have this opportunity.

**BEPKO:** Who defines when a person is, as Henry has described, a real party in interest? If, I as a faculty member, know that something may be said about me in a board of review procedure, do I have a right to declare myself a real party in interest and then be a party and a participant?

**ROTHE:** Ask Henry.

**KARLSON:** If the results of the board of review would have a direct impact upon you.

**BEPKO:** Who decides whether it has a direct impact?

**KARLSON:** I think initially the board of review.

**BEPKO:** Well, it's hard to envision a procedure that is designed to protect a person against whom adverse action has been taken as involving persons against whom you would grieve other than the entity which is the University. If we are contemplating having faculty members being able to grieve against other faculty members and convene a board of review in situations like Henry has described, I think that is a very major step and it seems to me to erode what is already in existence by way of the Code of Academic Ethics and Responsibility. I think those two things ought to be reconciled and that ought to be thought through more carefully than it seems to have been.

**KECK:** Part of this discussion of the parties involved in investigatory conferences came out of what was an old statement on page 5, now on page 6 under B. I am sorry, you should start on page 5 at the bottom of the page. "The informal hearing is now called the investigatory conference." The terminology there still refers to all parties involved so that the new wording referring to all parties has not changed. The old constitution and bylaws used the same wording. The difficulty was with the wording at the top of page six. It states "the observers must be agreed upon by both parties." It has been suggested that observers have been people like the grievant's girlfriend and we wanted to suggest the wording for C would be so that the hearings are open to all the relevant parties but any other observers need to be people that are going to have some major impact on the hearing and even those must be agreed on by both parties. So, "all parties" is not a change. The change is who can, in addition to the principles, be allowed to attend.

**PETERSON:** What do you suggest was the intent of that, Juanita?

**KECK:** That the conference shall be open to all relevant parties. That is the wording that we have used in A and B. But, that attendance of others must be agreed upon by both parties was an intent to move away from the idea that people could come and observe at will.

**ROTHE:** Your suggestion is that the conference shall be open to all relevant parties?

**KECK:** "Principles" does the same thing.

**WELLMAN:** Principles does what you are saying.

**KECK:** I feel that the idea was that more than one administrative person and one grievant might be involved. Reference to all parties is not a change in the new wording. The wording about all parties was in the old part. All we are doing is referring to who else can be involved in the conference.

**MEISS:** The new wording on page 6, C at the bottom says "grievant and other parties" plural, so we already adds up to more than two parties.

**ROTHE:** The last line on page 6. On page 4 at the bottom C "The conference shall be open to each principle. Each principle may be accompanied by an advisor or spokesperson. Would that satisfy it?

**PETERSON:** That sounds like a very good resolution to me. Does anyone have any comments on that particular amendment?

**GALANTI:** We are now introducing another term, "principle". Where we have used "parties" in the past and then all of a sudden, on 4A, I see "relevant parties", in 4B I see "relevant parties", and then in 4C I see "principle". The first thought that comes to my mind is that, "What does this mean?" Does this mean parties? Is it broader than parties? I am a little troubled by introducing a new term

in subsection C. I prefer "open to all relevant parties." I can foresee a circumstance where someone who is not an active party in the grievance against the University, but someone whose role is very important in the outcome of the action and the outcome of the board of review and I think that person should be entitled to have an advisor or spokesperson whichever. I am not trying to drum up work for a lawyer.

ROTHE: It seems to me that that is a good idea to make it that way.

GALANTI: That would allow everyone who has a valid interest in the proceedings to have a representative present.

ROTHE: That means that in part 4A it stays as written -- "Relevant parties. In part C at the bottom, "the conference shall be open to all relevant parties. Each relevant party may be accompanied by an advisor or spokesperson."

GALANTI: That would be my preference.

ROTHE: Then you are getting back to one word - party or parties. We are still leaving it open to more than just purely administration.

GALANTI: On page 7 E, it now says "only grievant or University administration objects." I would like to send this back to the committee to get all of these difficulties straightened out.

ROTHE: It seems to me that the grievant and the University is appropriate there. If we open it up wide open, we are going to have...

OLSON: This is about observers. Whether you allow observers or not. Only two people - either the grievant and the University can say...

ROTHE: Right.

WARFEL: I would just like to point out on behalf of the Nominating Committee that we have to have a slate to the Executive Committee within days. So, if we are going to table parts of this for further consideration, I would like to suggest that we at least consider a vote on the parts concerning elections so we can get on with it.

ROTHE: Jerry, do you feel strongly that opening this to other parties of the administration should not be...

BEPKO: I don't mind if the board of review wishes to have in the hearing somebody who is involved in the dramatic situation out of which the grievant surmises. I don't mind having a policy where the administration would encourage that person to be there and would let that person, if the person was in any jeopardy, have advisors and be advised by a lawyer, whatever that person wanted. But, I have real problems with allowing the board of review procedure to be used by faculty member A against faculty member B. I don't think that is the purpose of a board of review. We already have a procedure that allows for a faculty member to complain about another faculty member or anybody to complain about the conduct of anyone in the academic community and that is a process that has safeguards built into it. It is a process that involves academic misconduct and the evaluation of whether there has been academic misconduct. I would not want to see us indirectly advocate that system and wrap it all up into boards of review. Maybe that is a good idea, but I don't think that particular piece of this has been thought through well enough for me to be able to think that we should go forward with it



now. If all that is involved here, and if we could stipulate all that is involved here is that the grievant may wish to have certain persons from the University, whether you call them administration or whether they are faculty members who happen to be involved in an administrative decision. No matter what they are, if you want the grievant to have the opportunity to ask for that person to be present, and for that person to have some safeguards, I am very comfortable with that. We always do that now. The way we approach boards of review is that we are trying to help resolve the disputes and hope to provide any resources. We will try to get anyone there that the grievant wants to have there. If we have to bring someone there and use strong encouragement to get someone there who wants to be represented, by all means I think we should have representation for that person. But, I don't think that that means that we should take the larger step and say that a board of review is available for one faculty member to grieve against another unless that other faculty member really is the University. Meaning that there has been an adverse judgment or an adverse action taken against the grievant by the University.

ROTHE: Might I suggest that the Constitution is University. The purpose is stated on page one with respect to the University. So, the Council should really keep in mind those are what we are talking about here. This part later on is just an exceedingly unusual situation.

BESCH: Could you tell me where we ended up on page four, the last paragraph, the left side where it says "attendance of others must be agreed upon by all relevant parties." Is that what that says? Does that mean if I bring my girlfriend there, she must agree that the University administrator must be there even if I disagree with her?

ROTHE: Henry, instead of saying "both", why don't you just say "the relevant parties?"

BESCH: I am asking the question.

ROTHE: It can't be both if we have got more than two. So, just make it "the relevant parties." I hope that the girlfriend might not be...

BESCH: "Attendance of others must be agreed upon by the relevant parties." Not all relevant parties.

ROTHE: By the relevant parties.

PETERSON: I think the question that Henry Besch is asking is that there is another sentence under 4C that also says "both parties." The last sentence in that also says "both parties."

ROTHE: The last sentence will be "the relevant parties." Each relevant party, all relevant parties, and at the bottom, the relevant parties.

SIDHU: May I suggest at this time, as the chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, that it looks like there are some things that need to be taken care of. Chancellor Bepko has mentioned some concern. These are the bylaws and can those can be approved in the next meeting and we can bring some improvement and we can discuss with the Executive Committee, but to carry on the election I request to the Council members that they should approve that the number of the board of reviews and the type of people who can be selected on the board of reviews. If we can approve just a part of that and then they can conduct the elections on time otherwise we will be stuck again and not be able to follow the dates for the election. That is my motion.

ROTHE: Why can't we approve the whole thing and then make any amendments if necessary?

**SIDHU:** Sir, I agree with you but I think the elections which have to be conducted cannot be conducted if we don't approve it.

**WARFEL:** What is the main sticking point?

**PETERSON:** The sticking point is "parties" I think is what we are talking about. How many parties are involved in this and how many potentially can be involved. That is the only sticky point as I see it.

**SCHNEIDER:** Just a point of clarification but it is pretty fundamental. On the first page of the bylaws there is a definition of faculty member. Are you using this definition of faculty members to define who may bring a grievance before the Board of Review? That would mean individuals serving full-time.

**KARLSON:** That is correct.

**SCHNEIDER:** So, this does apply to part-time faculty?

**PLATER:** There is a committee looking into the procedure for part-time faculty members. That will be considered later and separate from this process.

**KECK:** I just want to reiterate that it was my understanding that it was never the intent of either the Constitution and Bylaws Committee or the Executive Committee to suggest, perhaps it was an unfortunate example, to suggest that this was faculty against faculty litigation. I repeat, all parties terminology is not different. All we were trying to do was clean up the idea that anybody could bring any observer that they wanted.

**BEPKO:** If that is all that it means, then I am happy about that. In answer to the specific question about whether the University isn't always the party against whom the grievance is filed, several people said "no" there could be a board of review requested by one faculty member for conduct of another faculty member about which the first faculty member was concerned. I don't that is appropriate.

**KARLSON:** I will correct that. That is not exactly what I said. Perhaps I can give a better example. A person denied tenure claims that someone in the sequence in which his denial of tenure took place acted in an inappropriate perhaps even criminal manner. He is attacking that in his denial of tenure which is clearly an action against the University. If we do not have some wording, that person he is accusing of improper conduct will not be present and will not have the right to present any evidence or will not have the right to even question any witnesses while his reputation and behavior is under attack. Somehow I feel that is inappropriate.

**BEPKO:** I don't mind the discretion in a board of review to allow a person who is being accused in the board of review process where the University is the party against whom the grievance is made. I don't mind the discretion to have that person present and to have the person represented by a counsel. If that is all that was intended, then I think that discretion is fine. That should be part of the legislative history. Not the suggestion that a grievance could be filed by faculty member A against faculty member B.

**DEETS:** I have question. One of my concerns is are the proceedings and whatever transpires in a review process, could that material through those documents be forwarded and used in some kind of legal proceedings? If the answer to that is yes, I think we better get ourselves an advisor back in the process. I don't know what the answer is.

**BESCH:** I second the motion of Hitwant Sidhu given the hour and the number of questions that are being raised.

**PETERSON:** The motion, then, is to essentially approve of one section of this and then look at these other problematic wording areas. The section that we would be approving, in order to get the elections underway, is Section B and C and actually Section D, terms of office, are also affected. The motion is on the floor and seconded for approval of that. Are there any other comments? The question has been called for. All of those in favor, say "Aye." Any opposed? [The vote was unanimous] We will bring further revisions of this with the fine tuning that has been asked for to the next Council meeting. Thank you very much, Carl.

**SIDHU:** May I request one small item? As Dr. Mannan mentioned if there are some dramatical mistakes and we need to make those changes, I request that we give the authority to the Secretary that that can be done and that may be done.

**PETERSON:** One more comment. If any of you do wish to pick up a copy of the bylaws as they are being discussed at this point and if you have any comments on these, please get back to us. I cannot guarantee that these are 100 percent correct because of some of the time restrictions on getting a copy of this out. But, it does have those same things in it that Hitwant talked to us earlier about -- the secretary being changed to present, vice president, and the Chancellor at IUPUI being put in as the officer.

**SIDHU:** Do you have any objection to giving that authority to the Secretary?

**PETERSON:** There are a couple of small gramaticals that are not consequential that we are talking about.

**SIDHU:** Do I hear any opposition to that motion? [No]

**PETERSON:** I think we have taken a lot of time for discussion. The Chancellor does have a State of the Campus Address that he wants to give us today. I don't know if there is anything else that we want to cover under the Question and Answer, Unfinished Business, or New Business, but I would consider, if there are no major issues in that area, to entertain a motion for adjournment. [So moved] Everyone so moved that, so I take that as a vote and we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

January 9, 1992  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Vice Chancellor J. Herman Blake, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, Barbara Fischler, P. Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Margaret Applegate, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Janice Bruckner, Walter Buchanan, Victor Childers, Philip Coons, Carol Deets, Naomi Fineberg, Dean Hawley, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Douglas Lees, Linda Marler, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, B. Keith Moore, Richard Peterson, Eric Pumroy, Terry Reed, Frederick Rescorla, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Phyllis Scherle, P. Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Richard Turner, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck.

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Deans: Richard C. Ruwe for William Voos, Hugh A. Wolf for Donald Warren. Elected Faculty: Eleanor Donnelly for Patricia Blake, Catherine Rhoades for Janice Froehlich, Susan Zunt for LaForrest Garner, Bill Orr for Jean Gnat.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Walter Daly, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, Angela McBride, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Thomas Ambrose, Darrell Bailey, Sally Bowman, Linda Brothers, Lucinda Carr, Elaine Cooney, Anne Donchin, John Emhardt, William Engle, Mary Fisher, Paul Galanti, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Melvin Glick, Steven Leapman, Golam Mannan, Steven Mazzuca, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Gerald Paar, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Sherry Ricchiardi, Neal Rothman, Edmund Schilling, Jan Shipps, Gregory Sutton, Vernon Vix, Lei Yu.

**VISITORS:** Erwin Boschmann, Kay Carl (Allied Health), Mark Grove (Registrar), Patrice Hartmann (Sagamore), Melisa Lalich, Kim Manlove (Dean of the Faculties Office), Carol Nathan (Dean of the Faculties Office), Carl Rothe, JoAnn Switzer (Academic Affairs Committee).

**AGENDA ITEM I - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS - CHANCELLOR GERALD L. BEPKO**

**BEPKO:** In this transition period leading to our new arrangement, Dick Peterson and I are going to share the responsibilities for chairing and managing the meeting. I will start off by saying, under Presiding Officer's Business, we have no items to bring to you today except for one very minor matter. In one sense it is minor and in one sense it may be very important. That is that after 22 years of having the parking situation on this campus get worse every year, and after hearing all of us who have been involved in the administration of the campus say year after year, "Please bear with us, it will get better," after those 22 years, in January of 1992, it has gotten better. The new Sports Garage, which has been opened just west of here, has 1,100 parking spaces and in a matter of days the Wilson Street Garage repairs will be finished and all of the cars that are now in the Outpatient Center Garage will move back to the Wilson Street Garage. There will be 700 more parking spaces in the Outpatient Garage which means that in January, 1992, we are adding 1,800 new spaces to the parking inventory, most of which, especially the 1,100 in the Sports Garage, are available as if they were surface parking spaces. Students, faculty, and staff may park there with no more than the ordinary tag. I thought we should commemorate this moment (applause). It is the first time in 22 years that things have gotten better. Unfortunately, Bob Martin who is Vice Chancellor for Administration, who normally is the lightning rod and the person who all of us

punish for the poor parking conditions on campus, is not here to take the credit for this but if you see him, tell him thanks. I would like to say though that we talk often about facilities and the development of the campus in various ways that involve steel and concrete, but that should not take away from the major premise by which we operate at all times and that is that people are the important part of university life, especially the faculty and the staff who are responsible for the academic programs. They are the really important part of Indiana University and IUPUI. We are very grateful for the high spirits that you have all maintained even through some of these periods of adversity, difficult parking, and, as I have said a couple of times this year already, also during this period of restructuring and retrenchment that has been brought about by the state's poor finances. We are very grateful and very pleased that the high spirits that you have brought to your work and to the affairs of the University have been what they are and we are delighted.

#### AGENDA ITEM II - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT - RICHARD PETERSON

**BEPKO:** Next we have the Executive Committee Report from Dick Peterson.

**PETERSON:** You will have to be careful or you will make a believer in this administration out of me since they met the deadline in getting that garage open on the first of the year.

**BEPKO:** That is another first.

**PETERSON:** I have two minor comments today which relate to Constitutional revisions. On December 6th I sent out the Constitutional revisions that were approved in this Council in December to all faculty. I am waiting for comments. If you or any of your colleagues have any comments, I would like to have those as soon as possible since we are soon due to send the ballots to the faculty as a whole so that we can vote on these constitutional revisions.

Also, as an agenda item, as an addendum to the agenda that you received for today, we have some suggested University Faculty Council amendments for the Constitution. We are in the process of revising that whole Constitution. We would like your comments on that. We are not going to open it up for discussion today but probably in February we should look at this. Any of you are welcome at any time to make your comments directly to the Task Force, the Constitutional Revision Committee, that is looking at this. Please make those comments and we may discuss some of the details in subsequent meetings. That completes my report.

**SIDHU:** Dick, what is the timetable approximately for the University Faculty Council's discussing these changes to the Constitution and Bylaws?

**PETERSON:** This was distributed at the University Faculty Council and there has been very little discussion even at the University Faculty Council level. They are looking for input from individuals at this point. I assume that either in the February or March meeting we will look at a draft that can be reacted to. There are things in here that will not be the final copy, but we are looking for reactions on those items. I hope that we would have something that would be substantial by the end of the year that might be approvable, but I don't know if that is realistic to think of it in that way. At least we have something on paper that we have not had for several years.

### AGENDA ITEM III - MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., CELEBRATION

**BEPKO:** In part, because of the speed with which we have disposed of the first two agenda items, we would like to ask your indulgence by allowing us to move Item VI up to this point in the agenda because of schedule commitments that Herman Blake has. Unless we hear any objections, we will assume that there is unanimous consent for changing the agenda as published. If there are no objections, I would like to ask Herman to say a few words about the Martin Luther King, Jr., celebrations which are forthcoming which we hope will increasingly become a very important part of the academic calendar.

**H. BLAKE:** Good afternoon. For some years IUPUI has celebrated the memory of Dr. Martin Luther King. Several years ago, however, Chancellor Bepko decided to increase the impact of the IUPUI celebration on the Indianapolis community in two ways. First, was to schedule the formal celebration at a time when more members of the community can participate. Therefore, the event was moved to a community-wide breakfast celebration. The second decision was to raise the quality of the event by presenting speakers who would not only be able to memorialize Dr. King, but who could leave the participants with a broader outlook on their daily activities as a result of their involvement in the IUPUI celebration. The speakers of the past two years were carefully selected as scholars/teachers/lecturers who were not only familiar with Dr. King, but who were intellectually involved in the exploration and amplification of his life and thought.

The Martin Luther King celebration for 1992 continues in this tradition, but with a significant augmentation. The Chancellor has invited two presenters who have worked together for the past 25 years, and who were close associates of Dr. King. The theme for the celebration this year is "Extending the Dream: Community not Chaos."

Speaking at the community breakfast on Monday morning, January 20 at 7:30 a.m. will be Rev. Dr. Otis J. Moss of Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Moss served with Dr. King as Co-Pastor of Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. He has a strong philosophical bond with Mahatma Gandhi as well as Dr. King. His moral commitment is reflected in his international work with political leaders in Israel, Taiwan, the Republic of China, Beirut, and West Africa.

In addition to the members of our own faculty, student body, and staff we have invited members of the business community, public servants from the offices of the governor, the mayor, the legislature, and others, as well as community and religious leaders to share in this breakfast celebration.

Following the breakfast, from 9:30 a.m. until noon, there will be a workshop presented on campus by Dr. Vincent Harding. Dr. Harding of the Iliff School of Theology in Denver is one of the nation's leading scholars on the life and thought of Dr. King. He is the author of the widely acclaimed book, There is a River, a history of black protest, and also served as a major consultant for the prize-winning TBS series, Eyes on the Prize. In the workshop Dr. Harding will focus on strategies for reflecting and acting upon the ideas of Dr. King that carry us beyond race, ethnicity, and gender and toward a unified community.

This workshop is designed for leaders and teachers in the public schools, religious and youth leaders, parents, and others who work directly with the general public. IUPUI faculty, students, and staff are especially encouraged to attend. Both the breakfast and the workshop are offered free of charge. However, we have asked the workshop participants to purchase and read Dr. Harding's most recent book, Hope and History since it will be used as the text for the session. The breakfast and the workshop have attracted wide attention and we expect a full house at each

events. For example, 14 teachers from just one public school have enrolled for the workshop because of their commitment to extending Dr. King's work in their school.

The campus celebration will conclude that evening with a special dinner sponsored by the Black Student Union. This will be held in the Westin Hotel at 7 p.m. The speaker for this dinner will be the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, former member of the United States Congress. Tickets for the dinner celebration are priced at \$25 per person and are available from the Black Student Union at 274-4239. We think these events manifest the quality of intellectual and civic leadership IUPUI should provide to Indianapolis. We invite your full participation. Should you need further information, you may call my office at 274-8990. Thank you.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Herman. Are there any questions about the Martin Luther King celebration events? We take very seriously the responsibility for not only making this an important event for our academic calendar, but also for the community, not only to bring people from the community into the University context, but also to provide leadership on the points that Herman made about using Dr. King's life, work, and philosophy as themes for community development.

**AGENDA ITEM IV - INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY - HENRY H.H. REMAK AND BENNET B. BRABSON**

**BEPKO:** Next we have the honor of having some special guests in our midst today. Henry Remak and Bennet Brabson from the Institute for Advanced Study are here to say some things about the Institute. I am pleased to be able to welcome you to the IUPUI Faculty Council and also introduce you to tell us some more about the Institute.

**REMAK:** Thank you, Chancellor Bepko. I am basically here to urge you, faculty of IUPUI, and the students to take advantage of an extraordinary opportunity you have which has no substantive cost for your University campus and is still very under utilized. I am talking about the Institute for Advanced Study and in particular its ability to bring Fellows to your campus to do research with you.

I think we all realize that no discipline can remain vital without constantly questioning and reviewing its premises. Research is not an expendable luxury, but simply is part of the essential mission of a major university and this is a major university. In research, even more than in teaching, no man or woman can be an island. It may be that colleagues in other departments on your campus or another school or another campus are closer to your own research than the immediate colleagues in your own department. Some of the research that you are carrying on is most relevantly carried on by someone in a very distant location. It is not enough to read somebody's publications, to meet some of your colleagues from other schools at conferences. What you really need is time and the opportunity to sit down with a researcher of similar interests from anywhere in the world for at least a period of two weeks or up to six or eight weeks, depending upon the funds we have, and to collaborate with them and to consult with them with an absolute minimum of formal obligations. There is only one official lecture needed; all the rest is left entirely to the faculty and to the Fellows. We are just about as informal as can be. One of the facts of academic life is that we talk about salary all the time. My experience is that most scholars need time, time, time to sit down to do their research and to talk to other scholars, and time is at a premium. These external Fellows, although their principal function is to work with individual faculty, also serve the secondary, but very important function, of being catalysts to bring faculty of this University together, who are pursuing related research interests in different departments. It is amazing to me how often faculty members have not met, or have met only very occasionally, other

faculty members who are working on a different angle of their own research interest, but, for some reason that is hard to fathom, they haven't got together. External Fellows seem to bring these faculty members together.

Any Fellow can be nominated by any faculty member on any campus and that Fellow could stay on your campus for his/her entire stay. That doesn't seem to be realized by some of our colleagues on campuses outside of Bloomington. We have had many Fellows, of course, staying mainly on other campuses, including Bloomington, who have visited here. But I do want to remind you that you have had a number of Fellows already who have been nominated by your colleagues on this campus who have stayed practically the entire time on this campus under the auspices of our institute. One of the first Fellows during my incumbency was Donald Brown, the chair of the Economics Department at Stanford University, formerly at Yale, who worked with Professors Aliprantis and Burkinshaw in your Mathematical Sciences Department and who spent only three or four hours in Bloomington. That was fine with us. Umberto Eco, one of the foremost cultural figures of our time, spent about five days on the Indianapolis campus. Sir Michael Roth, one of the leading psychiatric gerontologists of Great Britain spent all but one day on this campus working with Professors Hugh Hendrie and John Nurnberger, Jr. Jaakko Kaprio, distinguished Finnish substance addiction expert, worked on this campus with Professors Joe Christian, Ting-Kai Li, Judy Z. Miller, and John I. Nurnberger. Finally, in a month or two you will have, thanks to the nomination by your own colleague, Sharon Hamilton-Wieler, John Dixon, one of the great British experts on language education.

I want to take time for any questions you might have but I also want to tell you very simply and in a businesslike fashion, what you need to do to get a Fellow here. Our main categories are Academic Fellows. They have to stay two weeks. They get \$1,500 a week, for the first four weeks. After that is \$1,000 per week. The average stay is about three weeks. Two weeks is an absolute minimum stay. The stay can be anywhere on any or several campuses. We have cut down the bureaucracy to the utmost in nominating Fellows. We are the only Institute for Advanced Study in this country, to the best of my knowledge, that does not accept any external applications for Fellowships. We only accept Fellows who are nominated by our own faculty in order to assist them in their own research. We have no forms. We have no deadlines. You do not need any outside letters. No chairs or deans have to approve your nominations. We cherish direct personal relationships between the faculty member and us. What we do need is a good, solid, specific letter saying: 'this is the research that I have done, this is my CV, this is the research that the Fellow has done, this is his CV, and I would like for him to come here for so much time to work with me on this and that.' That is all we need. Our Fellowship nominations are not competitive. We are not playing one against the other. No deserving nomination has ever been turned down, so far, for lack of money, although budgetary realities may force us to cut down on longer stays.

It takes about three to four weeks to process your nomination once we feel that the dossier is ready. Nominations must, first, be approved by our Selection Committee (entirely internal) consisting of seven faculty members. You have a representative of this campus on the Selection Committee and that is Raima Larter, Chemistry. We work with the nominators on the dossier. If we see a dossier that we don't think will have a very good chance of making it, we don't send it to certain death to the Selection Committee. We go back to the nominator and tell him/her what they need to do to beef it up. We have an extremely high rate of acceptances of nominations once they go to the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee takes usually two weeks. After the Selection Committee has said 'yes', we call the faculty member and tell him/her orally, "You can now tell your Fellow that there is a 99 percent chance that he/she will be approved by our Governing Board." The Governing Board has to approve it, but has, in the past, almost always gone along with the Selection Committee. The Board members also make suggestions as to who



else might profit from the presence of that Fellow. So, basically, the process, once we send in the dossier, takes only two weeks and at the most three weeks until a formal confirmation, which takes about four or five weeks, is received.

The second category is that of Visiting Scholars. Visiting Scholars are faculty members from other institutions who have sabbatical or research leaves or grants and who would like to come to Indiana University to do research on their own. They may stay in the Institute for weeks or months where they can get a nice study, but they get no stipend from us. They have access to all office and mailing facilities, to association with our Fellows, library, university lodging, parking, etc.

The third category is Distinguished Citizen Fellows. It occurred to us that our students particularly would profit greatly from having distinguished minds who did not stay in academia as we did, but went out into what is sometimes called "real life" in order to see how the ideas that they had received from us worked out or didn't work out in real life. These Distinguished Citizen Fellows do not have to go through the same nomination process. You are free to suggest any of them. They are screened by the staff and approved directly by the Governing Board. We have had Otis R. Bowen (Governor of Indiana, subsequently U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Resources) here. He spent quite a bit of time on your campus. We have had Senator Birch Bayh whose first visit was to this campus. We have had Landrum Bolling, the former president of Earlham College and of the Lilly Endowment. We are going to have Alice Rivlin, first Director of the Congressional Budget Office, one of the chief economists in the country, now with the Brookings Institution.

The next category is Internal Faculty Fellows. These are faculty who have received major external research grants. They would like to have a quiet place to get away from their colleagues and students in order to do their work. If they are in Bloomington, we offer them a study for a whole year if they wish. They do not get a stipend because the external agency gives them a stipend. They have office facilities, access to our Fellows, etc. And we give them up to \$500 a semester for research purposes. That would be \$1,000 a year.

Finally, we have the Intercampus Scholars. Intercampus Scholars is a new category of scholars who must be from a campus other than Bloomington and want to come to Bloomington to do research, because there are certain laboratory facilities available there, library resources, or colleagues they wish to talk with. For them, thanks to the cooperation of the Graduate School, we have a new kind of scholarship called Intercampus Scholarships. They get, from Research and the University Graduate School (RUGS) up to \$500 for traveling expenses, lodging and per diem, and \$250 for research, and from us they receive facilities for studies. We had Jerry Kaminker, from your Mathematics Department, as an Inter-Campus Scholar last summer. We also had two other faculty members from other campuses who spent some time in Bloomington to study. That is all I have to say. If you have any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

**BUCHANAN:** This is off the subject, but I can't resist the opportunity to say that it is good to see you again after having had you as a teacher over 30 years ago.

**REMAK:** When former teacher meets former student there could be a ticklish situation. I used to go to the Dental School here for inexpensive treatment before I was promoted. I was seated in a chair and the dentist seemed slightly familiar to me but I couldn't pin him down. After he had wired me up and I was helpless and I had all of these horrible apparatuses in my mouth, he said, "Dr. Remak, do you remember me?" I trembled and said, "No." He said, "I had you as a German instructor twelve years ago." My first thought was: "Good God, what grade did I give him?" I am still here so I guess the grade was alright.

AGENDA ITEM V - BOARDS OF REVIEW ELECTION - NOMINATING COMMITTEE

#### AGENDA ITEM V - BOARDS OF REVIEW ELECTION - NOMINATING COMMITTEE

**PETERSON:** The next item on the agenda relates to the election for the Boards of Review. The Nominating Committee has candidates to present to you. We will hold an election for those Boards of Review at this point. Kathleen Warfel will be describing this process and distributing the ballots.

**WARFEL:** If you are not a voting member of the Faculty Council, please do not take a ballot.

**PETERSON:** Since I don't have my ballot yet I don't know what it says as far as voting instructions are concerned but we are voting for a slate of five individuals for each of these boards. Please vote for five individuals in each case.

#### AGENDA ITEM VI - CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE

**PETERSON:** We will go on with the next agenda item. I would like to make a couple of comments about the next agenda item. You should have picked up, as you came in, bylaw changes which were discussed at the last meeting. If you do not have a copy of those bylaw changes, we will get you a copy. These are the bylaw changes related to the Boards of Review. At the last session there was some discussion related to this item. You were asked, on the part of the Council, to go back and look at the document more carefully. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Hitwant Sidhu and Carl Rothe and myself have looked at this. We have some written comments on the first page of the document that you should have in front of you. We will be willing to discuss those at this point. If it seems that we have unanimity or relative unanimity, even though this item is not registered as an action item today, I would encourage you to bring forth a motion to bring this as an action item. We will have to have a two-thirds majority of the people who are here in order to be able to bring it as an action item as the Constitution states. If we don't, there is no big rush on this and we could have it as an action item next time. If necessary, make another tweaking of a word or two. I think we have come close to the point where we want to be. Dr. Sidhu, if you would introduce Carl Rothe.

**SIDHU:** As Dick has pointed out, we have received your suggestions. We would like to implement those suggestions. We have tried to use your suggestions by making some changes. Then, we discussed these with the Executive Committee as well as Chancellor Bepko. We tried our best but still this is not the final draft. I will request Dr. Rothe to explain or answer your questions.

**ROTHE:** As has been said, changes were made and I hope the right ones were made and I didn't make too many mistakes for you. The major change here is in terms of Item #2 -- You will design to cover a grievance between a faculty member and the administration and not get into the important but more difficult complex issue of "other parties" who are administration or a faculty member.

The first item, you will notice, we are suggesting, on page 1, Item 5 at the bottom -- "For definitions and criteria related to possible grievance, individuals should refer to the Academic Handbook of Indiana University." We have taken out the "definitions of non-renewal and dismissal." This goes along with our philosophy of a year ago of having one source of information and refer to that and in this case it will be the Faculty Handbook.

On Section E.4.h, on page five, "With either initial or formal hearings, the Board may consult at any time with members of the law school faculty concerning clarification of legal matters." We are doing that to reinforce the concept that members of the law school faculty can be asked to help

the Faculty Boards of Review. This is a point that was raised last time and we said we would add this and we did.

On page two, left hand column about six lines down, we changed from three to four tenured faculty members at your request.

On page seven, Section E. 6f, we substituted "University" for "Faculty Council's Expense."

On page nine, Section E. 6k, "Further appeal may be made by the Grievant to the President of the University and Board of Trustees." As I said, we hope we have all of the suggestions in this that you asked for from the meeting in December. You have approved parts A-D, but we have placed in Part A, a section (See A.5) about where definitions of possible grievances are described in the IU Handbook.

The sticking point last time was on page four, in terms of the Initial Investigatory Conference as to who could be a part of these conferences and who could be a grievant. As I said, our goal was to make this for faculty who have a grievance with the administration. To make it more broad than that would require, many of us felt, a constitutional amendment, including changes in the purposes and very specific definitions later on in the Bylaws. If I can answer questions at this time, I will try.

**VESSELY:** Does that mean then that if a faculty member has a grievance against another faculty member that they would take it to the administration and if the administration didn't do anything about it, that their grievance may then be transferred to the administration?

**ROTHER:** Administrative action would have to be taken. To me, it is a real problem. I won't discount that at all. However, if we allow faculty-to-faculty grievances before a Board of Review, that would get very complicated.

**BEPKO:** There is a process, I would assume, that is developed in every academic unit that involves evaluating accusations of some kind of misconduct. Those are faculty-based processes ordinarily. Those processes would be available for alleged wrong-doing of many kinds whether the allegation was made by a faculty colleague or by someone else. That would be the method for determining whether there had been a violation of our code of academic ethics.

**DEETS:** On page 6, #6a, second line, that "was" should be "has" not was. It should read: Upon notice that a Board of Review has been convened, and when the grievance "has" been reasonably specified, the Chancellor of IUPUI shall furnish a written statement of the reasons for the action which lead to the grievance.

**ROTHER:** This is the joy of computer spell checkers. You are certainly quite right. We will get that changed before we go any further.

**TURNER:** I would like to ask a question about page 5, letter h. This is about "...the Board may consult at any time with members of the law school faculty concerning clarification of legal matters." I take it that this goes on beyond procedural matters. How often does that happen? That the Board needs to go to the Law School for advice.

**ROTHER:** In part, we have had, as you will recall in the old Constitution, members of the Law School faculty available on the boards. Since they were there, it is hard to tell how often they were used in that role. My impression, in terms of legal matters, is not too often. Chancellor Bepko, is that correct?

**BEPKO:** I think you have said it correctly. I think that this is a substitute for the membership on each Board of a member of the Law faculty, as an advisor. I think if there are serious legal questions, then that is something that should be referred to University counsel and, if necessary, maybe independent counsel.

**TURNER:** Does the Law School usually speak with one voice on all matters? If they don't like one response, can they go to another?

**BEPKO:** I think that the sense of this, and I wasn't involved in the drafting of this, is that if there are questions that involve policy rooted in law and you want to talk to someone who has some background and experience in dealing with that sort of policy, the law faculty ought to be available and the person on the law faculty that you would go to as a chair of a board of review would be up to you. It would not be an official ruling of any kind. The Law School certainly does not speak with one voice, about anything. I think that it would just be a way of better informing the decisions of the Board of Review. I don't think that it would be a matter of submitting an issue to the Law School faculty for resolution. It is only advice to be either taken or not taken as the chair and the members of the Board of Review see fit.

**BALDWIN:** Often times there are questions which come up which have wider implications and might even have implications regarding the law, and it is nice to get some input since most people don't know what the law is. University counsel is not really suitable to be called on because the University counsel is usually sitting there as a partisan for one of the parties involved in the dispute, so it is nice to know that you can go somewhere else.

**SIDHU:** The way it was brought in, the faculty from the Law School, there were two sources. First, that the Nominating Committee will have a member from the Law School just to give general guidance, but they will not act as a legal person to make the decisions. That was the general idea. Now, because we have three boards and so many law faculty members may not be available, so this will be more efficiently made that, if there is need for consultation for general guidance, we will seek advice from one of the Law School faculty members. They do not act as a legal advisor, but they generally give the clarification of advice if they are asked.

**YOKOMOTO:** With the experience of the Law School faculty members they have great knowledge in conducting hearings. Therefore, I think Law School faculty members should be consulted.

**ROTHE:** One point that would make one of the changes here compared to the past, people serve for two years and it is my impression from Kathleen that the board itself, when it is elected now, will by themselves or a straw vote, decide which will serve for two years or one year, the goal being that at least one or two members who have served on a board before will have some experience. I would also point out that the initial hearing is not a legal kind of hearing and even the formal hearing is not a trial. It is strictly a matter of gathering information and trying to make a recommendation that would be of use to the administration and the grievant.

**BEPKO:** Is it your thought that this could be approved now, or would you like to wait and have it brought back when it is on the agenda for a vote?

**DEETS:** I move that we fill in whatever the appropriate words are and make it go.

**UNKNOWN:** I second the motion.

**PETERSON:** Juanita, did you have a comment?

**KECK:** No. I might have filled in a few more words than Carol, but I was going to suggest that we move to approve this document as amended.

**PETERSON:** Could you review the words that will be filled in? A couple of us have been involved with another problem.

**ROTHE:** To my knowledge the only changes on page 6 is to change the word "was" to "has."

**BEPKO:** We are going to suspend the usual rules and waive the notice requirement for this to be on the agenda. All in favor say "Aye." Opposed? [none] The committee has recommended that this needs no second.

**PETERSON:** We have a comment from our Parliamentarian.

**KARLSON:** You cannot suspend a notice requirement. In fact, you cannot suspend a bylaw unless your Bylaws provide for the suspension of that bylaw. Our bylaws do not provide for that.

**PETERSON:** But, we can vote by two-thirds of the...

**SIDHU:** I believe there are two-thirds of the membership present.

**KARLSON:** But, if you vote without previous notice, then it is two-thirds of the total membership of the Faculty Council which includes those who are not present today. I would advise you to look at Article VI, Section A.

**SIDHU:** Could you read it.

**KARLSON:** Adoption of an amendment to the bylaws shall require a favorable vote of two-thirds of those present at a regular member meeting of the Faculty Council, if prior notice of the intention to conduct a vote is given to members of the faculty and to members of the Council. If no prior notice is given, adoption will require a favorable vote of the two-third of the total membership of the Faculty Council.

**SIDHU:** Correct me if I am wrong, last time this was brought before the Council for action, we discussed it and this item was sent back to the committee to make some changes. Therefore, we have come back to the Council with some changes suggested by the members. Therefore, can that item be considered as item for action from the...

**KARLSON:** The question is whether or not notice was given of an intention to conduct a vote to members of the Faculty Council and members of the faculty.

**SIDHU:** If I remember correctly, last time it was.

**BEPKO:** I think, even if we follow the bylaws, and we must follow the Constitution that Henry is reading from, we probably have two-thirds of the total Faculty Council present. If there is a unanimous vote in favor, then we can adopt this proposal today. If there is no objection, the combined chairs will find that there is two-thirds of the Faculty Council present and ask for a vote on the proposal that is being made by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

**VESSELY:** So moved.

**BEPKO:** All in favor, say "Aye." Opposed? [none]

**AGENDA ITEM VII - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

**BEPKO:** We have a ten minute question period.

**PETERSON:** We might want to deal with the election at this time.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready to report on the election?

**PETERSON:** Are you going to report the results, Kathleen?

**WARFEL:** I am ready to report on the non-election. As Chairman of the Nominating Committee, I apologize because the Faculty Council cannot vote today. According to the Constitution, this ballot had to be distributed to the members of the Council seven days before this meeting and it wasn't. Henry says that we can't vote for that reason.

**VESSELY:** Didn't we just suspend...

**KARLSON:** No, we did not. You cannot suspend a bylaw unless that bylaw provides for its suspension in the bylaw or there is a provision providing for its suspension. The only bylaws that can be suspended by a two-thirds vote are those dealing with rules of order as opposed to rules of notice in voting.

**VESSELY:** So, the notice of this election is not the same?

**KARLSON:** No. The completed ballot has to be distributed not the notice of an election.

**PETERSON:** That was an oversight on my part.

**UNKNOWN:** Can't we count the ballots at the next meeting?

**KARLSON:** No. You have to distribute the ballot before you have the election and obviously you cannot hold the ballots and say you voted now that we have given you notice. It doesn't work that way unfortunately.

**PETERSON:** We need to have this election at the next meeting in order to make sure that we are not violating our own rules and guidelines. I apologize also. I did not go back and check the bylaws. After the Executive Committee looked at these names I did not tell Kathleen that we had approved them so that she could distribute them. The Boards of Review start functioning in February. If we can delay that election until the February meeting we will be reasonably safe to have those boards functioning at that point.

**ROTHE:** If I may speak as a non member of the Council, in the heart of the bylaw for this board of review that has been approved by this group, it does not talk about seven day notice. For elections of others there is a seven day notice, but are you sure there is a seven day notice required?

**KARLSON:** It is under a separate provision dealing with the duties of the Nominating Committee. Specifically, the Nominating Committee shall and the sixth duty of the Nominating Committee is to distribute, to the faculty, a completed list of nominees at least seven days prior to the date on

which the Council will hold an election. This is a general provision applying to all elections.

**ROTHE:** Should that be changed in our bylaw section on the Boards of Review?

**KARLSON:** No. It is separate. This deals with elections.

**BEPKO:** You say you cannot amend the bylaws by the process that we just did. I think Carl's point is that we just amended the bylaws and in that amendment to the bylaws we have now provided that the Boards of Review shall be elected at the January meeting.

**KARLSON:** There is a provision, however, that if you are going to amend the bylaws, it must first be sent to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

**BEPKO:** This was.

**KARLSON:** Yes, that was but that has nothing to do with this. That section deals with the Boards of Review. This is a totally separate section dealing with the duties of the Nominating Committee.

**BEPKO:** Couldn't we interpret our action of a few moments ago to mean that we have now amended the bylaws to make supreme this new clause that we have now incorporated into the bylaws? That is, no matter what else is contained in any other provision of the bylaws that is inconsistent, we now have mandated that we hold an election at the January meeting. In interpreting inconsistent provisions in the statute, constitution, or bylaws, you always conclude that the most recently enacted prevails.

**KARLSON:** This is not the most recently enacted. That provision exists in our present bylaws.

**BESCH:** What this provision number six does, under Nominating Committee, it prevents secret ballots containing errors and not knowing about who is going to be elected.

**KARLSON:** Jerry, Robert's Rules of Order says this is to protect the democratic process. Obviously, what Professor Besch has so appropriately stated, is to prevent secret ballots. These are not inconsistent. This is a restatement of present language. There is no change. There is an inconsistency but when you are dealing with the democratic process, the rules of procedure dealing with voting and the right of notification take precedent. These are not inconsistent. It is a restatement of present language.

**SIDHU:** I think in this case somehow or another we are wrong. Why? Because we generally give the notice and bring in the agenda with the Boards of Review. As Dick has pointed out, somehow or other we made a mistake and the members should have advance notice for whom they are going to vote. If we made a mistake, we should pay for it and we should not take action on this today.

**BEPKO:** I think the Parliamentarian should have the last word and the only point that I think would be appropriate to take up is whether we should have a motion to destroy the now invalid ballots. [So moved] All in favor, say "aye." Any opposed? Now we have our question period. If anyone has any questions. We have received no questions in advance of the meeting.

**ALIPRANTIS:** There have been so many rumors about the budget. Could you give some information about the budget?

**BEPKO:** The budget for 1992-93 was set in the 1991 legislature. The University's budget base will be reduced again for 1992-93 by something in the neighborhood of three percent of the tuition that we receive. Actually, our total budget will go up a little because we probably will raise tuition for undergraduates by roughly eight percent and in some of the graduate programs by more. That will make up the three percent loss plus give a little bit of additional funding. Of course, that will not be nearly enough to make up for the expected additional costs we will have because our hope is to provide reasonable compensation increases for all personnel. We are engaged in the process right now of working with the Faculty Council Budgetary Affairs Committee and the academic units to determine what the assumption should be in the final making of the budget, what should we do, in other words, about salary increases and how much effort should be made to give compensation increases. How much should be reallocated for compensation increases and those sorts of issues. The budget will not be finally set until after the legislative session is over, probably in March or April. I should mention that we have assumed, in starting to work with budgets for 1992-93, that there should be an average three percent compensation increase for all personnel. Also, we assumed that we will have increased costs in most areas, other than personnel compensation, of up to five percent. For health care our costs will go up about 22 percent. Those are the assumptions we have worked with and we have tried to build some budget models based on those assumptions. For the 1992 session of the General Assembly we are reasonably confident that there will be no change. The Governor makes his State of the State presentation tonight and I suspect he will say that there will be cuts in the state's budget but there will only be cuts that can be made without legislative action. I don't think that there can be cuts in the University's budget without legislative action. So, I don't think there will be any mid-year reductions for the University. There will be no reductions below what has already been made for 1992-93. We have little confidence in our speculation about what will happen in 1993.

**WILSON:** What percentage of the total budget is funded by the state?

**BEPKO:** Actually, in our total expenditure budget for the campus it is probably around 20 percent. That is not a fair computation because so much of our budget is unrelated to state expenditures. That is, our total budget includes the hospitals and quite a number of our other auxiliary activities. If you look just at the general fund budget, probably a little more than one-third comes from the state.

**BALDWIN:** This is on another subject. I have heard of something called the Roberts Academy, connected with IPS, coming to the 38th Street campus. Could somebody speak to that? Is that still a go project?

**BEPKO:** It is probably not going to go forward. We have had an interest in creating cooperative programs at IPS in a variety of ways. As I have said in this forum a number of times, we think that we have a responsibility to support the educational system from PK to PD or pre-kindergarten through post-doctorate. We can't accept total responsibility for the entire process but where we can we ought to make contributions to increasing the quality of students that come from the public schools into the University and encourage more of them to be interested in coming to the University. We have explored, without significant cost to the University, a variety of joint projects with IPS and with other school systems. We meet from time to time with the school superintendents from all of the area districts. We have regular contacts between faculty and people in the campus administration and principals of various schools in an effort to try to raise the whole product of our educational system. In that context, we talked to Cheryl Gilbert about creating a special academy on University property. Of course, we have no space on campus here in which we could have this kind of a program. But, as programs move out of the 38th Street facilities, we have some space that is not coveted as much by academic programs and we thought if IPS paid



the expense of operating those programs, that it would be a synergistic project (a win-win situation) to permit IPS, under carefully controlled circumstances, to conduct a program in those facilities. Unfortunately, the facilities are not equipped to satisfy fire code requirements for public schools. They are all right for universities, but they are not good enough for high schools. It would cost far more than the program might justify to bring the facilities into conformity with the fire codes and, as a result, that is not likely to happen. It is a shame in a way because, while we will eventually fill up every inch of space that is available to us no matter where it is located, even if it is 30 miles away, we don't have activities at this point that are ready to move in. It would have been a nice opportunity to work in cooperation with IPS to try to create a model that would have, I think, shown the way for more college aspirations and more higher achievement in public schools. But, I don't think it will happen, although there are still some possibilities that are being explored.

**MOORE:** I have a question related to parking. Although I join you in the sense of elation that these new facilities are opening, my concern about parking is a little more philosophical and broad based in relating to specific facilities. That is one of accountability. I wish Bob Martin were here today. It appears to me that Parking Services is accountable to no one. There certainly doesn't appear to be any faculty input at any stage in their decision-making process. They have a rate structure established for different levels of parking privileges which looks very arbitrary. I have never seen any kind of structured justification - or any real clear-cut indication for what you get for what you are paying. It has always been my assumption that if you chose to purchase an "A" sticker, you were paying a premium for the privilege of parking closer to the place where you worked and having a little more probability of finding a parking space. In the last 18 months, Parking Services has quickly removed that assumption. At the School of Dentistry, the "A" spaces for example, have been moved twice in the last 18 months. With each move the number of spaces available have become smaller and they have been moved further from the building. This last move, which occurred at the first of the year, is a real champ. There are two very small areas now located about as far away as you can get from the building. In the lots that are adjacent to the building all of the "B" spaces essentially that are available are now closer than the "A" spaces and yet there doesn't seem to be any accountability. We have talked to the administration at the Dental School and get the same message from them. In fact, the School of Dentistry faculty passed a motion at a meeting Friday to bring this issue to the administration. I have attempted to contact the people in Parking Services without any success so I really don't know what their response would be to this and it is too bad that Bob Martin isn't here. I have a real frustration about this lack of accountability that I sense on the part of Parking Services and the lack of any faculty input, direct or indirect, into any of the decision making. I really think that they are charging a fee for a service, but the service that they are providing, ought to be fairly well specified and the fees ought to be justified and justifiable. In the case of these different levels of parking that they are providing they ought to be spelled out and justification be given for the charges.

**BEPKO:** I would like to answer the philosophical question or the broad policy question, and then look into the issue of specific School of Dentistry "A" spaces. There is a Parking Policy Committee and I believe you have a School of Dentistry faculty representative on that committee. There is broad faculty participation on this Parking Policy Committee and they run the parking program. The Parking Services staff does not. All major policy questions are resolved by the Parking Policy Committee including all of the fees that are charged. I haven't been close to it in recent years but I served on that committee back in the 1970s and that committee, it seems to me, with a faculty representative from every unit, was a very good vehicle for translating faculty and staff needs into policy making within the University. There may be some changes in recent years that I don't know about, but the premise on which that Parking Policy Committee was based was a good one. In terms of costs, I don't know that I can answer the question about whether you get what you pay

for, but our parking on campus is comparatively inexpensive. I think it has been managed well over the years to try to keep the price low, recognizing that the parking system, by Indiana University Trustee policy must pay for itself. We don't get money from the state nor have we chosen to try to get money from the state because I don't think we would be successful. Moreover, we haven't reallocated any money from other programs. We haven't said we are going to take money from academic programs and put it into the parking because we think that it is a good approach to have parking pay for itself. As we become less of a surface parking system and more of a garage parking system, prices are going to go up. It costs only \$1,000 to create a surface space and it cost \$7,000 to create a garage space. Right now we are letting people park in garages at what are really very, very low rates considering the quality of parking in the garages. I don't know about the surface parking and the cost for that. I guess that it has gone up and it is getting more expensive, but I think that is simply a necessary part of having a parking system that serves an urban campus. I have no doubt that our parking, both in terms of availability and costs, is much better than at most urban universities, even urban universities that are located in less congested areas than we are. There are no urban universities, I am confident in saying, that are located in the downtown area of their city that have the kind of low-cost and available parking that we have. If you want to see some really horrible examples, go to places like Temple, the University of Pennsylvania, Columbia, or NYU and you will find that there are real problems there. But, I will look into your specific issue and get back to you on that and I will also find out who your representative is on the Parking Policy Committee and contact him/her and find out why they haven't been doing a very good job.

**VESSELY:** Jerry, I can't resist to correlate Keith's frustration about the Dental School parking and your honest and primary comment about the new parking garage since the chairmanship of that committee shifted by Bob Bogan in Dentistry to Jeff Vessely in Physical Education. [laughter]

**BEPKO:** The School of Dentistry goes down and the Physical Education goes up. Does this mean, Keith, that you are volunteering to chair the Parking Policy Committee? [laughter]

**MOORE:** No, but I have thought about asking for a faculty appointment though.

**VESSELY:** The Parking Policy Committee meets next Wednesday and on the top of our agenda will be this item.

**BEPKO:** Do you know off hand who the School of Dentistry representative might be?

**VESSELY:** Off the top of my head I can't remember, but it has always been a contention, when you are in the area of the School of Physical Education or the Law School, that when "A" from what we considered as the School of Physical Education lot shifted farther away, they get closer to the Law School. So, when the spaces shifted away from the Dental School they may be closer to the AO Building.

**BEPKO:** I think we can take care of the problem, though. It sounds bizarre to me that they would move "A" spaces away from the building. I can't imagine that. For whatever reason they did it we will find out and we will correct it.

**WELLMAN:** I don't put any ideas in your head but there are other parking places where you have to buy your parking place. For example, in Boston you have to buy your medicine and dentistry parking place at \$10,000.

**BEPKO:** Is there a second for Henry's motion? [laughter]

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

[There was no unfinished business]

**AGENDA ITEM IX - NEW BUSINESS**

[There was no new business]

**AGENDA ITEM X - ADJOURNMENT**

**BEPKO:** If there is no further business, we are adjourned.

*Approved May 1, 1992*

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
February 6, 1992  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, William Plater. Deans: Barbara Fischler, H. William Gilmore, P. Nicholas Kellum, Sheldon Siegel, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Thomas Ambrose, Margaret Applegate, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Henry Besch, Sally Bowman, Walter Buchanan, Lucinda Carr, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Carol Deets, Anne Donchin, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Michael Kubek, Richard Lawlor, Linda Marler, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, B Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, Richard Peterson, Eric Pumroy, Sherry Queener, Terry Reed, Sherry Ricchiardi, Norris Richmond, Edward Robbins, Phyllis Scherle, William Schneider, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto. Ex Officio Members: Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren. Elected Faculty: Eleanor Donnelly for Patricia Blake, Catherine Rhoades for Janice Froehlich, Richard Fredland for Patrick McGeever, Wei-Min Liu for Neal Rothman, Hee-Mung Park for Henry Wellman.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake. DEANS: John Barlow, A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, Norman Lefstein, David Stocum, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Anne Belcher, Linda Brothers, Janice Bruckner, John Emhardt, William Engle, Mary Fisher, Philip Gibbs, Melvin Glick, Dean Hawley, John Lappas, Steven Leapman, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Steven Mazzuca, Richard Meiss, James Murphy, Michael Parsons, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Philip Scarpino, Gregory Sutton, P Kent Sharp, Richard Turner, Donald Wong, Lei Yu.

**Visitors:** Erwin Boschmann, JoAnn Switzer (Academic Affairs Committee, Chair).

**AGENDA ITEM I - MEMORIAL RESOLUTION: DR. WILLIAM C. CLARK, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

**BEPKO:** The first order of business is a memorial resolution for Dr. William C. Clark in the School of Medicine. The resolution is appended to the agenda for today's meeting and, consistent with our practice, we will not read the memorial resolution. Unless there are any objections, we will adopt the resolution and send copies to the appropriate family members and colleagues of Dr. Clark. Will you join me in a moment of silence for Dr. Clark?

**AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF MINUTES - NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1991**

**BEPKO:** We are unable to approve the minutes since they have not been distributed as yet.

**AGENDA ITEM III - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**BEPKO:** I just have one item which has appeared in the news. Each year, for the last 20 years at least, Senator Larry Borst, a good friend of the University and a personal friend of many of us, has

offered a Bill in the General Assembly that would lead to the separation of IUPUI from Indiana and Purdue Universities. The Bill originally, in the first 15 years or so, was a Bill that actually would have resulted, if enacted, in the separation of IUPUI. In more recent years, building on the precedent set at the University of Southern Indiana in Evansville, the Bill calls for a commission to study whether IUPUI should be a separate University. We did not think this was something that was in the best interest of our academic programs and have opposed the Bill, although in a friendly way, because we need Senator Borst's support and he has been a good friend of higher education, particularly here in Indianapolis. The Bill was heard for the first time in the Senate Finance Committee, which happens to be the committee that Senator Borst chairs. It was voted out of the committee by a vote of eight in favor and five against. That was the first time the Bill has ever made it out of committee. However, less than one week later, it was defeated in the full Senate by a vote of 23 yes and 27 no. We think the issue is resolved, at least for this year, but it may come up again next year. We think we will be a little better prepared to deal with the issues and, in the interim, will be working with Senator Borst to try to address some of his concerns without changing the structure and the basic makeup of the campus. If there are any questions, I would be happy to answer them. [There were no questions.]

#### AGENDA ITEM IV - SECRETARY'S REPORT

**BEPKO:** We will now move to the report from the soon-to-be-President of the Faculty Council, Dick Peterson.

**PETERSON:** I will never really be President because the Constitution that we have currently operating goes to the start of the next fiscal year for the University.

I have the results of the ballot for the constitutional revisions. There were 458 persons approving of the Constitution who had valid ballots turned in. There were 11 people who voted "no". So, I consider we have an overwhelming approval of the Constitutional revisions which were sent out for a full faculty vote. I want to take a moment, however, to emphasize and to reflect this in the minutes. People do need to validate their ballots as they are sending them in. We have an additional 65 ballots which were invalid because people did not sign the outside of the envelopes and did not identify themselves in any way. A couple of people didn't even vote. It is unfortunate that we could not count the 65 ballots as a result of this problem. Please, when you are turning in your ballots for any election, make sure you follow the instructions. Place your name on the outside of the envelope so we can read it because we need to identify you as an appropriate individual. We also need a signature to know that we can validate it by that signature.

Since this Constitution has been approved, this does mean that we will need to vote on some additional Bylaw changes and, hopefully, we will have those distributed to you within the next week or so. You have already seen a draft of those last fall. It essentially relates to the placing of these different names in the Bylaws for the President and the Vice-President rather than Secretary and the new duties associated with those offices.

**SIDHU:** Henry Karlson, can you clarify something on this point? ~~The Bylaws, which are going to come to the Faculty Council from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, were distributed two meetings ago.~~ Even though the Secretary of the Council is planning to send those for information again, would there be any problem in bringing those for vote without an additional distribution?

**KARLSON:** Have the exact same Bylaws been distributed?

**SIDHU:** Yes. The way those were distributed they were placed on the table here and the Faculty Council members were requested to pick up a copy.

**KARLSON:** It is actually prior notice of the intent to conduct a vote must be given, not the Bylaws. You will find that in Article VI, Section B. of the Bylaws it states, "Adoption of Amendments to the Bylaws shall require a favorable vote of 2/3 of those present at a regular meeting of the faculty, if prior notice of the intention to conduct a vote is given to members of the faculty and to members of the Council. If no prior notice is given, adoption will require a favorable vote of 2/3." This can be the formal notice as of this meeting that there will be a vote and then there is no problem if previously distributed.

**PETERSON:** Action will take place in the next meeting and we will make every attempt to supply you with a complete copy of those Bylaws with the agenda as it goes out so that you will have it to look at ahead of time. We will also have additional copies here for people to look at if they wish to. In relationship to this issue, I would also like to see if we can destroy the ballots. Could I have a motion to that effect? [So moved]

**BEPKO:** It has been moved and seconded. All in favor, say "Aye".

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - BOARD OF REVIEW ELECTION**

**BEPKO:** Next, we return to the Board of Review election. I think everyone should know by now who the candidates are.

**WARFEL:** I will report on one other item while we are passing out the ballots. The next item on the agenda is a report from our committee in terms of elections. We will vote for President and Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty at our meeting in March. The slate is as you see it on the handout. We would also like you to know that the ballots for the election of the At-Large Representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council and representatives to the University Faculty Council were mailed last week. This leaves the Nominating Committee's work to the election of the Executive Committee, Nominating Committee, and the IUPUI Tenure Committee which will be held at our May meeting.

[The results of the election for Faculty Boards of Review were as follows:]

#### **FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #1:**

1992

David Bodenhamer, Liberal Arts  
Paul Galanti, Law School  
James McAteer, Medicine  
Richard Pflanzner, Science  
Roy Westcott, Engineering and Technology.

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #2:

Walter Buchanan, Engineering and Technology  
Sara Hook-Shelton, Dentistry  
Justin Libby, Liberal Arts  
Lawrence Wilkins, Law School  
Kathryn Wilson, Science.

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW #3:

James Baldwin, University Library  
Diane Billings, Nursing  
Carl Rothe, Medicine  
Phyllis Scherle, Liberal Arts  
Susan Zunt, Dentistry.

May we have a motion to destroy the ballots?

**BEPKO:** Do we have a motion to destroy the ballots? [So moved] [Second] All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? Thank you, Kathleen, for the management of that process.

**AGENDA ITEM VI - NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT**

[See Agenda Item V for this report.]

**AGENDA ITEM VII - COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**BEPKO:** Next we have some committee reports. The first of which will be the Academic Affairs Committee report from Jo Ann Switzer.

**SWITZER:** I hope everyone picked up a copy of the Postsecondary Credit Transfer report because we are going to discuss it during this report. The Academic Affairs Committee has worked on four issues, thus far, in the 1991-92 academic year. The two topics we have focused on are: the Fresh Start/Forgiveness Proposal and the faculty response to the Workforce Education Bill currently in the Legislature. We first heard about parts of this Bill in October when the section we were most interested in was still called the Distance Learning Consortium.

Members of the State Higher Education Commission and several state representatives are sure that the six state universities and IV Tech should pick 10 basic undergraduate general education courses that we teach in common and make credit for these classes totally transferable among these institutions. Our committee and other faculty groups, most notably the Educational Policies Committee of the UFC, were asked to respond to the administration's ideas as to how this section of the Bill might be implemented. Faculty governance in areas of curriculum is our main concern.

Senate Bill 419, as it is now called, was in the Ways and Means Committee this morning. A companion Bill, SB 76, also contains part of the Workforce Education Legislation so that the

Governor might be sure that major aspects of this Bill would get through one way or another. I checked with Glenna Dudley at 12:30 today so that you could have a real, up-to-date report. She said the strategy in including these sections in both Bills is to make sure that they pass one way or another. She said that 30-hour credit transfer is acceptable to all of the important powers to be in the Legislature. Action will happen soon; if not tomorrow, then by the end of next week. When it becomes law, it says that seven institutions must have some coursework in place by the Fall of 1993 and give a progress report to the State by January, 1994. The Educational Policies Committee will issue a position statement at the next UFC meeting on February 11. Before I move on to Fresh Start, are there any questions about the Bill?

**DEETS:** Did the University take a stand on this Bill?

**SWITZER:** The University administration has been consulted and has made proposals to help implement it. They certainly didn't ask for our permission. If the University administration would like to respond other than that, please feel free.

**BEPKO:** We haven't been involved on this campus, but I think this is not something that is viewed as attractive from the standpoint of the University. It would be better for this to have evolved among the institutions, but I don't think there is much that we can do about it.

**SWITZER:** The Fresh Start or Forgiveness Proposal has been kicking around on this campus for at least three years. The idea behind it is, as an example, a student returns to school after a 5-10-year timeout. That student had one terrible semester during his prior enrollment. If he went to Ball State and ten years later was admitted to IUPUI, his or her old, terrible GPA disappears. However, if that one disastrous semester occurred at an IU campus, that student would be forced to drag that old GPA around with him for the rest of his academic life. What our committee would like to propose to rectify this injustice is that we treat all of these returning students, who have been absent from any academic institution for at least five years, like transfer students and not discriminate against those who didn't happen to choose Muncie. If there are any comments or suggestions on this at this point, I would be glad to hear them because we are going to send a concrete proposal to the Executive Committee and it will come before you within the next month or two.

**FREDLAND:** Only one semester?

**SWITZER:** No. That is an example. There was a limit of credit hours that would be looked at in some of the historic work. I am just using that as an example because this is the kind of students we are getting here at IUPUI. When I last talked to Karen Black, she said if we looked at the most recent year's admittance figures, this would probably cover 11 students who were admitted in the Fall of 1991.

**APPLEGATE:** What are you proposing? What are the limits that you are talking about?

**SWITZER:** At this point, what we proposed is that we just treat them like other transfer students who have gone to other institutions and had not been enrolled at any college or university in the last five years. Transfer students don't have this kind of security. We are trying to take care of the discrimination against all of these students.



**AMBROSE:** This forgiveness would be only for the work towards that same level of degree?

**SWITZER:** We are only looking at the first undergraduate degree. It would obviously have to be applied for and the same rules would apply that apply now for transfer students as far as if there were any good credit which they still wanted to have applicable. The GPA cannot really disappear from a record or a former enrollment, especially for financial aid reasons. What we are talking about is closing our eyes.

**BEPKO:** I would like to add another note to the question that Carol Deets asked about what the University has done about the Workforce Bill. This has been a subject of discussion for quite a number of years. Transferability of credit among institutions has been a hot topic all across the country for years. Indiana University is no exception. I think our University has taken a strong position, year after year, consistently, in defense of the prerogatives of faculty to establish curriculum, to establish standards for graduation, and for progress through degree programs. I think this is something that has evolved, and in recent years our representatives have urged that the General Assembly not take steps to enact any laws on the subject, but to allow the institutions to work out these arrangements among faculties among the institutions. I think that position was probably voiced again this year; however, I think the political forces that support mandated transferability have mounted to the point where I don't think that anything the universities do would result in a change in the direction of the General Assembly right now.

**KARLSON:** May I ask a question to clarify what this means? On the instructional method, it says "...the courses shall be offered through (1) onsite instruction; (2) telecommunications; or (3) a combination of methods described in subdivisions (1) and (2)..." Does that mean that every course has to be taught by both of those methods? How do you select which method? The word "shall" is mandatory.

**BEPKO:** I think that is left up to the institutions. It says "or."

**KARLSON:** No. The only "or" comes after #2. It is #1 and #2 and then an "or." It says, "...shall be offered through (1) onsite instruction; (2) telecommunications; or..." It doesn't say onsite instruction or telecommunications, or... The way this is written, obviously, you have to offer every course by telecommunications. There is only an or after the last one in the series. "Shall be taught through (1) onsite instruction; (2) telecommunications; or..."

**BEPKO:** I don't know if anyone can tell you what the drafter of this had in mind, but I don't think there was any intent to specify that all courses be offered by telecommunications. I think it was to be left up to the institutions to decide how best to offer these courses.

**KARLSON:** The other question is, I believe an Associate of Arts degree takes 60 hours. That would mean that a person would get an IU degree without having taken a majority of their courses at IU because they would be fully transferable. Is that correct?

**PLATER:** It doesn't specify that it is an Associate of Arts degree.

**KARLSON:** But, it shall be fully transferable. An Associate of Arts degree is 30 hours so you would have 30 plus 30 and you would have your degree.

**PLATER:** I assume that, if this law passes, it will be up to the institutions to implement it. There is nothing in this legislation that would require us to change our degree requirements as a consequence of the hours that might be acceptable for transfer. A student might be able to transfer 30 hours but, if the requirements of an Associate of Arts degree are so highly specified that these 30 hours wouldn't satisfy specific requirements, then...

**KARLSON:** I understand that, but the way they talk about General Educational Requirements would appear to indicate that it might very well meet the 30-hour requirements of a basic Associate of Arts degree.

**PLATER:** If they would, there would be no problem.

**KARLSON:** Except for the fact that you would be getting an IU degree without having done the majority of your work at IU.

**PLATER:** We can do that now. Students in many schools at the undergraduate level can graduate with an IU degree completing only one-fourth of their coursework from Indiana University.

**BEPKO:** I think a larger issue is that higher education is not riding high in the General Assembly these days. I think that is something all of us have to take very seriously to heart. We can't assume that the whole world is wrong and we are right. I think that the people who were elected into the General Assembly may not understand higher education as well as we do, but they are reflecting public attitudes, and this may be something that we should look at much more seriously than we have in the past.

**BALDWIN:** Along with that, does the administration see this as a first step? You can think of all sorts of legislation coming down the pike about keeping degree requirements.

**BEPKO:** I don't think anyone views this as a first step in a series, but I certainly think it is a reflection of general public attitude.

## **AGENDA ITEM VII - COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**BEPKO:** Next, we have a report from the Fringe Benefits Committee. Roko Aliprantis will present that report.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Let me say something about what is going on. There are several rumors that we are going to have a reduction in our fringe benefits. There is a rumor that the 18/20 program is going to be abolished. The administration will present to the Fringe Benefits committees some cost figures of our retirement plans which we would like to make clear to the administration that we oppose any kind of reduction without discussing it with us. There are several occasions of "this is the way it should be done and we need to have it voted on tomorrow. Let's do it." We don't like it. Here is resolution #1.

*The IUPUI Faculty Council appreciates being involved in discussions concerning any changes in Fringe Benefits Programs if they are in the best interest of both the institution and its employees. Through this resolution, we on the IUPUI Faculty Council wish to go on record as stating that the IUPUI Faculty Council and its appropriate committees expect to*

*be fully involved in discussing possible outlines of such plans.*

This is what we want to make clear. Anything that involves fringe benefit changes should be discussed from the beginning with the appropriate faculty committees. The same resolution will be presented to the University Faculty Council at its meeting on Tuesday. I would like to have any comments you may have.

**DONCHIN:** Just a comment on wording. The first sentence in resolution #1 states, "The IUPUI Faculty Council appreciates being involved in discussions concerning any changes in fringe benefits programs if they are in the best interest of both the institution and its employees." I think the issue is that the faculty also, upon input into discussion, whether these proposed changes were in the best interest...

**ALIPRANTIS:** That is the intent. Do you have a better way of stating it?

**BEPKO:** Why don't you put a period after programs?

**ALIPRANTIS:** The first sentence, then, would read "The IUPUI Faculty Council appreciates being involved in discussions concerning any changes in fringe benefits programs."

**BEPKO:** Would you accept that as a friendly amendment?

**ALIPRANTIS:** I would accept that.

**FREDLAND:** So moved.

**BEPKO:** So, the proposal now is to have the resolution adopted as it was just amended. The second sentence would remain as it is. It is only a change in the first sentence. I have a question to ask, Roko, about the background for this resolution. Is there something that has happened this year that is troublesome?

**ALIPRANTIS:** There are several cases where the University Faculty Council will submit a proposal and say that our input is requested; however, a vote will be taken within a few weeks.

**BEPKO:** Was that this year?

**PETERSON:** This year we were informed of some major changes in fringe benefits. One of those was the disability insurance plan and a couple of other changes. We were told that it was already in press. TIAA/CREF had already been sent all the information and they were already producing it. We could say "No" but we would irritate TIAA/CREF a lot if we did that. It was kind of a forced issue. Part of the problem is related to timing. Many of those changes have to be brought about in the fall. Sometimes we don't know about them through the spring and fringe benefit committees don't get operating until in September or October. It gets to be difficult if there are some changes that need to be made. We have talked about that at the University Faculty Council level and one of the things that would be very good to do is to get the Fringe Benefits Committees up and operating or keep them operating year around so there is no down time on them so they can continue to consider this and bring these issues to the rest of the faculty as needed.

**ALIPRANTIS:** One example is the 18/20 program. There are calculations done by the University. We disagree with some of the figures. This is done and brought to us. We would like to have advanced notice of these issues so we can have input. It is one sided most of the time. Three years ago we had a reduction in the 18/20 program.

**BEPKO:** I don't think that there is a current proposal to change the 18/20 program. At least I don't know of any. I think you're right in saying that there is concern about the cost of the 18/20 program. That has been raised by the Trustees, not necessarily by the University administration.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I didn't say there was a proposal but there has been discussion. Tomorrow there will be a discussion on the health programs. There will be figures from the administration about the cost -- what is projected for the next few years. The point is that it is an expensive proposition and something needs to be done.

**BEPKO:** I can't speak for the other people in the University administration, but I would say it is more a matter of being aware of the cost of the 18/20 program. It is expensive but it has been a part of the fabric of Indiana University faculty life for a long time. I don't think there is any proposal pending to change it.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have not seen the proposal but I have heard the discussion. So, proposal #1 simply requests that when there is any kind of discussion regarding fringe benefits, that the faculty should be involved.

**SIDHU:** If you will remember two or three meetings ago, at the University Faculty Council meeting, President Ehrlich was asked the same question that there is a fear that reductions are going to be made in this. His reply at that time was that there was no proposal.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The proposal was actually the same.

**SIDHU:** There was no definite proposal...

**ALIPRANTIS:** There are discussions in the University regarding the cost. It is a concern but there is no proposal.

**BEPKO:** I don't know what the specific purpose of the meeting is because I wasn't involved in setting up the meeting. The assumption that I would make is that the purpose of talking about this is simply a matter of distributing information about the 18/20 program and its cost. I don't think that even the people who studied this within the University administration have been, at all times, fully aware of all the costs and the projections that have been made for the costs in the future based on expectations about retirement. I think it is really a matter of sharing information. The Operations Cabinet, which has been discussing fringe benefits, has asked the Human Resources people to make sure that the fringe benefits committees, both the UFC and campus committees, were fully informed of everything that was going on. The Operations Cabinet has talked about the 18/20 program. The Operations Cabinet doesn't take any votes and the Operations Cabinet does not have a recommendation at this point, but the discussion in the Operations Cabinet seemed to me to reaffirm the sanctity of the 18/20 program and the Cabinet would probably, if asked, recommend against any changes in the 18/20 program.

**ALIPRANTIS:** There is one number which is very large -- about \$11 million a year to date for about 200 persons per year in the 18/20 program

**PETERSON:** The current people who have retired on the 18/20 plan are costing the University \$11 million a year. That is a small portion of the total of us who are on that plan. There are approximately 3,600 additional individuals that will eventually be eligible for that plan.

**BEPKO:** I think, instead of viewing this as an effort by the University administration to change important fringe benefits that faculty members have relied on, I view this as a responsibility of the University administration to call to everyone's attention costs which were incurred, not to change anything, but to make sure that everyone understands the cost of the 18/20 program. We are going to enter into a period where the costs will go up. I don't think they are unmanageable costs, but they will require us to allocate funds from salaries to the 18/20 program. I think it is a matter of longstanding policy that we do that, but I think everyone should know that it is happening and will continue to happen as people retire under this program.

**SCHERLE:** I have a question about the diction on resolution #1. In the second part, do you just want to be involved in the discussion of the outlines or in the discussion of such plans? Wouldn't that include the total discussion or do you just want to discuss the outlines?

**ALIPRANTIS:** We would like to participate actively in any discussions concerning fringe benefits from the beginning.

**DONCHIN:** My understanding was that the first sentence of Resolution #1 would end with the word "programs", and that the balance of that sentence would be deleted.

**BEPKO:** That is what the sense of the group was, Roko, to delete the rest of that sentence and not delete the second sentence.

**ALIPRANTIS:** That is acceptable.

**SCHERLE:** Just omit "outlines." You could just say "...discussing possible plans" or "...discussing such plans."

**BEPKO:** What if you omit the words "possible outlines of?" So that it would say, "...involved in discussing such plans." You would omit the words "possible outlines of..." Roko, I think if you would accept the omission of those three words...

**ALIPRANTIS:** That is what we are going to do. Let me read to you what we have.

*The IUPUI Faculty Council appreciates being involved in discussions concerning any changes in Fringe Benefits Programs. Through this resolution, we on the IUPUI Faculty Council wish to go on record as stating that the IUPUI Faculty Council and its appropriate committees expect to be fully involved in discussing such plans.*

**BEPKO:** Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? The motion carries.

**ALIPRANTIS:** The next resolution is more or less a motion of the faculty. When we came here, all of us were told that we would have less salary compensation in lieu of a great fringe benefits package. We do like our fringe benefits and, once we had this commitment, this commitment should be continued by this University. So, we are now proposing the following resolution:

*Through this resolution the IUPUI Faculty Council goes on record as opposing any reduction of faculty retirement or early retirement programs.*

**KOLESKI:** What is the rationale behind this resolution?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Last year, for example, we had a reduction in the 18/20. It seems that there is a tendency to reduce fringe benefits.

**KOLESKI:** Is this a feeling or an actuality?

**BEPKO:** Roko, I don't think the changes in 18/20 were last year. I think that was three years ago and the changes were made with the concurrence of the faculty.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Okay. That was three years ago.

**APPLEGATE:** I guess the question I would raise about Resolution #2 is, if you have Resolution #1, why do you need Resolution #2?

**KOLESKI:** It doesn't seem to me that Resolution #1 does take care of Resolution #2. Resolution #1 is discussion and the other is a position statement.

**FREDLAND:** It just strikes me that whatever #2 adds, the negatives are far greater. If a member of the State legislature saw that resolution, it strikes me that the Bill, which we were just concerned about, is minor compared to what we communicate. Resolutions #1 and #3 express the sentiment that we are concerned, and they are contractual benefits that we can't have changed. I don't see that #2 says anything that is very useful.

**BEPKO:** I would like to make one comment about Resolution #2. We have talked about, in cooperation with the fringe benefits committees, looking at a flexible benefit program in which you would have options about fringe benefits and converting some of the fringe benefits into direct compensation. That flexibility could be inhibited if this resolution was interpreted in a certain way. I am not sure that it would be good, at this point, to go on record in a way that might inhibit that flexibility. As long as there was an understanding that there may be a time in the future when the topic of flexible benefit programs could be considered, it wouldn't bother me to have this adopted, but I recognize that it is broadly written and you could run into that interpretation problem.

**MCDONALD:** I am unclear as to what you want. Do you take the position that all of those who are presently employed may not ever suffer a reduction in those programs?

**BEPKO:** The University community should be, and is now looking at fringe benefits right now, as I understand it. The point is to say that we have a tremendous amount of investment in fringe benefits, in total. Taking the 18/20 program and putting it aside, even though it is one of the most costly of our programs, and say that it is inviolate. But, even apart from 18/20, there is a major investment in fringe benefits. Should those investments in fringe benefits, heavily weighted toward

retirement, be reviewed by the faculty as a whole to determine if we are spending our money wisely in fringe benefits by loading so heavily on the retirement side? Should we consider moving some of those fringe benefits to other types of fringe benefits -- child care, family leave, and a variety of other new age fringe benefits that we think, collectively, are needed?

**GALANTI:** I have two things. First, these resolutions, among fringe benefits committees, are basically resolutions that are being presented to the All-University Faculty Council from the All-University Fringe Benefits Committee, though I think we should be tracking what the University as a whole is going to do. The second point on Resolution #2 is that I am a little concerned, not so much when the issue of eliminating 18/20 comes up and the faculty objects, but the faculty is told, "Well, the faculty and selected bodies didn't object to the reduction back in 1989, 1990, or 1992." I think having a resolution like this on record is coddling to prevent good faith negotiations between administration and faculty, but won't prevent the possibility down the line of someone saying, "You should have objected back in 1992. Now it is too late to object." I am very much in favor of retaining Resolution #2 as the Fringe Benefits Committee proposes.

**SIDHU:** As far as Resolution #2 is concerned, even though it has been expressed that there is no need for it, but it is like you have said regarding the reduction in the 18/20 program. As I stated at the University Faculty Council meeting two or three meetings ago, President Ehrlich was questioned on this and we must keep in mind that changes can become reality also. So, by passing this resolution we are expressing our feelings that in the future, reductions should not be made.

**BEPKO:** I hope I haven't been misinterpreted. I don't see any reason to not adopt Resolution #2. Generally speaking, I think it reflects University views. The only thing I mentioned was that it seems to me that we ought to have some flexibility within the fringe benefit package. If you say, "no reduction in retirement," as long as you allow for the possibility that there could be future discussions about shifting retirement to other types of benefits, I would say fine.

**SIDHU:** I think using the word "existing" after "reduction of" would be a good idea.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I think that is a good idea. That will make it a little more formal. Would you accept the following resolution?

*Through this resolution the IUPUI Faculty Council goes on record as opposing any reduction of existing faculty retirement or early retirement programs.*

I would like to make a comment. I don't think the faculty would object to discussing these items but what they would object to is what we view as "one sided" decisions.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready to vote on Resolution #2? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none]

**ALIPRANTIS:** Last year, if you will remember there was a University wide task force to discuss the retirement plans. The Fringe Benefits committees worked hard with the administration and reached an agreement. The agreed changes in the retirement plan were satisfactory. I will read Resolution #3 to you which contains some of the agreements.

*The IUPUI Faculty Council requests that the Board of Trustees act favorably on the four\* revisions of retirement proposed in 1991 and not yet considered--as soon as relevant IRS rulings make such actions appropriate.*

\* These four include:

1. *Retirement under 18/20 at age 62.*
2. *Retirement for 18/20 participants under a plan equivalent to the new (post 1989) early retirement program, at the option of individual faculty members.*
3. *The phased early retirement program.*
4. *TIAA/CREF payments for faculty summer employment.*

These were agreed last year by the All University Task Force but they were not included in the final decision.

**PETERSON:** I would like to make a couple of comments about this. Certainly, there are some implications related to IRS and those implications related to improvements in our current 18/20 plan. If we consider them an improvement and, indeed, if IRS considers any of these an improvement in the plan, it could be fully taxable money at the time we are eligible for retirement, as I understand it. As we look at numbers 1, 2, and 3, however, these are really not enhancements to the program. They give people additional options, but they are not enhancements of the programs. Indeed, under #1, if you retire at an earlier age, you will also have to retire at an earlier salary. You would have a lower salary and then you would be eligible to receive an even lower salary plus you wouldn't have as many years of accumulation. Presumably, the University would save money if there were people who opted to take that. The same is true under points 2 and 3. We are talking about a plan under #2 that is equivalent to the new post 1989 earlier retirement program which is definitely less than the 18/20 plan. Number 3 is to go into a phased early retirement plan. Again, that has less benefits associated with it than the 18/20 plan, but it gives people who are on the 18/20 plan some options. If you must, or have to, or are requested to retire at an earlier time, these would be available to you.

The last one is probably the most problematic because that would look like an enhancement to the program in one way. But, in another way, we can transfer people easily from a 10-month appointment to a 12-month appointment without any compromise, whereas, a person who chooses to begin teaching summer courses, does not have the option of TIAA/CREF benefits paid on money received from teaching those courses in the summer. I don't look at it as a benefit. I am on a 12-month appointment so I have never had to worry about this personally. But, I nevertheless feel like those of you who are on 10-month appointments and are teaching summer classes are getting less than I am and might be jealous of me and I am fighting for you in this respect.

**MCDONALD:** I would be in favor of #4 if the monies that were needed would come from the responsibility center that is affected. That is, if librarians who are all on 12-month appointments didn't have to kick in to those who are on 10-month appointments, that is good. If the School of Science can find the money to do that, I rejoice for you. But, for the librarians to pay for that, it seems to me to be...

**ALIPRANTIS:** Let's say summer school. This is coming from the summer budget and will not be financed from any other resources. In addition, our past studies showed that, if TIAA/CREF summer retirement benefits are allowed for the 10-month appointees, forty percent of the money



needed will come from grant overhead.

**KECK:** We have already made decisions about whether we approve of these four items. The issue is to now bring them to the Board of Trustees.

**BEPKO:** As a matter of fact, I think this may be the second time that some of these have been reaffirmed. Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none]. Next, Ed Robbins has a report from the Commission on General Education.

**ROBBINS:** I will make this report very brief. Copies of the Progress Report of the Commission on General Education, [IUPUI Circular No. 92-13], are on the table so be sure and take one. Everything I say here will be expanded in there. On the premise that there may be some of you who won't pick it up and read it, let me tell you a couple of things very quickly.

The Commission on General Education is the current effort that stems from earlier efforts in the Council on Undergraduate Learning to look at general education across the campus. As part of that deliberation, there was a subcommittee of the Council appointed about one year ago that worked over the summer looking at ways in which we could approach the issue of general education, looking both at content and process. That is, looking at, not only what is taught and what is learned, but how it is taught and how it is learned. Among other things, the subcommittee recommended that a group be established to continue those deliberations, particularly for the purpose of engaging wide faculty participation in the discussions. As a result, the Council on Undergraduate Learning, in cooperation with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council, appointed the commission. The members, in addition to myself are: Barbara Cambridge, English; Scott Evenbeck, Director of the Undergraduate Education Center; John Kremer, Psychology; Raima Larter, Chemistry; Bruce Renda, Dean of the School of Engineering and Technology; Richard Ward, Anthropology; and Marie Wright, University Libraries.

The main thing that I want to alert you to is the current plans that we have for that wide faculty participation in the discussions. We already have tentative plans for a faculty symposium before the end of this semester. We would hope to have at least one faculty representative from every department in the Undergraduate programs to meet to discuss the general concepts related to general education. The primary goal of those discussions would be to identify more specific issues that we would then use as a focus for faculty forums in the fall. It is through these general discussions in the spring that the faculty forums in the fall would follow. We want to have a good sense of faculty views, faculty perspectives on general education, and how it ought to be approached throughout campus.

We anticipate that, by the end of the 1992-93 academic year, the Commission should be prepared to propose to the Council on Undergraduate Learning and through the Council, the rest of the campus, a general set of guidelines and proposals that we hope would be considered by all the academic units. We are operating on the fundamental principle that academic programs are the prerogative of the faculty of those units. Our major attempt is not to come up with a program that would dictate what general education ought to be in those academic units, but to find ways to stimulate conversations across the campus, to find mechanisms within the University that would support continuing efforts to address the fundamental issue of what it is that we want all of our students to gain as a result of their undergraduate experience here. Periodically, we will be developing progress reports and be sending invitations to all of the University committees who

participate in both our symposiums and our forums. We invite you to participate with us in this endeavor to find ways to provide the most effective and appropriate general education experience possible for all of our students. I would be glad to answer any questions you have.

**WILSON:** I heard from the Bloomington campus that there is already a plan on that campus for four core courses. How does that fit into our general education program? Are we going to have to have those four courses imposed on us? Can we have our own?

**ROBBINS:** I don't know of any intent to adopt or follow anything that the Bloomington campus is doing with reference to general education. I would hate to see that. If we consider academic units and the faculty here as having the authority for programs, then what is happening at Bloomington or anywhere else, shall not be imposed on us.

**PLATER:** Ed, may I comment on that? It is, as has been described, a Bloomington campus initiative in the College of Arts and Sciences. It is a similar activity to what we have been doing here for more than two years. They are much further along in developing a general education program. It is entirely a Bloomington campus initiative, originating in the College of Arts and Sciences, with no intent to impose it on anyone. Our Commission (and other campuses) will look at it as a useful model to draw upon, including the work of the faculty committees that have developed the plan. We have met with them, not as a part of the Commission, but in earlier committees, to take advantage of their planning. There is no intention for this College plan to be a University-wide general education program.

**ROBBINS:** One of the things that we are doing is tracking what is happening across the country in terms of efforts to review general education requirements. Our fundamental objective is to arrive at what faculty on this campus feel is the most appropriate orientation to general education for IUPUI.

**GALANTI:** What will the impact of the transferability provision in section 49 of SB 419 have on the General Education Program at IUPUI?

**ROBBINS:** We have just begun to look at that. I guess the most obvious implication is that, you obviously have to take into account the fact that many of our students come with transfer work anyway. So, any approach to general education on this campus, as we acknowledge and recognize the nature of the students we have, has to accept the fact that generally they are going to come with credits. In fact, one of the things the commission has to do is to look at general education in a broader context than the first 60 hours of the B.S. program. We are looking at it in relationship to the major and identifying ways in which some goals of general education might be achieved in conjunction with the major. In that way, we have the maximum opportunity within an undergraduate experience for students to achieve those general and specialized learnings that we think are important for all students.

**FREDLAND:** We adopted campus-wide general education requirements about six or seven years ago. It was not implemented by the administration.

**ROBBINS:** We certainly are taking a look at that and our Commission has the most recent analysis showing what the general education requirements are for the various units. We also have the general education proposal that was adopted by the Council. However, our charge from the subcommittee of the Council on Undergraduate Learning was to approach general education as

something other than an effort to find the ideal distribution pattern. We are convinced that that is not likely to be a very productive way to proceed for a variety of reasons. I guess that our view is not only content that determines the quality of the undergraduate experience, but it is the process, the nature of teaching that is more important. One premise that we are working on is that a very significant part of our efforts will be to look at the relationship of distribution and core course approaches with what we are calling the "process approach."

**BEPKO:** Thanks Ed, and thanks to all of the committees that made reports.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII - Question and Answer Period**

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Kathleen, for submitting a written question for the Question and Answer period. Last month we had the first improvement in parking in many years, maybe in the whole history of IUPUI. Today, we have the first written question, and it has to do with the article which appeared in the Sagamore reporting that the President had ordered the tearing down of a sign for the Circle Yearbook. Later there was an article in the Indianapolis News on the same subject with a little different slant suggesting that the President had not ordered the removal. In fact, that latter story was correct. The episode happened as follows. The President spends a lot of time in Indianapolis and his office is in the Conference Center looking out on the courtyard in front of the Library between Cavanaugh and the Business/SPEA building. I think that was where the sign was hung. It had been put up so that it was hanging horizontally but one side had blown down. President Ehrlich asked his secretary, "What is that sign? It doesn't look good the way it is hanging. Could you find out what it is?" The person of whom he asked that question called some people in campus administration and the message was handed from one to another until it reached Vice Chancellor Martin's office. At that point, it had been interpreted as the President wanted the sign torn down. Our dutiful campus administration went out, through the campus police, and removed the sign. Nobody who had any ability to exercise discretion was consulted. Since then our regrets have been expressed to the Circle Yearbook people. In fact, the President has been very supportive of the Circle Yearbook. Before this event occurred, he had received a copy of the Circle Yearbook and had written a letter praising the work that had been done and expressed his support for their activities. All of us have been very supportive, both personally and in terms of trying to squeeze out a little funding for their efforts. I think they have done a wonderful job. They deserve the support. The entire incident was a mistake which we regret very much. I suppose it makes good copy for the newspapers, but I think the Sagamore's approach was a little harder on the President than it should have been. He, in fact, had not ordered that the sign be torn down.

**ROBBINS:** There may be a fabulous opportunity here if we suggest that our President take a page from the book of the President of Butler University. When the hill there was closed that has been used for sledding, he ceremoniously opened it by sledding down the hill in full view of the news photographers. So, maybe we could get Tom Ehrlich to ceremoniously reinstall the sign.

**BEPKO:** It may already be back up, but I am sure he would be happy to do so and I would be happy to join him.

**SIDHU:** This year the faculty members who are on a 10-month appointment were asked if they would like to have 12 paychecks instead of 10. As far as I know, the answer was yes. Is that issue still under discussion?

**PLATER:** It is still under discussion. It was tied to several other provisions for paying faculty during the summer. Because of the complicated pay schedules that we have, we are trying to reduce the number of paid times to a more narrow and, therefore, less costly system. That is very much alive and is under current discussion. The Executive Committee of this campus has been asked to comment on the latest revision of the alternative pay periods. I hope that will be resolved some time this year to be effective the coming year.

**SIDHU:** We are not asking for any extra money but it makes it easier.

**BEPKO:** Pending the development of this policy, Hitwant, if you would like to give us some of your paycheck every month, I will put it in the bank for you and pay you during the summer with interest. [laughter]

**PLATER:** Would it be possible to ask Erv Boschmann if anything is happening tomorrow that the faculty might be interested in?

**BEPKO:** I think that is a brilliant question. I think Erv Boschmann would be happy to talk about that.

**BOSCHMANN:** Tomorrow there will be two faculty development symposiums held on this campus. The first one is Teaching With Computers which will be held at the Conference Center with a keynote speaker at 10:00 a.m. and workshops held throughout the afternoon.

The second one is the Edward C. Moore Symposium at 8:00 a.m. in Lecture Hall 101. John Gardner from the University of South Carolina will give the keynote address on the First Year Experience. There will be workshops following in the afternoon.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have a question. There are some rumors that the library is going to be delayed. Is there any truth to that?

**BEPKO:** As of the last report it was on schedule within a couple of weeks either way. I don't know of anything that would delay the actual construction of the building. We have been working as hard as we can to try to provide the technology component of the building. We have had some delays in that area which were unexpected and beyond our control. But, we still hope to have the dedication of the building next year and have the building open next year. At the time of the dedication we also hope to have the first phase of the technology which we think will make this the "learning center of the future."

**AGENDA ITEM IX - Unfinished Business**  
[There was no unfinished business]

**AGENDA ITEM X - New Business**  
[There was no new business]

**AGENDA ITEM XI - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** If there is no further business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

March 5, 1992

Law School, Room 116

3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, Norman Lefstein, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Thomas Ambrose, Anne Belcher, Henry Besch, Janice Bruckner, Lucinda Carr, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Carol Deets, Anne Donchin, Eleanor Donnelly, John Emhardt, Naomi Fineberg, Mary Fisher, Janice Froehlich, Paul Galanti, Michael Gleeson, Melvin Glick, Dean Hawley, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Douglas Lees, Linda Marler, Steven Mazzuca, James McAteer, Patrick McGeever, Richard Meiss, B Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, Michael Parsons, Richard Peterson, Terry Reed, Frederick Rescorla, Norris Richmond, Margaret Richwine, Edward Robbins, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, William Schneider, P Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenenbaum, Richard Turner, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Lu. Ex Officio Members: Henry Karlson, Juanita Keck, Gerald Powers, Jeffery Vessely.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Catherine Palmer for Walter Daly, Shirley Yegerlehner for Barbara Fischler, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, H. Oner Yurtseven for R Bruce Renda, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J. Marvin Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Leonard Koerber for LaForrest Garner, Bill Orme for Jean Gnat, Frances Brahmi for Dana McDonald, Wei-Min Liu for Neal Rothman, Kevin Robbins for Philip Scarpino, James Williams for Donald Wong.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A. James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Margaret Applegate, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Sally Bowman, Linda Brothers, Walter Buchanan, Philip Coons, William Engle, Philip Gibbs, Michael Kubek, Steven Leapman, Goiam Mannan, James Murphy, Eric Pumroy, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Sherry Ricchiardi, Gregory Sutton, Vernon Vix.

**Visitors:** Tom Allington, Erwin Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office), Vicki Browne, Barbara Cambridge, T. Kay Carl, Mark Grove (Registrar), Carol Nathan, Fran Oblander, John Snyder, Jeffrey Watt (Mathematical Sciences).

**AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution: Philip Albert Christiansen, M.D., School of Medicine**

**BEPKO:** Our meeting begins today with a memorial resolution for Philip Albert Christiansen from the School of Medicine. The memorial resolution is attached to today's agenda. Consistent with our practice, we will not read the resolution in the meeting today, but I would ask you to stand and observe a moment of silence. Thank you.

**AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes: December 5, 1991**

**BEPKO:** Next, we have the approval of the December 5, 1991 minutes which have been distributed. Do we have a motion to approve those minutes?

**BESCH:** So moved.                      **SIDHU:** I second that motion.

**BEPKO:** All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none] The minutes are approved.

### **AGENDA ITEM III - Presiding Officer's Business**

**BEPKO:** There is one item of business from campus administration. As you know, we have a number of reviews under way for persons who hold academic-administrative or other administrative positions. We started the year assuming that we would have seven such reviews. We launched six of them, all on this campus, early in the year and they are all in some state of conclusion. We don't have any of the reports for you yet from the Executive Committee, but that will happen within the next couple of weeks. They will start concluding and we will have those reports for you, I hope, by the end of the year.

The seventh review was not on this campus. It was our effort to include the deans on the Bloomington campus who report through the Indianapolis Vice President's office. The dean who was recommended for this year was Jim Weigand, Dean of the School of Continuing Studies. We did not begin the process at the start of the academic year, as we did all of the other six reviews on this campus, for a couple of reasons having to do with events which were taking place within the school and recommendations that were made to us by people in the school. As the year has worn on, we have learned one other fact. After consultation with the Faculty Council Executive Committee, we have concluded that it would probably not be a good idea to go ahead with the review this year. The fact which caused us to conclude that it would be better to not do a review is that Jim Weigand will be retiring at the end of next year. We thought that this would not be a good time in his last year, because it would inevitably spill over into the next academic year, to be reviewing somebody who had already announced his retirement. We have lots of business and it seemed to us to be excessively formalistic, and in the nature of make-work, for us to forge ahead with a review of somebody who is about to retire. We think there may be opportunities for other types of evaluation of the School of Continuing Studies as we begin a search for a new dean. We don't think we will lose anything by not having this review. We wanted you to know, though, at the earliest stage that we think this is not a good idea and we are not planning to go ahead with that review. We still have six under way and we will have those reports for you by the end of the academic year.

### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report**

**PETERSON:** I have several items on my report today including information regarding the University Faculty Council Constitutional revisions which are currently taking place. We are trying to work through those. I will mention several other things and leave that item until the end of my report.

The first item is just an informational item, but I would like to have some input into this. President Ehrlich will be here on April 22 from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. to visit with this campus. This is his spring campus visit. He will want to have a group of faculty meet with him. We are going to try to make this a larger group of faculty than we have had the last couple of meetings. The Council, along with committee chairs and committee members, will be specifically invited. We will send a more general invitation to all faculty, but I would particularly like to see you, as faculty who are on this Council, be there to discuss items with him, if you can possibly make that.

The next item which I want to mention briefly is that the Commission for Higher Education, through the faculty representative, Al Fabian, is inviting faculty participation in a conference which will be held on April 3, 1992. I was specifically invited and was asked to choose two other persons. I brought this to the Executive Committee and their desire was to have Gerald Powers and Juanita Keck also attend this session. The day's agenda for that will be paying attention to Indiana's

investment in higher education in comparison with other states, budget development, and long-term financial scenarios. We will be looking into those kinds of issues. I certainly would appreciate your feedback and any suggestions you might have as the three of us go to the faculty conference. This faculty conference will include all state institutions, as I understand it, therefore, there will be faculty members from each of the state institutions across the state. I think it is important input that we can have into the Commission's activities. Our feedback should be extremely important.

I want to briefly report on some of the things that are happening in the University Cabinet meetings -- the Academic Cabinet and the Operations Cabinet. We have looked at measures of academic progress and how we might look at ourselves. You, in the individual schools, should have been looking at this issue. There will be some additional discussion on the measures of academic progress as we go through this spring.

Another major issue that has been on the President's agenda, the Commission for Higher Education's agenda, and a number of other people's agenda is retention. How many students are we retaining? How many of those students are getting degrees? It is fairly low. It is, maybe, appallingly low to some people. Maybe that is the way it should be. I don't know. But, it is an item that has been on people's minds and we have looked at it quite carefully in these meetings.

We also looked at issues such as total quality management, a business term, but, nevertheless, looking at that as an issue and wondering if there are some parts of total quality management that the University might be able to utilize. We have pretty much placed that issue on a back burner for the time being with a number of other issues that have had a much greater consequence in a short run.

One item that we are just beginning to consider in the Cabinets, in fact, there was a combined Cabinet meeting on it at the last Board of Trustees meeting, is to begin to consider the 1993-95 budget and what we might want to put into that budget and how we are going to construct that budget. There are minutes of these meetings that we get on a regular basis. I have no problem with sharing those minutes with you as individuals. If you will contact me, I will find a mechanism to supply you with the minutes and some of the agenda items that are being discussed.

The next item I would like to mention at this time is that right after our meeting today there is the annual meeting of the IUPUI Faculty Club in the Faculty Club area at the Conference Center. Those of you who are members are particularly encouraged to attend, but others are invited to see what goes on in Faculty Club business.

Last of all, I would like to turn the chair over to Henry Besch to look at some of the University Faculty Council constitutional revisions that are currently being considered. This issue is going to be brought to the University Faculty Council floor next Tuesday for a general discussion and for the consideration of any amendments that individual Councils or people across the University might want to also bring to the floor. This does not get voted on at that time. Approval by the Council will be put off until the April meeting, if it is approved at that point. But, the final approval of constitutional revisions is by the faculty of the University. Before it goes out for a vote there will be additional discussions on all of the campuses of IU to further consider the revisions and also the amendments to those revisions that have been made. You have received a copy of some suggested amendments from the Executive Committee. Henry Besch will discuss those along with other pertinent items related to this. We don't want to take a lot of time on this at this time. There will be further discussion of this at a later time, but I think we need to be cognizant of a few

points which may be pertinent to this issue overall.

**BESCH:** Thank you very much, Dick. I assume everyone has been supplied with a copy of the constitutional amendments in a variety of forms. These proposed amendments come from the Constitutional Revisions Committee (ConRev) which was formed three years ago. I don't think there are major points that I want to especially bring to your attention. The major changes, I think, are fairly obvious to all of us and for me to tell you what you already know is a waste of both our time. I would like to identify my colleague, Kathleen Warfel, who has, among many other jobs, also served on this committee. We have done a lot of work back and forth by computer. With that introduction, what I would propose to do is simply ask for specific points you would like to have addressed or questions you may have.

**ROBBINS:** I don't know whether I missed something or not, but we have the two components of this that the Executive Committee wanted to offer as amendments to the proposal that is being considered by the University Faculty Council at its next meeting. Are those presented in a form that they are debatable?

**BESCH:** I assume that they are brought to the Council from the Executive Committee. We don't need a second.

**ROBBINS:** Are we expected to act on these at the Council meeting now?

**PETERSON:** I don't know if action is something that is required. I think we need to have a sense of your opinions on these issues. We are not voting to approve or disapprove of them, but if there is strong opinion for or against these, it certainly would be something that could be carried to the University Faculty Council.

**SIDHU:** Henry, if you could throw some light on these two amendments and, as you said, we may not have action on these, but I think, through discussion and consensus, the University Faculty Council representatives would like to know the opinion of the Council. I would like for Henry to say a few words about these amendments and then take a consensus on that.

**BESCH:** Basically, what the overall revisions to the constitution regard is only a small part of the constitution of the IU faculty, but ones that the CONREV Committee thought were probably the most important. Those concern the composition of the University Faculty Council (i.e. representation of faculty throughout the IU system to the Council) and who is going to preside at the Agenda Committee. Ultimately, those issues have been boiled down through this committee and the Agenda Committee of the University Faculty Council to a document that has now been widely circulated. However, there is another issue which we at IUPUI know very well. That is the issue of "faculty-ness" of the Faculty Council. It has been expressed here by both Constitutional amendments that there should only be a faculty member presiding over the Faculty Council. The head of the administration and the head of the faculty on this campus, (neither one presiding but both sit at the head table) will soon be enabled to communicate without the hindrance of the gavel. That was considered at the University Faculty Council as one model. As you know, the model at the University Faculty Council was very much like that, consistent throughout the IU system, before IUPUI begun the first step in the new direction. The IUB model is that the head academic officer presides over the Council meetings. Ultimately, the Constitutional Revision Committee provided to the Agenda Committee several alternative provisions regarding who would wield the gavel at University Faculty Council meetings. The Agenda Committee decided that they would



leave the provisions for the presiding officer as they are now for the University Faculty Council, not like the IUPUI model. But, our Executive Committee would like to amend the gavel provision, to spread the IUPUI model to the central University Faculty Council. So, that is the substance of one of the two amendments which have been circulated regarding the presiding officer. As it now stands, it simply provides that the University Faculty Council would elect a presiding officer to serve for the term of the Council.

The other amendment, regarding the circulated revision of the Constitution that our Executive Committee would like to propose, regards the apportioning of responsibility and authority. The Executive Committee would like to include a provision that says, in effect, the kind of administrative reviews that already go on at the campus level and at the all-University level, be enabled at the school level. Schools are not forced to do it, they are not mandated, but school administrative reviews would be enabled by the first provision, which states in Section 2.4.A, Insert Item 13. *Appointment and review of school academic and administrative officers affecting the academic mission, consistent with University and campus standards.* This item #13 was preceded, (as was all of the other 12) by the statement that puts the "consultative and legislative authority" in given bodies. These two amendments then provide review at the school level of administrative organization, as they are already at the campus level of organization.

**GALANTI:** Henry, on that proposed insert for subsection 13 of Section 2.4A, does that replace paragraph 13 on page 3 of document U15-92?

**BESCH:** It replaces #13 and then #13 becomes 14. ... *shall remain parallel among the various levels of organizations.*

**GALANTI:** And then the change to section 4.4.C, are there any changes to limits on terms of section 4.3.B?

**BESCH:** When we changed the provisions, what we decided to do was to leave specific implementations to the Bylaws Committee. That is why it states, "...for the terms of the council." It will have to be changed in the Bylaws.

**SIDHU:** What you are saying then is that this is to be inserted into the Constitution?

**BESCH:** Yes.

**PETERSON:** Do we have any feeling or sense of the Council on these matters? You do need to read these in the context of the total Constitution. I don't know if I have a consensus of positives or negatives or whether we should ask for such. Jerry, you had some ideas on this also. I will certainly welcome your comments related to these constitutional revisions.

**BEPKO:** When we talked yesterday, I offered an observation about the amendment to 2.4. This is something that is internal to the schools. Generally, the schools have worked out their own practices and standards with respect to the appointment and review of persons in academic and administrative positions, other than the dean. The dean is subject to the campus review procedures, but with respect to department chairs, assistant deans, and associate deans, that has been something that has been left within the province of the schools. It seemed to me that that has worked pretty well. I don't know of any problems that have arisen. The general practices and policies of the campus, although I don't think they are written anywhere, but the sense of the

campus, I think, is that department chairs, assistant deans, and associate deans serve at the pleasure of the dean of the school; that faculty views on the performance of any of these officers in schools should be taken into account in making appointments initially and in deciding on the continuation of officers of that kind, particularly, if the faculty are in the department in the case of the department chair. There should probably be some kind of a review. The type of review should be up to the school, but some type of opportunity for there to be a systematic feedback of information for the deans so that the dean, in concert with the faculty governing group in the school, can decide on appointments and continuation of these various officers. I think, currently, if the faculty in a school proposed such a process, that it would be treated (as any matter would be that was proposed by the faculty of a school) with receptiveness by deans.

The fear that I expressed to Dick Peterson was, in the system that we have now, which seems to work pretty well, if you create something constitutional, addressing a problem that may not exist, you may have a variety of unintended consequences that can't be foreseen with any specificity, but I think it should be obvious that some legislative bodies that have enacted laws every time they thought there might be a problem, have ended up creating more problems in some cases than they alleviated. The United States Congress may be a good example of that. I have cautioned Dick of that point and offer that observation for the Council.

**KARLSON:** I would just comment that this does not require the faculty to take any action, but merely empowers them to do so. I am aware of at least some faculties who feel that they have been told that they do not have that power within their school. The question in my mind is, if we do not have language in 2.4, which is parallel to the language in the next section, the authority of campus faculty, 2.4.B, then in 2.4.B.7 it clearly states that campus faculties have this power. In 2.4.A, if we leave it out by implication, we are saying that faculties of schools do not. It is important that the language here be parallel. Whether or not the faculty chooses to exercise it, or the manner in which they choose to exercise it, is up to them.

**SIDHU:** Chancellor Bepko, I think you gave us excellent direction when you started the reviews of the deans. The problem here is that reviews of some of the chairpersons, assistant deans or the associate deans will be at the discretion of the deans only. Therefore, it is through your office, that the faculty organizations of the schools can have some kind of provision for action. If there is a need for a review of these offices, the review could take place and the deans will not stand in their way. Those are the type of things we are worried about, because without that provision, there is every possibility that some schools will have it and others will not have it, and, for the most part, it may be the decision of one person only.

**BEPKO:** I can't respond except to say that in my experience I have not observed any problems of this kind. You may know more about that than I do, but it seems to me that, if it isn't broken, you shouldn't provide a constitutional provision to fix it. This is a constitution, after all. It is not the offering of an opinion or some observations. We are amending the constitution. I think that should be taken very seriously.

**ROBBINS:** One logic for including this statement in the section on School Authority is that it, in fact, it is based in the main section on authorities of the faculty. As I understand it, ConRev recognized this very late in their discussions of each of the subparts which articulated each of these authorities -- legislative and consultative -- embedded in the general section on faculty authority. The desire to include them in the schools is really an attempt to make them authorities parallel across the levels. If you argue that it resides in the main body of the faculty authority, then

you could argue that it be included in the school level.

**BEPKO:** I think there is a campus review policy in existence that we worked on together last year and that is probably more important than the provision in section B that reaffirms that for the faculty. You have a joint administrative/faculty effort to try to create a system that would work. I think that system is already working well. At least I hope it is going to work well. We are in the early stages and can't be sure of it. What seems to be happening in the schools right now, to the best of my knowledge, is working well also. The best kind of constitutional doctrine development is to respond to serious and broad problems, not to try to create problems and solve them with a constitutional provision. If there are problems that you see, that I don't know about, that may be something that would influence you in another direction. To the best of my knowledge, we have not had problems in this sort of thing and it seems to me overkill to respond to something that, to my knowledge, is not a problem, by enacting a constitutional provision.

**DEETS:** I would like to speak in favor of this because it seems to me what often happens to faculty is that we are given all kinds of responsibility with very little authority. This would be one time that it would be clearly stated what our authorities would be for taking appropriate action. It seems to me that we have got to, as faculty, begin to see written what our authority is as well as feel the extensive responsibilities that we always feel.

**GALANTI:** Am I wrong in reading this as saying that this proposal would allow a faculty member to appoint an assistant dean or an associate dean that is objected to by a dean?

**PETERSON:** I don't think so. That is why I made the comment earlier about you have to read this in the context of the whole constitution and particularly with the preceding comment under Authority of School Faculties, "School faculties and campus faculties on campuses not organized by schools have legislative and consultative authority pertaining to the school regarding..." and then follow that with the amendment. I don't think you can say that the faculty can overrule the dean, if the dean wants to appoint a faculty member. I think it might be somewhat foolish of a dean to not have somebody who is going to be able to coordinate his activities with the faculties of the very department that he serves.

**GALANTI:** Well, taking it the other way around, where the faculty would seek to have an associate dean or an assistant dean appointed who would be incompatible with the dean's policy. Not that the dean is exerting pressure or appointing someone who cannot work with the faculty, but vice versa. This raises that possibility.

**PETERSON:** I don't think there is any suggestion here that the faculty would appoint those individuals. Those individuals serve at the pleasure of the dean. It is consultative and it is legislative, related to developing the procedures that are chosen to be used within a school to do this reviewing process.

**BEPKO:** That is not what it says, though. It says that the school faculties have legislative and consultative authority. It doesn't say whether this is a case of legislative or consultative authority. But, the authority then is appointment and review of school academic and administrative officers. That can be read in a variety of different ways. That is one of the problems, incidentally, of creating constitutional solutions. They ought to be carefully read and re-read in order to make sure there aren't interpretations that were not intended. One clear and reasonable interpretation of this language is that there is legislative authority to appoint and review school, academic, and

administrative officers. That would create problems, I think, within the academic units. Let me say that, if what is suggested here is that the faculty only has consultative authority in this area, that is no different than what exists right now. If that is all that is intended, I would applaud the effort because I think that is the kind of encouragement there should be.

**WARFEL:** In Article II, Section 2.2 it states what is legislative authority and Section 2.3 states what is consultative authority. So that, in Section 2.4, when it says legislative and consultative authority, a person has to refer to Sections 2.2 and 2.3 to see which one you are talking about. I think that if you take this text as a whole, it is really quite clear that all we are saying is that school faculties have the school consultative authority to review administrators.

**BEPKO:** I think that helps greatly. I think that resolves my concern because, if what you are saying is that faculties have consultative authority to advise the dean on appointments of this kind, I would say that is exactly what they have now.

**PETERSON:** That is why you have to read all of the parts in context and that is why I encourage you to do that.

**BALDWIN:** In Section 2.4.11 it talks about the appointment of faculty and nobody interpreted that to mean that the faculty is the only body who can make appointments.

**KECK:** I was just going to point out the definition of authority under Section 2.2. It is clearly stating establishing policies and procedures and nothing more.

**PETERSON:** I think I would like to try to resolve this by getting some kind of an idea of who is in favor of and who is not in favor of this so that I might take this with some authority to the University Faculty Council. Those of you who are in favor of the first suggested amendment, would you respond by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? [There were a few opposed.] Those of you in favor of the second amendment regarding the presiding officer, would you respond by saying "Aye." Are there any opposed? [There were a few.] I think I have a good sense of those amendments. I thank you for your time on that. There will be additional times to discuss this. There is no assurance, by the way, even though we have voted as strongly as we have, that those will go out as part of the final constitution to be considered by the full University.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Election of President and Vice President - ACTION ITEM**

**BEPKO:** We have a Nominating Committee report. The agenda suggests that this is for the election of the President and Vice President, but I think there is also a Nominating Committee Report on the UFC election. Jim McAteer will handle the elections.

**PETERSON:** While the election is going on, I will announce the results of the UFC election. Those elected with terms expiring in 1994 for University Faculty Council are Henry Besch, Steven Mannheimer, B. Keith Moore, John Pless, Helen Schwartz, Hitwant Sidhu, and Martin Spechler. Congratulations to all of those persons elected.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - Assessment Committee Report - Barbara Cambridge**

**BEPKO:** Our next item is a report from Barbara Cambridge regarding the Assessment Committee. For those of you who are not familiar with Barbara's excellent work, she has become well known in

a number of fields. She was the first faculty member appointed to the Commission for Higher Education as a regular member and served with real distinction. She made it almost impossible for the Governor to find a successor who would do anywhere near as good a job as she did. Barbara also serves as a member of the faculty in the English department. She has become well known across the country for her work as a teacher of writing and in developing writing as a subject of scholarship. In addition to all of those many other things, she has become one of our campus' leading figures in assessment of outcomes.

**CAMBRIDGE:** Thank you, Chancellor Bepko. I would like first of all to introduce the other members of the IUPUI Assessment Committee, most of whom are here today. If they would stand until I finish the list, you can have a sense of who your colleagues are in the assessment business. Tom Allington (Law School), Cyrus Behroozi (School of Social Work), Diane Billings (School of Nursing), Bill Blomquist (School of Liberal Arts), Erv Boschmann (Dean of the Faculties Office-/School of Science), David Bostwick (School of Engineering and Technology), Vickie Browne (School of Medicine), Carol Bush (School of Dentistry), Miriam Langsam (School of Liberal Arts), Fran Oblander (School of Education), Bill Voss (Dean, Herron School of Art), and Jeff Watt (School of Science).

The IUPUI Assessment Committee has four main charges: (1) To coordinate IUPUI's assessment efforts with those on other campuses, primarily Indiana University campuses, (2) to become informed about assessment at IUPUI and to inform IUPUI faculty about assessment, (3) to identify and to fund pilot projects at IUPUI, and, (4) to secure support for faculty who are working in the area of assessment.

Today I am here primarily to talk about that second charge, that is, to become informed about assessment at IUPUI and to inform IUPUI faculty about assessment. The committee has chosen to do this in the following way. I am going to present a very brief history and a bit of our portion of the North Central Accreditation report, the section on assessment. I will be using the ten characteristics of an effective assessment program as stipulated by the North Central Association. Three other members of the committee will then share with you the kinds of diverse projects that have gone on on this campus and are going on on this campus. First of all, Jeff Watt will talk about a quantitative project that has to do with students as they enter the University. Secondly, Bill Blomquist will talk about peer assessment among faculty members. Thirdly, Bill Voss will talk about the other end of the spectrum, that is, what happens to students after they have left IUPUI and how can we benefit from finding out information from them? Then, if we have time, we would like to answer any questions that you might have. If we don't have time for questions, we have provided for you a list of committee members, a list of the 15 funded projects so far with the names of the directors whom you might contact, and then thirdly, the latest edition of our newsletter which you are probably familiar with. Fran Oblander is the editor of Assessment Exchange. That newsletter also has some names and numbers of people you might call if you need information.

I am going to read from the report to make this as expeditious as possible. The first part has a little bit of history and then I will discuss the characteristics. In the spring of 1987, Carol Nathan, our Associate Dean of the Faculties, organized a meeting in Indianapolis at which faculty and administrators from all Indiana University campuses examined possibilities and responsibilities in assessment. The initial meeting led to a statewide conference co-sponsored by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and to which other universities in Indiana were invited. At that fall, 1987 conference, Ed White from the California State System helped campuses focus on

establishing an assessment plan and IU faculty described assessment measures from standardized tests to portfolio assessment. That conference sparked a series of speakers and consultants over the next years, including Peter Ewell on General Education, including its assessments; Lillian Bridwell Bowles on Portfolio Assessment, and Richard Light on the Harvard Assessment Project. From 1988 through the present, the Intercampus Committee of Writing and Assessment of Writing, chaired from its inception by an IUPUI faculty member, published three reports for statewide dissemination, two on Portfolio Assessment and one on Placement Testing.

The IU Assessment Council has met regularly, by phone and in person, to keep abreast of advances on various campuses. In the spring of 1991, a report in the IU Newspaper by the President's academic advisor, an associate dean on the IU Bloomington campus, and an IUPUI professor reviewed the current IU positions on assessment and chronicled past, present, and future initiatives. At the 1991 FACET meeting of outstanding teachers, Lee Knefelkamp, formerly with the Association of American Colleges and now at Columbia University, praised Indiana University for all of its efforts in the area of assessment. A review of the Indiana University efforts in assessment provides a context for IUPUI's efforts and demonstrates IUPUI's leading role in these efforts. IUPUI has been, and continues to be, a leader among IU campuses in its focus on assessment as shown by its administrative support, its faculty leadership, and its diversity of activities.

Using the characteristics of an effective assessment program provided by the North Central Association, this overview brings together an array of projects to demonstrate institutional focus. I will say that there are many more projects going on in this campus than I can briefly cover in these few minutes. Some of these projects have been funded by the IUPUI Assessment Committee. Others are projects which have been initiated and funded internally within different schools.

1. The first characteristic of an effective assessment program is that it flows from the institution's mission. This characteristic can be addressed with five short examples. The Department of Economics, which has as part of its mission to prepare students for other majors, accounts for over 80 percent of its credit hours in E201, E202, and E270. The department has, therefore, focused its assessment attention on pre- and post-tests to determine consistency of instruction and learning across numerous sections of the same course. Both the Departments of English and Math have traced the success of graduates of courses in the Undergraduate Education Center as they have entered other university courses to determine if the UECP's mission of preparing students for university courses is being fulfilled. Herron School of Art, in describing its student' outcomes assessment, concludes, "The work of students in the BFA program at Herron School of Art has always been evaluated cumulatively because that is the nature of a professional visual arts program." The School of Nursing used an external evaluation of the DNS program to determine if its missions should become a Ph.D. program, while the School of Medicine used the 1990 Statewide Student Performance Study to correlate undergraduate preparation, MCAT scores, and subsequent medical school basic science and NBME performance as it investigated the interrelationship of the undergraduate and graduate missions. These units have taken seriously the fact that an assessment program flows from a unit's mission.
2. An effective assessment program also must have a conceptual framework. Conceptual framework here means essentially that an institution chooses components in its assessment process that provide appropriate documentation for work done by students, faculty, and institutions. The framework should, for example, reinforce the

importance of relating curriculum design, teaching, learning, and assessment.

This interrelationship of parts of an assessment plan can be illustrated by the work of the departments of history, English, and philosophy. Funded by one of the initial IUPUI assessment grants, the department of history conducted a review of courses, not just those on the books, but those actually taken by students in the past ten years. At the same time, it conducted a survey of graduates regarding their sense of preparation in history. Currently, the department is reviewing and revising requirements for the undergraduate degree with changes to be in place by 1993-94. The symbiosis of assessment and curriculum change is evidenced in the experience of the department of English, which determined that curricular goals demanded a new form of assessment of student writing. As writing courses moved to portfolio assessment, collaborative pedagogical was emphasized even more strongly than ever. In addition, the department added a capstone portfolio in which students integrate their learning and from which the department learns much about its success with students. From 1990-92 the Department of Philosophy is conducting an assessment of curriculum and requirements for philosophy majors and minors. Courses have been dropped, added, and modified. In one change, the assessment has motivated a different approach to writing assignments in some basic courses. Having a conceptual framework form promotes holistic teaching, learning, and assessing.

3. An assessment program needs faculty ownership and responsibility. In correspondence with Chancellor Bepko and Dean Plater, the IUPUI Assessment Committee has emphasized the necessity of faculty ownership and responsibility for assessment at IUPUI. Consistent with the AAUP Recommended Standards for Mandated Assessment, the Committee wrote to Dean Plater, "Throughout the process, primary faculty responsibility for assessment at IUPUI should be stressed, ad nauseam if need be. Faculty will be more responsive to assessment if they have the knowledge that they designed it." Fortunately, faculty on this campus continue to have ownership of and responsibility for assessment. Faculty will have extended support from the new Office for Planning and Institutional Improvement beginning with the 1992-93 academic year. That office is committed, and we want to see that it is committed, to the continuing central role of faculty in assessment at all levels on this campus.
4. Assessment has wide institutional support. The history of assessment at IUPUI demonstrates the high level of administrative support. Examples in this part of the NCA report and reports of units provide the breadth of activities. Through education, discussion, and rewards more and more faculty and programs enter consciously the development of assessment activities. In 1991, the IUPUI Assessment Committee wrote to Dean Plater, "The opportunities for faculty development and research support, as part of the assessment process, should be emphasized. We have discovered that some individual faculty members are intrigued by the possibilities of performing publishable research on student progress, innovative educational approaches, and methods of assessment. Some teaching-oriented faculty members may desire to become more active researchers if they see opportunities to research the educational process within a respective discipline." Development of ways to value the development of assessment activities when promotion, tenure, and merit decisions are made, must be continued in order to demonstrate and motivate institution wide support for assessment.

5. The assessment program must use multiple measures. Funded projects and individual school projects have done an excellent job of using multiple measures. Surveys of alumni have been undertaken by departments and schools such as Anthropology, Communication and Theater, Art, Dentistry, History, and Nursing. Faculty teaching is assessed by student evaluations in at least part of every school, by videotaping and peer review within the Department of Political Science, which we will hear about in a moment, and by exit interviews of BAs in the Department of Geography. Pre- and post-test, in multiple class sections are done in Political Science and in Economics. Portfolios are used extensively in English and are being studied and developed in undergraduate programs in the Schools of Nursing and Education, with financial support from the University Writing Center. The School of Dentistry provides one of many possible examples of the use of multiple measures. That school uses surveys of recent grads, results of state board examinations, results of national board examinations, graduation rates of students, patient surveys, student questionnaires, and student clinical performance ratings. Although the ways these measures are used to improve teaching and learning is crucial to examine, and we have not done that as extensively as we will be in the future, IUPUI is employing a wide variety of measures.
6. The Assessment Program provides feedback to students and the institution. IUPUI provides feedback in a number of ways. Even a partial list is illustrative. Outside reviewers have provided feedback to Sociology, English as a second language, public history in the History Department, IMAGIS in Geography, and upcoming and funded by an outside source, Lilly Endowment, over the next three years, the Center on Philanthropy. Capstone seminars in English and Religious Studies and the National Teacher Examination in the School of Physical Education provide feedback to graduating seniors. When Math did a study of the former pre-calculus placement examination and found it to have statistically poor reliability, faculty rewrote the exam. The National Board of Medicine exam results are used by various standing committees in the School of Medicine to analyze educational programs.
7. An assessment program should be cost effective. As faculty in programs choose their assessment measures, they are actively aware of cost -- both in dollars and in time. The Department of French, for instance, stated in 1991 that, currently, resources and time do not permit involvement in assessment. When the Department of Economics looked at nationally normed tests for majors, they decided that the exams might be too costly for the effect and that, in fact, they wanted to develop their own exams. The University has constantly tried to decide about its investment and the return on its investment in assessment. Imaginative measures can be most effective at times. At others, the University must be willing to allocate some substantial investment in this process.
8. An assessment program does not restrict or inhibit goals of access, equity, and diversity established by the institution. North Central Association notes that, "If institutions undertake to design more sophisticated, qualitative, and quantitative approaches to assessment appropriate to their distinctive institutional character and student body, then educational quality and the serving of students' diverse needs and aspirations can only improve." The departments of English and Math have developed placement tests that internal studies show accurately predict success in courses designed to help students at various developmental stages in their discipline.



Nursing's Office of Student Services data base project includes attrition studies as does a campus-wide look at retention. The project funded for Disabled Students revealed that faculty and student attitudes and cooperation are positive on this campus, yet the physical facilities at IUPUI continue to impede the academic success of some students. We learn from assessment measures ways to improve movement toward our goals.

9. An assessment program leads to improvement. Three examples of many available on this campus illustrate the positive effects of assessment. The University Writing Center used its spring, 1991 survey of W132 and W231 students about workshops to improve its workshop series for 1991-92. The Department of Religious Studies has undergone five full changes in the curriculum in its 19-year history. One reason is that each new faculty member must do curriculum development so that the entire curriculum is re-examined in view of contributions able to be made by newer professors. And, the Department of Anthropology had a retreat in September, 1991, to examine how the undergraduate major has developed in the past 10 years since its initiation and to improve even further the range of courses within the requirements of the major.
10. An assessment program has a process in place for evaluating the Assessment Program. IUPUI is moving in that direction. For example, at the academic unit level, in 1990, a Department of English faculty member and an undergraduate student used undergraduate mentorship funds to examine student and teacher response to portfolio assessment. The student reported results at a national conference on undergraduate research. Two other faculty members were funded by the School of Liberal Arts to look at the effect of portfolio assessment on student writing processes. One activity of the new Office of Planning and Institutional Improvement will be to help faculty develop ways to evaluate their assessment program and to put in place an evaluation system of assessment on the institutional level as well.

Now we will learn from three colleagues about diverse projects at IUPUI.

**WATT:** The assessment project for the Department of Mathematical Sciences is a longitudinal study that started last July. It tracks the undergraduate students from where they came, how they got to the University, their placement tests, what courses they selected based on that or how they were placed into courses, the grades in those courses, and how they move up the ladder of mathematics to that final course that meets the requirement in their chosen major, and whether that meets the requirements for the department that we are serving. We are a large service department and so that is an ultimate end result for that project. Since we are only one semester into it, we have only collected about one-third of the data. So, we don't really have any results to present or any trends of anything that is going on. I will describe the proposal as it was written and submitted and give you a flavor of the types of things that we have considered and are looking at in the proposal.

The assessment of the mathematics program has been designed to provide the growing student population at IUPUI with the highest quality mathematics education that can be provided. This project allows the department of mathematical sciences to analyze data on performance of students, teachers, and the curriculum and enhance the development of the undergraduate mathematics education program as a whole. It is the department's belief that a single instrument alone should not be used for the assessment project. There are two reasons for this belief. The

first is that no one assessment tool or measurement can accurately provide all of the information desired to evaluate a large program such as that in mathematical sciences. Second, each instrument is designed to focus on only one dimension of the program and not on the entire picture of how students, curriculum, and instruction integrate together. Thus, many sources of data must be utilized in the assessment program. These sources of data should be selected in such a way that, when analyzed in various combinations, will provide different perspectives on the quality of the program.

It is important to note that the assessment proposal's objective is to measure the quality of the program and not the success of individual students. The analysis of the statistics of the assessment data will be presented in a yearly report which will be widely disseminated through the decision makers on the program. The type of model that we are using is a cyclic model which we felt was very important. The first step is to establish the objectives for the program. The second step is to go out and measure those objectives. The third step is to report these results and to disseminate those to the decision makers. The fourth step is to affect change in the program. I have had an opportunity to look at many of the assessment proposals across the United States before writing this one. This is where most of the programs just stop. We measured it, we wrote a report, and that is it. But, assessment needs to go further than that -- to the fourth step. And, that is, to effect change within the program. The fifth step is to remeasure those objectives and then the cycle begins all over again.

The purposes of the assessment in the service programs are many. I will list those:

- (1) The department seeks to contribute quality over quantity in the undergraduate education program.
- (2) The student population entering IUPUI comes from a large spectrum of mathematical abilities. These abilities need to be well defined for the placement procedure.
- (3) Maintaining a valid and reliable placement program will provide accurate information for skill level requirement for admission, for identifying honor students, for advance placement of students, and for waiving prerequisite requirements for various majors.
- (4) The gains in mathematical abilities of the students completing the developmental curriculum need to be documented to access that program's success rate.
- (5) Proficiency measurements at the completion of the algebra sequences need to develop confidence in the students that they have actually completed a sequence and that the sequence was meaningful.
- (6) The assessment reports provide a basis to develop a dialogue between faculties of the various departments served by mathematical sciences to improve the total learning environment of our undergraduate students.

I won't go into detail on these, but the instruments that we use are:

- (1) The SAT math score.
- (2) The placement exam, which is under continuous change. Every semester we do item analysis on that and determine what questions have predictive validity for the particular courses we are placing.
- (3) Math 001, which is a first-year algebra course, the grade the students earn in that course.
- (4) In Math 111, we have instituted it as the department final this year. That will be used as a common item base for all students going through that curriculum.

- (5) The course grades in all of the 0100 and 100 level math courses.
- (6) The Student Evaluation of Teaching which was developed by John Kremer in the department of psychology. We use the global score on that for students' belief in evaluation of the teaching process.

The last thing I want to do is go through the three components of the actual assessment program and how these instruments fit together.

- (1) Assessment of students. The assessment of students is designed to focus on the performance of groups of students as they proceed through the mathematics curriculum. This assessment will be used to identify problem areas in the curriculum or instruction for various types of students. Tracking students from course to course in computer correlations of grades with SAT scores and placement test results will provide valuable information in assessing admissions in the counseling units throughout the campus.
- (2) Assessment of instruction. There will two different measures of instructional evaluation for each teacher. The first is the global score on the student evaluation of teaching. This score will be compared with the other instructors of the same course. The second measure is the grade correlation between the grade assigned by the instructor in the fall semester to the grade received in the next mathematics course by that student in the spring semester.
- (3) Assessment of the Curriculum. The tracking of student performance will be the primary assessment of the mathematics curriculum. As students are promoted into the next mathematics course, their performance is heavily weighted on the mastery of the pre-requisite material. If average grades significantly deviate between any two courses, this might indicate curriculum problems which should be further investigated and changed for the upcoming semester.

This is a quick overview of the longitudinal study that mathematics has proposed on how students get to the campus, where they get placed, how they get placed, and where they end up by the time we finish our service to those students and they go on to take their junior and senior level courses within their departments. It is important that this is not a planned, one time study or one-shot deal. It is actually a continuous model that feeds in on itself so that the software will be developed to pull that information off student databases and that it will generate reports on a routine basis every year so that those decision makers, whether they be at the dean's level, at the department head level, or the actual course coordinator can make those changes.

**BLOMQUIST:** In 1989, the Department of Political Science proposed an evaluation model with the intent of improving our ability to assess teaching and learning both in our courses and over the course of our undergraduate major. There were two broad motivations behind this. First, it fit into a larger and ongoing agenda of the department to continually try to improve teaching effectiveness and student learning. Second, it signaled a recognition on our part of the growing awareness of assessment and the preference of the faculty for developing our own assessment practices rather than waiting and possibly having to implement an assessment model at some future date that had been developed elsewhere.

This evaluation model that we developed incorporates some already used practices in the department previously. These practices, however, may not have been done on as regular a basis as they should or perhaps not as clearly directed toward assessment -- and also proposed new activities. Those old and new activities combine into three major elements similar to the ones that Jeff was talking about in mathematical sciences. First, assessment of classroom teaching methods and effectiveness; second, the development of pre- and post-test measures for certain courses; and, third, a survey of recent graduates from our major. In assessing classroom teaching methods effectiveness, we have previously relied primarily, although not exclusively, on student evaluations. Student evaluations have been used in political science in assessing the performance of our part-time and our full-time faculty and in annual reviews of our full-time faculty.

At the time we were developing the evaluation model in 1989, we had occasionally done peer observation in classes, but not on any kind of a regular basis. During 1989 we developed a simple, one-page form in order to improve consistency across evaluators and across classrooms with a series of questions and items to review. In addition in our evaluation model, we proposed adding to that an opportunity for the individual instructor to observe himself or herself through the videotaping of classroom teaching. With respect to the second major element which has been development and administration of pre- and post-test measures in certain courses, we targeted our two 100 level courses, Y101, which is Introduction to Political Science, and Y103, which is Introduction to American Politics, for two reasons. First, those are the two courses that we teach that are met by the largest number of sections taught by part-time instructors and, therefore, there was some concern about getting measures of student learning outcomes across sessions that are taught by both full-time and part-time instructors. Second, all political science majors have to take one or the other of those courses. So, we were concerned that there ought to be factual materials, terms and concepts to be solidly in place by the time the students exit that course so they can be built upon in upper division courses later. Given, however, the diversity of instructors, tests, and approaches used in those courses, you first work out some agreement about a common outline of the content of those courses. So, during 1989 all full-time faculty who offer those courses, were involved in developing common outlines of material covered in those courses. Once common agreement had been reached on those outlines, individual faculty members began to develop and circulate questions that might be used to approach that content. This process of sharing questions and eventually coming to a common set of questions that met with agreement among full-time instructors who teach those courses occurred during 1990.

In the third major element of our evaluation model, we proposed to survey up to 150 graduates of the political science department who had been out of school for five years or more. Our feeling was that that kind of distance from commencement would be useful to gain insights through the students on what aspects of their undergraduate education in our department really stood out either positively or negatively with that kind of length of perspective. We felt that this would be particularly useful in helping us to review and evaluate both the structure and the content of our undergraduate major.

We forwarded this evaluation model to the IUPUI Assessment Committee. The committee responded with suggestions and questions in the fall of 1989. In the spring of 1990 the department requested and received a small grant, one of those assessment grants that Barbara talked about, to implement the new practices that we were talking about; specifically, to get some workstudy students with time to arrange the videotaping, collecting, assembling and administering the pre- and post-test in the 101 and 103 courses and help us to update the information we have on graduates who are out in the world now so that we could contact them for our survey.

To date, we have implemented most of our evaluation model. Student evaluations are now supplemented by peer observations and by videotapes for evaluating classroom teaching methods and effectiveness. The collegial review of the videotapes where an instructor and colleagues could, together, view the videotapes and share ideas, suggestions, and comments was postponed through the fall of 1991 simply because of some sabbaticals and leaves among some of the full-time members of our department. We anticipate doing that later this semester. However, several members of the department have taken advantage of the opportunity to review the videotapes on their own -- to look at the tapes of their own courses. And, in at least one case, this has already led to some ideas for making improvements. Our pre- and post-test instruments have gone through three cycles now, if you count spring, summer, and fall of 1991, and are already helping us to provide a baseline against which to evaluate student learning outcomes across sections which are taught by different instructors at different times. They are also helping us to identify and reward gains as well as to spot and make recommendations for improvement in some other areas. After we allow the pre- and post-tests instruments to remain in place for a couple of years, then we will take another look at them about modifying questions, etc. American Politics, in particular, is a dynamic field.

In the third part of our model, is the survey of recent graduates we hope to accomplish by the end of this semester, but I think it might better to let Bill Voos talk about a unit that has completed that kind of survey.

**VOOS:** Our project was an assessment of experiences at Herron. We felt the need to define the status of current programs at Herron and also to determine how those programs could be revised and strengthened and what things need to be done based on a survey of alumni. We chose to contact everyone who had graduated over the ten years preceding the survey. That included 430 people. We contacted Bryan Vargus' IUPUI Public Opinion Laboratory because we wanted to make sure that this would be an impartial study and that it would be done according to correct procedures. We prepared a survey booklet. We worked with them to make sure that the right questions were stated in such a way that art students our art graduates would understand the terminology. These were sent out to this group. We received replies from 206 of the graduates, approximately 40 percent. We asked these people to rate their education. We also asked them if they were still working as artists and whether they had been successful in getting jobs right out of school, which is a concern for art students. Of course, it is a concern for everyone, but it seems to be a particular concern in this field. We asked what they thought of the school. What were the good points? What were the bad points? What we needed to do for the future? Whether they were succeeding in their goals on the short term and the long term. We asked them about their interests in graduate education. There also were a number of other questions.

Basically, the results were positive. But, they did give us directions that we could follow to continue to study and revise our curriculum. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents were still seriously involved in art. Over one-half were making all or a large part of their living through art. That may not sound like a high percentage to some of you who have students graduating in fields where they have a very definite career pattern and it is very easy to make a living in a field, but in the area of fine arts, where you have poets, creative writers, drama people, and fine artists, you find that many of them have to pursue alternative careers in order to support themselves. We found this 87 percent a very high percentage of people who stayed in the field. Seventy-two percent rated the course work and the education that they had received at Herron as either excellent or very good. Again, we felt that was a very positive survey number. However, they mentioned facilities as a weakness at our place, as well as the academic environment. These were

things that we were already aware of and it suggests that the move to the main campus will be a welcome one, indeed, for our students. Among the programs that students said that they would have liked to have had while they were in school were in computer graphics design. We have put in a computer graphics design program and students who are at Herron now have that opportunity. Another program that was mentioned by a number of students was a Master of Fine Arts degree. We are working on a proposal for that program at this time.

A number of students had trouble finding an initial job, but most of them managed to persevere. Again, this is not unusual compared to the national average. It is pretty typical for art students. We also intended to run a second part of this survey. That was a telephone survey talking to employers and potential employers. The survey was run but it wasn't a large enough segment so that we could come up with a focused enough body of information. It provided a lot of good information but it did not provide the kind of structured material that we were looking for. We are now trying to decide whether we should try an alternative system to gain this direct employer input or whether we should simply use the information we have. We may end up sending people out to do interviews in offices throughout the area. In any case, we think this is a very valuable tool and it will help us to strengthen our programs in the future. Thank you.

**CAMBRIDGE:** There is a lot of this work going on on this campus. However, we are soliciting more project proposals. We have passed out a set of guidelines for proposals. We hope that you will distribute these guidelines to your faculty and encourage people to apply for project funding. In the newsletter there is also information about these guidelines and about the availability of funding on this campus for projects generated by faculty. Thank you very much for your time today, and we hope to hear from a number of people.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Barbara.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VII - Faculty Council Bylaw Changes**

**BEPKO:** We have an action item from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

**SIDHU:** This Council has already approved the amendments of the Constitution of the IUPUI faculty. Now, we are bringing to you the bylaws. The bylaws have been circulated to you. I would like to say a word or two that Henry Besch and his computer have helped a lot in cleaning up and writing all of these changes. Henry, I think your computer already has some kind of virus because it did not pick up some of the spelling mistakes. There is only one I could find. That is on the first page, Section B.1.e. the second line. The word "Babsent" should be "absent." Everything else seems to be okay from our point of view. I would like to hear from the floor if there are some suggestions for changes or any clarifications.

**WARFEL:** There is another spelling error on the next page under Parliamentarian. The word "consulatation" should be "consultation."

**BEPKO:** Are there any other comments? Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none]

### AGENDA ITEM VIII - Committee Reports

**BEPKO:** We have some other items on the agenda, but the time is running out. If we could have the Student Affairs Committee report with Judy Kosegi.

**KOSEGI:** Our committee has met once last fall. Most business, however, was conducted by mail. We thought that would be easier. Our next meeting will be April 24, 1992. Work completed: The committee has reviewed and offered suggestions for change in the following issues:

- (1) Testing for disabled students.
- (2) Academic Handbook proposed changes which address faculty relations with students under the Code of Academic Ethics.
- (3) Academic information involving the removal of the coding of students on probation on school rosters.
- (4) The new undergraduate student association constitution.

The committee also reviewed, but did not comment on, minutes from the newly-formed University Operations and Academic Cabinets.

Ongoing work: Two subcommittees have been formed to address the issues of:

- (1) Campus aids policy task force.
- (2) Educating the New Majority document.

Finally, the topics pending are:

- (1) The sexual orientation discrimination issue.

**BEPKO:** We have a report on the Accordia Health Care Conference with Ed Robbins reporting.

**ROBBINS:** I have this report and think it is pretty good, but I don't want to hear it again.

**BEPKO:** Could you give it in April?

**ROBBINS:** I'll see how I feel then. [laughter]

**BEPKO:** Our next report will be from the Faculty Affairs Committee with Kathleen Warfel reporting.

**WARFEL:** The Faculty Affairs Committee has a handout to go along with the committee report. We have met a lot of times and completed work reviewing proposed policies and other documents as listed on the sheet. Most of these things have come to the Council, so you have worked on them also.

I would like to point out some aspects of our ongoing work. Since late November, the Faculty Affairs Committee has been concerned with faculty issues related to the new Vice Chancellor's Office for Planning and Institutional Improvement. The committee has sent comments to Chancellor Bepko and we have discussed some of the items in a recent meeting with Dean Plater. At this point, the committee believes that the extent to which faculty can communicate with the new Vice Chancellor for Planning will be crucial in determining the academic future of IUPUI.

We are working on a proposal to bring to the Executive Committee suggesting some official interface between the Faculty Council and the new Vice Chancellor. We underscore a number of times how important we think getting this right is going to be.

We will be bringing a proposal for a new version of the IUPUI Faculty Handbook, not to replace the Indiana University Academic Handbook, but to serve as a supplement to it for our campus. The Handbook subcommittee chairman is Ed Byrne. We hope to get back on this issue before the year is over.

The committee has also discussed concerns about how the relatively new salary policy has been implemented on our campus, with particular issues including the status of merit raises and the extent of faculty input into campus-wide decisions related to the distribution of limited funds available for salary increases.

As you can see, we have several topics pending. I am not sure how many of them we will get to before the end of the year, but we have been asked specifically to address the issue of grievance procedures for non-tenure track faculty and to look at proposed language regarding sexual orientation. We would particularly like to have your input at this stage on, not necessarily right this minute but soon, about how the Council can best communicate officially with the new Vice Chancellor's office. Some people have suggested that there be an exchanging committee for planning, for example. So, if you have ideas along those lines, please let me, or any of the other members of the Faculty Affairs Committee know. Thank you.

**BEPKO:** Are there any comments or questions? [none]

#### **AGENDA ITEM IX - Question-and-Answer Period**

**BEPKO:** We had a question that was put to the administration about a proposal for a new initiative in the School of Library and Information Sciences. Bill Plater will comment on that.

**PLATER:** I will comment very briefly and I will report more later. We wanted you to be aware of the fact that the faculty of the School of Library and Information Sciences, along with faculty and administrators on this campus, have been discussing the possibility of the school's becoming a bi-campus school, much as the School of Education, School of Music, and the School of Journalism. The School of Library and Information Sciences has offered courses at IUPUI for a number of years, but it has not had a presence as a school nor has it awarded degrees on this campus. There continues to be interest in the traditional library science programs, but with the changes in technology, there is a growing interest in a new sub-field known as Information Science. The proposal is to establish a program on this campus that would have a particular orientation toward information sciences while maintaining the courses in the traditional fields of library sciences. The degree would be available on both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campus. To develop this, the School of Library and Information Sciences has engaged in an overall curriculum review at the same time they are working with the appropriate committees and administrators here to establish the school. This proposal has been referred to the Academic Affairs Committee as well as the Budgetary Affairs Committee here at the IUPUI campus, while discussions are underway with the school faculty. The intent is to establish the degree program as early as the fall of 1994 which would mean that during the coming year there would be considerable discussion about curriculum, development of the degree proposal, and all of the reviews that would be necessary if, for example, there is a new degree to go through the University review process as well as the



Commission for Higher Education. It may be that the existing degree can simply be awarded on this campus by a site extension of the existing degree program. Those discussions will have to take place during the coming year. In any event, because of the importance of this development, we wanted the Council to know that this development was underway. We will keep you posted through the Executive Committee, the Budgetary Affairs Committee, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the progress towards establishing the school.

**BEPKO:** Are there any comments or questions? Ed, I think there is time for your report after all, if you would like to give it.

**ROBBINS:** I am totally out of the mood. I will give it next month.

**BEPKO:** We have a report from the Nominating Committee with Jim McAteer.

**MCATEER:** The newly-elected President of the IUPUI faculty is Richard Fredland. The newly-elected Vice-President of the IUPUI Faculty is Kathleen Warfel. I would like to have a motion to destroy the votes. [so moved]

**BEPKO:** All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? Motion carries. The ballots will be destroyed.

**AGENDA ITEM X - Unfinished Business**

[There was no unfinished business.]

**AGENDA ITEM XI - New Business**

[There was no new business.]

**AGENDA ITEM XII - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** We have not had the 10-minute question-and-answer period session, but given then temperature in this room and the length of time we have been here, I think we should adjourn.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
Faculty Council Meeting  
April 2, 1992  
Law School, Room 116  
3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko. Deans: Barbara Fischler, P Nicholas Kellum, William Voos. Elected Faculty: C D Aliprantis, Margaret Applegate, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Sally Bowman, Janice Bruckner, Lucinda Carr, Victor Childers, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Anne Donchin, Eleanor Donnelly, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Michael Gleeson, Jean Gnat, Linda Kasper, Raymond Koleski, Douglas Lees, Steven Mazzuca, Dana McDonald, Patrick McGeever, B Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Michael Parsons, Richard Peterson, Terry Reed, Norris Richmond, Edward Robbins, Phyllis Scherle, Edmund Schilling, Jan Tenenbaum, Vernon Vix, Kathleen Warfel.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: Doris Merritt for Walter Daly, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, Marion Wagner for Sheldon Siegel, J. M. Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Catherine E. Rhoades for Janice Froehlich, John E. Pless for Dean Hawley, Bernadette Rodak for Linda Marler

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Juanita Keck, Jeffery Vessely.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: Vice Chancellor J. Herman Blake and Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, A. James Brown, Trevor Brown, H. William Gilmore, Norman Lefstein, R Bruce Renda, David Stocum, Donald Warren, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Thomas Ambrose, Darrell Bailey, Henry Besch, Linda Brothers, Walter Buchanan, Carol Deets, John Emhardt, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Mary Fisher, Philip Gibbs, Melvin Glick, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Steven Leapman, Golam Mannan, James McAteer, Richard Meiss, Eric Pumroy, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Sherry Ricchiardi, Margaret Richwine, Neal Rothman, Philip Scarpino, William Schneider, P Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Gregory Sutton, Richard Turner, Henry Wellman, Kathryn Wilson, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Yu.

**Ex Officio Members Absent:** Henry Karlson, Melissa Lalich, Gerald Powers, Maxine Tutterrow.

**Visitors Present:** Erwin Boschmann, Glenna Dudley, Mark Grove, Lisa Hite-Wadler, Carol Nathan, William Spencer (External Affairs).

**AGENDA ITEM I - Memorial Resolution - Dr. Ronald Ellsworth Kirk, School of Science**

**BEPKO:** Our first item of business is a memorial resolution. Consistent with our practice, we will not read the resolution but, unless there are any objections, it will be adopted as a resolution of the Council and communicated to the appropriate survivors of the deceased faculty member Ronald Ellsworth Kirk. Would you rise for a moment of silence? [A moment of silence was observed.]

**AGENDA ITEM II - Approval of Minutes: November 7, 1991 and January 9, 1992**

**BEPKO:** Our next item of business is the approval of the November 7, 1991, and January 9, 1992, minutes which have been distributed. Do we have a motion to approve? [So moved]

**FREDLAND:** There are two errors. In the November 7, 1991 minutes, on page 6, third line from the bottom. That sentence should read: **Employees who have been here for quite a while, 15 or 20 years or more, may feel very comfortable with the plan we have now.** In the January 9, 1992 minutes on page 13, fourth line from the bottom, ***Cheryl Gilbert should be Shirl Gilbert.***

BEPKO: Those corrections will be made and incorporated into the motion to approve these minutes which I think has been seconded. All in favor say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [none] The minutes are approved with indicated changes being made.

**AGENDA ITEM III - Presiding Officer's Business - Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko**

BEPKO: I think you have probably been made aware that a memo has been sent to all faculty in the School of Nursing regarding this issue, but I don't think we were prepared to make this announcement last month when we met. Angela McBride will be recommended tomorrow to the Indiana University Board of Trustees as the new permanent dean of the School of Nursing. I say "permanent" in the sense that she will not be interim dean anymore. As we all know, there is nothing permanent about academic administrative appointments. The Trustees should adopt that recommendation tomorrow and Angela will be the dean. It will be the University Dean of Nursing to take into account the multi-campus responsibilities of the office.

We also sent a memo to a number of people late in March informing them that at this Trustees' meeting it will be recommended that Trudy Banta, of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, be appointed Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement at IUPUI. I think many of you have had a chance to meet her and work with her. She has been a consultant with IUPUI for the past couple of years and is a national leader in planning for institutional improvement and assessment of outcomes. We think she will be a person who will give us a great advantage in moving into the national forefront in these fields.

I am sure you have been made aware that in the fall this year we will undergo our decennial accreditation visit by the North Central Association of Colleges and Universities. Our last one was in 1982. In the fall of 1992 we come up again for another visitation. Carol Nathan is the leader and coordinator of our preparation for the visit. Carol will say a few words now about the preparations we are making. There is a self-study report which is in rough draft form. Carol will tell you how we would like to have you review that and participate in the preparation of the final draft of the report which has to be at the North Central Association by September 1st.

NATHAN: The rough draft is off my desk today and will be back from the printer by Monday, hopefully. It is a very large volume at this point. Whether we can shrink it for a final version, I don't know. There have been many participants in this activity -- all of the schools and major offices, etc. Students have been involved. You may have seen an article in the Sagamore not too long ago where students were taking a survey themselves about IUPUI. This was a very good survey.

I wanted to point out that the memo you picked up from the table (See IUPUI Circular 92-08) states that we are making 50 copies available for people to review. We encourage you to do so. It says in the memo that there will be some copies in the University Library as well as distributing them to the schools. I have made arrangements to have copies in all libraries on campus (38th Street, Herron, etc.). They will also be available for you to review there. It is going to be spiral bound so you can take it to a copy machine, copy the page, mark it, and send it back to me with the indication, "Please correct." That kind of review is what we want. If you think an entire section should be removed or that something is missing, please let us know. Thank you.

BEPKO: Thank you, Carol. This is a very important project and we hope you will read the document in draft form and give us your comments. Those comments should be directed to Carol,

but if you think there is something of great significance that should be discussed, we will have an opportunity at the May meeting of the Council to discuss policy issues that may be raised by the document. We hope you will look at it sooner rather than later.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - Executive Committee Report - Richard Peterson**

**BEPKO:** Next, we have the Executive Committee report.

**PETERSON:** I would like to emphasize the support of the Executive Committee and myself of this document and its going forward and particularly encourage you, as individual members of this Council, to look particularly at those areas of the document which relate to your schools and to your level of interest. As Jerry said, if need be, we will consider any problematic issues related to specific areas of this at the next Council meeting.

I would also like to mention a couple of other things briefly in my report today. First of all, the University Faculty Council Constitutional revisions are going forward. The Agenda Committee has met again and has made up a Constitution which will be presented to the University Faculty Council. There are still some alternative amendments in this version which are going to the University Faculty Council on April 14th. After that is voted on by the University Faculty Council, if it is positively approved at that point, there will be a number of other sequences which will take place in its final approval. The final approval of the document is by the faculty of the whole University. It will be going out for a vote. In the interim, copies of the final version of the Constitution will be sent out, and there will be discussions on each of the campuses across the University related to these University Faculty Council Constitutional revisions. We will have a session here on campus. It will probably not be a Faculty Council meeting because of so many other items of business which come up here. We will be sending out announcements for that meeting at an appropriate time. We will try to make it at a time when most of you can attend.

The last item I want to mention is that the President will be coming to this campus from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. on April 22, 1992. Invitations have not been mailed as yet because we do not have a specific meeting place. We are trying to get into the Ambulatory Care Facility, if possible, so the President can interact with us at that level. That is a brand new area that will be opening up within the next two months. We will send out specific room announcements about that in due course as soon as we find the appropriate room.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - Nominating Committee Report - Kathleen Warfel**

**BEPKO:** Next, is the Nominating Committee Report with Vice-President Elect Kathleen Warfel.

**WARFEL:** The information for the Nominating Committee report is before you. I won't take the time to read it to you. At our next Faculty Council meeting, we will elect new members of three very important committees -- the Executive Committee, the Nominating Committee, and the Tenure Committee. The pages here indicate which members will be continuing on these committees and also the slate of those persons to be elected and how many are to be voted for.

Our report also includes the results of the election of the new at-large representatives to this Council, the newly elected University Faculty Council representatives, and also for your information, the newly elected Unit representatives to this Council. Are there any questions?

## AGENDA ITEM VI - Committee Reports

**BEPKO:** Next, we have some other committee reports. We have three listed on the agenda. If there are any other committees prepared to report, we will do those as well. Roko, do you have a report?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Yes, I do.

**BEPKO:** Why don't we take your report at the end of these other three committee reports? I just thought I would ask if there was anyone who was prepared to make a report to consider that while the other committees are making their reports. We will take those up at the conclusion of the section on committee reports.

The first report is from the Academic Affairs Committee with James Baldwin.

**BALDWIN:** This has been through the Calendar Committee, the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, the Academic Affairs Committee and it comes here now. Mark [Grove] is here to answer any questions you may have. Does anyone have any questions about this? There are a number of constraints on the calendar as I have learned. We have constraints at the beginning of the year in that we insist on having Labor Day off. We have constraints at the end of the year because of the dates for the Hoosier Dome and the need to reserve that. There is a need that there be sufficient time between the last day of exams and commencement in the spring for the recorders and the Registrar to get everything recorded correctly so we don't give out bogus degrees. There are some innuendos involved in the schedule that perhaps Mark can answer if anyone has any questions.

**GROVE:** The calendar that is proposed to you, with the exception of several years late in this decade, is following the most recently approved calendar this body approved last year. It is basically the same format as last year. The advantages to it, primarily as far as faculty are concerned, is there is a slightly longer break in time between the end of the second summer session and the start of the fall term. Classes end on the second Monday in August with the combinations of the July 4th holiday being off as well. There is a couple of weeks break in between the end of the second summer session and the start of the fall classes. We have kept to this campus traditional format by keeping a 15-week calendar for both major sessions. As Jeff Vessely can testify, at the All-University calendar stage, there has been significant progress moving toward a point in a uniform All-University calendar. The spring semester is essentially the same at most IU campuses now. Our current semester is the last one we have started earlier than everyone else. So, ordinarily we would start this year on the 13th. We started on the 6th in order to accommodate commencement.

The reason we made the calendar up as far in advance as we did is to allow for the booking of the Hoosier Dome. We also need time at the end of the spring term to allow the recorders enough time to certify graduates. Commencement traditionally falls on the second Sunday in May. Some years that simply falls too early for the recorders to review grades and to allow registration to happen at the beginning of January. In seven years you will notice that commencement falls on the third Sunday in May. In four cases, between now and the end of this decade, we are proposing that the calendar begin on Saturday rather than Monday. That affects one year which you have already approved which is next year. By starting on Saturday rather than on Monday, it would get us out of conflict with commencement which is so early in May. We wanted to allow enough time to

register and review the academic calendar and not have the calendar determined by when commencement falls.

The Commencement Committee in Bloomington is happy for the third Sunday. Dean East is happy with it starting on Saturday. As Jim has suggested, it is a very complicated project to put these things together. We have honored, basically, the calendar model which was approved by this group most recently.

**BEPKO:** I think the lack of response does not indicate that this is not an interesting report. Instead, emotionally, I think a number of people are having the same reaction that I am having. This is the first time I have ever engaged in any kind of planning, with this specificity, that takes me a couple of years into my 18/20 program. Are there any comments or questions? Thank you very much.

Next, we have Ed Robbins' report that was postponed from last month. Ed was gracious enough to agree to make his comments this month about a session that he attended on our behalf -- the Accordia Health Care Conference that was held in the Conference Center.

**ROBBINS:** Given my recollection of that meeting, I think I more or less insisted on it being postponed. [laughter] This is really not a committee report, but it does relate to our Fringe Benefits Committee's efforts. I was asked to share with you some of the issues that were discussed in a Health Care Conference that Accordia sponsored just one month ago today on this campus. It was a state wide conference. There were representatives not only from other IU campuses, but other universities in Indiana. The conference addressed a number of major issues related to rising health care costs, including the nature of some of the legislation being considered around the country, issues related to what hospitals are doing, and how health care providers and health care insurers are trying to deal with the problems.

The part I want to share with you is the substance of the first session in which L. Ben Lytle, Chief Executive Officer of the Accordia Parent Group, identified a series of issues or problems that we have to find a way to deal with before we are likely to get any kind of a handle on the rising costs of health care. He didn't suggest these as items for which he had answers, but he simply identified them as the kind of issues that ought to guide our deliberations. I just want to go through those very quickly for you. I also want to disavow responsibility for the use of some of the terms that were used. These were not my terms. These are Ben Lytle's terms. I am sure that some of you will have problems with the way he characterized some issues and with some of the terminology he used. I will let you take those issues up with Ben. Let me go through the issues quickly.

The first of these is what was identified as the health care costs of high risk, personal behaviors. Included in that list would be things such as unsafe sex, preventable injury from accidents (the unwillingness of automobile drivers and passengers to wear seat belts or motorcycle riders to wear helmets), smoking, eating too much and exercising too little. He also mentioned the cost of improved health care options associated with aging and improved survival rates. That is, as we find ways to keep people alive longer, we encounter problems associated with the maintenance of health and the quality of life that we haven't encountered before. This is also related to improved survival rates of newborns, that is, infants who survive now who would not have survived, historically, and who, as a result, require particularly expensive health care services. He mentioned problems related to the lack of market forces in health care delivery and in the hospital infrastruc-

ture. Most hospitals are not-for-profit. There are no particular profit or market incentives that would motivate hospitals to be cost effective. There is a major inclination for hospitals to provide all types of care. The lack of specialization and diversification within the hospital system drives up rates at a time when there is a surplus of hospital rooms.

Another area identified was that of soft medicine (Ben's term) -- mental and chiropractic treatments. Apparently there are disproportionate costs associated with these services. Listed also was the issue of unnecessary treatment. It was suggested that 15 to 20 percent of health care treatment is unnecessary. Included here is disease caused by treatment. Fraud was identified as a problem. Patients are billed for treatments that are not provided.

The increasing cost of primary care was listed. This is, in essence, part of the result of a shortage of primary care providers and the difficulty of getting practitioners to engage in an area of service that would most likely prevent the more expensive, specialized care that so many health care practitioners seem to prefer. Included in this issue is a reluctance to use lower cost alternatives, such as nursing care and other technical services that might be delivered by health care providers who are not required to have completed the long and expensive preparation programs that doctors and specialists, are required to complete.

Another problem is litigation costs, including for at least health care practices that are designed to avoid the cost of litigation. Doctors, and other health care providers, because they are so concerned about the liability they are exposed to in their practice, tend to over practice. That is, they tend to take every precautionary measure they can so there can be no questions about the quality of the service they provide.

The last item that was suggested was the issue related to defining the quality of life, including the fundamental issue of what is life and what is death? When is life worth preserving and maintaining and when is it not? This question was raised in relation to the issue of rationing health care. As long as it is not possible to provide the health care that is wanted and expected by everybody -- young, old, rich, and the poor -- then we must confront the issue of rationing and the fundamental question of how we are going to manage the "right" to health care.

**BEPKO:** That was an excellent summary, Ed.

**KOLESKI:** Most of these are major national issues. Did he suggest any kind of things that people within health care systems could do?

**ROBBINS:** Some of these are being addressed by some health care providers and by employers and their employees. For example, the issue of whether or not health care costs ought to be increased for people who smoke or people who over eat and whether or not certain kinds of things ought to be excluded from health care coverage, such as head injuries resulting from motorcycle accidents when a helmet hasn't been worn. There may be others that you could deal with in an individual health care system for a particular employer and the employees.

**KOLESKI:** People who handle our systems might give us periodic suggestions as to what we might do ourselves. Some of this we are going to have to do for ourselves.

**BEPKO:** Such as suggestions on how to lead a healthier life.

KOLESKI: That is right.

BEPKO: I think the University on this campus has already done a great deal of that. We have several programs, I think the most prominent of which has been the MaxWell Program, although it has been cut back some because of funding problems. We have campus wide health and wellness efforts underway (exercise, reducing smoking, reducing weight). We have taken that initiative ourselves and I think it is a very important thing to continue to do. One might argue about whether that really reduces costs. The argument has been that it only postpones costs and may make them higher because, if you are healthy enough, you may live to the point where you will have one of those really expensive diseases. I say that partly to be lighthearted, but I think there isn't clearly the same kind of cost savings that can be produced by other initiatives which are being looked at by the University right now. It would not surprise me if various forms of managed care that reduce costs weren't brought to you for your consideration at some point. At least the industry has data showing it reduces costs. The type of thing that they have in mind is making contracts so that you have fewer options and our health care needs would be channeled into fewer providers that would give better prices for the services they perform. You would have options that would be available to you to go outside the system, but you wouldn't get a full 100 percent reimbursement or you would get a lower percentage of reimbursement outside the system than you would in it. It is clear that health care is a problem. I don't know how serious of a problem you think it is, but it depends on how you view the resources that are allocated to other things within the University. It is clear that over the last five years, and even more so over the next five years, we are going to be reallocating from other activities to pay for the costs of health care. Health care costs this year are estimated to go up 22 or 24 percent. That type of increase is projected for the next five years. Thank you, Ed.

Next, we have a report from the Faculty Affairs Committee by Kathleen Warfel.

WARFEL: I have three handouts for this presentation. [see IUPUI Circulars 92-09, 92-10, and 92-11 attached] I am here from the Faculty Affairs Committee to recommend to you that we create two new standing committees. I know that some of you are going to moan and say, "The last thing we need is more committees. We don't have enough time to do our work as it is." Let's examine the situations which are involved.

The first situation is that the administration is creating a new office of Planning and Institutional Improvement. We have heard that Trudy Banta is essentially coming as our new Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement. The Faculty Affairs Committee believes that it is very important that the Faculty Council and the faculty as a whole have some way of being involved from day one with the shaping of that new office and assisting the new Vice-Chancellor in developing methods practice and style practice in this very important new office. For that reason, we are proposing that we create a new committee -- the Faculty Planning Committee. The suggested details are on IUPUI Circular 92-10. This committee would have a membership that would include at least one representative from the IUPUI Executive Committee, the IUPUI Tenure Committee, and the other IUPUI Faculty Council standing committees, plus additional individuals as indicated. All of these members would be appointed by the Executive Committee, as is the case with all standing committees.

This committee shall be responsible for ongoing communication with the Administration, particularly with the Office for Planning and Institutional Improvement. In this regard, the committee will not itself be the faculty planning body, but will meet regularly with the Vice Chancellor for Planning and



will work to involve the Faculty Council and its various other committees appropriately and in a timely manner in institutional planning at IUPUI. The IUPUI Faculty Council and the Executive Committee will continue to be the decision making bodies of the faculty.

The last part of this I wrote as a response to early concerns. This was talked about at Faculty Council, the Executive Committee, and with the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The thing brought up most often was, "Why do we need another committee? Why can't the Executive Committee do this?" Our feeling is that the Executive Committee already has more to do every year than it can accomplish. Before I move on to our second situation and our second proposal, maybe we could discuss this idea.

**BEPKO:** From the standpoint of the administration, it sounds like a very good idea. I don't want to kill the idea by indicating that administration thinks it is a good idea. I think it is a very important step.

**KOLESKI:** I would like to commend the Administration of the University for making the move to develop a Department on Planning and Institutional Improvement. I think that such a move is in the right direction. About ten years ago, I came from a University that had a planning department in the administrative offices. As time passed, that department seemed to play a more and more significant role in the projections and assessment of goals and outcomes in the operation of that university as time moved on. It seems to me that this is going to be a most significant effort or endeavor on this campus. At the same time, it seems to me that, if we are talking about outcomes of other kinds of things, we are really talking about linking of performance to goals and outcomes of academic programs, administrative efforts and support services. Certainly, of course, with the schools, academic departments, and faculty members of the university being appraised in performance as to what they do, I think that a committee of the faculty, working with the particular person who heads Planning and Institutional Improvement very closely, is really quite essential.

**PARSONS:** I was wondering about making a smaller committee. Also, if you had thought about perhaps picking out fewer numbers of standing committees so that you don't end up increasing their workload.

**WARFEL:** I think those are perfectly reasonable suggestions. One of the reasons that we are presenting this today is that we want to have something in place by the end of the academic year. We thought that this was a reasonable starting point. If we talk about it today, we can approve it at the next Council meeting and have a committee in place when the new Vice-Chancellor walks in the door. It may be that we find this committee too cumbersome. It can be trimmed down relatively easily. One of the reasons for including a member of each of the standing committees was that this committee might serve two purposes. One, an official interface with the Vice-Chancellor and the other, a time when one member of all the committees is in the same room and there is some communication among the committees as well as between the committees and the Vice-Chancellor. We are not saying that this is perfect, but we think it is a good starting point.

**MCDONALD:** Another idea might be to have representatives from various schools. That doesn't do anything about the size, but when you are talking about evaluation and effect of the programs, one faculty member cannot be very valuable in judging activities of a school which is not his/her own. There would be some reason to have some type of representation from every school.

**WARFEL:** The way this is proposed, the Executive Committee could add as many school representatives as it wishes.

**BEPKO:** It may be that the makeup of the office will be such that it will work directly with school faculties. Outcomes assessment has to be faculty generated. I think you are right, Dana. It has to be generated in the disciplines in which it will be applied. I think that is the conception we have of the office. But, I think it would be helpful to have a campus wide group as well for liaison purposes and to get a campus perspective on all of the things that are going on. In other words, I don't think it is as important to have each school represented on this committee because the office is going to work with the school faculties. It will not be an office that will generate things. It will be an office that will encourage the generation of things within the schools.

**ROBBINS:** There may be some small opportunity to do that within the committee because the composition of the standing committees of the Council includes individuals who represent various schools as well. Therefore, the Executive Committee might also distribute that across the schools in its attempt to identify the most appropriate person from the Faculty Council committees.

**BEPKO:** If you have 13 people, you will probably cover 12 of the schools. It is unusual, I believe, to have more than one chair from a school.

**NATHAN:** I think there will be other committees which will work with this Vice-Chancellor. It appears to me that it is very important that there be a faculty governance committee, not representing the schools, but representing faculty governance. That is what I hear being proposed.

**PETERSON:** From that perspective, this committee would be sensitive to reaching out to the schools and working with this Vice-Chancellor in that interaction with the schools and their individual faculties, as I see it.

**WARFEL:** There is so much unknown about how this is going to develop. I think that this committee would have a lot of flexibility and it would have enough people in enough different places that it would facilitate communication.

**GALANTI:** Are we contemplating that the representatives would be the chairs of the standing committees?

**WARFEL:** We didn't specify that. I think, ideally, it would be the chair of the standing committee, assuming that the chair is the person most actively involved in the committee, most knowledgeable, and charting the course of that committee. On the other hand, there are some times when a particular chair says, "If I have to do one thing more, I am not going to be chair." There are always many people who are active in a given committee. We left the flexibility in there.

The other thing we want to do something about is the IUPUI Faculty Handbook. The last IUPUI Faculty Handbook was dated 1984. Many people for many years have recognized how useful it would be to have an updated version of that. The Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to think about the Handbook and come up with suggestions. Most of our suggestions are on IUPUI Circular 92-09. At least it starts there.

A lot of the work in this regard was done by the Handbook Committee which was chaired by Ed Byrne. The members are listed on the second page (see IUPUI Circular 92-09) and they deserve a

lot of credit. This turned out to be a lot more work than one would think at the beginning. The suggestions are presented to you today in categories. We have suggestions for the Format, Contents, and for the Process (See IUPUI Circular 92-09). I will go through each one of these individually.

Format.

1. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook will contain important policies, procedures and other information pertinent to faculty life at IUPUI. It will not reduplicate information already in the Indiana University Academic Handbook.
2. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook will be made available to all faculty.
  - a. All IUPUI full-time faculty will receive a copy of the initial new handbook.
  - b. All new IUPUI full-time faculty will receive a copy of the handbook at the time of appointment.
  - c. Annual changes in the handbook will be distributed to all IUPUI full-time faculty.
3. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook should be published in a loose-leaf format so that future revisions and additions will not require reduplication of the entire volume.
4. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook will include a preface, a table of contents, and an index. (In addition to citing pages in the IUPUI Faculty Handbook itself, the index might refer faculty to appropriate sections of the Indiana University Academic Handbook.)
5. The source of each item in the IUPUI Faculty Handbook will be indicated (e.g., passed by IUPUI Faculty Council, 9/xx/89).
6. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook will include a page listing a history of all revisions made, including the dates and nature of all updates after the initial publication.

Content.

1. The IUPUI Faculty Handbook will contain items deemed appropriate from the following sources:
  - a. policies passed by the IUPUI Faculty Council
  - b. administrative policies and procedures of particular importance to faculty
  - c. other general information about IUPUI

The subcommittee looked at a number of things. We looked at the old IUPUI Handbook, Indiana University Academic Handbook, IUPUI Academic Procedure Manual and brainstormed. From that the subcommittee came up with the ultimate table of contents. The ultimate contents are not ready to go to press as yet. We submit to the Council today this four-page draft of table of contents (see IUPUI Circular 92-09, pages 3-6). We hope it will be accepted as a guide to the future. On it you can see that several items have been starred. These items are ready to go to press and are also very core essential items of information. We would suggest that core be put together now, ready to go as the first edition of the new IUPUI Handbook. I think it would be important to get some sort of Handbook out and then work on making it a more complete

document. I worry that if we wait to get the ultimate handbook, we won't ever see it.

It was all well and good for those of us on the Faculty Affairs Committee to sit around and think about what ought to be in the Handbook, but when it comes to really deciding its contents, input from administration is needed. Clearly, when it comes to paying for the Handbook and producing it, you have to have input from administration. We are proposing that we create a committee that will have both faculty and administrative members who will be able to continue to develop the Handbook and produce it.

The details of that proposed second standing committee, called the IUPUI Handbook Committee, are on page two of IUPUI Circular 92-09. I don't believe that what is written here goes beyond what I have already said so I am not going to read it to you. We would be interested in your reactions to the idea of a Handbook Committee.

**PARSONS:** I guess my first reaction is whether or not it is really a task for a standing committee or whether it might better be a task for a special committee that would disband once we have it ready. It seems to me that would mainly be a matter of maintenance of the Handbook which could then be handled by a standing committee.

**WARFEL:** Whatever form the Handbook Committee takes, whether it is a standing committee or an ad hoc committee, I predict, if they do their job, they are going to be very busy for two years. After that, I think it would settle into a situation of reviewing it, thinking about changes which may occur, etc. There would be much less work for the committee to do. On the other hand, we have a concern that, if it is not a standing committee, it will dwindle. I think both sides of this can be argued.

**VESSELY:** I think in the eight years which I have spent on the Executive Committee we have talked every year about the need for the Handbook. It has been precisely eight years since the last Handbook. Thus, I would support the notion of a standing Handbook committee so that it is not left up to the whim or the collective wisdom or lack of wisdom of a particular group to decide if now is the time to revise the Handbook. It is an ongoing process that happens every year and the task for that group of people who are appointed for that purpose.

**NATHAN:** It is similar to a Bylaws Committee. If it isn't there, it won't function. Also, the linkage to the IU Handbook and the monitoring of what is happening there, needs to happen. We have had situations where we have not been involved in looking at that IU Handbook and, unless there is a group responsible for that, we will have that problem again.

**WARFEL:** Because we only have one more month left this year to get these committees done, if we are going to get them done. I breezed this by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. They have asked for specific suggested language in regard to amending the Bylaws. (See Circular 92-10). If you have comments about the particular language that has been suggested by us that you think could be improved, you could state that now or contact Hitwant Sidhu before the next meeting. IUPUI Circular 92-11 is a trimmed down version of IUPUI Circular 92-10.

**BEPKO:** Are there any other comments? Thanks, Kathleen. Those are good suggestions. Our next report is from the Fringe Benefits Committee with Roko Aliprantis.

**ALIPRANTIS:** I have two items from the Fringe Benefits Committee. First, I would like to report to you that the IU Board of Trustees in their last meeting said that there will be no more reductions in the 18/20 program.

The second item has to do with transferability. As you may remember, a year ago, we talked about transferability from the TIAA/CREF retirement funds. We had a motion and a resolution that were tabled because we could not figure out the cost of transferring funds from one vendor to another. This year the administration came up with a proposal which exclusively said that it would cost \$31,000 to do the following: Your retirement money should go to TIAA/CREF as usual. From there, TIAA/CREF agreed you can transfer your money (once a month at a minimum of \$1,000) to some outside vendor. It is anticipated that an appropriate committee will choose two outside vendors. So, there would be a proposal to UFC on April 14th for approval of such a proposal with a suggestion that the administrative cost should be passed to people adopting this new benefit. Our committee recommended approval of this proposal. So, if this resolution is adopted, if this were passed, then Indiana University would give you, for the first time, the option of investing your money outside of TIAA/CREF.

**KASPER:** The other piece of that was that the money not be taken out of the General Operating Fund.

**PARSONS:** Your use of the word "transfer", would they be transferring funds which are already held by TIAA/CREF?

**ALIPRANTIS:** Yes. If our resolution to UFC is adopted, then you would be able to send a letter or a note to TIAA/CREF saying, "I want \$2,000 to go to Fidelity." If you go there, it is up to you to monitor it. There will be a cost. The proposal asserts that it will cost the IU system \$31,000.

**ROBBINS:** Just a clarification on the cost. TIAA/CREF has indicated that they would be willing, at least for the time being, to handle the transfer to other vendors. The costs associated with the University's administering the program include notifying faculty about this option and advising them about the implications of investing their retirement contributions from the University into one of these other funds. The resolution of our Fringe Benefits Committee was that there should be a mechanism by which any such costs to the University ought to be paid by those who ultimately opt to have their funds transferred from TIAA/CREF to some second or third vendor.

**ALIPRANTIS:** At this time TIAA/CREF will not charge a transfer fee. However, they reserve the right to charge such a fee in the future.

**BEPKO:** Does anyone have any figures on how other funds did as compared with CREF?

**ALIPRANTIS:** CREF seems to be among the leading funds. Only some Fidelity funds are performing a little bit better than CREF. Of course, it is very difficult to compare the newly-created CREF funds with the existing old funds in the market.

**ROBBINS:** Just another clarification. The proposal was that these alternate vendors would be vendors who had "families of funds." That is, they would have funds such as the various categories of funds that exists within Fidelity, such as growth funds, income, and bond funds. Your contributions would be distributed to any one of the funds within the family you selected.

BEPKO: Thanks, Roko. Are there any other comments?

**AGENDA ITEM VII - Constitution and Bylaws Committee Report - Hitwant Sidhu**

BEPKO: We have the Constitution and Bylaws Committee report but it is my understanding that the report is not ready. In any event, its chair Hitwant Sidhu is not here today. Unless I hear to the contrary, we will table the Constitution and Bylaws Committee Report until the May meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM VIII - Question-and-Answer Period**

BEPKO: The next item is the Question-and-Answer Period. We are going to use the question and answer period to provide some information about a project that is underway at the University. Indeed, we have been asked about this project. It is a project that involves the image or identity of Indiana University across the eight campuses and the development of a logo or typeface that can be used in letterheads and identifiers for other documents. Doug Wilson's office in Bloomington has led this project. They are getting closer to the point where they would like to actually have the Trustees adopt some new identifier for Indiana University. We thought that you should see this and have an opportunity to make your views known by way of a form for providing comments. To take you through the suggestions which are being made now by Doug Wilson's office, Glenna Dudley, Director of Community Relations for the campus, will show slides on what they have in mind

DUDLEY: Let me begin by saying these slides were not intended nor were they devised by the School of Optometry nor the Department of Ophthalmology. For those of you sitting beyond the halfway point in the room will probably have difficulty with some of the slides because of the level of detail that they have tried to get in proposing all of the various alternatives. The slides are pretty much a self-contained unit. There is about a month's worth of time for some concentrated opinion gathering. It is really more appropriate for showing to a school or a department rather than a group this large. Many of you may have seen earlier generations of this same process. It has been going on now for almost two years. It started when a national group, which Vice President Wilson brought together to talk about the University's identity, was confronted with the fact that the University has as many identities as it has different units, entities, and departments within it. [Glenna showed slides of various logo suggestions and styles.] (See Circular 92-11) Four different graphic designers from around the system were asked to put together what you see before you. You have before you an evaluation sheet. Please mark down your comments and thoughts about it. If you have questions, Lisa Hite-Wadler from the IUPUI Publications Office, is a graphic designer and she might be able to answer some of your questions.

The other plan is that, once there has been a mark, an identity established, there will be a standards manual to describe the numbers of logos that can be associated with which type and how it is arranged and used. The other aim is to devise a method with maximum flexibility.

HITE-WADLER: The examples they are using with the University seal, can two seals be used together?

DUDLEY: Each designer, as they established the four samples that you are going to see, made suggested proposals for which seals could be used with it. One is, in fact, a new seal and would eliminate the other seals. These are the type of things on which they are seeking input. If you have thoughts about a particular word mark on a sample sheet and you feel that the relationship of

the seals ought to have different possibilities than those that you see, those would be appropriate comments. It would also be appropriate for you to indicate your preferences. If you feel strongly about one, if you feel neutral about all of them, if you like some, if you don't like others, or if you just want to go first, second, third, and last, that would also be appropriate.

**ALIPRANTIS:** Shouldn't the name of the School of Science be the IUPUI School of Science?

**BEPKO:** That is not the way the Board of Trustees see it.

**KECK:** Since this logo situation was mandated by the IU Board of Trustees, I wondered if the Purdue Board of Trustees also supported subsuming all of the Purdue School of Science and Engineering and Technology under Indiana University as a primary logo and then Purdue's logo underneath it?

**BEPKO:** I don't think the Trustees of either University mandate any particular logo unless it is recommended to them. I don't think they will want to decide what we put on our stationery. The issue here has to do mainly with selecting which of the four general themes or artistic renderings of the wording of the University is most appealing. I think that is the main question. With respect to Roko's question though, in particular, he was saying that the name of the School of Science should be the IUPUI School of Science. I said that was not the way the Board of Trustees saw it because both the Purdue and Indiana Trustees have said that the name of the school is the Purdue School of Science at IUPUI, IUPUI being the corporate name for the campus, but the school name is Purdue as it is with Engineering and Technology, just as it is with the School of Nursing. It is the IU School of Nursing. There is no IUPUI school as such.

**DUDLEY:** One of the other comments that perhaps would be appropriate here too was the designers have shown the various subdivisions. That has, in part, come out because of earlier meetings and sessions with other groups of people who have posed "what if?" or "How do I replace my identity if I am going to have to give up the way I am doing it now?" While there is a great deal of depth shown here, it wouldn't necessarily be used.

**ALIPRANTIS:** We cannot identify ourselves when we go to conferences. If we send a letter overseas or anywhere, using our letterhead, people should be able to tell who we are. The point should be well taken that once we establish ourselves as IUPUI, we should put it best so people can understand it. I don't think it comes out from this new logo.

**VESSELY:** Roko, I agree with you wholeheartedly, but we should be realistic. We are down to four choices and we should have as much input as we can in these four choices so that we don't end up with the one that we didn't want picked and someone would say, "Well, you didn't tell us what you really thought."

**DUDLEY:** Make the points on your sheet that you are making about the overall identity issue. Would you would please cast your votes even if you don't like any of them.

**KOLESKI:** I assume that you showed us the maximum amount of material or printing that could be placed on a letterhead. Since people seem to be apprehensive about the amount of information that you presented on each sheet of paper, I presume that a school could choose to do less with it if it wanted to do so. So, it may not be as big a problem as we think.

**DUDLEY:** Furthermore, this is an evolutionary process. This has been going on for about two years. Lots of things have been added as people asked the question "How do I make this particular point about myself?" While it is likely that the standards manual will provide an explanation for how to explain that level of detail if you feel it is necessary, it depends upon whether or not you feel it is necessary. It is to provide as many options as possible within a standard framework.

**BALDWIN:** What will be the level of the standards manual? Obviously, it is not at the campus level because on that same slide, there is one unit which is listed as Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis and the next slide down, the School of Medicine is listed as Indiana University. So, the campus is not always the top line, is that correct?

**BEPKO:** I think that is a recurring problem. I think it has been addressed in one way and that is to say that the entire Medical Center is located on the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis. I think you are raising a question that has been discussed a lot. A few years ago, we said let's simplify the whole issue and change the name to IPI and there was great resistance to that for a variety of reasons. We dropped the project because generally the faculty did not want to change what we have now.

**BALDWIN:** At one time, as I understand it, there was a provision that whatever name we came up with, had to have both Indiana and Purdue in the title which doesn't give you much leeway.

**BEPKO:** One thing that was clear about it all was that there were very strong feelings in lots of places on campus that what we have now is better than all the alternatives that would have been available. We can't decide to change the name of the University and drop the Indiana and the Purdue identification unless we want to support Larry Borst's political movement which I think would not be good.

**DUDLEY:** I don't think I clearly explained this at the beginning. This is a system wide project. The designers designed a logo, a type style, and a word mark in such a way that it could be used at any campus of Indiana University. Many of the examples are IUPUI because we represented some of the most complex examples.

**VESSELY:** What happens when somebody doesn't follow this and does their own stationery? For example, I have friends who send me ads from the Chronicle of Higher Education that say Indiana University at Indianapolis and they want to know if that is the same place as IUPUI? What happens to those people when they run an ad in the Chronicle of Higher Education and disavow the fact that we voted collectively, like it or not, that this be IUPUI and not Indiana University at Indianapolis?

**DUDLEY:** I think those are some of the kinds of issues that the existence of a standards manual will attempt to address.

**BEPKO:** I think that is one of the issues that you inevitably come to. If what you are saying is that you want to hire a new chair in the department of pediatrics, and you want to announce it Indiana University School of Medicine. I don't think that is going to change. It will be the same whether it is the School of Dentistry, the School of Law, or the School of Social Work.

**VESSELY:** It isn't the same for the School of Liberal Arts, for example. It is not Indiana University School of Liberal Arts. It is not generally promoted here. We do with the School of Medicine and the School of Law, but it doesn't seem that some of the other schools promote it that way. It is



an Indiana University school. That is correct. But, we at least say -- at IUPUI. We don't create an Indiana University at Indianapolis where there isn't one.

BEPKO: I agree with that. The whole effort here is designed to try to reign in some of the deviation that has cropped up. I think that to assume the University will be able to have one single standards manual and that everyone will have to originally adhere to it, is probably overstating what can be accomplished. What I think the President wants to do, and he is the one who initiated it, is try to tighten things up. He gave the job to Doug Wilson and Doug has been trying to figure how to do it for the last couple of years. It is not an easy task and it raises all kinds of political issues that may be outside of what seems to be the initial range of topics that you encounter when you are trying to come up with new logos. That makes it very difficult.

BALDWIN: I think one thing that could be done is to require that every official document from each campus have on it the official name of the campus.

DUDLEY: The standards manual will probably be the subject of another series of meetings.

BEPKO: I think that is right. We have gotten ourselves way into the complexities of trying to identify every department and deal with the most complex departments. The real issue here is not how to solve these problems, it is which of these four themes is the most attractive? Then, people could start to work on how to figure out how we will describe the Geology department which is an Indiana University degree program at a Purdue school at IUPUI -- one of Indiana University's eight front doors.

ALIPRANTIS: I think we should have the IUPUI name on the top of every letterhead used by the IUPUI personnel.

KECK: I just want to make sure I understand what is trying to be resolved. Am I correct that the logos that could be used on official stationery or cards would be only one of the two -- the block logo or the seal? The Purdue schools could no longer use the Purdue seal?

DUDLEY: What you see are the designers' suggestions as to the appropriate use. The numbers of seals that can be used with the name, the appropriate placement of the seals, the variety of the seals, and the combination of seals are the issues that ultimately will be resolved by this standards group that will decide where a Purdue seal goes in relation to an IU seal or having other seals. For example, the Malaysia Program, could they have a seal at each level -- an IU seal, an IUPUI seal, a Malaysia Program seal, etc.?

BEPKO: I think we may have gone further into the complexities than we should have. The four different examples that you have on the response sheet are the things that, in the short term, Doug Wilson's office wants to get feedback on. In fact, I don't think any standards committee is going to resolve these complex questions. Those are going to have to be resolved by practice and by individual negotiations with whoever is responsible for policing this. It will probably be the President. My guess is that there will be lots of flexibility.

DUDLEY: Marcia Busch-Jones, director of University Relations, would like your reactions. If you have taken the time to write your reactions as we have gone through the presentation and want to leave them with me today, I will be happy to deliver them to her. If you want to take it with you and spend more time on, her address is on the bottom of the evaluation form you have. If any of

**IUPUI Faculty Council Meeting**  
**April 2, 1992**

you would like to arrange for the carousel so you can have a meeting with your own school or department or another group on the campus, just give me a call and let me know. However, we would like your input within the next three to four weeks.

**AGENDA ITEM IX - Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

**AGENDA ITEM X - New Business**

**BEPKO:** I just have one footnote. As you can see, Henry Karlson, who is the Parliamentarian, was not here today and Dick Fredland served as Parliamentarian. I want to say publicly that his performance was flawless. [laughter]

**FREDLAND:** I just think that the opportunity to sit at the table and see Bill Plater and Henry Karlson both gone, I am delighted I could be here.

**AGENDA ITEM XI - Adjournment**

**BEPKO:** If there is no further business, we are adjourned.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING  
MAY 7, 1992  
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116  
3:30 - 5:30 P.M.

*approved*  
*9/3/92*

**Members Present:** Administrative: Chancellor Gerald L. Bepko, Dean William Plater. Deans: John Barlow, P Nicholas Kellum, R Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, David Stocum, William Voos. Elected Faculty: Margaret Applegate, Henry Besch, Sally Bowman, Linda Brothers, Janice Bruckner, Walter Buchanan, Lucinda Carr, Elaine Cooney, Philip Coons, Carol Deets, Eleanor Donnelly, Paul Galanti, Dean Hawley, Raymond Koleski, Linda marler, James McAteer, Dana McDonald, Richard Meiss, B. Keith Moore, Sandra Morzorati, James Murphy, Richard Peterson, Eric Pumroy, Terry Reed, Norris Richmond, Phyllis Scherle, William Schneider, P Kent Sharp, Hitwant Sidhu, Jan Tenebaum, Kathleen Warfel, Henry Wellman, Donald Wong, Charles Yokomoto, Lei Lu.

**Alternates Present:** Deans: James Carter for Walter Daly, Shirley Yegerlehner for Barbara Fischler, Tom Allington for Norman Lefstein, Shirley Ross for Angela McBride, Hugh Wolf for Donald Warren, J M Ebbert for James Weigand. Elected Faculty: Bart Ng for C D Aliprantis, Catherine Rhoades for Janice Froehlich, Steven Schmidt for Jean Gnat, Bernadette Rodak for Linda Kasper, James Wallihan for Michael Parsons, Julie Fore for Margaret Richwine.

**Members Absent:** Administrative: J. Herman Blake. Deans: A James Barnes, Trevor Brown, H William Gilmore, Jack Wentworth. Elected Faculty: Veda Ackerman, Thomas Ambrose, Darrell Bailey, James Baldwin, Anne Belcher, Victor Childers, Anne Donchin, John Emhardt, William Engle, Naomi Fineberg, Mary Fisher, LaForrest Garner, Philip Gibbs, Michael Gleeson, Michael Kubek, John Lappas, Richard Lawlor, Steven Leapman, Douglas Lees, Golam Mannan, Steven Mazzuca, Patrick McGeever, Sherry Queener, Jeffrey Rasmussen, Frederick Rescorla, Sherry Ricciardi, Edward Robbins, Neal Rothman, Philip Scarpino, Edmund Schilling, Gregory Sutton, Richard Turner, Vernon Vix, Kathryn Wilson.

**Ex Officio Members Present:** Henry Karlson. **Ex Officio Members Absent:** Juanita Keck, Melissa Lalich, Gerald Powers, Maxine Tutterrow, Jeffery Vessely.

**Visitors Present:** Erwin Boschmann, Richard Fredland, Mark Grove, Carol Nathan.

#### **AGENDA ITEM I - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS**

**BEPKO:** We are ready to begin our last Faculty Council meeting of the academic year. Judging by the size of the group today it appears that some have already begun their summer recess.

There are two items which I have to present today. The first has to do with the administrative review procedures which we adopted last year. We are required to report to you on the administrators' reviews that will take place in the forthcoming year -- 1992-93, in this case. We have planned to do one campus administrator, Dean Tim Langston, who is the Dean for Student Affairs, and four academic unit deans -- Jim Brown, Dean of Journalism for Indianapolis programs and Associate Dean in the School of Journalism; William Voos, Dean of the Herron School of Art; William Gilmore, Dean of the School of Dentistry; and Walter Daly, Dean of the School of Medicine. In the case of the School of Medicine, we plan to experiment with something that we think is contemplated by the review procedure, and that is to invite a person or persons from other universities, someone who will agree to join with the review to try to make absolutely certain that we have a national perspective in the review of the School of Medicine.

The second item which I would like to report is something which will happen tomorrow. I am pleased to say that, if all goes well between now and 1:15 tomorrow afternoon, there will be a report of a substantial grant provided for the Center on Urban Policy and the Environment. This is a center that has grown up administratively as a part of the School of Public and Environmental Affairs, but there are substantial commitments and substantial involvement on the part of the School of Liberal Arts. Also, Bill Plater has played a very important role in the shepherding of this project to the point where we are now. We are delighted that we were able to provide for you that there will be an announcement, we hope, that an \$8.5 million grant will be forthcoming for the first five years of this center. It is a center that is perfect for IUPUI because it not only is interdisciplinary in the best sense of that expression, but it is also a part of our overall commitment to be the urban university of the future. We think that in the not-too-distant future our urban policy studies will be catapulted into the national forefront and will be known all across the country for the high quality urban studies that take place here and for how we have helped the city of Indianapolis and the state of Indiana deal with the urban problems of the 21st century.

#### **AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 6, 1992**

**BEPKO:** I would like to ask for approval of the minutes of the February 6, 1992, meeting which were appended to the agenda for today's meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

**MCDONALD:** I move for the approval. **BESCH:** I second that motion.

**BEPKO:** Thank you. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None] The minutes will be placed in our permanent file.

#### **AGENDA ITEM III - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT - RICHARD PETERSON, SECRETARY**

**BEPKO:** Our next agenda item is the Executive Committee report made by Dick Peterson.

**PETERSON:** I have two items today. One is the resolution which you should have picked up on your way in regarding the University Faculty Council Constitutional amendments which are currently being discussed on campuses across the University. Some of the persons here today met on April 30 for a discussion regarding these Constitutional amendments. One of the things that came up during that discussion was that that group was strong supportive of the Constitutional revisions, but we will wanted to emphasize the principle which had been supported from this campus over a long period of time. I would ask for this Council's support of this resolution. This will be included, along with the material that goes out when the Constitution goes out for an all-faculty, across-all-units-of-the-University vote to see whether or not these amendments would be approved. It reads as follows:

***IUPUI supports the principle that the University Faculty Council should have an elected faculty member as the presiding officer. Despite a difference from this principle in the current amendments for constitutional revisions, IUPUI supports the positive changes which these revisions would bring to the UFC and recommends support of this document by a vote for approval.***

The reason that I would like to do this is that there might be enough discontent about the particular issue that the President still presides over the University Faculty Council that people might vote

negatively on this. I would like to see a positive vote from this campus and I would like to have you support this resolution regarding this. We can open this up for discussion and then I will entertain a motion related to that.

**MCDONALD:** What is the sense of the rest of the campuses?

**PETERSON:** About the Constitution or about this particular point? It is mixed. I think there is some positive and some negative. I think, basically, people think it is not time for a faculty member to be the head of the University Faculty Council. Bloomington is strongly against moving the President out as head of the University Faculty Council. It is almost a block vote. Some of the smaller campuses spoke in favor of it and some spoke against it. Some of the University Faculty Council members from here voted against it at the vote that was taken at the University Faculty Council when this was approved by Faculty Council. It is mixed across the board on this issue. We were strongly, as a Council, in support of this and, as a campus, we strongly supported this concept as we changed our Constitution here. The people who met last Thursday were also strongly in support of at least making our feelings known on that, but also showing our degree of support for the benefits that the University Faculty Council constitution will bring to us. I encourage all of you to vote for those revisions. I also want to encourage others on campus to vote.

**SIDHU:** What was the reason for taking another vote when we had already approved of that?

**PETERSON:** A resolution from the campuses can go along with the Constitution as it goes out for a vote. Simply, all I am saying is that, if you are supportive of this, I will say it is endorsed by this body.

**WALLIHAN:** A motion is in order then? **PETERSON:** Yes.

**WALLIHAN:** I move the adoption of this. **BESCH:** I second that motion.

**PETERSON:** Are there any other comments or questions? If not, if you are all in favor of this, will you please say, "Aye?" Are there any opposed? [None] Thank you very much.

There is one other item that the Secretary, and subsequently the President, is supposed to do each year and that is to report on Faculty Boards of Review which have met and have reached a resolution and also give some superficial information on the level of those resolutions. Indeed, it keeps the Secretary, and it will keep our new President busy, having people call you on the telephone on a fairly regular basis about various complaints against their administrators. You have quite a bit of this going on. I have fairly hefty files in at least 10 cases in my file drawers in my room. I will gladly hand those over to Dick Fredland, of course, and he can handle them from now on. Some of these may be continuing and some may not. Several of these have come to the point of officially requesting a Faculty Board of Review.

Relative to that, on two of those cases that requested a specific Faculty Board of Review, I was able to intervene with the administration and work out a satisfactory resolution before a Faculty Board of Review needed to get involved. That was satisfying to me to know that could be done. I don't think everyone was 100 percent satisfied, but at least it prevented those cases from going to a Faculty Board of Review and there was a resolution that was reasonable.

A third case went to a Faculty Board of Review. The Faculty Board of Review met for a period of

time and the faculty member finally realized it would be better if he ended up negotiating an agreement with the administration on his particular case. That was resolved through an administrative resolution with that faculty member's lawyer and the administration. I don't know what the details were, but there was a retirement policy set up for him so that he could retire in good grace as a result of that. That Board of Review never completed its actions because it was resolved before that.

Two other Boards of Review completed their actions. Many of you who are in this room worked on those Faculty Boards of Review. Certainly your duties and work on those are very much appreciated. Relative to that, there were some mixed results that came out. Some of the recommendations were in favor of the faculty member and some were in favor of the administration. They were clear resolutions one way or the other. Administration has responded to the recommendations that were made in both of these cases. Again, not always to everybody's full satisfaction, but, indeed, they accepted the recommendations to the best of their ability to resolve these cases. In both of these cases, there were faculty members who were not being reappointed before they came up for a tenure review. In one case the resolution was that the faculty member should go to another unit of the University for a two-year period of time and then make a transition to a new job some place else from that other position in the University. That was partly because of the contest that was going on between the administration and the faculty. It wasn't felt that it would be a good thing for that faculty member to remain in that position. This faculty member refused that resolution and, indeed, allowed his appointment to terminate. It will terminate on June 30, 1992 and he will go on to something else after that time. Also in that case, some recommendations related to other people in that unit as far as counseling was concerned, and other issues related to trying to prevent problems of a similar nature in the future.

The last case I would like to review briefly for you has recently completed its consideration and recommendations have gone forward. Again, there were favorable comments in both directions but, indeed, the non-reappointment stood for that faculty member. He was given an additional resolution of this. I don't know whether he will accept that or not. He has not come to the point of accepting that. But, there is a mediated resolution which, hopefully, will be satisfactory for that faculty member so that he might make a transition again to a new job. In that particular case there were some recommendations by the Faculty Board of Review within the school itself. Some problems existed in that school and there were recommendations by that Faculty Board of Review that some of those problems should be addressed and that appropriate action should be taken, again, so that issues like this would not come up again in that school. That completes my report.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IV - ELECTION OF EXECUTIVE, NOMINATING, AND TENURE COMMITTEES**

**BEPKO:** Our next item is the election of the Executive, Nominating, and Tenure committees. Kathleen Warfel will present this item.

**WARFEL:** We have three separate ballots. Each of the ballots indicate how many persons who are to vote for. If you are not a member, please do not take a ballot. (The results of the election were as follows:)

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:** Paul Galanti, School of Law; Jean Gnat, University Library; William Schneider, School of Liberal Arts; and Hitwant Sidhu, School of Physical Education.

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE:** Frances Brahmi, School of Medicine; Michael Cohen, School of Education; Paul Galanti, School of Law; and Susan Zunt, School of Dentistry.

Susan received the highest number of votes and, therefore, will chair the Nominating Committee in the second year of her term. James McAteer is the chairman of the Nominating Committee next year.

**TENURE COMMITTEE:** Edmund Byrne, School of Liberal Arts; Betsy Joyce, School of Nursing, and Richard Pflanzner, School of Science.

May I have permission to destroy the ballots?

**BEPKO:** I will take that as a motion. Do I hear a second? [seconded] All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None] The ballots will be destroyed.

#### **AGENDA ITEM V - PROPOSED ACADEMIC CALENDAR**

**BEPKO:** Let's go on to the next agenda item which is the proposed academic calendars which comes to us from the Academic Affairs Committee. Dick Peterson will present this item.

**PETERSON:** JoAnn Switzer was unable to be here today. Jim Baldwin presented this to us at the last meeting. Unfortunately, we received this at the time of the meeting last time and we did not take a vote on this. This requires a vote on our part to approve of the calendars. We have a number of years of calendars which are being presented to you today. Hopefully, you have looked all of this over and are secure as to your activities for the rest of your lives here at IUPUI. In reality, as Jim Baldwin and Gene Tempel explained to us last time, we need to make some long-term plans relative to reservations at the Hoosier Dome for graduation. This is one of the reasons why we had to establish some kind of calendar. Mark Grove, IUPUI Registrar, is present today. If there are any questions about these calendars, they can be addressed at this point. There is no reason that we, as a Council, cannot make a change in a calendar that has a complication with it some 10 years in the future as we approach that time. In the meantime, we may want to go with some kind of a standard approval of this so that we can make some of those long term plans that are necessary. Are there any questions or comments?

**COONEY:** Originally, we have Labor Day off and we started our week on a Monday every year. Some of us who have labs found that to be very nice because our labs followed our course schedule very well. I would like to suggest that maybe 10 years from now, or whenever we need to go through this process again, that issue could be looked at again. For some of us, we really liked it the way it was.

**GROVE:** The Calendar Committee looked at that question carefully and Joe Kuczkowski's (School of Science) sense was, even from the School of Science, it was preferable, recognizing the interest of having the Monday and Friday combination, but even with that it was preferable to go with the Wednesday start rather than the Monday start. It is a problem, we understand, but at least there is a correct number of days in there. It was looked at but we would be happy to look at it again. Our intention is to take a look at this every year to see if there are any alterations needed.

**SHARP:** Can we be assured that this will be placed on the agenda every year?

**GROVE:** Yes.

**PETERSON:** I think we can approve of it each year as we are going into the future, but with some restrictions on major changes such as graduation dates, obviously.

**GROVE:** For your information, the West Lafayette campus has approved their calendars through the year 2002 and Bloomington has approved their calendar through the year 2000.

**BEPKO:** This will put us just where we should be -- about four years ahead of Bloomington and about six years ahead of Purdue. [laughter]

**BESCH:** I will move for approval on that basis alone. [laughter]

**BEPKO:** Since this comes from a committee, we don't need a second. All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]

#### **AGENDA ITEM VI - CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE PRESENTATION**

**BEPKO:** Our next agenda item is the Constitution and Bylaws Committee presentation and Hitwant Sidhu will make the presentation as the chair, assisted by Kathleen Warfel.

**SIDHU:** We are bringing three items for your approval and those are the creation of two new committees, changes in the existing committees, and the UFC representation membership to this Council. We are going to take those items separately.

The first item is the creation of two new committees. I am going to request Professor Warfel to speak on that and explain to you why those have been requested by the Executive Committee as well as by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

**WARFEL:** Some of you will recall that at this time last month at this meeting I brought the information concerning these two committees to you from the Faculty Affairs Committee. The proposed language is shown in IUPUI Circular 92-17. The one new committee is wanting to coordinate planning efforts on the campus and the other is to be persistent in getting a handbook put together. The last time we talked about this, the Campus Planning Committee was called the Faculty Planning Committee, so that is one change in the language from the last time. Another change is in composition. The Campus Planning Committee shall include at least one representative from the IUPUI Executive Committee and from the other IUPUI Faculty Council standing committees, plus other members appointed by the Executive Committee. We used to have the Tenure Committee in there also, but, at the suggestion of a number of people, we have dropped a representative from the Tenure Committee. Another change is that the IUPUI Vice-Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement shall be an ex-officio member. That wasn't specified the last time. It seemed to make sense. The duties have not changed for that committee. Are there any questions about what is now called the IUPUI Faculty Council Planning Committee?

**KOLESKI:** I move that we accept the report on the Campus Planning Committee.

**BESCH:** I second that motion.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready for the question? All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]



**WARFEL:** The second new standing committee is the IUPUI Faculty Handbook Committee. There was quite a bit of discussion about the need for this to be a standing committee. As it is written here, it hasn't changed since we discussed it at our last meeting.

**BEPKO:** Does anyone have anything to say about it? I would accept a motion for approval.

**MOORE:** I move we approve the newly-established Handbook Committee.

**UNKNOWN:** I second that motion.

**BEPKO:** All in favor, say "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]

**SIDHU:** The second item is shown on IUPUI Circular 92-15. This regards a change of the charges of three committees. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has approved these changes. Please refer questions regarding this item to Professor Peterson because the item is coming directly from the Executive Committee.

**UNKNOWN:** So moved. **BESCH:** I second that motion.

**BEPKO:** Is there any discussion of this item?

**APPLEGATE:** In looking at the Athletic Affairs Committee, I was absolutely delighted to see the addition of "wellness activities." The question that I have is that there needs to be something of this nature reported in the formulation of the committees. I would hope that the health profession would be well represented on this committee in the future to help meet its charge.

**PETERSON:** There is nothing built into the appointment structure to assure that, but certainly that is one of the things that should be taken into account as these committees are recommended each year as the Executive Committee considers the appointment of those individuals. Those of you who will serve on this year's committee will certainly take that into account as this committee is appointed.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready for the question? All in favor say, "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]

**SIDHU:** The last item is discussed in IUPUI Circular 92-21. The reason for this is that our representatives to the University Faculty Council sometimes are not always in touch with what is happening at the IUPUI Faculty Council. The recommendation is that, if we make them ex-officio members of the IUPUI Faculty Council, they at least would be given the opportunity to attend the meetings and see what is happening here. They are representing our Council and not individual schools. The main reason we are bringing this amendment here today is that those who are going to represent IUPUI Faculty Council at the University Faculty Council should be considered as ex-officio member of this Council. We are adding the underlined portion with reads, as well as any elected IUPUI representative to the University Faculty Council. If there are any questions, I will try to answer them.

**DEETS:** Do ex-officio members have the right to vote?

**PETERSON:** Yes they do.

**BESCH:** Have you considered the impact on N?

**SIDHU:** We thought about that and decided that it would not do as much harm by increasing N as it would do good by keeping in touch with the happenings in this Council. I don't think, at the moment, we are thinking of decreasing the number in any other way.

**YOKOMOTO:** Several points come to my mind. I see the need to increase communication so the persons on UFC know the attitude of this body, but it seems like there may be a lot of new people here plus it might affect the rule that no one school can have more than 50 percent of the body. I understand about communication, but it seems like a mute solution to a communication problem. How does that affect the rule about no more than 50 percent of representation can come from any one school?

**SIDHU:** I think I understand your question. Do you mean the representation from a particular school?

**YOKOMOTO:** In other words, suppose the School of Medicine's representation was two persons shy of being within 50 percent and there were, for example, five School of Medicine people on the UFC but not on our Faculty Council. Would all of the five from the UFC be added ex-officio and bring their total above 50 percent?

**SIDHU:** As far as the representation on the Council is concerned, it will remain as it has been in the past. We are hoping that these members will not be representing their school, as such, but they will be representing the whole faculty. That is the principle we are working on. We can try that at this time and later on, if we find some difficulties, we can work on the fact that no school should have more than the 50 percent.

**WARFEL:** For a point of clarification, what it says is that the number of elected representatives from any academic unit shall be less than one-half of the total number of elected representatives. So, the addition of ex-officio members doesn't change that.

**YOKOMOTO:** But, that rule was written in the days when we only had elected representatives, so that might have to be looked at in relationship to its original intent.

**SIDHU:** I will pass that information on to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

**WARFEL:** I think it would actually work to the advantage of the schools with smaller faculty. In the rules to elect University Faculty Council representatives, which we currently get to have 13, no more than 40 percent of them can be from the same unit. To use the School of Medicine as an example, I think it would work out that we would have fewer people from the School of Medicine rather than more.

**YOKOMOTO:** I wasn't placing one school against another. I only felt that the School of Medicine usually comes closest to reaching its quota.

**SIDHU:** We will keep that in mind and will discuss it. If there is a solution, we will try to solve that problem.

**PETERSON:** It seems to me that, with what Kathleen has brought to our attention, it would be impossible to go over 50 percent. If, indeed, our elected members can't be more than 50 percent

and the University Faculty Council members can't be more than 40 percent from any one unit, therefore, it would be impossible for the whole Council to be over 50 percent from any one given unit. I think we are okay on that particular issue. I might also comment that this particular item is a Constitutional revision. We need to endorse that today by a majority vote, but it does need to go out to the entire faculty to be voted on since it is a Constitutional revision.

**SIDHU:** Thank you, Dick. Today's approval will go to the whole faculty as it has been done in the past. The President of the Faculty will report the results to you.

**BEPKO:** Are you ready for the question? All in favor say, "Aye." Are there any opposed? [None]

## **AGENDA ITEM VII - COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**BEPKO:** Our next item is the committee reports. Our first report will be the Athletic Advisory Committee report with Dean Hugh Wolf.

**WOLF:** I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to make this annual report of the Athletic Advisory Committee. Each year I look forward to doing this and this is a particularly significant year because for the first time the Athletic Advisory Committee has a reporting line relationship to the Faculty Council. In the past I have always shared information with the group about the activities of the committee and I propose to do that again this year by way of this written report which I will give to the Secretary at this time.

I have also made it a custom to say a word or two about the accomplishments of the athletic teams at IUPUI. While that is not the focus of my report today, I am going to take a moment to mention three things because they are so noteworthy that not to do so, I think, would be really remiss. First of all, I would like to call attention to Jamie Vogel. This young lady is a junior in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Last spring she was named the national softball player of the year by the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), the organization with which our program is affiliated. There is only one person like that in the whole country and she is right here at IUPUI.

I also want to highlight the performance of our women's volleyball team which, as I hope you read in the Sagamore and other places, was the national runner-up in the tournament conducted last December by the NAIA. Our women finished second in that tournament. That performance followed on the heels of a Final Four appearance by our women's basketball team in the preceding season. These are the two highest finishes ever by IUPUI athletic teams in national competition.

Finally, I should, for the record, call attention to the fact that our women's volleyball coach, Tom Pingle, was named the National Coach of the Year. So, we have a lot to be proud of.

My real purpose this afternoon is to give the members of the Faculty Council some insight into a dimension of the intercollegiate athletic program that you may not know about. It is not as apparent as wins, losses, Final Four appearances, and national tournaments, but it is nonetheless, every bit as important. Last season, the members of our men's and women's basketball teams spent two hours a week in mentoring relationships with students at two nearby elementary schools. One of those schools was Washington Irving, School #14, which is located on East Ohio Street. I invite all of you to visit that school. It is a wonderful school. I have invited the principal of that school here today because I thought you would be interested in hearing from her what it

meant to have those IUPUI student-athletes in her school, what it meant to the school, and what it meant to the students in that school. I had the privilege of hearing Elizabeth Odle talk about this activity at a reception not too long ago at Chancellor Bepko's house. I was impressed by her presentation and thought the Council might be as well. Would you please give a warm IUPUI welcome to Elizabeth Odle, Principal of School #14?

**ELIZABETH ODLE:** Many students do not always come to school with the social skills they need to interact effectively with others. Therefore, it is the contention of many that teachers need to teach the appropriate communication, leadership, trust, and decision-making, and conflict-management skills.

In addition, schools need to provide the motivation to use these or demonstrate the comprehensive use of these skills, in order for groups to function effectively.

Also, schools need to foster the attitude of "VOLUNTEERISM." The community's youth need to be taught the spirit of "VOLUNTEERISM." The philosophy of "that you help yourself when you help others." "It changes your life."

Indianapolis Public Schools 14 and 26, along with Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI) Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, initiated a program to teach the skills that fit under the umbrella of "SPORTSMANSHIP." As a matter of being pro-active, planned activities were administered in a 12-week lunch time program. IPS 14 and 26 teachers, in cooperation with student-athletes, managers, trainers, and cheerleaders, hoped that this interaction would guide and role model IPS 14 and 26 students toward more appropriate and acceptable social skills, i.e., "SPORTSMANSHIP," yet curtail some of the discipline problems.

Processing sportsmanship skills via games (small indoor/outdoor activities) allowed students to analyze how well they function in group activities. With feedback from the IPS 14 and 26 teachers and the IUPUI Department of Intercollegiate Athletics students, the students began to build a strong foundation of positive social skills.

It is believe that the job of the school is to meet the needs of its students. Therefore, it is realized that the IPS 14 and 26 and IUPUI Department of Intercollegiate Athletics took a chance offering a program to demonstrate "SPORTSMANSHIP" and "VOLUNTEERISM" to its students but the schools felt there was a need to offer more than academics.

I thank you and I thank you for the opportunity. I welcome you to come and visit us when we get started again. The only disadvantage is that we did it for the first part of the year and we were not able to manage to keep it going for the second semester. That was a disappointment to our boys and girls because they wanted to keep that relationship going. I hope that maybe next year we can have it as a year around process verses just being at the beginning of the year.

**WOLF:** Thank you, Elizabeth. As you can see, she has almost no enthusiasm. [laughter]

**BEPKO:** Thanks, Hugh. Our next report comes from the Metropolitan Affairs Committee with Walter Buchanan.

**BUCHANAN:** I hope you picked up a copy of the summary of the community service survey on your way in today. I am going to add a few points to that. The actual report that we received, with the help of the Center on Philanthropy, is about a six-page report. Anybody who is interested

in that can contact the Faculty Council Office for a copy. The original idea for this survey was a faculty service booklet that was published in 1979-80 showing involvement of faculty at IUPUI in different activities. It was done by school and it wasn't very standardized in its format. The Metropolitan Affairs Committee decided it might be a good idea to see what the faculty were doing individually in the way of community service. The original idea was to send out a questionnaire that each faculty member would list their involvement in different community service activities. In fact, we did a pilot study on that. Then there was some disagreement within the committee that some faculty members might object to listing their involvement in different activities. The resources involved also in doing this would be quite expensive. So, what we finally decided to do, and we received the agreement of the Center on Philanthropy to help us with this, is to actually do a random survey of the faculty to find out what activities they were actually involved in. This is the summary of that and is what you have before you.

We sent out 1,000 randomly selected surveys to our faculty and staff. Unfortunately, we only received 188 back. We couldn't get anything past broad generalizations, but we did do that. What we found out was that, although the area of religion was the first type of organization that faculty volunteered for, the second was work related in education with over one-fourth of the responses. We then asked how the faculty became involved in the different activities. As has been found out by philanthropy in the past, usually you get involved when somebody asks you to. That turned out to be one of the major reasons for getting involved with participation in an organization.

As far as reasons for involvement, it was mainly from an altruistic sense of helping those who were less fortunate or doing work that was needed. One of the main reasons for not volunteering was that their schedule was too full or they were too busy. Almost one-half of the respondents indicated that that was the reason for not volunteering. It may also count for the low response to the survey.

As far as why they began giving or getting involved, it was usually being asked by a clergy or someone they knew well. The third reason is receiving a letter. We found that usually it is personal contact that causes one to volunteer.

The last part of the survey dealt with how the respondents viewed the organizations which they were participating in. In general, it was felt that the organizations were effective and using the funds in an ethical and appropriate manner. We used the scale from 0 to 5, 0 being not agreeing to 5 meaning strongly agreeing. In general, we found that most felt that organizations were effective and they could place trust in organizations that they were dealing with.

That gives you a brief summary. As far as the figures, I have a list of those and would be glad to share them with anyone who would like to see them. Are there any questions about the survey?

**DEETS:** I want to comment about the fifth paragraph, the fourth line. That particular point, you contend that "time is too valuable" and "schedule is too full." When I filled it out originally, I didn't think so and after reading it now I still think that those are meant to mean the same thing. When I read that I took it to mean that my time would be too valuable to volunteer. I think it has a very different meaning and, frankly, I think that is systemic with what the problems are with this questionnaire. I almost didn't fill it out because I had so much problem figuring out what the question was. I would certainly counsel, before repeating this, that some work be done on it.

**BUCHANAN:** Thank you for that comment. Are there any other comments about the questionnaire?

**REED:** I was just going to comment on how representative this really is. With an 18 percent return plus one-fifth of them saying they started because a clergy member gave them advice.

**BUCHANAN:** It is true that this is a low response rate, so you can't get as good a generalization as we could have otherwise.

**BEPKO:** Thank you, Walter.

#### **AGENDA ITEM VIII - QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD**

**BEPKO:** Next, we have the ten-minute question-and-answer period. We have received no questions in advance of the meeting. Are there any questions now?

**WARFEL:** I want to bring something up related to our tenure procedures. I was on the Tenure Committee this year so I have been thinking about our policies and procedures. In asking this question I am not asking for any details of the particular case, but I have concerns about the policies and procedures we have were somehow bypassed. The case I have a question about is a case that received a negative review at the school level, received a unanimously negative review at the campus tenure committee level. This was an individual who had been granted two years toward tenure at the time of appointment. I am hearing now that this person has been given two more years. It was my understanding that in seven years you were up or out. Could you tell me how this came about?

**BEPKO:** That is true. Ordinarily, there are no exceptions to that rule. If someone asks for an extension, the answer generally is "no." However, we have from time to time, in response to concerns expressed by the leadership of the Faculty Council, looked into the procedures a little more closely than might be the case in the ordinary review when we have lots of files to look at. In the case to which you are referring, through a duly constituted group within the academic unit, it was determined that there were some problems. I don't want to go into what they were, but it was determined that the fairest thing to do, under the circumstances and recommended by the faculty group that looked into it, would be to not impose the non-reappointment but to allow two more years which, according to the analysis, should have been given anyway. That is, the person was given what we call "credit" towards tenure, but it was not credit really at all. It was not a positive thing. It was a negative thing because it reduced the time during which a person has to build a dossier. Our handling of this case was what I would call the "disposition" of a case that had been brought to our attention as having some troublesome aspects to it and the fairest and most decent thing to do was to extend the period for two years.

**WARFEL:** I don't want to get involved with what some of the defense stated in this individual case would be. The Academic Handbook says when someone has complaints about how their tenure decision is going, it should be brought to a duly constituted campus Faculty Board of Review. This is not what the faculty did in this case.

**BEPKO:** What you are saying is that, if we have a complaint, we have to have it in front of a Board of Review? We can't talk to the leadership of the Faculty Council, as Dick Peterson has suggested, and find a resolution short of a Board of Review? I don't think that is right. We would be happy to abide by that if that is the will of the faculty, but we think that there should be an opportunity for not having to go to a Board of Review. A Board of Review may or may not have concluded, as we

did, that this was the best result. We thought that this was the best response, given that a faculty group within the school looked into the matter and recommended this result.

**WARFEL:** Was it an elected faculty group?

**BEPKO:** I don't think so.

**WARFEL:** This was done without the school's promotion and tenure committee knowing anything about it or the campus tenure committee knowing about it before, during, or after. I don't think that is in the interest of our community.

**BEPKO:** We would be happy to not do this if that is the sense of the Council. This is a sort of thing that is not fun or attractive to be involved in. It would be easier for us to allow everything to go to a Board of Review. If that is what we are given advice to do, that is what we will do. I see your point and I think the question is whether we should try to work out cases in which we see a problem, short of going to a Board of Review, short of going to the point where it becomes almost a litigation matter, and you are suggesting that we should not do that.

**WARFEL:** I am suggesting, at the very least, that if there is going to be an additional faculty group that reviews it, it should be some duly constituted group.

**BEPKO:** I think it was duly constituted but it wasn't duly constituted the way you would like for it to be constituted. It was appointed rather than elected.

**WARFEL:** I don't know how it was constituted. I am not aware of what this body is.

**BEPKO:** I think if we talk much more about it, we will have stepped over the line in terms of revealing details about the case, but I would be happy to talk to you about it otherwise. I think it is a good policy question. I don't think there is a right answer to it. It is like so many other things we do in our academic family; it is what the community itself thinks is the best way to handle key situations. We thought that having this flexibility, being able to work with the head of the Faculty Council, being able to identify problems that may exist, and being able to avoid having to go to a Board of Review, was a good thing. But, it may not be. Maybe we should have a chance to look at it. There are committees to give us advice on it.

**WARFEL:** I think at the very least it would be useful to let those faculty members who served on promotion and tenure committees -- who spent a lot of time doing it and agonizing over it -- I think you could have at least let them know what has happened.

**BEPKO:** That is a very good point and I am sorry you didn't know. I apologize for that. We should have alerted everyone and I think in due course that will be done. I am sorry that it has not been done up until now. I am sorry that you found out about it other than through communication from us.

**DEETS:** I would like to suggest two principles. One is that full communication be established with involved faculty groups that have been elected and involved in it no matter what is going on. Secondly, if there is going to be an ad hoc group or some other group that is not normally within the system, they should be elected. I think that any time administration does an appointment they put themselves in a position of being criticized, whereas, if they would simply have an election for the constitution of this committee, then they would put faculty in a position where they have some

say and that ought to take care of the problem with the administration. It seems to me that these are simple principles that could be followed. This group (promotion and tenure) was elected to carry out certain roles. I was chair of my promotion and tenure committee so I have a feel for what might be the emotional reaction at this point. I would hate to think that this committee did all of this work and then was completely screened from any input, from being involved or at least having the courtesy of knowing what was going on.

**BEPKO:** I think it has raised a very important policy question. We have just changed the faculty constitution to create new offices. We have now a President and Vice-President of our Faculty Council. As I understand it, the Vice-President of the Faculty Council will preside and the President of the Faculty is to work with the administration in this area. That is what we have been doing. It is true we didn't have the new constitution this year, but we were doing in substance the same thing contemplated by this constitution the duly elected Council leadership. We think we should have the opportunity to work with that duly-elected person. What you are saying is that the duly-elected person is not a committee and, therefore, we shouldn't work with that duly-elected person.

**DEETS:** That is not what I said. I said that, if a committee is to be created, it should be elected not appointed.

**BESCH:** I am on the Faculty Steering Committee, which is a School of Medicine committee elected by the faculty, that drew up the rules for the review procedures that apparently are in question. They certainly were discussed and approved by both the Faculty Steering Committee and our own Executive Committee. It is not ad hoc, there are school-approved documents on how to make up the committee for faculty grievances. Everything is spelled out. There is no possibility for an administrator to just select whoever he might wish. It was the Faculty Steering Committee which generated this. The notion that it somehow is ad hoc is erroneous. What was spelled out has been followed. Direct election is not the only way one may end up on a duly-constituted committee. For example, documents that call for administrative reviews spell out how the committees are to be constituted. Again, those documents don't say that just volunteers to ballots are the only ones who can serve but those administrative review committees are not ad hoc. So, the notion that this committee was somehow ad hoc, I think is an incorrect one. The question is perhaps poor communication and not a variety of other things.

**BEPKO:** Let me clear up one thing. In the case that Kathleen was talking about, there was this duly-constituted group within the school, which Henry has described, and I am glad he did because I don't know precisely how it was created. I guess, Kathleen, you didn't understand that that group was created under a procedure that the School of Medicine faculty had endorsed.

**WARFEL:** I wasn't aware that there was a group within the School of Medicine.

**BEPKO:** I don't think it was elected.

**WARFEL:** I thought he just said that there was an elected body.

**BESCH:** No. I said, in the same way that a variety of different committees are constituted, some are constituted by election, some are constituted without direct election, but the point is that this grievance committee procedure mandates constitution by a mechanism established in the document which has been approved in the School. There is a specific means of constitution of such a committee in that document and that is how that first grievance committee was constituted.



**BEPKO:** That is the way we understood it. It is not that someone just said, "We are going out and grab a couple of faculty members and ask them to look into this." It was a school-based procedure. It may not be an elected committee in the sense that the members of the committee were elected, but the school system of making decisions created this procedure and it was referred to that grievance group so created. I am sorry that we didn't communicate to you what happened as a result of that grievance procedure. Let me clarify one other thing. I was talking about this in the abstract, as well. Dick Peterson was not involved in the discussions that took place and the decision to provide a remedy for the faculty member who we thought might have been not treated as well as he should have been. There are, though, other cases in which we have had that kind of consultation. I think in the future it will be important for us to understand whether, in a given case, if the faculty member goes to the President of the Faculty Council and says, "I don't think that this has been a fair procedure," and then the Faculty Council President comes to the campus administration, as I thought we had envisioned that the Faculty Council President would, and says, "There may be a problem here," and we look into it together and determine that there is a problem, that we either can or cannot, at that point, fashion a remedy or settle the case as we think it should be settled. Should we be able to do that, in other words, or should we say, "I am sorry we can't discuss this because we have to go to a Board of Review?"

**WELLMAN:** I want to touch on the corollary to the above question and something you mentioned. Namely, what kind of credit recruited individuals receive for prior tenure. I think it is very arbitrary and I think it needs to be firmed up in some way or another. We had one instance where an individual was coming and wanted credit for tenure. He was coming with a government grant and was going to come on January 1st. He found out that he had to transfer the government grant in December so he came around December 28th and threw the entire tenure thing off by one year. When he came up for tenure he had not been able to reapply for the grant. We inquired as to whether another year could be given before tenure consideration and the answer was that there were no changes in the rules whatsoever about when one is considered for tenure. So, the individual left and, subsequently, got his grant and is doing very well. I can see this business about tenure and credit given being very soft and suggest that somehow or another that it be firmed up and not be such an arbitrary decision.

I have another question in terms of recruiting. Those of us who are recruiting and trying to bring quality individuals in, we are still left up in the air what to tell people about what their retirement program is going to be. Is there going to be a resolution to that situation?

**BEPKO:** The Trustees have already made it clear that there is going to be no change in the 18/20 program. Of course, that doesn't affect new appointees. I think that the existing retirement programs for new appointees, which are different than for those appointed before January 1, 1989, those retirement benefits I think are not going to be changed except as they might be given over to the employees by way of the election under a flexible benefits program. That is, you won't have to use your retirement benefits for anything other than what they are being used for now, but we may create a plan whereby you would be able to say, "I choose to use some of the money that is now in my retirement program -- that is, the payments which are made into the retirement program each year, -- for other types of fringe benefits that I choose to have." It would not be mandatory. It would simply be an option. Other than that, I can't imagine that there will be any change in the retirement program and I don't think we should say anything to new appointees other than that this retirement program exists. There is no reason to believe that it will be changed.

**SIDHU:** I would like to raise a question as far as the period of time for tenure is concerned. It may happen, especially in the Medical School, that instead of five years or six years, they might renew

it earlier because the candidate wants to get credit for two years and later on it is discovered that the candidate cannot meet the requirement or it is not up to the point where he or she can get the tenure. I think there should be some uniformity in that process. If it is five years, even though the period has been reduced, then that person still can be given five years. That is one possibility. Another possibility is, if it has taken place in writing that you will go for tenure after three years, because you have been given credit for two years, then I think that should not be changed because the school wants it or the chairperson wants it. I think that flexibility in that kind of situation should be used. There should be a clear cut understanding across the board.

**BEPKO:** The only time we have used it is as a remedy for which we have some deprivation of some interest of the faculty member.

**PLATER:** I would recommend that you read the language of the Academic Handbook. It has a clear statement about prior credit for service as applied to tenure and makes the provision, I don't recall the exact language, but it makes clear that there can be changes only under unusual circumstances not for the convenience of the individual faculty member which requires, as the Chancellor suggests, some remedy that involves the agreement and cooperation of the candidate, the department chair, the dean, and the campus administration. This happens very rarely but I think the provision that is in the Handbook is intended to allow some flexibility in remedying situations that cannot be anticipated when a faculty member is being recruited and the issue of prior credit comes up.

**WARFEL:** I think that the Handbook talks about being given time towards tenure and going up for tenure early. One is when you are talking about written agreements made at the time of initial appointment, in which appointees are given years toward tenure. What the Handbook says about that is, "this agreement is binding on both parties. The language of the probationary period resulting from any such reduction cannot at a later date be extended to suit the convenience of a faculty member or librarian or the academic unit." Elsewhere in the Handbook it talks about going up for tenure early and that there is some flexibility in that. But, that is a different topic.

**BEPKO:** I will repeat that we would only consider this as a remedy for what we see to be a problem.

**WARFEL:** But, our broad understanding of remedy for faculty grievances about tenure and promotion, as stated in the Academic Handbook, is that you go to a Faculty Board of Review.

**BEPKO:** That is why I asked the question. I think you have raised a good policy issue, Kathleen. There is a new Faculty Council Constitution and, if the new President of the Faculty comes to us and says, "I have just heard from a faculty member in school X and the faculty member thinks she got a raw deal on a tenure decision and I think so too. I have talked to the person and I want you to look into this short of a Board of Review." The question is whether we should do that or whether we should say, "I can't deal with it. It must go to a Board of Review and that is the only remedy."

**KARLSON:** Jerry, the present remedy which in our present constitution allows the Secretary to attempt to settle this before sending it to a Board of Review once one has been requested.

**BEPKO:** Kathleen is suggesting changing that.

**KARLSON:** That is our present constitution. The proposed constitution clearly indicates that the person who would act in the status of ombudsman which is a representative who can, in fact, negotiate a settlement. I do not think that a Board of Review has to be consisted. Under our present constitution, once a Board of Review has been requested, then the Secretary has the power to attempt to settle this without formally referring it to a Board of Review. Under the proposed constitution, the way I see it, is a faculty grievance could first be taken to the President of the Faculty who, acting in the capacity of an ombudsman, would attempt to work out a settlement. If that could not be worked out, then there would be a request for a Board of Review.

**WARFEL:** Are you talking about the proposed changes in the Board of Review?

**KARLSON:** I am talking about the proposed power of the President of the Faculty in our new constitution.

**BEPKO:** Maybe we should take this up as a part of the Executive Committee agenda for this coming year because I think we should have a resolution of this before we get into the promotion and tenure season next year.

**KARLSON:** It is within the constitution itself on these powers to represent faculty grievances, at least I thought it was fairly clear when we were drafting this, and we referred to it as an ombudsman type of activity in that committee.

**BEPKO:** But, I think that the fact that the Vice President elect of the Faculty raises it is a reason to want to look into it and make sure that we have given it careful study in the future.

**KARLSON:** I notice a slight difference here. I do believe that the committees who were involved in the determination up to that point should be contacted as a matter of courtesy and for information when the President is attempting to resolve the issue. But, there does not have to be an elected Board of Review to resolve a conflict either under our present constitution, at least the way it has functioned for the past ten years, or under our proposed constitution.

**BEPKO:** We freely stipulate that Kathleen has made an excellent point that, if we do these things, we have to make sure that the committees that have already engaged in a review are notified immediately. We didn't do that and I am sorry.

**PLATER:** There was communication with the Tenure Committee about these cases. But, in accord with what was my understanding of the wishes of the faculty in allowing faculty members to withdraw from tenure considerations before it reached the President's office, no record was made of the candidate's request. All other cases were reported. The committee was notified of the action on all cases.

**WARFEL:** Apparently, we have confusion between cases with time towards tenure and cases going up for tenure early. Individuals who are going up for tenure early have seven years to work on and if they want to try for it after three years, they can withdraw at any point. For people at the end of the time line, however, it is either up or out.

**BEPKO:** Unless they take another job.

**PLATER:** In this case, once the person had a different tenure contract arranged, it was earlier than required, earlier than mandatory tenure.

**BEPKO:** Your point if well taken, Kathleen. I think a notification procedure has to be clear, but I think you have made a more fundamental question which should be looked at too, and that is whether this is something that is desire.

**WARFEL:** Just for clarification, the IUPUI Tenure Committee did receive a summary of what had happened to tenure cases it had considered. There was nothing in that communication notifying the committee that this case was being withdrawn. There was no notice that it had been removed from the list. So, if you weren't looking carefully, you never would have known.

**BEPKO:** I think these cases should be highlighted if we ever do them again.

**BESCH:** Having spent a lot of time over the last two years working on the revised Faculty Board of Review procedures, which were adopted this year, I am a little concerned about some of the implications that I think I am hearing from Kathleen. For example, if a Board of Review had been appointed by Faculty Council bylaws and that Board of Review had made the same recommendations and the administration had responded in the same way, in that instance, the Tenure Committee would be prohibited by our bylaws from being apprised of that outcome. I am not sure that the communication from the Board or the administration in this particular case would have flowed differently if it had been a Board of Review, regardless of what their prior contribution may or may not have been. On the other hand, to suggest that the Tenure Committee, the Promotions Committee, or the Library Committee, or any one of those, is so infallible that they must be drawn in again whenever there is any further review, is a little dangerous in my mind.

**BEPKO:** I think we have used up the 10 minutes.

#### **AGENDA ITEM IX - UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There was no unfinished business.

#### **AGENDA ITEM X - NEW BUSINESS**

**BEPKO:** Professor Koleski has one item of new business.

**KOLESKI:** I was going to suggest that we move this last issue into the Executive Committee's system because there are many complex policy issues that should be considered.

I make this statement not in the form of a motion since I think it would be embarrassing for many members of the Faculty Council to vote on it because of its contents:

*This has been a very productive year for the Faculty Council. Many positive things have occurred that have been of benefit to IUPUI and the Faculty as a whole. A number of persons have worked with judiciousness and perseverance to improve the well-being of this University. The officers of the Faculty Council, both elected and administrative, are to be commended for their leadership. The committee chairs and committee members are to be praised for their work. Perhaps we could join in expressing appreciation to all of these persons for a job well done. We thank every one of you. [Applause]*

**BEPKO:** We have one last item of business that I would like to take care of now. I have had the pleasure of working with three leaders of the Faculty Council -- Susan Zunt, Jeff Vessely, and now Dick Peterson. Each of them has contributed enormously to the welfare of this institution. Today, however, I would like to say a special word about Dick Peterson. I would like to say that first by putting on my administrator's hat. We have been reminded often over the last couple of years, especially by Dick, that those of us in the administration wear two hats -- one as an administrator and the other as a faculty member. I would like to put on my administrator's hat and say that, from the University's standpoint, our most precious asset, I believe, here at IUPUI is the collegiality, the camaraderie, the enthusiasm, and the good friendships that prevail across the campus. We saw this in bold relief a couple of years ago when the Task Force on Faculty Appointments and Advancement did a survey and received an extraordinary response from the faculty. I think it was an 87 percent response rate. We know that is the highest response rate we have received to any mailing that has ever been sent out except for paychecks. The most important part of that response, I believe, was the extraordinary statistic that showed that the most important reason for faculty members choosing to stay at IUPUI, and to not accept invitations to go to other institutions, was collegiality the intellectual ambiance that we have created at IUPUI. I think is truly our most precious asset. If we don't maintain that kind of atmosphere, it can be terribly debilitating. Faculty energy can be sapped very rapidly if there is chronic disagreement, if we don't have harmony, if we don't have the kind of shared responsibilities that we have tried to create at IUPUI. I think this will be especially important in the future for all universities because it is likely that we are going to be undergoing retrenchment for longer than any of us would like. The news from state legislatures all across the country is not good.

In that setting in particular, we have to have the very best of collegiality, the very best of collaboration, and partnership between the administration and the faculty. I think Dick Peterson has made an extraordinary contribution to that partnership in these past two years -- to the openness in which all of us try to operate and the participation of faculty in the decision making process for the University.

Now I want to put on my hat as a faculty member. I still generate between 120 and 150 credit hours for the Law School every year, without additional pay. When I have my faculty hat on I think that Dick Peterson is also a major contributor to the life of the University. There has been no more passionate advocate for faculty interests and for the faculty, individually and collectively, than Dick Peterson. There has been no more competent analyst of the problems that arise within the University and there certainly is no one who has worked harder or more tirelessly than Dick Peterson on behalf of each and everyone of us as faculty members. So then, as an administrator and as a faculty colleague, I would like to say to Dick Peterson, thank you from the bottom of my heart, and on behalf of everyone, for two excellent years of leadership of the Faculty Council. We have a couple of symbols of our appreciation for what you have done. These are really tokens but they represent profound good feeling and appreciation, Dick. First, we have a gift for you.

We also have something that we hope you will put on your wall in your office. It reads:

***To Richard Peterson - In appreciation of your dedicated service as Secretary of the Faculty Council of Indiana University - Purdue University at Indianapolis for the 1990-91 and 1991-92 academic years.***

As I give this to Dick, I would like to ask everyone to stand and show our appreciation.

**PETERSON:** I have enjoyed my time in many ways. I can't say that Jerry, Bill, and I have always agreed on all issues, but I feel like I have had an open forum to be able to go into their offices and express what I had to express relating to how I feel. We need to express things as faculty. That openness and that willingness for them to have me in their office to discuss things that may have been somewhat controversial at times, has been very welcome. I have also appreciated being able to represent the faculty as a whole in that respect. I hope that I haven't fallen on my face in too many cases. I know that what I have wanted and what I felt was right hasn't always been what was the result of a review process or whatever. I have tried my best and, hopefully, there is a better University today than there was when I came here as a result of some of those small things that I did. Thank you.

**AGENDA ITEM XI - ADJOURNMENT**

**BEPKO:** We are adjourned.

BERNICE CHUMLEY  
FACULTY COUNCIL OFFICE  
ES 3108A  
IUPUI