

S U M M A R Y
IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL
MEETING
SEPTEMBER 6, 1984

AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
I. Call to Order	1
II. Memorial Resolution Ronald S. Ping - School of Dentistry	1
III. Approval of Minutes - May 3, 1984	1
IV. Presiding Officer's Business Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.	1
V. Executive Committee Report H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary	3
VI. New Business	5
VII. Adjournment	6

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL
MEETING
SEPTEMBER 6, 1984
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116

Members Present: Vice President Irwin, Executive Dean Schaller. Deans: Boaz, Bepko, Grossman, Wentworth, Yovits. Professors: Aliprantis, Bendick, Besch, Bixler, Blake, F. Brahmi, Z. Brahmi, Brandt, Carley, Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Crabb, Cutshall, Dial, Dowdeswell, Edmondson, Ellinger, Fineberg, Galanti, Garner, Gartner, Glant, Gnat, Goodwin, Gruver, Haas, Holland, Hutten, C. Hutton, L. Hutton, Jones, Joyce, Karlson, Kasper, Kehrein, Koleski, Kuczowski, Kulsrud, Laidig, Lyon, Mannheimer, Markand, Mueller, Palmer, Pflanzner, Quate, Rothman, Salama, Shipps, Simek, Smith, Solow, Sondhi, Sparks, Turner, Vessely, Wall, G. Wallis, Wilson, Woodham, Yokomoto.

Alternates Present: Deans: Jeannette Matthew for Barbara Fischler; Michael Curtis for Ralph McDonald; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John Barlow for William Plater; W. D. Bostwick for R. Bruce Renda; John Werenko for Arthur Weber; Louis Holtzclaw for James Weigand, Gerald Powers for Sheldon Siegel.

Members Absent: Deans: Bonser, Daly, Kellum. Professors: Allen, Appledorn, Biegel, Blevins, Brown, Michael Cohen, Dille, Dunipace, Eble, Kuczowski, McCarthy, McHugh, Meiere, Padilla, Passo, Porter, Rhodes, Shanks, Shea, Simon, V. Wallis, Wheeler

Visitors: Nancy Ostrander, Dean Carol Nathan.

AGENDA ITEM I
CALL TO ORDER

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the new academic year of 1984-85. I hope each of you had a good vacation this summer.

AGENDA ITEM II
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION - RONALD S. PING, SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY (IUPUI CIRCULAR 84/84-001)

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first item on our agenda is a memorial resolution for Ronald Ping of the School of Dentistry. That resolution has been prepared but unfortunately Dean McDonald could not be here today so the resolution will be distributed to you and, as is customary, copies will be sent to the members of the family.

AGENDA ITEM III
APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MAY 3, 1984

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the approval of the minutes of our May 3 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? (So moved) Is there a second? (seconded) Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM IV
PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I would like first to call on Dick Turner, who will introduce a distinguished guest who is with us today.

PROF. TURNER: It is my privilege today to introduce Nancy Ostrander who is a Diplomat in Residence at the School of Liberal Arts this year. The Diplomat in Residence program is a program of the State Department that makes available to universities career diplomats to share their expertise with the universities and to hear what information the universities have to offer with the State Department. This year there were five universities in the country which got them. Nancy Ostrander's rank is Minister-Counselor and Ambassador. She has served in Cuba, Belgium, the Netherlands, Mexico, Jamaica, Surinam, and Washington, D.C. She has a special expertise in management quality, in personnel counseling and career development with the State Department. She has also done some work on political asylum and refugee reception. I would like us to say welcome to Nancy Ostrander. She has agreed to say a few words to us.

NANCY OSTRANDER: I have the title of Ambassador, as Dick has mentioned. I think that title can be a bridge but it also can be a barrier. Don't be frightened by it. I hope it will be more of a bridge than otherwise.

To make it a little easier on you, I want to tell you that I am a product of the Indianapolis school system. I was born in Methodist Hospital and my home is in Irvington. I have always made that my home in spite of my many years overseas. I attended Public School #57, then Howe High School and I have a degree from Butler University.

The Diplomat in Residence program was begun in 1964 at the suggestion of Congress. Foreign policy probably begins at home. If it isn't going to work, it is going to fail at home. Vietnam is probably the best example of that. For that reason, since those of us who are career diplomats spend most of our lives overseas, it is very important that we know what is going on back home. Those of us who are selected as Diplomats in Residence are expected to be of service to the university to lecture and teach. As far as the State Department goes, I am supposed to come back with a sense of what students and faculty are talking about. That is where foreign policy begins on the campuses. As a Diplomat, I would welcome any ideas you have to bounce off me. If you have any students who are interested in taking the Foreign Service Officer's Exam, I do have pamphlets and booklets explaining how to apply. Applications should be in by October 19. The exam is always given the first Saturday in December. Those pamphlets have samples of the Foreign Service Officer's Exam questions in the back. If you want a humbling experience, have a try at the exam questions yourself. Thank you for letting me come today.

PROF. MANNHEIMER: I have read that booklet and actually it is not that much more difficult than the GREs. I have also talked with the State Department people. They tell me that they are interested in recruiting people who are a few years out of undergraduate school who may have already staked out for themselves some reasonable plan for success in other fields as professional communicators, as we all are. Perhaps the State Department might make very valid and agreeable use of some of us.

NANCY OSTRANDER: I think the average age of people passing not only the written exam but also the oral exam is higher than most people expect. I think especially on the oral exam part, nobody really cares what you know but rather whether or not you can apply what you know.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Diplomat Ostrander. Since our last meeting we have acquired two new deans. We have a new dean of the School of Social Work, Sheldon Siegel, who directs the School of Social Work at the University of Cincinnati. He will join us in January. We are delighted that Jerry Powers has agreed to continue as the Acting Dean until that time. Second, we have a new dean of the School of Business. He happens to be here so I am going to ask Jack Wentworth to stand so that everyone can see him.

Our next meeting will be held in the Madam Walker Urban Life Center. At that time we will introduce new members of this Faculty Council.

I hope each of you picked up a copy of the official Indiana University budget request for 1985-87. If you didn't, please get one on your way out. This request was approved by the Trustees at their August meeting. I would like to go over some highlights of the document with you.

For 1985-87, the highest priority will be to maintain and improve current services, including enhancement of compensation for faculty. There are several components of this budget request. One is an annual inflation adjustment of six percent, reflecting increases in the cost of living, higher prices for supplies, expenses, and student aid.

There is a very important new category called "Quality Recovery." In the last 20 years, faculty compensation at this institution has fallen behind salaries and fringe benefits in the Big Ten. Twenty years ago, Indiana University ranked fifth in the Big Ten. Ten years ago, the ranking had slipped to seventh. Our current ranking is tenth -- last in other words. So, in the budget request, the Quality Recovery category addresses that situation. To bring Indiana University faculty compensation up the mid-range of comparable institutions, an added \$12.1 million is requested for 1985-86.

Also, we have several degree programs that have been approved but have not previously been funded. These include programs in Nursing, Allied Health, Art History, Geology, Journalism, and History. We are requesting funding for each of these programs.

In addition, we have several program development requests aimed at attracting and retaining faculty, replacing part-time faculty, providing computers and library support, replacing equipment and supporting economic development and research projects.

The Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Faculty Council has previously identified three high priorities for future budgeting. These priorities involve improvements in faculty salaries, library support, and academic computing. I believe this budget request does reflect the sentiment of last year's Budgetary Affairs Committee.

I would like to turn next to the capital appropriation request. It includes, for IUPUI, the proposed Clinical Research Building and the next phase of the Science-Engineering facility, which will make it possible to move Purdue programs from 38th Street to the main campus.

The economy of the state has improved. Although there will be many other agencies competing for the state's tax dollars, many of us believe that the time for higher education has come for this forthcoming session.

Howard Schaller, you have a couple of items.

DEAN SCHALLER: You will recall that, over the last year or two, we have had some discussions and planning, hoping to lead to an arrangement whereby faculty, staff, and students will be able to purchase personal computers and related equipment at a discount. I understand that these plans are now completed and approved. Very soon this new service activity, called the ACCESS Program, will be coordinated by our office of Computing Services. You should shortly be receiving further information from our Director, Kristin Froehlke.

While we are on computing, I might mention that the figures that Vice President Irwin cited in our request for improvement, if funded, would be added to the budget base. Those amounts would then become available in subsequent years. So, if that request survives, we could purchase initially considerably more than a couple of hundred thousand dollars worth of computer equipment and then use that budgetary allocation over a period of four or five years to pay off the cost. We would have to make arrangements that would give us a substantial boost of that kind. If we do, we would use those and other funds to bolster our computer capacity on this campus.

I also wanted to mention the work of the Task Force on Summer Sessions, which was appointed last year. That Task Force now has a draft of its report, copies of which will be reviewed by appropriate committees of the Faculty Council. There are two major recommendations in the report. The first one is that we should seek means to permit offering summer courses that will exceed six weeks in duration. As you know, our summer sessions now consist of two six-week terms. There are several disciplines in which we feel that a six-week period would be pedagogically inadequate. Therefore, we don't offer certain courses in the summer. So, the report recommends that we seek means of scheduling courses that might last eight, ten, or twelve weeks. We feel reasonably sure that, with more flexibility in our registration procedures, we might be able to handle that.

The second recommendation would involve changes in the way we plan and budget for the summer sessions. We now include in the fiscal-year budget of each school amounts to cover the second session of one summer and the first session of the following summer because the fiscal year breaks between them. The suggestion is that we avoid that split and budget for both sessions each summer. What is more important is that we would build those budgets after constructing the schedule, responding to the needs of particular schools or departments and the special needs of the students that we serve in the summer. Many of our summer students come from other campuses and institutions. After constructing the schedule, we would work back to a budget, with each school making estimates of enrollment and credit hours in various courses and then estimating income before coming up with a budget of expenditures. This second recommendation has yet to be thought out in great detail, but members of the Task Force feel that it deserves consideration.

PROF. GARTNER: Would you please explain the term "Quality Recovery?"

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Quality Recovery is a name for a new category this year, which concerns bringing faculty compensation up to the median of comparable institutions, where Indiana University once stood. Program Development replaces the generic term Quality Improvement, which includes requests for more full-time faculty, equipment replacement, library and computing support, and special projects for state economic development and research.

DEAN SCHALLER: Among the state economic development items is a request that the Business School has for support for their statewide data gathering and retrieval system and related requests from the Schools of Science and Engineering and Technology. We used to call those items Quality Improvement, but now we put them under the category of Program Development. We now use the term Quality Recovery to signify a catchup in faculty compensation, which has lagged behind inflation and increases at comparable institutions. That is where the word "recovery" comes from.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: On page 19 is a summary of the program development for the non-health equipment, academic computing, library, economic development. The terms are confusing since they have been changed from last year.

PROF. MANNHEIMER: This may be the wrong place to bring it up, but I am tired of being referred to as the "non-health" division. Couldn't we call it disease and non-disease? Why do we call this non-health?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The terms were actually given to us by the Commission on Higher Education.

AGENDA ITEM V EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Our next agenda item is the Executive Committee Report from Henry Besch.

PROF. BESCH: One of the privileges that I get as Secretary of the Faculty Council is an invitation to attend the Board of Trustees' meetings. I attended the Board of Trustees' meeting and their recent summer retreat at which the appropriation request we have been discussing was approved. I just want to underscore the seriousness of the commitment of our administration -- including Vice President Irwin, Vice President Gros Louis, President Ryan -- and, as you know, the Board of Trustees, all of whom have

demonstrated a major commitment -- to an upward adjustment of the faculty salary structure at our universities. The budget request reflects that commitment, and deserves your applause.

As an obsessive, I want to draw your attention to certain features of the minutes and agenda you have received. First, I would point out that they are printed on a lighter color than you are accustomed to. This makes them more distinguishable and easier to Xerox. Secondly, they are being printed on our campus and not being shipped down to the Bloomington campus. This means that we can have a later date for inclusion of items on the agenda since our turnaround time on this campus has been arranged by Bernice Chumley to be at least a week shorter than it was when we sent the materials to Bloomington. Moreover, we have better control over the mailing labels. I hope we will no longer be sending duplicates of announcements as we have occasionally done in the past. We are able to edit the mailing list so that it reflects our campus population. This may seem trivial but when 1300 names are involved, it becomes less tractable than you might imagine. Finally, please note the Faculty Council membership list printed on the last page of today's announcement. Please advise us of any errors you may find.

My main comments from the Executive Committee regard the committee structure of the IUPUI Faculty Council and the all University Faculty Council. Perhaps these remarks are more appropriately aimed at the people who aren't here, rather than at you who are here, but hopefully some of the absentees will read the minutes. The Executive Committee would like to have been able to put together a committee structure that truly represents this body. However, there is again this year a relative lack of people in this Council who serve on the standing committees of this Council. I will get to a sermonette on that in just a second.

First, I would remind you of the new members of the Executive Committee. Since we delayed sending out the minutes until the time when the agenda for this meeting was prepared, you can refer to page two for the names of the newly elected members. As you can see, they are John Chalian, School of Dentistry; Lucreda Hutton, School of Science; Brenda Lyon, School of Nursing; and Jeff Vessely, School of Physical Education. These faculty members joined the carryover members from last year's Executive Committee. Although committee structures will appear in some future minutes, you may want to pencil in persons who are continuing to serve. They are Jean Gnat, University Libraries; Steve Mannheimer, Herron School of Art; Richard Turner, School of Liberal Arts; and Charles Yokomoto, School of Engineering and Technology.

Also listed on page two are the new members of the Nominating Committee including Ken Dunipace, LaForrest Garner, Bill Kulsrud, and Gerald McHugh. These people joined the carryover members Pat Blake, School of Nursing (Chair of the Nominating Committee this year); Donna Dial, School of Liberal Arts; and Kathryn Wilson, School of Science. John Chalian will serve as the liaison from the Executive Committee to the Nominating Committee. As a further reminder, the Nominating Committee slates candidates for the two Faculty Boards of Review (which we as a Council vote on in January), and for the Executive Committee, Tenure Committee, and itself, the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee handles elections of at-large representatives for this Faculty Council and for the IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council.

To launch into the Secretary's annual sermonette about poor civic performance by Faculty Council members, let me remind you that, virtually every name reaching a slate for any of the above committees or for any of the standing committees of this body, come from a volunteer list. The volunteer list is based on the annual request sent out to all faculty asking which committees they would like to serve on. Those requests, of course, do go to members of the Faculty Council as well as all other faculty. The majority of the elected members of this Council fail to respond to the request. As a result, 58 percent of the Council membership does not serve on any of the committees. This concern has been expressed each year about this time, but is important enough to bear reiteration. End of sermonette.

Turning to a little less somber note, I want to point out that the Executive Committee, as you have constituted it, excluding two important members of that committee, Vice President Irwin and Executive Dean Schaller, brings with it 105 years of IUPUI experience. Most of us have been here quite a while.

PROF. MANNHEIMER: Henry, couldn't you take off a few years for me?

PROF. BESCH: I don't have ot. Your lifestyle will take care of that.

I would also like to report to the Faculty Council on the activities of the Faculty Relations Committee. I think, perhaps, most of you know that the Board of Trustees' meetings rotate among the various campuses of IU and that their agenda each time includes presentations to a committee of the Board of Trustees called the Faculty Relations Committee. The purpose of this committee is to hear local concerns of the faculty and to hear comments that the faculty would like to bring to the Board of Trustees as a whole. The overall message of our faculty presentation given to the Board earlier today was to emphasize the large marginal return on their investment in the people and programs at IUPUI. The individual fifteen minute presentations on your behalf were: "A Hard Look at Atherosclerosis", an intensely interesting discussion led by Dave Hathaway, School of Medicine; "Reading, Writing, and Resources", a very elegant presentation by Ed Casebeer, School of Liberal Arts; and "Giving and Getting", a potpurri presented by Steve Mannheimer, Herron School of Art, given on behalf of the Executive Committee. Steve gave them a little

h_ _ but he did it gently. These presentations were very very well received by the Board of Trustees.

Finally, I would just like to applaud last year's standing committees' efforts. As you can see from the summaries in the minutes, they were busy. As a further single example, I would like to mention that the idea of stage a new members' reception at our second meeting of the year came from the standing committee structure. Two different committees suggested this. As Dr. Irwin mentioned, the reception will be held in the Madame Walker Theater after our business meeting on October 4, 1984.

AGENDA ITEM VI
NEW BUSINESS

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We come to New Business. Does anyone have any new business?

PROF. ALIPRANTIS: How is our foreign student enrollment here this Fall?

DEAN SCHALLER: Your question is in regard to the international students on this campus. Dean Boaz can answer that. As you know, Pat is Acting Dean of Student Affairs as well as Associate Dean of the Faculties.

DEAN BOAZ: This fall we received applications for 61 international students. Some of these are undergraduate, some graduate, and some were for professional schools. For the first time I had the privilege of going to an orientation meeting and seeing each new international student receive two packets of material including an orientation handbook. We are in the process of contacting the people for a visit to the Mayor's Office and of producing a roster of Indianapolis families that are willing to contribute to the social life of our international students.

DEAN SCHALLER: We have reconstituted the International Committee, which will be chaired by Richard Fredland. Vice President Irwin has given that committee a special charge for the year -to come up with a policy statement with respect to international programming on this campus on the one hand and the provision of student services to international students on the other hand. As you heard from what Dean Boaz said, certain things are already underway in this particular area. As far as admissions of international undergraduate students, we have a special kind of problem on this campus. Although there has been a long tradition of international students here in many of the professional programs, including those of the Medical School, the Dental School and more recently, the School of Social Work, even in these programs only a limited number of top foreign students can be accommodated. As far as the undergraduate programs are concerned, we have even more difficulty accommodating foreign students. We have problems providing the resources even for what we might call our local constituency. In addition, foreign students find our admissions criteria for most programs quite stringent. We get a lot of inquiries about Engineering and Technology students coming here. Their chances of being admitted are practically non-existent. Another program we could overfill with international students is in our School of Business, if we wanted to encourage admissions. As you know, the School of Business is sorely pressed both in Bloomington and Indianapolis with not having enough faculty resources. I am reasonably sure that that would also be the case in Allied Health. What we are going to have to do with this committee is try to work out some kind of position to foster controlled growth of international programs at IUPUI. It is healthy to include an international flavor in some programs. That is one of the reasons the School of Business, for example, has always maintained a certain number of international students in the MBA program in Bloomington.

We do have a number of concerns in the international area. That is why Vice President Irwin, following the Student Services Task Force report last year, decided to reconstitute that committee and ask them to take on this year a special mission to look into this whole area. Anyone that is interested, and I know many of you are, I would urge them strongly to contact Dick Fredland soon.

PROF. SPARKS: What are your projections for the enrollment for the fall semester? Is enrollment affected at all by the awkward way in which the students receive their bills? Is anything going to be addressed on the issue of timing of students receiving their bills?

DEAN BOAZ: We currently have meetings taking place between what I call the Big Four -the Registrar, the Admissions Officer, the Financial Aids Officer, and the Bursar. The objective is to look at, and change as needed, the local decisions and policies which affect the student's registration. These officers have not met previously for exchange of information, but will do so now, I assure you. They will address concerns such as the one you mention.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The enrollment of both headcount and credit hours is still very unofficial. It won't be officially available until about a month from now. But, preliminary figures from this campus indicate that the headcount is just barely down from last year; approximately one percent at this point. Also, from the budgetary standpoint, we have actually gone a little over the projected income. I am really pleased at this point but we still have some time to go. We had projected a two percent decrease in the enrollment for this year vs. last fall and that has not occurred. The President, this morning, indicated that for the system the enrollment dropped very minimally.

Is there any other new business?

AGENDA ITEM VII
ADJOURNMENT

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: There being no other new business, this meeting is adjourned.

H. R. Besch, Jr. /k
H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

JEANNETTE MATTHEW
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
LY
IUPUI

[9/6/1984] FCI

A G E N D A

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1984

3:30 P.M., MADAME WALKER THEATER

CORNER NORTH STREET AND INDIANA AVENUE

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes - September 6, 1984
- III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
Introductions of New Members of the Faculty Council
- V. New Business
- VI. Adjournment

*
* PLEASE NOTE THE CHANGE IN PLACE FOR THE IUPUI *
* FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING FOR OCTOBER. IT WILL *
* BE HELD AT THE MADAME WALKER THEATER. *
*

MINUTES

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL
OCTOBER 4, 1984
MADAME WALKER URBAN LIFE CENTER
3:30 P.M.

Members Present: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin; Executive Dean Schaller. DEANS: Bepko, Boaz, Kellum, McDonald, Weber. PROFESSORS: Aliprantis, Allen, Appledorn, Bendick, Besch, Bixler, Blake, F. Brahma, Z. Brahma, Brown, Carlley, Chalian, Crabb, Cutshall, Dial, Eble, Edmundson, Galanti, Garner, Gartner, Gnat, Goodwin, Hutten, Jones, Joyce, Karlson, Kehrein, Koleski, Kuczkowski, Kulsrud, Mannheimer, McHugh, Mueller, Passo, Quate, Rhodes, Rothman, Shipps, Simek, Smith, Solow, Sparks, Vessely, Weber, Wheeler, Wilkins, Willis, Wilson, Woodham.

Alternates Present: DEANS: Daniel P. Benford for Walter Daly; Helen Dorsch for Elizabeth Grossman; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John Barlow for William Plater; W. David Bostwick for R. Bruce Renda; Gerald Powers for Sheldon Siegel; Louis R. Holtzclaw for James Weigand; Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. PROFESSORS: Judy Lambert for Juanita Laidig; P. Yu for Catherine Palmer; Frances D. Rhome for Victor Wallis.

Members Absent: DEANS: Bonser, Yovits. PROFESSORS: Allen, Biegel, Blevins, Brandt, Mervyn Cohen, Michael Cohen, Dilley, Dowdeswell, Dunipace, Ellinger, Fineberg, Glant, Gruver, Haas, Holland, Hutton, Hutton, Kasper, Kettlekamp, Markand, McCarthy, Meiere, Padilla, Pflanzner, Porter, Salama, Shanks, Shea, Simon, Sondhi, Turner, Wall, Yokomoto.

Visitors: C. Hughes Wright, New Bureau, IUPUI.

AGENDA ITEM I - CALL TO ORDER

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Welcome to the Madame Walker Urban Life Center.

AGENDA ITEM II - APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first order of business is the approval of the minutes of our September 6 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [Motion made] Are there any corrections, deletions, or additions? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III - PRESIDING OFFICER'S BUSINESS

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few items today that I would like to call to your attention. Since our last meeting, the Commission on Higher Education approved the M.A. in history for our School of Liberal Arts. As you know, the faculty of Liberal Arts has worked for a long time to arrive at this point. We expect to continue to pursue other selected master degree courses in that school.

Since our last meeting, we have completed our participation in "Partners 2000," a summer youth employment program in the city. Over 2,000 youths were employed, most of whom came from the intercity and are minorities. IUPUI hired 101 of these young people, and 95 of them completed the entire summer. Ninety-two of the original 101 were blacks. Twelve of the 95 who completed the summer are now permanently employed with us. The group did varied jobs, including recording taped maps of our campus on cassettes for students who are visually impaired. This is the first audible map that we know of and we are very proud of the thirteen young people who designed this remarkable program.

In a few minutes I will introduce Kenneth Morgan, who is Executive Director of this beautiful facility -- the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. He will give you some highlights and history of this building and its restoration. It is a very fascinating story. This building represents one of the first steps in the redevelopment of Indiana Avenue, the Lockefield Gardens area, and the housing just east of here.

Based on previous agreements and continuing discussions, we are moving toward resolution of plans for Lockefield Gardens and the surrounding area. The settlement of this matter is important because the next step will be to expedite private development of a major, multipurpose facility east of the University Hospital. Such development requires clear title to property. The facility would contain rooms for persons taking part in continuing education activities and for patients who will not need hospital beds but who will need to be near our hospitals for a few days. The facility also is to house office space for university-related organizations and a number of national organizations that are now on this campus. There also would be commercial operations, such as shops and restaurants, along with meeting rooms. I now introduce Ken Morgan, who will tell you about this building.

KENNETH MORGAN: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. First of all, I would like to welcome all of you to the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. We are happy to have made the facility available for this meeting. It is an added pleasure to see you since I am a graduate of the Indiana University School of Business and of the Indiana University School of Law here in Indianapolis.

The building was constructed by the Walker Manufacturing Company in 1928 at a cost of \$1 million. The company made cosmetic products and was founded by Madame C. J. Walker, the first black, female, self-made millionaire. She may well have been the first female self-made millionaire. The building housed professional offices, a theater (where Louis Armstrong and other top entertainers performed), this now-renovated ballroom, and a restaurant. It began to decline in the 1950s. In the late 1970s several organizations joined in efforts to restore the structure as a symbol of minority achievement and as a catalyst for revitalization of the Indiana Avenue area. The organizations included the Walker Manufacturing Company, Medic (a neighborhood development organization), The Council of Negro Women, the nearby Fall Creek YMCA, the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, and IUPUI. After receiving a grant from the Lilly Endowment, restoration began in 1981. We are now about 75 percent complete, with work on the theater to begin early in 1985. We have a great deal of minority participation. Our architect, Bob LaRue, is black, as are our leasing agent and interior designer. Twenty-five percent of the dollars spent on the project has gone to minority businesses and more than 40 percent of the workforce has been minority.

We plan to sponsor many cultural and social events in this building. The IU School of Optometry has opened a clinic on the ground floor, and most of the office and commercial space has been leased. We also will be assisting in the development of small business. Before leaving, I hope you will visit the other end of this fourth floor, to see our conference and memorial area, where memorabilia about Madame Walker and her company will be on display. We expect her to become even more widely known, when a new book and perhaps a film about her life appear. We look forward to continuing to work with the University in the future.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Thank you, Ken. That is a remarkable story.

AGENDA ITEM IV - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the Executive Committee Report.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I will keep my remarks fairly brief but there are a few things that the Executive Committee has asked me to bring to you.

First of all, I also want to extend my thanks to you for coming over here. You had to navigate some street curbs that were not there the last time you were in this area. I commend you but I also that you are well rewarded by the things you just heard from Kenny Morgan and by the beautiful structure that you are in. Hopefully, you will take the opportunity to see the Memorial Room. It was not mentioned before, but you are seated in only half of the Ballroom. The walls are moveable and fold up so that this can be opened into an enormous room for some social occasions or professional activity that you might want to plan in the future. We are looking forward to a growing relationship between IUPUI and the Madame Walker Urban Life Center.

Next, I wanted to apologize for the apparent excessive strength of my admonitions at our last meeting in which I indicated that not enough people had volunteered for Faculty Council committees. I did briefly caution you that I was aware that I was probably addressing the wrong group because the people who come to these meetings are the same ones who work diligently on the committees. On the other hand, I neglected to say that we recognize that some of you do volunteer but to no avail. We have attempted to remind you that the committee memberships are generated by the Executive Committee serving as a Committee on Committees. At least one member of the Executive Committee serves as a liaison to each of the standing committees. That member and the current year's chair of each of the committees, go over the volunteer list and make recommendations based in part on the current membership of the committee. The whole Executive Committee then discusses each of the committee structures with regard to the balance among units, bylaw consistency, etc. We have done that for the past couple of years and we intend to ask current committee chairs for their recommendations again this coming year. That system should not preclude your mentioning your interests directly to any of the Executive Committee, or to the chair of any committee on which you would to serve. We will be publishing with the next minutes the current committee structures. There have been some changes in committee memberships since September and we have delayed publishing the lists until the rates of change were slowed. Thank you for volunteering and thank you for serving.

I would also like to report to you that several of the standing committees are already at work. For example, the Faculty Affairs Committee and several other Council standing committees are actively considering a report mentioned by Dean Schaller last time, from the Summer Sessions Task Force. Also, the Budgetary Affairs Committee is preparing a flow sheet which attempts to explain how the budget is created at IU. They have included explanations of some of the terminology changes about which there were questions at the last meeting of the Faculty Council. What is "Quality Recovery" and does that differ from "Quality Improvement Items?" They expect to have the flow sheet ready by the November Faculty Council meeting.

My last comments have to do with another item that will probably come before you at next month's Faculty Council meeting: the Campaign for Indiana. Dr. Irwin and Dean Schaller recently indicated that the capital campaign you have been hearing about for some time is really getting geared up now even though the public announcement will be delayed until September 1985. Nevertheless, there is much activity already and a great deal of faculty involvement in this Campaign for Indiana. The administration has already designated two Campaign for Indiana leaders for this campaign: Jan Shipps and Maynard K. Hine who will be heading up the University Community Challenge Fund. Bloomington campus faculty leaders are to be designated soon. The Campaign involves all of us and will no doubt affect our future as faculty at Indiana University for a long time to come. It is important to us all that we personally take pride in this Campaign project and become enthusiastically involved in it. That concludes my remarks.

The main order of business today, as you know, is the introduction of the members of the Faculty Council -- introduction of us to each other. The Executive Committee requested that I ask each of the Deans to either personally introduce their faculty or to identify a faculty leader in their school to make the introductions. We have asked that the largest schools introduce their faculty last. I think each of the units is prepared to introduce their faculty at this time. [At this time the members of the Council were introduced by Deans or faculty leaders of the units. At a minimum, the faculty members' department, disciplines, and Faculty Council standing committee on which the member serves were outlined. In addition, occasionally some additional information on the outside interests and hobbies of the member was also given. Because of the acoustics of the room, most of this interesting commentary did not tape well and could not be unscrambled for these minutes.]

The Faculty Council has been somewhat remiss in our preparation of Council membership lists each year for the past few years. We have listed in the Council documents only the elected members of this body. I think most of you know that the deans of each of the units are also ex-officio members of the Faculty Council. Also serving are the Vice President, who is the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Council, and two persons designated by him to serve. By tradition, Executive Dean and Dean of the Faculties Howard Schaller is one of those designates and he will introduce the other member from the Vice President's Office.

DEAN SCHALLER: I would like to introduce Pat Boaz. As you know, Pat became Associate Dean of the Faculties on July 1, 1984 and this year is also serving as Acting Dean of Student Affairs. Pat came from the School of Science. She was a member of the faculty in chemistry and had been serving as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. I would also like to introduce Carol Nathan who will serve as an alternate for Pat or me in case we can't be here. She will also represent us in various other activities. Carol was promoted to Associate Dean of Faculties on July 1, 1984. She is a member of the faculty of Allied Health, in the School of Medicine. She has served as acting Chairman of her department last year and, I am happy to say that she is back with us full time this year after having served double duty, as it were, for almost a year.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Dean Schaller. And, thanks to all of you for your introductions. The additional comments about extracurricular activities of some of the faculty was very interesting. Presumably, we have today established a tradition. In future years, we will be learning more and more about some of the unusual extracurricular activities we do not ordinarily share in our working environment.

AGENDA ITEM V - NEW BUSINESS

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next to the last order of the agenda is new business. Does anyone have any new business to bring forth? Hearing none, we will move on to the next item.

AGENDA ITEM VI - ADJOURNMENT

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Do I hear a motion to adjourn? [Motion made] [So moved]

H. R. Besch, Jr.
H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
IUPUI Faculty Council

[10/4/1984]

3FCI

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1984
3:30 P.M., LAW SCHOOL ROOM 116

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of October 4, 1984
- III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
- V. New Business
 - Access Line - Kristin Froehlke
 - Institute for Humanities Research - Frances Dodson Rhome
- VI. Old Business
 - IUPUI Calendar, 1985-86 - Pat Boaz
- VII. Adjournment

MINUTES

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 1, 1984
3:30 P.M., LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin; Executive Dean Schaller. Deans Patricia Boaz, Gerald Bepko, Elizabeth Grossman, Nicholas Kellum, Arthur Weber, Marshall Yovits. Professors: C. Aliprantis, H. R. Besch, Jr., Angenieta Biegel, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Charlotte Carlley, Michael Cohen, Theodore Cutshall, Donna Dial, Ian Dowdeswell, James Edmondson, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Jean Gnat, Vania Goodwin, Ruth Holland, Jean Hutten, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Suetta Kehrein, Ray Koleski, Joseph Kuczowski, Juanita Laidig, Brenda Lyon, Steven Mannheim, Jeanne Mueller, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Shirley Quate, Frances Rhone, Neal Rothman, Jan Shipp, Jay Simon, Elizabeth Solow, Anoop Sondhi, Marie Sparks, Jeffrey Vessely, Harriett Wilkins, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Charles Yokomoto.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Catherine Palmer for Walter Daly; Ethel Kersey for Barbara Fischler; Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John Barton for William Plater; David Bostwick for R. Bruce Renda; Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. Professors: Judy Miller for Naomi Fineberg; Mary Feeley for Linda Kasper; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp; Jordan Leibman for William Kulsrud; Mary McKenzie for Rebecca Porter; Mary McKenzie for Erna Simek; Monroe Little for Richard Turner; Jeri Gruner for George Willis.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles Bonser, James Weigand. Professors: Stephen Allen, Robert Appledorn, Philip Bendick, David Bixler, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Edwin Brown, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Russell Dilley, Kenneth Dunipace, Charles Ellinger, Donald Gartner, Michael Glant, Gary Gruver, Ain Haas, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Thomas Jones, Onkar Markand, Leo McCarthy, Gerald McHugh, Forrest Meiere, Lille-Mae Padilla, Murray Passo, Mitchell Rhodes, Ramsis Salama, James Shanks, Philip Shea, Ernest Smith, Roger Wall, Lawrence Wheeler.

VISITORS: Hitwant Sidhu

AGENDA ITEM I Call to Order

Vice President Irwin: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We will begin this meeting now although additional faculty members will probably arrive. The pouring rain obviously slows us down. Just think, if this rain had been snow today, we would have been closed.

AGENDA ITEM II Approval of Minutes - October 4, 1984

Vice President Irwin: The first order of business today is the approval of the minutes of our October 4 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] There is one correction that we know of: Charles Hutton was present at the October meeting of the Council but his attendance was not recorded. Are there any other corrections? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business

Vice President Irwin: I thought I would give you what progress report I can today on the Commission on Higher Education and their recommendation regarding our biennial budget request. This is certainly unofficial because they have not formally presented their recommendations to the Budget Committee, although there has been a lot of activity in the last ten days. Some of you, I know, were disquieted and perhaps unhappy about the fact that in one of their reports, the Commission had categorized the non-health units on this campus as a "regional campus". I want you to know that the categorization has been corrected. Secondly, they also had forgotten, that all of the utility bills of this campus are budgeted into the non-health component and internally reallocated between health and non-health. We have reminded them of that and as a result, they have modified the budget rather substantially in our favor. I will give you some summaries comparing what they are recommending and what we requested. For the health units we had requested \$10.4 million of new monies, and for the non-health units we had requested \$23.3 million. That represents a 20 percent increase on the health side and a 43.3 percent on the non-health side. This year the ICHE has framed their recommendations in terms of five categories of funding levels. Depending on how well the economy is progressing, the following budgeting levels are recommended: (1) Maintenance level; (2) highest recommendation; (3) high recommendation; (4) important to the institution; and (5) do not fund. At the maintenance of programs level, they have recommended a 6 percent increase for people and for supplies and expenses, as well as a 16.2 percent increase for the health units and 21.6 percent increase for the non-health side. We are the opinion that they will also fund the Highest category and that would be a total increase of 19.6 percent for the health units and 25 percent increase for the non-health units. If they get down to the third category, and the estimate is they will get down to at least part of the third category, this would mean a total of 20.2 percent for health units and 27.9 percent for the non-health units. When I am using these percentages, I am talking about the percentage increase of our 1984-85 base. Thus, right now it would seem to me that easily about 20 to 75 percent of our request is still in a category that is likely to be funded. Those are just overview figures which we obtained this morning from them. We believe they will present these figures to the Budget Committee with their recommendations. We have a meeting with the Commissioner next week to review again some of the features of this campus so apparently Commissioner Ingle has not completely finalized the recommendations, and wishes to discuss them further. Hopefully, that will be beneficial to both parties.

AGENDA ITEM IV

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Vice President Irwin: The next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee Report from Henry Besch.

Professor Besch: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. I have three matters to touch on today: First, some comments on the mailings concerning IUPUI Faculty Council meetings; second, a brief report on a major announcement made by President Ryan at the University Faculty Council meeting held a couple of weeks ago; and third, some upcoming events, including the election of at-large representatives to this Council.

Let me start with the mailed announcements of today's meeting. A few years ago, the Faculty Council Office used to send two separate mailings for each Council meeting — an early one to Council members and a subsequent one to the rest of the voting faculty of IUPUI. With that double mailing, inevitably some people got two copies of the agenda and

minutes, and we got some complaints about this. Some even said they would be far happier to receive no mailings at all. The Executive Committee then came up with a simple solution: Send a single mailing to all voting faculty, and that would include the members of this Council. We have followed that pattern for several years. This year, however, we have been told that some of you wish to have an early announcement of the Faculty Council meeting so you can plan your calendar further in advance. We are going to try another solution, even though we recognize that the chief cause of problems is solutions. We suggest that you mark your calendars on the first Thursday of each month for the remainder of the 1984-85 academic year except for January, when we will meet on the second Thursday.

Now to turn to the content of the mailing for today's meeting. As you can see in the back of today's agenda and minutes, we are publishing the list of committees of the Council. Since we all met each other in the ballroom of the Walker Center last month, you should not feel reluctant to contact anyone on any of the committees with your ideas, suggestions or complaints. To encourage you to make that contact with a committee member who is currently serving on this Council, we have also provided with today's agenda, a Faculty Council membership roster, with addresses and phone numbers.

A copy of the Constitution and Bylaws is also appended. Because the faculty amended the Constitution last year, an update was necessary. To clearly distinguish this updated version, we have used a different letter font to print it. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee has worked to assure that most of the errors of previous versions have been corrected. Note too that for the first time in the history of our current Constitution and Bylaws, the pages are numbered consecutively from front to back.

I have a few other comments about Faculty Council standing committees. I have been advised to alert you that we do intend to publish the goals and objectives of each of your standing committees with the minutes of today's meeting. Each of the Committee Chairs has been requested to provide this information to the Faculty Council Office no later than next week, in order that we may include them in the next mailing.

In follow up to some comments in last month's Executive Committee report, I would point out that the Budgetary Affairs Committee has made available the promised flowsheet explaining the budgetary process at Indiana University. Copies of this flowsheet are on the table. Please take one if you like. Since this is a draft version, we will not include it with the minutes of this meeting. You may consider it a reward for having swum to this meeting today.

We also told you last month something about the activities of the Faculty Affairs Committee. I would like to update that information because it illustrates that the curmudgeons who assail Faculty Council concerns as all taradiddle are simply ignorant of the facts. One of the goals set by the Faculty Affairs Committee this year is to examine promotion and tenure policies and practices at IUPUI and they have already begun this task. The Faculty Affairs Committee is chaired this year by Professor Byron Olson. He has appointed a subcommittee of seven faculty members, chaired by Bob Nevin of the School of Social Work. That subcommittee has devised a possible survey form to determine faculty attitudes, perceptions, and current practices concerning promotion and tenure at our institution. You'll be hearing more from this group, but I wanted to mention it now as but a single example that the standing committees of the Faculty Council are not afraid of intractable problems. With that more serious pronouncement as a guide, I'll try to spare you some verbiage and be a bit more brief with the other two items of the Executive Committee report.

As most of you know, the University Faculty Council first met this academic year in Indianapolis on October 9th. A significant item at that meeting was that President Ryan announced his intention to appoint a small group, which he termed a University Commission, to evaluate the current organization and academic structure of the University. This Commission will be charged with, among other things, reviewing the implementation of the 1974 reorganization policies approved by the Board of Trustees at that time. In addition, the Commission will be asked to assess how those policies may need to be adjusted to meet updated goals for Indiana University for the next 10-15 years.

The President has indicated that he expects the Commission to seek input from the Faculty Councils. Accordingly, we will be asking each of the standing committees of this Council to review the most recent 10 year history of their activities and to provide the Executive Committee and the Council with a synopsis of that committee history. The committees should also consider and enumerate ways in which the areas they subserve may be restructured to increase efficiency.

The third item I have to bring to you from the Executive Committee is a short reminder that the elections process of this faculty will begin within the next two weeks. Our Constitution and Bylaws mandate that the list of voting faculty from which the faculty will nominate at-large representatives to the Faculty Council should be received by mid-November, with a return date of mid-December. The Nominating Committee intends to mail this list shortly. Each voting member of the IUPUI faculty and librarians is eligible to nominate three persons on the upcoming ballot.

Finally, I would like to mention that next month's Faculty Council meeting will be followed by the Fall Faculty Meeting at which Vice-President Irwin will deliver his annual address on the State of the Campus. Those meetings, on December 6th, will be held as is customary, in the Nursing School Auditorium.

That concludes my remarks.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM V

New Business

Vice President Irwin: Under 'New Business' we have a couple of items. The first one is an update on the Academic Computing Services, to be presented by Kristin Froehlke.

Kristin Froehlke: Thank you. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to talk to you. When Henry asked me to bring you up to date on Academic Computing and I began to collect the information, it occurred to me that I could go into enough detail to keep you here a long time, or I could be brief and allow time for questions. The agenda suggests that I am going to talk about the Access Program and I will talk more in detail about that than about anything else, but I would like to enlarge the scope of this presentation a bit. If you want to pursue anything in more detail, please feel free to come visit us in the Center. We would be delighted.

I hope that most of you are aware that we have had some changes in the Center in the last couple of years. We have doubled our mainframe capacity by replacing our old DEC system 10 with two DEC 2060's and by replacing our IBM 4341 with an IBM 4381. We currently have 200 interactive ports on the DEC systems and 160 interactive ports on the IBM system. To facilitate access, we also have totally replaced our communication equipment. Of course, the systems in Bloomington are still accessible from our network here in Indianapolis,

which provides all of the capabilities of new resources that a VAX computing center has been able to add in the last couple of years as well. We plan upgrades to these systems, as we can get the funds to secure them, but the basic direction of our mainframe computing should remain steady for three to five years. The real thrust right now, as I am sure you are all aware, is in distributive computing. That presents some challenges for Computing Services to meet your needs for both distributive computing and mainframe computing. Clearly, microcomputing is one example of distributive computing. It is definitely an understatement to say that microcomputing is exploding on this campus. The IU system in total is acquiring micros departmentally at the rate of about 100 per month. Computing Services is attempting to keep up with this explosion as it relates to both departmental and personal purchases. Our microcomputing support group, which is managed by Jim Williams, is working to take care of your departmental needs. The microcomputer support group provides a full range of services to departments, including consulting, configuration assistance, installation services, programming support, and training. Maintenance of departmental systems is also available from the operating group.

Our newest project, as it relates to microcomputer support, is the Access Program. This is a support service to assist in the personal purchase and use of microcomputers. Through the efforts of President Ryan and Executive Vice President Pinnell, the IU Foundation has agreed to buy and resell computing equipment to the faculty, staff and students of the University.

Access is a membership organization, with an annual fee of \$15. Through Access, Computing Services is able to provide assistance to members in selecting an appropriate personal computing systems and assistance in acquiring this equipment. We currently have contracts with several computer and peripheral-device manufacturers and dealers, with discount percentages that average about 30 percent below list price. The Access Program is also able to provide warranty service and a very limited amount of non-warranty maintenance for the equipment that is purchased through Access.

Probably the biggest problem that we are still wrestling with is software, which is available in very limited quantities through Access at discount prices. We have not been very successful to date in negotiating university contracts for software. What we would hope to arrange would be contracts to permit unlimited copying privileges of software, so that we can make it available to faculty at very reasonable prices.

Another major obstacle with software involves evaluating, learning about, and being able to train people on the hundreds of software packages that are available. A day doesn't go by that we don't get a new catalogue with the latest and greatest software that is available for micros. When you call and request our opinion or ask us to work toward a university discount for a given software package, we often don't have enough staff to respond in the way that we wish we could. We are working very closely with the Academic Computing Advisory Committee to revitalize a campus microcomputer users' group through which faculty will have resource sharing facilities. We are working towards having a database that people could access to find out who else might be interested in, or already be using a particular software package.

The Access Point is located in the Discovery Room of the Computing Center and contains demonstration units of most of the products available through Access. In addition, we do have special peripheral devices in the Access facility. One is a laser jet printer, which is connected to an IBM PC. If you bring in a minifloppy disk with a Multi-Mate or Word Star file on it, you can simply insert it into the PC and get letter quality printing. We also have a 9600 baud upline and downline file loading capability in the facility and shortly we hope to have a multi-colored plotter that you would be able to use. The

program is expanding with the Access fees. These are used to buy additional equipment for the facility, usually in the area of the higher priced peripherals. We certainly invite all of you to come down to the Access facility. I would ask that you announce to your classes that Access Point is also available to students.

Growth in distributive computing is also evidenced by departmentally-owned minicomputers. Many IUPUI departments could benefit from the specialized computing that is possible on a stand-alone minicomputer. I've heard that many people have the impression that the Computing Services is reluctant to support minicomputers, much less to recommend their purchase. That is really not the case. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss and plan with you when it is advisable for you to have a departmentally-owned mini. Don't hesitate to ask for our help.

In addition, we have recently worked out arrangements with Purdue University to have access to their Cyber 205 supercomputer. This machine is particularly well suited for large number-crunching problems. We do have a few users here at IUPUI that we have simply had to tell that our resources were not sufficient to provide them the computing that they needed done. So, Purdue's Cyber 205 is a good alternative for them. Through our Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, there is a small amount of grant money that is available if you have an interest in accessing the Cyber 205. We do have to pay real dollars for that access, but we are charged something like \$800 per CPU hour, which contrasts with the usual commercial charge of about \$3000 per CPU hour.

I hope all of you are aware of the services that we have been providing over the years with consulting and programming support for mainframe applications. It used to be a fairly straightforward task to develop a long range plan for computing. We simply wanted to double your computing power every couple of years. But there has been so much blending of the technologies in recent years that new long-range plans are very complex and very far reaching. Rapid current advances in telecommunications, office automation, and microcomputing are areas of importance. To develop a long range plan that encompasses this blending of technologies and best meets your needs, the charge to the Academic Computing Advisory Committee has been expanded this year to include the development of a strategic plan for computing on this campus. Under the chairmanship of Ray Russo, ACAC will address all of these issues and probably others including, a curricular rationale for projected computer development, trends in computer configurations and the mix of computer types which will provide both breadth and depth in the available hardware, trends in private ownership of computing hardware and its impact on the IU computing network, effective integration of microcomputing into the total computing environment, impact on computing of the university's strategic plan for telecommunications, review of funding policies for computing services, and trends in computing languages and application packages.

This will take a year's effort for this strategic plan and a subcommittee of ACAC has been appointed to deal with it. We invite your input on those topics and any others you might have to add to the list. Are there any questions?

Dean Yovits: I believe that Purdue University has been defined by the National Science Foundation as one of three major computer centers in the United States and that they have a federal grant to provide service for people who can't afford it.

Kristin Froehlke: I should have mentioned that. My understanding is that if you choose to use the Cyber 205 and request NSF grant funds to do so, that you actually make the request to NSF, not to Purdue. If you have such a grant from NSF, then Purdue provides the time and bills NSF.

Vice President Irwin: Are there any other questions for Kris? Thank you very much, Kris. The next item of new business is an overview of the Institute for Humanities Research, which will be given by its Director, Fran Rhome.

Frances Rhome: Thank you very much for the invitation to talk to you about the Institute. Many people are starting to ask a few questions of us. We are only one year old and just getting started. All of you should have received announcements about the Institute and an invitation to join. There is no membership charge at the moment. The notion of having members is to help us develop some kind of a directory of activities that are going on within the Institution. We noted an increasing interest in legal and ethical issues, which involve research in both the sciences and the humanities. This is the reason that I see this Institute as terribly important, because it can help to pull us together as a faculty on a number of projects. We want to introduce our faculty to one another and to the community. We have started a series of free lectures by IUPUI faculty members and others at the City Center on the Circle. People come in, eat their lunch, and listen. The response has been interesting. We have a number of persons who have come back every session. One of these individuals has even decided to return to college. There is a problem, however, with his transfer credits. He had completed two years of his coursework at Purdue in 1917. He is 87 years old and plans to enter the School of Liberal Arts to study history. It is stimulating to see people that are responding to our Institution in this regard.

On November 15, Thomas Kingston, director of fellowships and seminar programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities, will be present a talk about "How to Get a Grant from the NEH". Actually, he will present two sessions to accommodate people who are teaching different courses loads, one at 2:30 in the School of Nursing, Room 108 and again at 7:30. He will discuss varied grants and will talk to any individual who might have questions. We also, are planning a "Humanities Seminar for Executives" which is to start in January. We hope from that project to bring a number of executives to our campus to talk about how the humanities affect various companies. We are also inviting, for each session, a number of "movers and shakers" in Indianapolis to come in as resource persons for programs. During the 1985 spring semester, our major project will be to explore the impact of technology in the 21st century. We would like to hear about anything that you may be doing in this respect. To give structure to this project, we have settled on several subjects, including nutrition, medical genetics, robotics and labor, and communications. Teams of faculty members are developing agendas on each of these topics. They are now meeting and will make their presentations on April 27 at a campus colloquium. We hope that we will have some papers that we can publish as a result of that meeting. Dr. Hubert London, who is with the Hudson Institute, has agreed to open that particular meeting. We also send a monthly newsletter to members of the Institute, reporting on various research activities. We would be pleased to send this to everyone. We only need your completed membership blank in order to know whom to send it to.

The Institute's organization includes Overseers and a Board of Governors, some of whom were elected from the membership and some appointed by Vice-President Irwin. They cover a wide range of fields. We have a number of projects that we do want to develop within the near future as soon as we can locate funding. Thank you very much.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you Professor Rhome. Are there any questions?

Dean Yovits: This Executive Seminar, is that open to faculty to attend?

Frances Rhome: We haven't determined that at the moment. What we were hoping for is a 20-person enrollment. We are inviting a number of members of the faculty to come in for each of the sessions, in addition to the presenters. We haven't opened it for the general faculty. That might be a thing to consider, though. Do you think that would be a good idea?

Dean Yovits: Some faculty in my school would like to go, but they can't afford the fee.

Frances Rhome: The fee of \$600 for the session is a competitive price for an executive seminar. We have cooperation from the School of Medicine, incidentally. For an additional \$300, participants can have a complete physical examination.

Dean Yovits: I think this would be a great thing to publicize.

AGENDA ITEM VI
Old Business

Vice President Irwin: We have one item of old business. That has to do with the 1985-86 IUPUI calendar. Pat Boaz will present that.

Dean Boaz: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. This isn't as stimulating as Kris' or Fran's items, since it is a little difficult to get excited about a calendar. However, it is a very important piece of business for us. It is becoming quite difficult to proceed with academic and registration plans without an approved 1985-86 calendar. Copies of the proposed calendar are available on the front table. At the Council's April 5 meeting last year, this calendar was presented. After considerable discussion, it was tabled, largely because of differences that existed between the IUPUI and the Bloomington calendars. Those of you who were here on that day and who looked at the calendar before, will see that one of these differences has already been removed by action of the Bloomington Faculty Council. Both campuses now are not recessing for the Martin Luther King observation, but instead are planning major campus events, so the two calendars are now in uniformity in that respect.

Because of some rather serious differences, members of the IUPUI and the Bloomington Calendar Committees met on May 16. It soon became obvious that some of the differences result from the very different characteristics of the faculty and student bodies. For example, at the IUPUI campus a large percentage of students are commuters and come to the campus only to attend classes. For that reason, it has continued to seem advisable for classes to continue for a full 15 weeks. Notice that we have 15 weeks followed by an exam week. Bloomington, on the other hand, has 14 weeks and an exam week. This extra week of instruction appeals to the Academic Affairs Committee as enhancing contact between our students and our teachers, many of whom are part-time.

Another example is the Thanksgiving holiday. In Indianapolis where the students generally commute, Monday and Tuesday of the Thanksgiving week are class days. In Bloomington, however, where many students travel considerable distances to reach their homes, beginning the holiday on Wednesday would not meet their needs. It has been found that class attendance drastically declines on Monday and Tuesday, so scheduling a week's recess at this time is a concession to that particular problem in Bloomington.

There are also some constraints for each campus on the scheduling of the spring term. Indianapolis requires a very long lead time to reserve commencement facilities. Our current reservation, combined with the need for 15 weeks of classes, literally make it impossible to start our semester later in January than is now scheduled. In Bloomington,

the annual Little 500 events, which have substantial importance to the University, must be given calendar space in reasonably predictable weather, before the last week of classes and final exams. It appears that our different ways of scheduling for the spring semester, particularly starting the spring semester, are brought about by very significant combination of circumstances and educational principles. This joint committee did affirm the goal of integrating the calendars of the core campus as much as possible.

In two ways, the new Bloomington calendar now more resembles the Indianapolis one than it did before. In shortening its instructional period to 14 weeks, Bloomington has increased class time to 50 minutes, which was already the custom in Indianapolis. This has reduced the difference in contact time for students at the two campuses. These changes should make it easier for faculty members to teach the same course on the two campuses at the same time. You will note that the spring vacations also coincide, and there is every intent that they shall continue to do so. The joint committee was very much aware of the inconvenience caused by the IUPUI calendar for faculty and students who teach or study both at Bloomington and Indianapolis. We took some trouble to determine the number of people so affected and found that only about one half of one percent of Bloomington's students also take classes in Indianapolis. The figures are comparable for Indianapolis-based students. The problem is greatest for the Bloomington faculty in certain of the professional schools — Business, Education, and Library and Information Science. One out of every five of that group teaches on both campuses in a given semester. The colleagues involved, however, are really a small fraction not only of the total faculty but of their departmental or school faculty. We concluded that it is probably possible for the administrations of these professional schools to adjust to teaching schedules to accommodate the faculty so affected. These seem to be rather local problems that perhaps could be better addressed on the local level.

This joint meeting of the IUPUI and IUB Calendar Committees was considered to be so useful that, rather than continue the process of adopting calendars separately and then coming together to talk about the differences, there will be some planning sessions this fall to address shared concerns before the calendars are proposed. The proposed calendar before you does not differ from the one that we presented on April 5th, but perhaps we now have a little more justification for it.

Professor Rothman: I have a question about the first week in January. I don't know how many other professional societies have reserved the second week of January for their meetings. Those of us in mathematics attend such meetings at that period. Did you ask the faculty about other sciences that might have meetings in the winter? Everybody objected to having meetings at Christmas, so they moved dates into January when the new end-of-the-semester-in-December situation arose. Most schools end in December and start around January 20th like Bloomington. The meetings of the scientific societies are held between those times.

Dean Schaller: There are many such meetings in August now, too.

Professor Rothman: We have two a year — in August and in January. The January meeting is where you go to recruit faculty. This is where the interviewing takes place.

Dean Boaz: I don't know whether that kind of information has been gathered by the Calendar Committee. It can go to them as a request. However, we do have the constraint of the firm graduation date.

Professor Rothman: The other question I had is why Bloomington has a five week and an eight week session and we have two six week sessions?

Dean Boaz: As you know, the entire summer session schedule is being discussed now. I don't know why Bloomington adopted that particular format. Ours has consisted of two six-week sessions but it may very well change.

Dean Schaller: The summer schedule has been that way for a long time in Bloomington. There is a great deal of unhappiness there with the five-week session, from the pedagogical standpoint. Of course, we have some concerns in certain areas on this campus about a six week session.

Professor Rhome: Do they still retain the two week intersession and the pre-session? We have never adopted that here at IUPUI.

Dean Schaller: Those are small in number, but they still have them, I think in the School of Education particularly.

Dean Yovits: In the past, Bloomington has had their spring recess coincide with that of the public schools. Have they decided not to do that now?

Dean Schaller: That is correct.

Dean Boaz: Wasn't that largely myth?

Dean Schaller: No. It wasn't when it was first adopted. It was adopted for that reason. The Monroe County School System has been varying the dates of spring recess, however, with great delays in announcing the dates. I think, also, there is a certain amount of sentiment at Bloomington that the vacation, if it is to be meaningful in the sense of a break, be placed in the middle of the semester rather than in April. That gets into what we had when vacations started in December, coming back to finish the semester after a substantial recess. They were getting into that in the spring semester. Of course, we are getting into that now, with a week off for Thanksgiving.

Dean Boaz: I think both campus calendar committees are committed to the idea of spring break falling right in the middle of the spring semester.

Dean Wolf: I would like to say that I appreciate the sensitivity of the committee to the problems of faculty who teach at both campuses. I hope that the two committees, or whatever mechanism is organized to deal with this problem, won't just dismiss it and will continue to try to reconcile some of these differences because this can be a serious problem for these faculty members. Also, I am not sure what local abilities the School of Education has to resolve such problems.

Dean Boaz: Actually, the formal report that went to the Chairman of the University Calendar Committee suggested that the School of Education might form a study group to recommend how to handle this matter. The typical pattern of faculty duties could be varied for those who have the special responsibility of teaching in two locations in the same semester.

Dean Wolf: It is not an easy matter as things are now to persuade people to teach on both campuses.

Dean Schaller: Hugh, the biggest problem for us occurs in January. The start of the fall semester is about the same. The problem is in January and how to best deal with that is very difficult because the Little 500 Weekend is the reason that Bloomington has adopted this calendar. We will have to ask ourselves whether, because of that event, we want to

affect the programs of 23,000 students and about 1300 faculty members up here, as opposed to trying to live with it in the few units that are affected. I know it is tough, and there is a certain amount of emotion that surrounds it; but, given the reasons, I guess it is something that we will just have to have trouble with. You are right, however. It is a problem.

Professor Blake: I know that you have given us a comparison, but I can't recall comparing the instructional hours on each campus.

Dean Boaz: I do not have those numbers with me, but the difference I can tell you. For a three credit course, the difference in instructional time has been reduced from 270 minutes to 150 minutes. For a three credit course we have 150 additional instructional minutes here. In system schools, where classes are supposed to be taught the same on each campus I have sympathy for the students in Bloomington because, if they are getting the same instruction that we have, they are running quite a bit faster.

Dean Yovits: I would like to point out that the Purdue schools are teaching courses which are identical to courses on the West Lafayette campus. Accordingly, the time and other factors involved would be very similar.

Dean Schaller: I think there is actually one less week of instruction each semester in Bloomington than we have here in Indianapolis. I think that is significant in total minutes. You are going to have several fewer contacts with the student, with one less week to present class material. One-fifteenth of the instructional time is a fair amount of time. I think that we should continue to regard the number of weeks we have to teach as being extremely important on this campus, particularly with classes that meet only once a week.

Vice President Irwin: Are there other comments? This is a report from a standing committee, so we have to consider this as a motion and it is automatically seconded. Are you ready for the question? All in favor of accepting this calendar, please say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM VII

Adjournment

Vice President Irwin: This meeting is adjourned.

H. R. Besch

H. R. Besch, Secretary

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

3:00 p.m., THURSDAY, December 6, 1984

N U R S I N G S C H O O L A U D I T O R I U M

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of November 1, 1984
- III. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
Nominating Committee Report - Pat Blake, (Boards of Review Slates)
- IV. The Hudson Institute - Mr. Thomas D. Bell, Jr., President
- V. Adjournment

AGENDA

FALL FACULTY MEETING
(4:00 p.m., following Faculty Council Meeting)

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr.

THE STATE OF THE CAMPUS ADDRESS, 1984

- III. Adjournment.

JOHN RYAN
PRESIDENT'S OFC
BRYAN HALL
BLOOMINGTON

MINUTES

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
DECEMBER 6, 1984
3:00 P.M., NURSING AUDITORIUM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Executive Dean Schaller. Deans: Patricia Boaz, Barbara Fischler, Nicholas Kellum, Ralph E. McDonald, Arthur Weber, Marshall Yovits. Professors: Stephen Allen, Philip Bendick, H. R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Ira Brandt, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Carley, Varoujan Chalian, David Crabb, Theodore Cutshall, Donna Dial, Naomi Fineberg, LaForrest Garner, Donald Gartner, Jean Gnat, Thomas Jones, Betsy Joyce, Linda Kasper, Ray Koleski, William Kulsrud, Juanita Laidig, Jeanne Mueller, Catherine Palmer, Richard Pflanzner, Frances Dodson Rhome, James Shanks, Jan Shipps, Ernest Smith, Elizabeth Solow, Marie Sparks, Richard Turner, Jeffery Vessely, Roger Wall, Harriet Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: G. Kent Frandsen for Gerald Bepko; Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; Edward Robbins for Howard Mehlinger; John D. Barton for William M. Plater; David Bostwick for R. Bruce Renda; W. Harvey Hegarty for Jack Wentworth. Professors: Ronald E. Dehnke for Michael Cohen; Judy Lambert for Jean Hutten; Judith E. Kosegi for Suetta Kehrein; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp; Janice Bruckner for Rebecca Porter.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles Bonser, Elizabeth Grossman, Acting Dean Gerald Powers for Sheldon Siegel, James Weigand. Professors: Charolambos Aliprantis, Robert Appledorn, Angenieta Biegel, David Bixler, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Mervyn Cohen, Russell Dilley, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Paul Galanti, Michael Glant, Vania Goodwin, Gary Gruver, Ain Haas, Ruth Holland, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Henry Karlson, Joseph Kuczkowski, Brenda Lyon, Steven Mannheimer, Omkar Markand, Leo McCarthy, Gerald McHugh, Forrest Meiere, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Murray Passo, Shirley Quate, Mitchell Rhodes, Neal Rothman, Ramsis Salama, Philip Shea, Erna Simek, Jay Simon, Anoop Sondhi, Lawrence Wheeler, Ruth Woodham.

VISITORS: Virginia Harvin, School of Education; Charlotte Wright, IUPUI News Bureau.

AGENDA ITEM I
Call to Order

Vice President Irwin: Good afternoon. The parking around the School of Nursing is difficult so I suspect people are still mushing their way over here.

AGENDA ITEM II
Approval of Minutes - November 1, 1984

Vice President Irwin: The first order of business is the approval of the minutes of our November 1 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Are there any comments, questions, additions, deletions? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion say "Aye". Opposed? Hearing none, motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Vice President Irwin: Henry, I will call on you for the Executive Committee Report.

Professor Besch: Thank you, Dr. Irwin. The Executive Committee's business is short. I have just a couple of announcements and then the business that is indicated on the agenda under "Executive Committee Report" including the Nominating Committee Report regarding the Faculty Boards of Review.

I would like to remind the faculty that the next Board of Trustees meeting is this Saturday and that a subcommittee of the Executive Committee will be making a presentation to the Faculty Relations Committee of the Board of Trustees. John Chalian chairs that subcommittee; Henry Karlson, Jeff Vessely and Chuck Yokomoto are also serving. They will be delivering the program at 8:30 this Saturday morning in the Business/SPEA building. So, as you are snuggled in behind warm blankets, please think fond thoughts of John and the others who are out in the cold weather attending the Board of Trustees meeting in order to represent you and your concerns. Their presentation is on outreach activities that are going on from IUPUI to primary and secondary schools throughout Indiana. We will be reporting back to you on that.

The only other item the Executive Committee asked me to bring to you will be presented by Dean Schaller who has some comments about an upcoming event.

Dean Schaller: You will recall when we were deliberating and then passed the Academic Calendar for next year, we indicated that we would be arranging for a celebration of Martin Luther King's birthday as a means of recognizing the contributions that he has made to all of us. I am pleased to tell you that a group chaired by Dr. Lincoln Lewis is at work on that and, as a matter of fact, practically has the program lined up. I won't try to announce details today because it is not quite all set. But, we will have the first observation of Martin Luther King's birthday during this academic year and it will be on January 21, 1985. I would like for all of you to mark your calendars for that day because it will be an historic day on this campus, marking the first time we will be doing this. Dr. Lewis shortly will be releasing the program. I can tell you that we have two nationally-prominent figures who are just about committed to be with us that day and there will also be some panels. I think the university community does have an excellent opportunity ahead of us come January 21st next year. Thank you.

Professor Besch: Thank you, Dean Schaller. I would like now to call on Pat Blake, Chair of the Nominating Committee for a report on the slates for the Boards of Review.

Professor Blake: Thank you. There are two Faculty Boards of Review to be elected at the January meeting of the Council. I am presenting the slates only for your information today and to record the names in the minutes for your convenience.

For Faculty Board of Review #1, the nominees, their rank and their unit are: Robert Dick, Professor - Liberal Arts; Doris Froebe, Professor - Nursing; Frederick Kleinhans, Associate Professor - Science; John Kremer, Associate Professor - Science; Richard Miyamoto, Associate Professor - Medicine; Robert Nevin, Assistant Professor - Social Work; John Ottensmann, Associate Professor

- SPEA; Charles Palenik, Assistant Professor - Dentistry; Aristotle Siakotos, Professor - Medicine; Hitwant Sidhu, Associate Professor - Physical Education; Maudine Williams, Associate Librarian - Herron School of Art; and Pao-Lu Yu, Professor - Medicine.

For Faculty Board of Review #2, they are: Anne Belcher, Assistant Professor - Nursing; Merle Draper, Professor - Education; Warren Epinette, Associate Professor - Medicine; Richard Hamburger, Professor - Medicine; Florence Juillerat, Assistant Professor - Science; Steven Mannheimer, Assistant Professor - Herron School of Art; Robert Mendelson, Associate Professor - SPEA; Chris Miller, Professor - Dentistry; John O'Loughlin, Professor - Engineering & Technology; Lawrence Wheeler, Associate Professor - Medicine; and Marie Wright, Assistant Librarian - University Libraries.

The Bylaws restrict the compositions of the Board of Reviews in several ways. There can be no more than two from the same unit; no more than three from the same rank; three must be tenured and each Board is composed of five faculty members. The Executive Committee appoints a legal counsel to each one of those boards. When you get the ballot, you will select one from each rank or two from each category. In the end, after your votes are tallied, we will apply these criteria to judge whether there are too many from one unit or one rank. Are there any questions?

Also, there is one other thing that I would like to mention to you. We are still waiting for some of you to send in your nominations for faculty and librarians to the University Faculty Council. That ballot will be coming out in January. Thank you.

Professor Besch: Thank you, Pat. Finally, I would like to point out that the goals and objectives of the various committees are printed in the back of your minutes for today's meeting [Circular 84/85-007]. I would urge you to look at those and see if there are items that you would want to speak to or if there are items missing from the goals and objectives statements of any of the committees that you think should be there. Please contact committee chairs or members with your suggestions.

Dr. Irwin has given me the privilege and I am honored to introduce to you today Thomas D. Bell, Jr., who is President and Chief Executive Officer of the Hudson Institute. Tom Bell has an outstanding record in national and international activities in business and in government. He has administered, consulted, assisted, managed, and otherwise proven himself to be an effective leader in both the public and the private sectors. Mr. Bell has headed the Hudson Institute since 1982, after serving as Executive Vice President of Citizens Choice, a national business organization founded by the United States Chamber of Commerce. He also was Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Creative Communications Corporation, a public affairs consulting company. He has been an advertising and public relations executive, and has held a number of national governmental and political posts. He also is a director of several companies and not-for-profit corporations. He was educated at the University of Tennessee and did additional course work at George Washington University. Tom Bell is now a bona fide resident of the city of Indianapolis, and the Hudson Institute is now a resident of the IUPUI campus. IUPUI faculty members have expressed much interest in working with the scholars who are members of

one of the country's outstanding "think tanks", the Hudson Institute. I know that we are all interested in how the presence of the Hudson Institute in our city will benefit not only the intellectual reputation but also the economic condition of Indianapolis and Indiana. I am sure most of you know that the Hudson Institute is named after a river to the northeast of here. However, there's no truth to the rumor that the Institute's name is being changed to the White Institute. I am happy to introduce to you now...Thomas D. Bell, Jr.

Mr. Bell: Normally I wouldn't stand up here, but if I didn't, I couldn't see most of you through the lecturn. Actually, Henry, you were almost correct. We might be changing the name to the Hudson Institute on the White River. Either that or we want to find a senior faculty member to associate with us by the name of Hudson.

The first thing I would like to do is say a very sincere thank you to each and every one of you for having us here. We feel like we are the newest of new recruits in the university system but it is very very pleasant to be here. At least it was until I got up this morning and started to walk across the campus in the snow. Except for the weather, the environment is everything that we hoped it would be and, frankly, the associations with Indiana University and Purdue University were the primary and, I think, the most significant motivating factor in our move from the greater New York area to Indianapolis and Indiana. I will tell you more about that in a little while. Everyone here has been absolutely tremendous to Hudson and the staff of the Hudson Institute -- from the people who run the Union Building and the hotel to the architect and the contractors who have helped us redesign the dorm to fit our needs -- to the tremendous cooperation we have received from John Ryan, Steve Beering, Glenn, Howard and the rest of the faculty here. We are deeply appreciative of all their help.

The two questions that I get asked most often in my travels around the country and even here in Indiana and Indianapolis are: Why did you move the Hudson Institute to Indiana? That is number one. Number two is: What does the Hudson Institute do anyway? I think the latter is the one I get asked most often on campus. I will start with the first question.

"Why would we want to move the Hudson Institute to Indianapolis?" That is the first question that my Trustees asked me when I brought the subject up. Well, that's not really accurate. The first question was "Where is Indianapolis?" The second question was why would we want to move the Hudson Institute to Indianapolis? After the Trustees had decided in May that we were, in fact, going to move, I presented the senior staff with the news. They weren't ecstatic. The first question literally was "Where is Indianapolis?" Now these guys are all pretty smart people. I had to get a map and show them. They said, "Oh yes! We fly over there on our way out to the coast." This is a think tank, right? The second question was "What is the subway system like?" Actually, there were four primary reasons to move to Indianapolis. First, while we were considering moving and had begun very tentative conversations with Phoenix, Santa Barbara, Austin, Columbus, Washington, Alexandria and other places, we were a long way from a final decision. However, the partnership that the Indiana community put together between the government, academic, labor, and business communities was not prepared to wait. All the other cities said very

politely, "Well, that's fine. Please let us know when you are farther along." End of conversation. Tom Moses wanted to know why we were waiting in the first place. He said he couldn't understand why we wanted to spend another day back east when in fact we might be able to be fortunate enough to be in the Indianapolis area. So, they moved the process ahead -- this dynamic partnership. Everytime the Hudson Trustees, staff or I would come up with a series of unqualified reasons as to why it was impossible to make the move and present it to them, within ten days they would be back with a way to resolve each issue. We, frankly, became very very impressed with the strength and the depth of your leadership; the excitement, the attitude the community and the state had about itself, particularly when you consider that Indianapolis is located in the middle of what the New York Times and the Washington Post repeatedly told us was Rustbelt. Then we visited here.

First, I came here several times with a couple of members of the staff, then we brought the Trustees here and finally we brought the staff here. About 60 of us showed up one night at 11:00 at the busy Indianapolis International Airport. The community made a tremendous impression on these hard core New Yorkers. I will never forget the first night, as two staff members and myself walked out of the restaurant a very nice hostess said, "Gee, I hope you enjoy your stay and you come back soon." One of my staff members turned around and said, "That's an awful smart alec thing to say." He thought she was being sarcastic. It took a while to get used to this friendliness. A policeman stopped one of our staff members. She had run a red light by accident. She wouldn't know the light was there. She showed her New York driver's license. He asked her what she was doing here and she said "Our company, The Hudson Institute, is thinking about moving here and we are visiting." He said, "That's fine. Be more careful in the future." He gave her license back to her. She said she would have done 30 days in New York City. So, it is different. The staff now gets done in two hours on a Saturday morning what it used to take us three weeks to do in the greater New York area. It is a whole new lifestyle for us. This partnership is a unique asset that you have. I don't think you really appreciate it when you are here all of the time but when you travel around the United States and the world as frequently as the people at Hudson do, it really is unique and powerful. It is a development device that you are using in your best interest.

The second reason, as I said earlier, probably the most important one is the advantages that we believe will be provided us by our associations with Indiana University and Purdue University and the other fine educational institutions of this area. We had a long-term and close working relationship with New York University in Columbia when we were in New York. That relationship, frankly, became more and more difficult to maintain over time. As the universities became what they perceived to be more competitive with policy research organizations, they became less and less interested in "policy research" as we represented it. When we came here and talked to senior faculty members, deans, presidents, vice presidents, and executive deans of the universities, they seemed to have a completely different attitude -- a real interest in becoming involved, both on the part of the faculty and the Hudson staff.

We believe there our joint interests are served. Our association with IUPUI will allow us to leverage our research capabilities to a substantial degree by involving over time either groups or individuals within the university community who might be willing and able to contribute to our studies. For example, this morning we talked with people from the School of Business. I don't know whether it would hurt or help their reputation to have you know who we are talking to so I won't mention names. It was amazing to me how many common ideas we had about how we might be able to help one another -- how we might be able to provide contacts in the government, business, and foundation communities that we have built over the years -- to assist in research that the School of Business would be interested in. Not all of their interests necessarily fit what we are currently studying but much of it would. We identified many areas where we might work together: projects of taxation, fiscal problems, budget problems, medicare, and medicaid.

We went on and on. The more we talked the more areas we found where we might be able to find a mutually beneficial relationship. We have found this same attitude all over the university system -- every place we have gone. We look forward with a lot of excitement to developing those relationships over time.

The third reason for our move to Indianapolis is the quality of life. In practical business terms I think we reduced our base operating costs by about 33 percent and increased our productivity by about 30 percent. The people that we brought with us who have been doing this for 20 to 25 years are better and more productive now than they were in New York. The reason is that their working conditions are better and their lifestyle is substantially enhanced. They don't have to commute for an hour, it takes them 20 minutes to get to work. The new people we have injected into the organization have brought new ideas and created a sense of excitement that frankly was needed. It has been a very very productive and interesting relationship. As we considered our move, many people said that, and I think our Trustees' greatest concern was, we wouldn't be able to attract to Hudson in Indianapolis the kind of long range policy oriented research staff we had traditionally attracted because they wouldn't want to live here. I can tell you that that doesn't appear to be true. As long as you are willing to be slightly sneaky and devious, you can get all the people you want to move. What you need to do is to be a little flexible. You have to offer them commuter privileges and tell them "You don't have to live in Indianapolis. I am not sure they would want you anyway. As long as you promise to spend three days a week in Indianapolis, that's fine. You are going to be spending most of your time on the road anyway. We will put you up in the Student Union. You have never stayed in a nicer place." By and large, it appears, with only one exception, and that is a man with a personal problem, this tactic is going to be successful because after they spend some time in Indianapolis, they want to move here. We are not going to have trouble getting people here as long as we are willing to be patient because Indianapolis and Indiana are addictive. It is easy to succumb to the charm and to the excitement of the community.

At the Hudson Institute we have always prided ourselves on being ahead of the curve on the cutting edge of change. Leading into change, that's always been sort of our "niche".

We love breaking the Cardinal Rule of Forecasting, which is that if you predict an event, never predict the time; if you give the time, don't give an event, because people are liable to write that down. My description of a politician has always been, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, a person who has the ability to look into the future 10 or 15 years and accurately describe what is going to happen in great detail, and when it doesn't happen, explain why he was correct. That certainly is true of the politicians we work with. It is also sometimes true of the Hudson Institute. We have always delighted in giving long range predictions or stating the obvious when everyone else was trying to brush it under the carpet. We have always delighted in challenging conventional wisdom. When in 1964 we wrote a book that said that by 1980, Japan would exceed the United States in per capita income, not only were we laughed at in the United States, we were laughed at in Japan. Remember that in the early sixties, you used to scrape the "Made in Japan" label off the camera that you gave your mother-in-law for Christmas. Now we buy Japanese labels and put them on our gifts. Things have really changed. Since we have this reputation for being ahead of the times, we try to maintain it. We are delighted to watch our fellow think tankers squirm in their seat as they scratch their head and try to figure out what it is that we know, that they haven't yet figured out about Indiana.

The second most asked question is "What does Hudson Institute do?" That is a harder question to answer. We do policy research. Parts of Hudson Institute also spend a lot of time on operation research, systems research, and to a lesser degree, scientific research. By and large, what Hudson does and is best known for is policy research. As a way to describe our functions, we see our job not as making decisions but as instead providing decision making information to the decision makers. Hopefully, creative, innovative, imaginative formulations that will help them make better decisions on tough policy questions. The research is not always perfect. It is not always easy to justify absolutely. In fact, many times we give what we call "scotch verdicts". In Scotland you were allowed to render three verdicts in court: guilty, not guilty, and unproven. Guilty and not guilty we understand but unproven means in the considered opinion of the jury the individual appears to be guilty but that the prosecutor has not made a case beyond a shadow of a doubt; therefore, we cannot charge him guilty. Many times we produce studies and forward them up to the top decision makers of government, business and the foundation world that are very obviously scotch verdicts. We cannot prove beyond a shadow of a doubt the decisions are absolutely correct ones. However, given the resources and the time that we had to do the work, it is our best effort. Although this is hard for serious scientific scholars to deal with, it is very much a part of the policy research business. Our research is basically in four areas. National security is a big chunk of our business and is done mostly for the U.S. Government and allied governments. Economic research, both domestic and international, is next and covers a broad array of subjects from labor trends to trade issues, budget issues, regulatory issues, and the like, and economic development issues for LDC countries, and in the Asian and Western European areas. The third area is in education employment and structural adjustment, an area we want to expand now that we are here in the midwest both because of the very valuable resources that are now available to us here from the university and also because I think we are better situated here than we were in New York to pursue those issues.

Lastly, we do a lot of futures research. We do not consider "futureology" a science, although some try to claim it is. But, scenario analysis is a very interesting technique for decision making, for trying to look over the horizon to better understand social, political, economic and cultural trends. All that is part of the decision making process and we are good at it. I think many of the methodologies now common in the futures business were originally developed by Herman Kahn and our colleagues at Hudson Institute. So, it still remains an important part of our business.

How does Hudson Institute do its work? Well, generally, we use a team approach. We create a research team to address a given issue. Most of the researchers have a specialty but our interdisciplinarians usually cover two or three areas. The team is generally made up of three to seven members. There is a team leader who is a specialist with some specific qualifications in an area of study. That person is almost always a full time staff member of the Hudson Institute. Then there are other team members which might come from either that area or other diverse areas. For instance, right now we are doing a study on the future of Michigan. The team has a very senior social scientist demographer as the team leader and an anthropologist, urban developers, an historian, and a lawyer. We almost never have one individual author a report on a single subject. Having a single author is, as we say at the Hudson, "promoting unilogic", a disastrous term. Literally interpreted, this means that you already knew what he or she was going to say, given the opportunity. There is nothing wrong with that, so long as the person is truly an expert. Many of our people are and write their article outside of the framework of the Hudson Institute. But, the main idea of the Hudson Institute is to try to break away from unilogics and be a little more demanding and challenging in making our representations to the public. We pride ourselves on taking to the decision makers a document that they can read, understand and act upon. Many times we have not furthered the science or the area of economics in which we worked but instead have dealt with the political and policy realities of that economic subject in order to try to help a member of Congress or a member of the Executive branch or some other leader who must deal with a particular issue.

We are non-partisan -- not bi-partisan -- but non-partisan. We are not interested in party labels. We are very interested in politics but only in the sense that we might advise those people who generally make the decisions on the issues we are most interested in. We are often accused of being a "right wing" think tank. All I can say is that I know Mr. Lane Kirkland who is a member of the Hudson Institute, and Pat Moynihan who is a member of Hudson Institute, and Roger Fisher who is a member of Hudson Institute, Helmut Schmitt who is a member of Hudson Institute would be very disappointed to hear Hudson was too "conservative". With these people in the organization, we would challenge anyone to maintain the accusation of our being right wing; that is flatly not true. Our position is we do our research to find the answer. We don't figure out what the answer is and then try to do research to back it up. By the same token, we also have William F. Buckley, John Connally, Fred Hartley, Martin Anderson, and Al Haig as members of Hudson Institute. So, Hudson covers a very very broad range. That is our purpose. We want to be stimulated by our staff and not typecast into one ideological area or another. But, that is hard for some people to understand and believe.

Structurally there are four pieces of Hudson Institute: Board of Trustees, which is the senior policy making organization; members, who like the members of the Council of Foreign Relations are nominated by the Board and elected by the membership. By our statutes or bylaws, there are 182 members who serve anywhere from three- to seven-year terms. They serve in three different categories: fellows, who generally come out of scholarly pursuits of one sort or another; public members, who generally come out of government or business; and employee members, who are long time employees or former employees of the Institute. Next there are officers of the corporation: myself and four vice presidents and lastly there is the Research Management Council, which I would guess is not unlike the various faculty councils that exist here. They serve as an advisory organization for the President and basically tell all of the rest of us what to do whenever they get a chance.

In summary, let me say that we hope to develop a very close, continuing and mutually beneficial partnership with the faculty and the leadership of Indiana University and Purdue University. That is one of the major reason we moved here. We are already enjoying the fruits of our association in terms of intellectual stimulation and atmosphere. I think we will soon begin to enjoy the fruits of it in terms of the actual research we are doing. We look forward to years of cooperation. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Professor Rhome: How many of those 182 members who you have on your research team are really in this area or are they all working back home someplace?

Mr. Bell: The members of the Institute, which are different from the research staff, are nominated by the Board and are not full time staff members. On the Institute staff, I should have pointed out, we have 465 total people. About 270 of those are professionals. By the time we get back up to the full count, we should have about 80 to 85 here in Indianapolis. The rest of them are spread out between Washington, New York, Montreal, Phoenix, and Tokyo. The biggest chunk of them, almost 280, are in Washington, D.C. where they have to be because of contractual relationships we have with the State Department, the Department of Defense and other agencies. As absurd as it seems, these people are required by these contracts to be within a specific number of minutes from defined locations. Since a big chunk of the support of our research program comes from the government, we live with those constraints. We hope, however, to build and develop our core program right here in Indianapolis. While we are completely committed to Indiana University in its entire systems, and Purdue University in their entire system, our home is IUPUI which is where we hope we will be most involved.

Professor Rhome: May I follow up? In our teaching classrooms we love to have outside experts come in from time to time for our own students' experience and perspective. I wondered when some of your imminent persons are in the area, if it would be possible for us to have them visit and contribute to our classes?

Mr. Bell: I think it would be. I have talked to Howard about that. We have people in and out of Indianapolis frequently. We were talking to Helmut Schmitt about coming through during this next trip. I believe Henry Kauffman will be here in June. On March 26 we will have our first open forum here. We also have, of course, our headquarters research staff who are here all of the time.

Professor Koleski: Could you describe some of your more significant projects of which you are most well known?

Mr. Bell: In the past or things that we are involved in now?

Professor Koleski: Past and present.

Mr. Bell: We will finish in December a study called "Europe in the World" which is project on Western European revitalization. I am sure this report will be a very fine piece. Our "Vision of the Future" program is quite well received. We have done over the years a number of other future studies that have been quite well received. We would

one on the future of the United Kingdom in 1973 -- it was called "UK 1980" -- which proved to be more correct than any of us could imagine. It called for both the conservative revolution in government there and the devaluation of the pound. We have done a lot of national security work which is of general interest. Some of it involved deterrence and the ways to avoid nuclear conflict. We have also published on the very unpopular subject of ways to survive nuclear conflict which is not our favorite business, but which must be done.

We do a lot of economic development work for AID and for other government development agencies. We have done quite a bit of future research and development research mostly in economic areas.

Also economic and political trends for Western European and Asian governments including Japan, South Korea and China.

They go on and on. If you are interested, call the office. They can provide you with publications lists which go back to 1982.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you very much, Tom. We certainly are delighted to have you and the Hudson Institute on our campus. We look forward to a solid future.

AGENDA ITEM IV
Adjournment

Vice President Irwin: We are now adjourned. The Fall Faculty meeting will start in five minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

THURSDAY, January 10, 1985
LAW SCHOOL, ROOM 116, 3:30 p.m.

A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of December 6, 1984 Meeting
- III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
Nominating Committee Report - Pat Blake, Chair
Boards of Review Elections
- V. New Business
The Campaign for Indiana - Gene Temple, IUF
The Martin Luther King, Jr., Day Observance - Lincoln Lewis
Indianapolis Public Schools Task Force Report - Carlyn Johnson
- VI. Adjournment

HITWANT SIDHU
PHYSICAL EDU
PE 265
IUPUI

Minutes

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

January 10, 1985

3:00 P.M., Law School, Room 116

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Executive Dean Schaller. Deans: Patricia Boaz, Gerald Bepko, Elizabeth Grossman, Nicholas Kellum, Ralph McDonald, William Plater, Sheldon Siegel, Arthur Weber, Marshall Yovits. Professors: Henry Besch, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Theodore Cutshall, James Edmondson, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Donald Gartner, Gary Gruver, Ain Haas, Ruth Holland, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Juanita Laidig, Steven Mannheim, Gerald McHugh, Jeanne Mueller, Murray Passo, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Shirley Quate, Mitchell Rhodes, Frances Rhone, James Shanks, Jan Shipp, Jay Simon, Ernest Smith, Elizabeth Solow, Marie Sparks, Richard Turner, Jeffery Vessely, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; Jeannette Matthew for Barbara Fischler; H. Oner Yurtseven for R. Bruce Renda; Louis Holtzclaw for James Weigand. Professors: Karen Gable for Michael Cohen; Randi Stocker for Jean Gnat; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp; Elton Ridley for Erna Simek; Mary A. Feeley for Elizabeth Solow; Cliff Goodwin for Charles Yokomoto.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles Bonser, Howard Mehlinger, Jack Wentworth. Professors: C. Aliprantis, Stephen Allen, Robert Appledorn, Philip Bendick, Angenieta Biegel, David Bixler, Charles Blevins, Ira Brandt, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Carley, David Crabb, Donna Dial, Russell Dilley, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Charles Ellinger, Naomi Fineberg, Michael Glant, Vania Goodwin, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Ray Koleski, Joseph Kuczowski, William Kulrud, Brenda Lyon, Omkar Markand, Leo McCarthy, Forrest Meiere, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Catherine Palmer, Neal Rothman, Ramsis Salama, Philip Shea, Anoop Sondhi, Roger Wall.

AGENDA ITEM I

Call to Order

Vice President Irwin: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to 1985.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - December 6, 1984

Vice President Irwin: The first order of business is the approval of the minutes of our December 6, 1984 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] Are there any comments, questions, additions, or deletions? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business

Vice President Irwin: I would like to give a brief progress report today regarding the status of the operating budget which is working its way through the Indiana General Assembly. In fact, today the House Ways and Means Committee had their first meeting on budgetary affairs. I hope you picked

up the one-page summary that was on the front table up here. [Copy attached] This is not a complete summary of the budget. What it represents are recommended changes in the budget from the current year —1984-85 — for the next biennium. What we have listed on this page are really the major concerns that we have about the Governor's budget recommendations as they now stand. These are matters that we will be dealing with from now until the waning hours of the session.

First of all, the budget is based on the premise that there will be a five percent increase in fees the first year of the biennium and a six percent increase the second year of the biennium. There is concern that the General Assembly may again, as they have in the past, enact legislation that has the legislature, not the respective universities, setting student fees in the budget bills. Of course, there will be considerable opposition to that.

Regarding the first item, "Recommended Changes in Operating Appropriation", the Governor has recommended \$7.1 million compared with the State Budget Committee's recommendation of \$5.3 million. That is in the first year. In the second year he has recommended \$6.34 million compared with the Budget Committee's recommendation of \$4.5 million, so that the Governor's recommendation for this campus for the biennium would appear to be \$3.59 million more than the Budget Committee recommends. Of course, the Budget Committee very substantially reduced the earlier recommendations of the Higher Education Commission.

The second item has to do with the issue of salaries. The Governor is recommending faculty and staff salary increases of 4.3 percent the first year and 5.2 percent the second year of the biennium. In that instance, the Governor has actually recommended about \$905,000 less than the five and six percent. But, going down to the very end of the page, the Governor has recommended for this campus money over and above the 4.3 and the 5.2 percentage increases for wages. Under the item "Retention and Attraction of Faculty" there is \$1.78 million the first year and the same amount the second year. This is to be used to improve the salary positions of our people.

A big concern is the third item which is the "Funding for Utilities and Insurance." The Commission recommended \$1.5 million, which was essentially what the University requested for this campus. The Governor recommended only \$513,000. So, we have a shortfall in utilities and insurance of \$1 million the first year. That becomes worse in the second year when the shortfall, as we project it, will be \$2.6 million. This is a shortfall for the biennium of \$3.7 million on utilities for Indianapolis. I think one of the premises is that if inflation in the cost utilities is of this magnitude, the General Assembly will make an adjustment in the 1986 short session, making up the difference of the shortfall and projecting a new level of funding for the second year of the biennium. The problem is that, as a University, we have to balance the budget. Some way or another, we must balance that budget without having to cannibalize money from the salary and wages appropriation.

I also have a few comments about the new programs. The only programs that the Governor or the Budget Committee has recommended are continuation of those programs that have been started up in a token manner for nursing. This is a Master's program in nursing throughout the state, a program at IU Kokomo, and a program at IU East. There was no mention of money for nursing at South Bend, which is badly needed. Also, there was no mention of new program money for geology, the Master's in history, art history, or journalism. Of course, these are items that we have to work on with vigor as the process goes on. There was no mention in the recommendations of the Governor or the Budget Committee of funds for quality improvement. For example, we had a big item there for library upgrading. We also had an important item for replacement of part-time faculty with full-time faculty, plus substantial items for equipment for this campus and computer assisted instruction. None of these items is to be found in the recommendations to this point.

Regarding the supplies and expense category, there is a five percent increase in S & E for each of the two years, which is totally inadequate in view of what has happened to us for ten years. So, as

I say, we have some areas that we will continue to work on. The information on this sheet does not represent the complete budget; it is a summary of some of the concerns that we will all be working on as this budget goes through the process of various committees and the leadership of the General Assembly.

Howard, do you want to make any comments regarding this?

Dean Schaller: No. Do you want to mention the Capital Budget items which are not on the sheet?

Vice President Irwin: The capital items haven't even been discussed. That is traditional. They are left until the waning hours of the session. In fact, the final Operating Budget is worked out only in the last hours of the session. There will be alterations in the current budget recommendations. You can expect days in which certain committees improve the picture, and there will be days when another committee may reduce those improvements. It is not unusual to start off in this fashion. Hopefully, with the efforts of all of us, we can make some improvements.

Howard, why don't you say something about the enrollment?

Dean Schaller: As of Friday, the enrollment for this semester, compared with the same time in the spring semester of last year, is down about 1.6 percent in headcount and 2.4 percent in credit hours. The story isn't all over because, as you know, we continue to have some late registration this week and we are going through drop and add. Our experience is that these numbers usually change some between the end of the regular registration and the final statistics. The activity this week indicates that there probably isn't going to be a great deal of change. These numbers may improve a little bit. It would appear, at this time, that the numbers I just gave are a fairly accurate reflection of the final picture. You will recall that we had forecasted a slight decline in the enrollment and budgeted on that basis. Our forecast is proving practically 100 percent accurate, both in the terms of the enrollment numbers and fee income, as George Lindle informed me this morning. Fee income may be down slightly but not enough to be a worrisome item at this point. Of course, the fee income story will not finally be told until after summer registration. The decline that we forecasted was based on two factors: (1) the well-known demographic factors affecting our population of traditional college-age students and also (2) the reciprocal relationship between the employment picture and our enrollment. In other words, the enrollment tends to be countercyclical. So, it was those factors that led us to conclude that we probably ought to forecast and budget for a slight decline. Frankly, I am somewhat surprised, as Dr. Irwin can tell you. My projection was a little gloomier than what we actually put in. I think performance of enrollment on this campus indicates a basic underlying strength in the enrollment picture. Even though there are some slight negatives, and I am sure we will be reading that this happened on all campuses across the state, I think nonetheless the enrollment picture probably is looking stronger here than on many other campuses in Indiana. So, I would conclude from what we know at this point, that the enrollment picture is encouraging. Thank you.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you. At this time I would like to introduce a new administrator for this campus. We are delighted to have Sheldon Siegel, the new dean of our School of Social Work, here with us today.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report

Vice President Irwin: Our next item on the agenda is the Executive Committee Report.

Professor Besch: Thank you. The Executive Committee has asked me to report to you on an item that

does not appear on the agenda. This regards a very successful presentation on your behalf to the Board of Trustees. I indicated to you before that three of your representatives would be reporting to the Board's Faculty Relations Committee at their December meeting, which was held on this campus. An Executive Committee subcommittee composed of Dr. John Chalian (Chair), Jeff Vessely, and Henry Karlson presented a report and some specific examples of Outreach activities of faculty from this campus. As part of their presentation, John prepared a list of Outreach activities from the information supplied by the faculty in response to a request published in the Green Sheet. There are copies of the list on the table at the front of the room. It makes very interesting reading, citing some of the multiple ways in which the faculty at IUPUI serve the city, state, and nation. I would urge you to have a look at this material.

The main item of business is the election of the Boards of Review. At this time, I would like to turn the floor over to Pat Blake, Chairman of the Nominating Committee.

Professor Blake: First I have a report from the Committee. The at-large IUPUI nominee votes have been tallied and the results will be presented to the Executive Committee next week. The ballot to elect the at-large representatives to this Council, along with the nominees for election to the UFC will be coming out by the end of January. We will be electing 21 candidates for available at large positions on the Faculty Council and six for the UFC. Along with that timeframe, we will be sending out preference sheets for you to sign up for the type of committee work that you would be interested in doing as an IUPUI faculty member.

At this time, I would like to have a vote on whether we can destroy the ballots for the nominations. We will keep the computer sheet tallies.

Professor Besch: That comes as a motion from the committee and is therefore already seconded. It would call for a vote. Is there discussion of the motion to destroy the ballots? The question has been called for. All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? Motion carries.

Professor Blake: I would like to take this opportunity to ask the deans to check on the progress of their unit representatives elections. Names of the unit representatives are due to the Faculty Council Office no later than March 15.

Now, we would like to conduct the election for the Faculty Boards of Review. There are two boards.

[After the election, the following results were announced]:

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW ONE

Frederick Kleinhans, Associate Professor, School of Science
 P.O. John Kremer, Associate Professor, School of Science
 Richard Miyamoto, Associate Professor, School of Medicine
 Charles Palenik, Assistant Professor, School of Dentistry
 Aristotle Siakotos, Professor, School of Medicine

FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW TWO

Anne Belcher, Assistant Professor, School of Nursing
 P.O. Merle Draper, Professor, School of Education
 Richard Hamburger, Professor, School of Medicine
 Steven Mannheim, Assistant Professor, Herron School of Art
 John O'Loughlin, Professor, School of Engineering & Technology

The Nominating Committee moves that the ballots for the Boards of Review election be destroyed.

Vice President Irwin: All in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed? Motion carries. The ballots will be destroyed.

Professor Besch: I would again urge the individual units to proceed with their elections in a timely manner. The Nominating Committee and the Committee on Committees need these names to slate next year's candidates. We do want to have all of the names as soon as practical. This year the University Faculty Council is re-emphasizing timeliness. They have passed a new resolution that those units of the University who have not reported their unit representatives should not be allowed to delay University Faculty Council elections. The bylaws of the UFC specify that the Council elect next year's officers at the April meeting, and we intend to hold to that operating procedure this year. That is the end of my report.

AGENDA ITEM V

New Business

Vice President Irwin: Under New Business we have three items today. The first will be presented by Gene Tempel. Gene is the Executive Director of the IU Foundation Office for this campus. Gene will tell us about the operation of his office, as well as a few highlights at this time of the Campaign for Indiana at this time.

Gene Tempel: Thank you, Dr. Irwin, and thank you, members of the faculty, for allowing me to come here this afternoon to describe to you briefly what the Indiana University Foundation Office on this campus does. The work we do is in direct support of the work that you do in teaching, research and service to the University. I appreciate the opportunity to explain to you how our work and your work fits hand in hand.

I am not sure how much you know about the Indiana University Foundation or its operation on this campus. I will begin by telling you, by way of example, a few things that we are not. We don't own the Brooklyn Bridge, but we do own a Buddhist Temple about which some of you read in the paper today and about which I received some phone calls. If any of you are interested in acquiring the temple, (for restoration purposes) please see me after the meeting and I think we can make arrangements to transfer it. The temple is something that I will get back to in a moment because it illustrates very well the diversity of the IU Foundation.

About a year and one-half ago, George Pinnell who had recently become President of the Indiana University Foundation, asked me to move to Indianapolis to help establish a reorganized Indiana University Foundation staff and philosophy here. We wished to organize on this campus what we call a "constituent-based" or decentralized fund-raising program and to develop out of that a model for fund raising that could be used across the University system. Those challenges and the relationships that he described were very attractive. I came here from Bloomington where I had worked in the Dean's Office in the College of Arts and Sciences. Since that time, I think we have had a great deal of success in instituting what we call constituent-based or school-based development programs.

The role of the IU Foundation in this new, reorganized system is to provide consulting services, direction, and coordination to the various schools and units in the University which undertake their own fund-raising activities on their own behalf. I serve as a member of Dr. Irwin's administrative staff on this campus even though my salary is paid by the IU Foundation. That relationship symbolizes what we now view as the University Foundation's mission: raising private funds within the context of the goals, missions, and structure of the University itself. We now have on this campus, and on the Bloomington campus, fund-raising officers appointed in every school with which we work except two, and perhaps the School of Social Work where we have a new dean just now arriving.

All of these development people work with us through what we call the Indianapolis Development Council. The Indianapolis Development Council is chaired by Dr. Irwin and meets monthly to bring people together to discuss what they are doing with development, and to try to coordinate the activity in such a way that, as all of us become better entrepreneurs for our own schools and for our own self interests, we don't interfere with others who are doing the same kind of work. All of the schools on this campus have, as of this fall, annual fund drives in place. I think that is an important first step.

That brings me back to the Buddhist Temple. It turns out that almost everything we receive and almost everything we own is really held by someone else on behalf of the Foundation. The IUPUI Office of the Indiana University Foundation received a horse right before the end of the year. That horse is going to be owned by Bradford Woods, although the Foundation holds the title to the horse. The Buddhist Temple was really owned by the East Asian Studies Program. Anything that we get in our office which is owned by someone else, we simply accept title to on behalf of those people and enter records about it into an account over which a designated dean or program director has complete control. Very little of the money that we receive is actually money that someone inside the Foundation can decide how to spend. That is the rationale behind our having a decentralized or constituent-based fund raising program.

It turns out that in an organization the size of Indiana University it is very difficult to raise unrestricted money for the University. It is much more efficient and effective to raise money on behalf of schools or programs where interest groups, corporations and foundations can see the money tied to programs. Many Big Ten schools have proved this. Most notable is Minnesota which showed us how to do it right and Michigan which showed us how to do it wrong. At Michigan, there is no coordination for the de-centralized fund raising program. It is now really a "feudal" system and they are feuding vigorously.

Let me tell you briefly about my office. When I came, the IU Foundation office in Indianapolis was basically a place where some schools received money. It was not directive or proactive. Now, in addition to myself, there is an Associate Director for annual giving who works with all of our schools for their annual fund raising programs and shoring up those programs. Her name is Gail Plater. She came to us from the University of Illinois where she was the Associate Director for the annual giving program. I have two clerical staff members; one from the School of Medicine Library and the other, a former employee of the Dean's Office in the School of Law. I think we have a very well qualified clerical and professional staff in our office. We have also recently added a part-time person whose entire assignment is to help us on the Campaign for Indiana.

I have also been asked to say a little bit about the Campaign for Indiana. It is currently proposed as a five-year plan to add somewhere between \$150 million and \$200 million to the University's assets. We are working currently with a goal of \$184 million to add assets for four areas. The first is for endowments to support professorships, faculty chairs, research professorships, and student endowments in the form of fellowships and scholarships. That is by far the largest push for this particular campaign. The second is to add University resources in terms of equipment, including library resources and library equipment. That is about \$15 million; professorships are somewhere around \$75 million. I have forgotten the exact figures. There are also some priority construction projects in the campaign, amounting to about \$48 million, and about \$50 million for what we call ongoing support. That is, over the five-year period we hope, through enhanced development efforts, to add a minimum of \$10 million a year in new annual giving. That will come into the University because we are all working harder and better at raising money for our own particular schools. That campaign is underway now in a very quiet way, obtaining leadership gifts from members of the Board of Trustees, the Foundation Board of Directors, and people with whom we are fairly close and from whom we can secure large commitments. One person on my staff is working part-time to do research and set up appointments for Dr. Irwin and me to visit people that we believe we can enlist in this campaign, not only to make leadership gifts but also to help us seek

gifts from others.

You will be hearing shortly from some of your colleagues about a recruitment effort among faculty and staff that we are calling the Campus Campaign. In mounting the Campaign for Indiana, we feel that we must give an opportunity to all faculty and staff members to support areas in which they are interested. We must also be able to demonstrate to the public that not only do our Board of Trustees and our Foundation Board of Directors support it with personal contributions, but also our own faculty and staff support this campaign by direct giving. Significant contributions by faculty and staff will give credibility to the campaign and show to the outside world, including the legislature, that we are serious people committed to moving this University forward. Gail Plater is coordinating this Campus Campaign for IUPUI. Chancellor Emeritus Maynard Hine, Professor Jan Shippo, and Neil Lantz, Director of Administrative Affairs at IUPUI, are co-chairing the campaign. You will be hearing more about that this spring. If you have questions or comments, please feel free to stop by. The door is always open. We are in the Administration Building. I hope that working with your deans and development officers in your schools, looking two or three years down the road, much of what we are trying to do now, will come true.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you very much, Gene. Now, Lincoln Lewis is going to bring us up-to-date on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Day observance.

Dr. Lincoln Lewis: Good afternoon. I brought you an invitation. Literally, there are some invitations on the table if you would like to pick one up on your way out. They read: The Planning Committee of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Observance cordially invites you to a program honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on January 21, 1985 at 11:00 a.m. in the Physical Education Building." In bringing you this invitation, I would like to tell you what I am inviting you to and give you a little more detail about it.

First, I would like to mention something about the planning for the event. Last summer Dean Schaller appointed a campus-wide committee which he asked to serve as a focal point of discussion about how individuals and groups relate to one another at IUPUI. Given the diversity of our campus operation, we recognize the potential for problems and misunderstandings that can occur in the everyday course of campus life. When we say diversity, we refer not only to minorities, which of course, come to mind, but also to the disabled. We are talking about the age diversity that we have on our campus. As Dr. Schaller likes to point out, we have some people from the inner-city and some from rural areas. So, with 23,000 students and a large faculty from diverse geographic areas, there is really a potential for communication problems. Dean Schaller appointed representatives from the Student Assembly, the Faculty Council, the Staff Council, and the Black Faculty and Staff Council to serve on this committee, and he asked me to chair the group. The first project Dean Schaller asked that we undertake was to plan for the celebration of Martin Luther King's birthday. With this kind of broad group, we got good cross pollination. I would like to thank especially the people from the Faculty Council — Professor Kathryn Wilson, School of Science; Gary Gruver, School of Medicine, Allied Health; Naomi Fineberg, School of Medicine; Suetta Kehrein, School of Medicine; and Chales Blevins, School of Medicine. We all worked very hard on this committee.

Dr. King had a profound influence on our thinking about how all of us should get along with each other, and I think that you will agree that Dr. King has had a profound influence on academia in general. It was important for us to develop a program that would be a significant tribute to Dr. King through the involvement of these campus groups and also of the outside community. We believe we have developed such a program. I would like to have a few more minutes to describe that.

The program, which is actually in three parts, begins in the gymnasium of the Physical Education/Natatorium Building. The highlight of the morning session will be a major speech by Lerone Bennett, Senior Editor, EBONY Magazine, and author of several excellent books on minority perspectives. He is in wide demand as a lecturer and speaker. Before his speech, we will start the

program with some slides of Dr. King's past with some appropriate accompanying background music. At 11:40, Dr. Taylor will make some introductory remarks to begin the program. We will have Hallie Crombaugh, Director of Community Affairs, WISH, Channel 8, give the Community Welcome and an invocation to begin the program. We will then have Dr. Irwin, who will give the University Welcome. He will ask Dr. Besch to introduce the Mayor who, in turn, will give the City's Greeting. Then after a short musical interlude, we will have the main speaker. We hope to end that formal program with the audience participating in singing We Shall Overcome.

Beginning at 3:00, we will have a dialogue among the faculty and students, led by those from the Afro-American Studies Program, the Metropolitan Affairs Committee, the Marion County Bar Association, and the Black Student Union. This dialogue, in the Lecture Hall, will follow up on some of the things that Mr. Bennett will have mentioned earlier. He will be present as a reactor.

Following a break from 5:00 to 6:00, the third part of the program will be a traditional dinner that the Black Student Union has hosted annually for the last 13 years. It will be held for the first time in the Madame Walker Urban Life Center. We will start with a general reception at the Center to which everyone is invited. At 7:00 the program begins. We will have a speaker who will talk about the significance of the Martin Luther King Day. The dinner speaker will be Mr. Julian Bond, whom you know is the very distinguished Georgia State Senator. After that speech, we will have a short social hour and that will conclude the activities for the day.

There will be no charge for any of the day's proceedings except for the dinner. Tickets for the dinner are \$10 for non-students and \$5.00 for students. Faculty will have an opportunity to buy tickets for students. In other words, you may sponsor two students' dinners for \$10. Tickets are on sale through the distribution network at the Black Student Union Office.

Dean Yovits: Do you have a policy about attendance for staff?

Lincoln Lewis: Yes. I am glad you mentioned that. My invitation, of course, is open to everyone. I would like for the faculty to come to lend stature to this occasion, which I know that Dr. Irwin and Dean Schaller feel is extremely important to the university. Dr. Irwin will be asking faculty, staff and directors to allow students and staff to be excused from either their classroom or work activities for a period of time, especially for Mr. Bennett's presentation which is from noon to 1:00. This is the time that most of the working people would be excused and this is also the period the students would be out of class.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you very much, Lincoln. The last item of new business is Carlyn Johnson. She will give us some highlights of a report on Indiana's public schools.

Professor Johnson: I would like to present to you today a summary of the findings from a year-long Lilly Endowment funded study, conducted by Professor Robert Lehen and myself, analyzing the results of the financing patterns for Indiana's public primary and secondary schools. The study first outlines the very complex, annually changing, school finance formulas used in the years since 1973, the year Indiana's property tax reform program was adopted. The results show that, while tax rates have gone down, variations in tax rates are no less now than they were in 1973. Expenditures have increased and the variation in expenditures has more than doubled. Schools are no longer allowed to exercise control over the magnitude of their expenditures. The state dictates each year to each school corporation the number of dollars each may spend and the source of each of those dollars. The low spending schools in 1973 remain the low spenders in 1984 and are prohibited from increasing expenditures to catch up! They are also seriously impeded from increasing their income.

The study next compares Indiana with other states in a number of both input and output measures. Indiana ranks in the lowest quarter of the states in most of these measures, and, according to Terrance Bell, the U.S. Secretary of Education, Indiana's ranking in most of the measures has

dropped in 1984.

The study then examines Indiana's vulnerability to a constitutional challenge to its school finance scheme, and concludes that the system might indeed be declared unconstitutional, if tested. The final chapter proposes an alternative formula for distribution of state funds to schools which would deal with the existing formula's shortcomings.

Vice President Irwin: Thank you very much, Carlyn.

AGENDA ITEM VI
Adjournment

Vice President Irwin: If there is no other business, this meeting is adjourned.

[1/10/1985]

Recd
2/6/85
LD.

Did
Should have report # of units & at leg. reps -
with minutes of Dec FC meeting. Then, the
chat (Circular 2/4/85-006) came with those minutes.
minutes.

? MRL to talk?

? S. Mankin to announce.

Announcement of
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

February 7, 1985
Law School, Room 116 3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of January 10, 1985 meeting
- III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
Elections Deadlines
- V. Adjournment
- VI. **SPECIAL REPORT:** Capital Planning at IUPUI - N. E. Lantz, R. Baxter, T. Clapacs (joint presentation to Faculty and Staff Councils)

***** ALL FACULTY AND STAFF INVITED *****

HENRY BESCH, JR.
PHARM & TOXICOL
MS A 405
IUPUI

FAMCO

Minutes

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

February 7, 1985

3:30 P. M., Law School, Room 116

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., Executive Dean Schaller. Deans: Patricia Boaz, Walter Daly, Elizabeth Grossman, Ralph E. McDonald, Sheldon Siegel, Arthur Weber, Marshall Yovits. Professors: Henry Besch, Angenieta Biegel, David Bixler, Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Carlley, Varoujan Chalian, David Crabb, Theodore Outshall, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Donald Gartner, Jean Gnat, Vania Goodwin, Ain Haas, Ruth Holland, Jean Hutten, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Thomas Jones, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Ray Koleski, Juanita Laidig, Brenda Lyon, Gerald McHugh, Jeanne Mueller, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Shirley Quate, Mitchell Rhodes, Neal Rothman, Ramsis Salama, James Shanks, Philip Shea, Jan Shipps, Erna Simek, Jay Simon, Marie Sparks, Jeffery Vessely, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriett Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Charles Yokomoto.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James Bindley for Gerald L. Bepko; Dolores Hoyt for Barbara Fischler; Hitwant Sidhu for Nicholas Kellum; Ed Robbins for Howard Mehlinger; Georgia Miller for Jack Wentworth. Professors: C. Crown for C. Aliprantis; Ronald Dehnke for Michael Cohen; Joe Koss for Gary Gruver; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles F. Bonser, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Arthur Weigand. Professors: Stephen Allen, Robert Appledorn, Philip Bendick, Ira Brandt, Mervyn Cohen, Donna Dial, Russell Dilley, Ian Dowdeswell, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, James Edmundson, Charles Ellinger, Michael Glant, Suetta Kehrein, Joseph Kuczowski, William Kulrsrud, Steven Mannheimer, Onkar Markand, Leo McCarthy, Forrest Meiere, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Catherine Palmer, Murray Passo, Frances Rhome, Ernest Smith, Elizabeth Solow, Anoop Sondhi, Richard Turner, Roger Wall, Victor Wallis, Ruth Woodham.

VISITORS: David Bostwick, Engineering & Technology; Bennie Keller, Engineering & Technology; Neil Lantz, Administrative Affairs; Jans Muller, School of Medicine; Robert Baxter, Vice President's Office; Terry Clapacs, University Physical Facilities.

AGENDA ITEM I

Call to Order

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - January 10, 1985

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first order of business today is the approval of the minutes of our January 10 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded]

PROF. HOLLAND: I believe there is a misspelling. I believe that Gene Tempel's name is spelled "Tempel" rather than "Temple."

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: All right. We will make that correction. Thank you. Are there any other corrections, deletions, or additions? All in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few comments that perhaps may update the story of what's happening at the State House. This morning, Indiana University had an opportunity to present its budget requests to the House Ways and Means Committee. I'll cover some of the highlights. There is a handout at the door which was given to the members of the House Ways and Means Committee this morning. [IUPUI Circular 84/85-009]

We have talked about some of these items at previous meetings of the Council. President Ryan emphasized again that our highest priority is to improve faculty salaries to make us competitive, particularly in the Big Ten. We have talked about the amounts of money that would be required by each campus, including this one, to bring our salaries to somewhere in the midpoint in the Big Ten. The dollars to do that for this campus were very substantial compared to most of the campuses.

The Governor has recommended an improved budget over the Budget Committee. He, in general, has recommended that \$38.1 million of additional money go to higher education during the biennium for quality improvement. Indiana University's share of that would be \$10.3 million, or 27 percent of the total for the entire state. Ordinarily, Indiana University shares closer to 40 percent of the total higher education budget. Nevertheless, there would be some improvement if the Governor's recommendations are adopted. Of IU's \$10.3 million, \$8.9 million was designated for Faculty Retention and Recruitment. We had requested, however, \$12.9 million for the IU system to bring faculty salaries to competitive levels on all campuses. So, there is a shortfall there. In addition, as the President pointed out, there are other components of the budget that are also of great concern.

On page 3 of the handout is a listing of shortfall items even with the Governor's improved recommendations over the Budget Committee's. We had requested, as base increases in faculty salaries, five percent the first year and six percent the second year. But, the budget, as it now stands, only provides 4.3 percent the first year and 5.2 percent the second year. It would take, for the system and the biennium, \$4.6 million to bring the full funding of faculty salary increases up to the five and six percent levels.

Another problem, which we also have discussed previously, is the energy issue. For the biennium and for the system, we are projecting a \$5.2 million shortfall. We had projected a 13 percent increase the first year for utilities and a 19 percent increase the second year. The Budget Committee and the Governor still have that at five percent and six percent for the two years. That is a matter, of course, where there could be corrections, depending upon experience, during the 1986 short session. The Nursing programs are still short by \$882,000. These programs, basically around the state, were approved by the Commission for Higher Education up to three years ago and have never been funded. The last item is a shortfall on the base adjustment for IU Southeast, which is low on the totem pole in the IU system in the faculty salaries and per capita appropriation. There is a shortfall there of \$12.6 million, all of this in spite of the \$10.3 million that the Governor felt he was giving us for program improvement. Those issues will have to be resolved.

Listed on page 6 in the handout, are program development items for the IU system which are not included in the Governor's Quality Improvement Program. The first item there, which is very important to this campus, involves replacement of part-time faculty. We had a request for the two years a total of \$5.1 million and none of that is in there. There also are no items in the budget bill for academic computing or equipment replacement. A very important item concerns library support. Much of that \$4.1 million would be used to computerize the library in Bloomington, making its materials available to this campus and others.

There is no funding for that or for other items such as student access, economic development, program development, and new degree programs. That includes Nursing as well as all other programs which have been approved.

So, there is a good deal of work that has to be done on the part of all of us to try to improve the budget bill as it winds its way through the General Assembly. I think one can be cautiously optimistic that some of these deficiencies can be improved during the process. Does anyone have any questions about the budget as it stands?

Howard, you have some items today.

DEAN SCHALLER: Last month I reported to you on enrollment for the spring semester, which was preliminary at that time. I said that I thought that, when the final data were released, our enrollment decline for the spring semester this year below the spring semester last year would be very small. President Ryan released the official data at the February Trustees' meeting. His report confirmed that our decline was very small — something like .7 percent in headcount and about 1.7 percent in credit hours. That is about what we had projected for budget purposes. We have been right on target in both semesters this academic year. If we are on target for Summer I, we will be in pretty good shape. Our preliminary thinking at this time for next year is that we will probably forecast another small decline.

One other item is an announcement about a very interesting lecture that will be jointly sponsored by the School of Business and the Herron School of Art. To make that announcement and to tell you a little more about it, I call on Dean Keck from the School of Science. Bob is with us today so he will tell you about this.

DEAN KECK: We tried to send announcements to all offices. I have found out that some offices did not get it. Aaron Marcus, a graphic designer, will speak on computer graphics at IUPUI on February 20. This lecture is part of our Distinguished Lecturers' Series. If you did not receive this announcement, I would encourage you to pick one up and announce it to your classes. I have placed some copies on the table at the door.

DEAN SCHALLER: Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

VICE PRESIDENT DEWIN: Item four is the Executive Committee Report from Henry Besch.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Glenn. In view of the major item later today on Capital Planning on and around the IUPUI campus, the Executive Committee business is limited to essential items.

First, a word on the election deadlines. I would like to urge you to return, as soon as possible, the computer sheet ballots which you recently received. Ballots are for both elections to this body and to the University Faculty Council, and for indicating your committee preferences for next year. The deadline for the return of both of these items this year is February 15 — that is, one week from tomorrow. I have written the deadlines that I am going to be talking about on the board. I won't say anything more about the Mardi Gras date.

We intend to print, with the minutes of this meeting, the results of the elections of at large representatives to this body and to the University Faculty Council. That will be at the back of the minutes [IUPUI Circular 84/85-012]. Each unit then will know which of their favorite sons or daughters did not get elected as an at-large representative and they will then have time to elect such a person(s) the compliment of unit representatives.

Our Constitution (Article IV.A.2.c.) specifies that the units must report the results of their unit representatives elections no later than March 15. For most units the Dean reports these names to the Faculty Council Office. Our Constitution specifies the date to be "not later than March 15". Each year the Executive Committee establishes what date up to March 15 is actually the deadline for that year. This year March 15 falls in Spring break so we have set the actual deadline one Friday before that. That day is March 7, which is one month from today. Thus, we have two deadlines coming up — the election ballots due in one week and the unit representatives list due in one month. The deadlines have been set so that the Nominating Committee will have sufficient time, which actually will represent about two weeks, to develop the slates for next year's Executive Committee, Nominating Committee and Tenure Committee. Since membership on the Executive Committee and the Nominating Committee is limited to elected representatives of this Council, it is important that the Nominating Committee have sufficient time with the knowledge of who is going to be serving on this Council next year in order that they can slate the widest possible choice of candidates. By tradition of the last several years, we have attempted to present slates for all elections of this body one month in advance of the election day. The slates go out with the minutes of the meeting preceeding the one at which the election occurs. Elections to the Nominating Committee, Tenure Committee, and the Executive Committee will occur by Constitutional mandate at our May meeting. That means those slates have to have been developed by the April meeting. That is the extent of my comments about the elections except to ask if there are other questions or comments?

PROF. DEHNKE: I have a question. One of the candidates' names for the University Faculty Council was omitted from the ballot and I would like to request that the ballots be redistributed with that candidate's name on it.

PROF. RESCH: We have been made aware of that. Ed Robbins' name was mentioned in the candidates' statements group and his statement was there but his name did not appear in the list and he did not have a number on the ballot by which he could be elected.

PROF. DEHNKE: Could he be given a number so that he might be elected?

PROF. RESCH: Of course, but that is not my decision. It is the decision, I presume, of the Executive Committee [Art IV.F.4.c., citation added] and I would expect that the Executive Committee would ask the Council's will. I would say that, in anticipation of this comment and perhaps one other one that may come, that as Lord Halifax observed (and he is probably not the first person or the last person to observe it) "He that leaveth nothing to chance will do few things ill, but he will do very few things". Apparently, we left something to chance and that resulted in an inadvertent omission. With that comment, I would ask the Presiding Officer's or the Parliamentarian's guidance on what we should do. However, I would ask that we postpone further discussion of this until we finish the other components of the Executive Committee Report.

Reminders of the deadlines, at this time, should cause some of the veteran members of the Council to realize that today's meeting is the sixth of the total of nine meetings that have been scheduled for the IUPUI Faculty Council this year. We will be two-thirds completed by 4:15 p.m. today. I don't want to have to pass around a handkerchief for your tears but that is the situation. Why I mention this is that the accomplishments of the standing committees must be completed and proudly written up in less than two months from now. During that period the chair of the standing committees and the liaisons from the Executive Committee to each of the standing committees will have to get together to make recommendations about the composition of the committees for next year. There is a specified job for each of the committees to do during this time period when they are also finishing their accomplishments of the year. So, if your committee or a committee on which you serve wishes to bring business to the March meeting of this Council, that should be communicated to the Executive Committee by February 21. That is about the time that the minutes of this meeting will arrive in your hands. Items for the April meeting, that is our penultimate meeting this year, must reach the Executive Committee by March 21st in order to be slated on the agenda for the April meeting. Parkinson's First Law says that work expands to fill the

time available for its completion, and it has been observed that little would get accomplished on time if it weren't for the last minute. Ladies and gentlemen, the last minute is at hand.

The last specific item I have to bring to you today is a reminder that the University Faculty Council — sometimes referred to as the All University Faculty Council — will hold its May meeting next Tuesday, February 12 in the Roof Lounge of the Union Building on this campus. According to the Bylaws of the University Faculty Council [7.E.] "...Faculty members, students, members of the University staff, and members of the press are welcome to attend meetings of the University Faculty Council — subject to the adequacy of available space." Since the meeting is to be held in the Roof Lounge, there will be space available, if you would like to come. For your information, Miriam Langsam who Co-chairs the Fringe Benefits Committee of the University Faculty Council will be reporting at that meeting, specifically about the disability portion of our fringe benefits. That meeting is the third of five that the University Faculty Council will have this year and it is the second of the three which will be on this campus. You are all welcome to come to that, although I would caution you that you may participate in the meeting by invitation only. According to Bylaw 8.E. of the University Faculty Council, the Agenda Committee of that Council shall invite you if you request to be invited and you will then be allowed to participate but not vote. If you just show up, as I have done before I was a member, they don't throw you out. That's the end of the items that the Executive Committee asked me to bring to you today. We should now return to the matter of the ballot.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: May I ask our Parliamentarian what options we have here regarding the omission of Ed Robbins' name from the ballot?

PROF. KARLSON: Bylaw Article II D, Subsection 4 Nomination of at-large members - UFC states that "Each academic unit may place in nomination two candidates." Although the Bylaw is not specific in this, the Bylaw has no meaning unless the candidate was included on the ballot. It is my opinion that he is entitled, if he so desires, to have a new ballot submitted with his name on it. Robert's Rules of Order has nothing inconsistent with that.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: So, we don't require a vote here today of the Council to do that?

PROF. KARLSON: I would say it would not be appropriate to vote. Roberts' clearly indicates that when the bylaws requires any vote to be taken by ballot, the necessity of a ballot cannot be suspended even by a unanimous vote of the members at a meeting. You can remove a nominees' name from a ballot unless he affirmatively withdraws.

PROF. BESCH: The Nominating Committee did speak to Ed Robbins about this. Perhaps the Chair, Pat Blake could tell us what his wishes are.

PROF. BLAKE: When this was discovered, I did call Ed and ask him how he felt about it and if whether he would like to have a re-ballot. He said that as far as he was concerned he would not raise the issue; that he had plenty to do. I might also mention that Ed is on the IUPUI at large ballot and he said he was not aware of that. I made him aware of that. There is a difference — one is IUPUI and the other is the University Faculty Council. At that time, he said he was going to drop it. Immediately before this meeting started, someone from his unit pointed out to him that that means that Education would only have one chance at having a UFC representative.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Then a second ballot will be forthcoming from the Secretary of the Council's office.

DEAN YOVITS: Will you make sure the second ballot is somehow or another identified differently than the first? Some of us have already returned our ballots.

PROF. BESCH: I had previously wished to bring to your attention that there is, of course, a human interface in the counting procedures. Although the ballots actually are counted by computer, they are taken from envelopes by humans before being sent to the computer for counting. That also insures against double counting of votes.

PROF. SPARKS: Having chaired the Nominating Committee, I know what it means for Pat to have to meet these deadlines. I know that the ballots were written so that they can be optically scanned. I would recommend that ballots for at-large representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council be counted so that Pat can proceed. Just ignore the ballots for UFC and recount those only. I think that would make it a lot easier. The ballot envelopes could somehow be designed for UFC so that the new and old ballots would not be confused, rather than relying on a differently colored ballot.

PROF. BESCH: May I ask, for the record, that we establish why we are having another ballot? It is not the will of the candidate involved apparently.

DEAN SCHALLER: It is required by the Constitution & Bylaws. Isn't that what Henry said?

PROF. KARLSON: If the candidate wishes to affirmatively withdraw, he may do so. Unless he affirmatively withdraws, then his faculty has the right to have him on the ballot.

DEAN SCHALLER: I don't think Ed affirmatively withdrew.

PROF. DEHNKE: No, he did not withdraw. It is just that he is not campaigning.

DEAN SCHALLER: Or not making an issue out of this.

PROF. BESCH: I didn't mean for my comment to be interpreted as in anyway against Ed but I wanted to be sure that we knew why we were doing it.

DEAN YOVITS: He probably stands a much better chance now than anybody else. [laughter]

PROF. SIDHU: I was just thinking over Marie's suggestion and I don't think you need to re-send both ballots because one is correct and you need only to send one for the UFC. I would still make a suggestion that if Ed really wants to withdraw, he be allowed to and you might check with him but if Ed is willing to go along with his school's faculty wishes, it should be done again.

PROF. DEHNKE: He does not want to withdraw.

PROF. SIDHU: Then it is okay.

PROF. DEHNKE: I asked him before I raised the issue. He is not withdrawing.

VICE PRESIDENT DEWIN: At this time, I will call for any other business before adjournment and our special program.

AGENDA ITEM V
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT DEWIN: Hearing none, I will entertain a motion for adjournment. [So moved] Second? [Seconded] All in favor say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

[Attached as IUPUI Circular 84/85-011 is a generic map of the IUPUI area, circa late 1984, that may be used for orientation in the Capital Development Review presentation which follows.]

[2/7/1985]

*People
FC
minutes
Agendas*

Annotated #8 -

Enc: Circ 10 - Cap. Fund. at IUPUI

" 9 - Approp. Reg.

11 - Map

12 - Atty. Gen. Election Panel

13 - C & B Agendas

*14 - Memorial Res.
Roscoe Miller*

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
Faculty Council Meeting
March 7, 1985
Law School, Room 116 3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Memorial Resolution - Roscoe E. Miller, School of Medicine
Memorial Resolution will be read by Dr. Edward M. Cockerill
- III. Approval of the Minutes of February 7, 1985 Meeting
- IV. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- V. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
- VI. Standing Committee Reports
Metropolitan Affairs Committee - Steven Mannheimer
Constitution & Bylaws Committee - Henry Karlson
- VII. Adjournment

Minutes

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

March 7, 1985

3:30 P.M., Law School, Room 116

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, M.D., Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Patricia A. Boaz, Barbara B. Fischler, Elizabeth Grossman, Ralph E. McDonald, Sheldon Siegel, Arthur Weber. Faculty: Henry R. Besch, Jr., Patricia Blake, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Carley, Theodore Cutshall, Ian Dowdeswell, Vania Goodwin, Jean Hutten, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Ray Koleski, Joseph Kuczowski, William Kulsrud, Juanita Laidig, Onkar Markand, Jeanne Mueller, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Shirley Quate, Neal Rothman, James Shanks, Jay Simon, Marie Sparks, Richard Turner, Jeffery Vessely, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham, Charles Yokomoto.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James T. Bindley for Gerald L. Bepko; Daniel P. Benford for Walter J. Daly; Hugh A. Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; John D. Barlow for William M. Plater. Faculty: Ronald E. Dehnke for Michael Cohen; Saeed T. Vakili for John Eble; Janet Huettnner for Jean Gnat; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp; Mary Feeley for Erna Simek; Mary Feeley for Elizabeth Solow.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles F. Bonser, Nicholas Kellum, R. Bruce Renda, James Weigand, Jack Wentworth, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: C. Aliprantis, Stephen Allen, Robert Appledorn, Philip Bendick, Angenieta Biegel, David Bixler, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Ira Brandt, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, David Crabb, Donna Dial, Russell Dilley, Kenneth Dunipace, James Edmondson, Charles Ellinger, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Donald Gartner, Michael Glant, Gary Gruver, Ain Haas, Ruth Holland, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Thomas Jones, Brenda Lyon, Steven Mannheim, Leo McCarthy, Gerald McHugh, Forrest Meiere, Catherine Palmer, Murray Passo, Mitchell Rhodes, Frances Rhone, Ramsis Salama, Philip Shea, Jan Shippe, Ernest Smith, Anoop Sondhi, Roger Wall, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriett Wilkins.

VISITORS: Christian Kloesel, School of Liberal Arts; Miriam Z. Langsam, School of Liberal Arts/Honors Program; Richard E. Slocum, Office of the Registrar.

AGENDA ITEM I

Call to Order

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

AGENDA ITEM II

Memorial Resolution - Roscoe E. Miller, School of Medicine [IUPUI Circular 84/85-014]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first order of business is a Memorial Resolution for Roscoe E. Miller of the School of Medicine which will be read by Dr. Edward Cockerill. [Dr. Cockerill read the memorial resolution.] [A moment of silence was observed.]

AGENDA ITEM III

Approval of Minutes - February 7, 1985

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Item 3 is the approval of the minutes of our February 7 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] Are there any corrections, deletions, or additions? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a few items that I would like to bring to your attention today. Since our last meeting, the Indiana House has passed a budget bill which is now over at the Senate and is being worked on. Briefly, although we don't have a complete analysis yet, the budget bill passed by the House contains just under a five percent increase for personnel compensation for the first year of the biennium and slightly under six percent the second year. In addition, there is an item referred to as "Retention and Attraction of Faculty." In essence, this is additional personnel compensation money to be added to the base adjustments that I mentioned.

There is no money for new programs. The Nursing program at Richmond has been picked up, but there is no new money for Nursing Programs at South Bend, Kokomo, and Gary. That, of course, also applies to the non-health new degrees that we have. Hopefully, some of these new programs can be added as the budget bill goes through the Senate this week and next. Our people will be working on that as one of the goals of the University this coming week.

The capital budget from the House still contains the major proposed addition to this campus, providing \$20 million in bonding authority for a Clinical Research Center and Medical Library. Bloomington also is to receive funding for the first phase of their Chemistry Building. IU Southeast is to receive funding for brick repair. That is about all that the University has obtained on the capital side for this year.

A good thing is that the Senate probably will not introduce a separate budget bill, which it usually does, but will modify the House bill, hopefully restoring rather than deleting items.

I think at the last meeting I told you that we had a problem, a \$1 million problem, in fact, on utilities for this campus. That has been, to a great extent restored, which is a very important and positive addition.

Another item that is important to all of us is the construction of a multi-purpose hotel/office/commercial facility east of the University Hospital. The architects are now diligently working at that to see if a first-class, if you will world-class, conference center can also be built in that complex. This would not necessarily be a large conference center, but it would be an elegant one with the most sophisticated of equipment for instantaneous translation of various languages, instantaneous telecast equipment, and instantaneous receiving from satellites and other sources of communications. The Deans have been briefed on this and I suspect in the next couple of weeks many of you in this room will be asked for your ideas. We are studying the finest of such facilities in the world. Hopefully, ground will be broken this summer for this multi-purpose University facility. This will be largely financed by private development, but also financed by endowments, private donors, and possibly the state.

This week we had the presentation of the Edward C. Moore Award for the outstanding teaching on this campus. I think most of you know that Bob Harris of Biochemistry won that award this year. That carried with it a plaque, placement of his name on a major plaque in the main library, and a check for \$1,000. That is an annual event which is becoming a tradition on this campus.

Also I would like for you to know, if you don't already know, that last night the IUPUI men's basketball

team won a cliff-hanger and defeated Tri-State University for IUPUI's first such Regional championship. They go to Kansas City on Thursday for the finals in this tournament. I think we need to cheer on that team, which had a pretty grim beginning this season but certainly came through with flying colors. I think it is one of the few teams, if not the only team in Indiana, to have a 20 game winning streak this year. On that happy note, I will turn it over to Henry Besch.

PROF. WILSON: I am curious to know what usually happens to these new degree programs when they are not funded.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The policy of the University is that, if there is a budget request to the General Assembly and that isn't forthcoming, we don't start. Some new programs have had no money requested or have had only token amounts of money requested. The reason for that policy is that when we have started some programs without money, the HEC instantly draws out any future request for those new programs. If we have too many of those, like two or three, they are liable to say "Well, you have 20 degrees, IU, 10 of them here on this campus. If you can start them without money, we will not fund any of it." That is a very difficult posture for us to be in. That has been the philosophy of the University. I think it is the philosophy of all of the state universities. That could change. If there is a degree that is funded reasonably well and it is going to be discontinued, there is a possibility that internal reallocations could pick up some new degrees that don't have too many dollars requested for them.

PROF. KOLESKI: Dr. Irwin, can the money for the retention and attraction of faculty package be translated into a percentage of overall increase in personnel compensation?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Not at this time we can't. Hopefully, we will be able to in a week or ten days.

PROF. KOLESKI: Could you tell us what the submission was to the Indiana General Assembly or what percentage we might reasonably expect?

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I think I reported that to you three or four meetings ago. To bring this campus to the median in the Big Ten will require a considerable amount of money. As I recall, it was something like 12 percent above the 6 percentage because we are all different in our rankings. The budget requested the most money for this campus. Of course, as so often happens, the General Assembly tends to make things uniform and everybody pretty much gets the same. That's too bad.

AGENDA ITEM V

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

PROF. BESCH: I would like to begin by telling you about the results of the election that we started over the last time we met: the election for the IUPUI representatives to the University Faculty Council. Those ballots were changed, as you know, and sent out again. We received the results from the computer yesterday. The reason that I am telling you instead of asking the chairman of the Nominating Committee to tell you, is that the Constitution is very specific about who counts the ballots. It says that the Committee on Committees, that is the Executive Committee, counts the ballots. Since we count the ballots, we presume that we are the ones who are supposed to tell you what the results were. In any case, Pat [Blake] was very involved as chairman of the Nominating Committee. The winners are:

Charles Blevins, School of Medicine
Barbara Fischler, University Library
Richard Hamburger, School of Medicine
Beverly Richards, School of Nursing
Neal Rothman, School of Science
Brian Vargus, School of Liberal Arts

I think it is appropriate, then, to move to destroy the ballots upon certification of the election. Therefore, I so move. [Seconded.]

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any discussion? All in favor of that motion, say "Aye". Opposed? Motion carried.

PROF. RESCH: The next meeting of the University Faculty Council will be in Bloomington on March 26. As you may know, the last UFC meeting was cancelled because of weather. I have reminded you before that you are welcome there but I don't expect to see a huge parade of cars going down to Bloomington on the 26th. To allay your fears, I should tell you that we do not expect Bobby Knight at that meeting. I understand he has given a whole new dimension to the meaning of the word 'chairman'.

I would like, at this time, to turn the floor over to Dr. Kloesel, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, to report some material on the IUPUI calendar.

PROF. KLOESEL: I am delighted to be here to present the proposed 1986-87 to you. I hope everyone has picked up copies of two calendar worksheets from the front table [IUPUI Circular 84/85-015]. One contains the approved calendar for 1985-86; the other, the two core campus calendars for 1986-87. The one for IU Bloomington has been approved. The one for IUPUI was proposed by the IUPUI Calendar Committee in its February 15 meeting and it was accepted by the Academic Affairs Committee in its February 27 meeting. I present this calendar for your acceptance and approval. If after a few remarks about our calendar, I am unable to answer some of the questions you might have, I will call upon Dr. Slocum our registrar and current chairman of the IUPUI Calendar Committee, or Dean Boaz, who gave a full presentation on the 1985-86 calendar this past November.

The proposed 1986-87 calendar is well within the Indiana University calendar guidelines. It closely follows exact calendar patterns for the Fall and Spring semesters. I'll get to the pattern for the Summer sessions in just a moment. Because it continues the pattern of our 15 weeks of instruction vs IU Bloomington's 14 weeks of instruction, it is a source of great pride for all of us. A word about the Summer sessions, if you will look at the 1986-87 worksheet. The Memorial Day Recess is Monday, May 25 and the Independence Day Recess is Friday, July 3. In order to retain the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday classes for each of the six-week sessions, the Calendar Committee decided to hold the classes for those two recess days on the last days of the two regular Summer sessions. In other words, the May 26 classes will be held on the 24th of June, and the July 3 classes will meet on the 10th of August. As you have already seen, discrepancies between our calendar and that of IU Bloomington persist. They include the length of instructional time, as I've have already said, the length of the Thanksgiving Recess (four days vs. a whole week), the length of the Christmas vacation, and the beginning of the spring semester. There is the spring break of the Monroe County School Corporation. While all of these discrepancies have been addressed by the IUPUI Calendar Committee, the joint meeting of the IUPUI and IUB Calendar Committees, and by the University Calendar Committee, the only immediate results of these meetings are (1) a better understanding of the factors that cause these discrepancies and (2) reaffirmation that we seek a goal of integrating more closely the two calendars of the core campus in order to facilitate our common missions and reduce inconvenience for affected students and faculty. That goal will be reached soon if we subscribe to the chronological optimism of a mutual goal. If we don't, well, here we are. You have the 1986-87 calendar before you. I'll take any questions.

PROF. ROTHMAN: On the exam periods, why are there six exam days in the first semester and seven days in the second?

PROF. KLOESEL: I think I'll let Dr. Slocum answer that.

DEAN SLOCUM: This body approved the calendar for 1985-86, making the changes in the Fall semester. The calendar allowed a seven day period for that year. With a new year, the different pattern of dates meant that we had to cut off one day in the same period. We only have six days available before final exams in

the Fall semester. It didn't happen to make a change in the 1985-86 calendar.

PROF. ROTHMAN: If you can do it in six days in one semester, then why can't you do it in six days in the other?

DEAN SCHALLER: As I understand it, it is preferable to do it in seven days.

PROF. ROTHMAN: I have been asking for them to set aside one day so we can give uniform final examinations for classes that meet at different times of the day. If they have that seventh day, I would rather use that day, if possible.

DEAN SCHALLER: I am sure that recommendation can be entertained. Whether it can be accomplished is something else.

PROF. WILSON: Is there any way that we can change the 1986-87 calendar so that we can have a longer Christmas break vacation? Lots of faculty dislike that. We have now lost one week there. That week has been put into the summer. You don't notice that you have that week in the summer but you notice when you don't have it between semesters. I think it increases faculty burnout. People are very tired at the end of the semester, and they don't have enough time to rest.

PROF. KLOESSEL: Dean Boaz made a presentation in November before the 1985-86 calendar was approved indicating that, following the various meetings by the various committees, joint or single, at this point it seemed wisest to remain as we have been. In other words, we should stick with our 15 weeks of instruction because of the difficulties concerning Commencement. That is, apparently we have made arrangements for what is now the Hoosier Dome for nearly a decade. At this point, it would be somewhat difficult to change, so that on account of those reservations it would be rather difficult to move the semester back by a week.

PROF. WILSON: We used to do it the other way. We used to have two weeks. We had more time than we do now. We changed suddenly. Everything has changed for the worse and all because of the Hoosier Dome. It is nonsense that a whole faculty has to bow down because of the Hoosier Dome.

DEAN SCHALLER: Do you want to start the second semester later? Do you want to move it toward the Bloomington calendar?

PROF. WILSON: All I want is to have more time between semesters.

DEAN SCHALLER: Then you would recommend adopting the Bloomington schedule?

PROF. WILSON: That might be a better schedule. We used to have this much time and still have those two weeks. I don't understand what has happened, except that now we are tied up with the Hoosier Dome.

PROF. KLOESSEL: I don't think it is the fault of the Hoosier Dome. Before we had the Dome, we dealt with similar deadlines for the Convention Center. That is not the only reason. The problem is that the facilities have been reserved for many years in advance.

DEAN SCHALLER: Aren't there about 16 days there? It all looks the same to me.

PROF. WILSON: There used to be more time.

PROF. KERRIN: It used to start on Monday.

PROF. BLAKE: I have another difficulty with the schedule ending on December 21. It gives one no time to deal with students' academic problems because they leave after their last exams. The building is closed

on the 22nd or the 23rd. They are gone. We had cases this year where people who should have been dismissed, were in classes in January because of pre-registration. I find it very difficult not having that extra week in December for windup.

DEAN SCHALLER: Are you recommending that we start the fall semester earlier?

PROF. BLAKE: I like the 21st, if that is all you can do to make us have the week of the 16th to do our academic procedures.

DEAN SCHALLER: If we move the fall term up a week and if we were to move the spring term back a week, that makes the school year two weeks longer to accomplish the same amount of instruction. If we moved the Fall beginning up, we would accomplish what Kathryn wants, that is more rest in between semesters.

PROF. ROHRMAN: We started on the 21st of August this year.

PROF. RESCH: Professor Yokomoto was at the most recent meeting of the Calendar Committee and he is holding up his hand.

PROF. YOKOMOTO: I wasn't going to speak about that. I was going to voice an opinion about a later starting date for the second semester. This semester, I think there were only three working days between the opening of the school building for us and the starting of classes. Next semester I think it will be four and the following semester there will be only three. For those of us who print a lot of handout notes, there is not enough time. If the buildings were open a little more during this break, if the print shops worked, we could probably overcome the problem. Three days, I find, are inadequate for preparing notes for the second semester.

PROF. WILSON: I think another reason that the faculty have complained is that, we have to do all of the work for the beginning of January at the end of December, while we are doing our final exams. Before, we had time to come back and do that in plenty of time for classes to start, whereas now we don't have that time.

PROF. KOLESKI: It is not clear to me how Bloomington can start 12 days later and finish only three days later.

DEAN SCHALLER: They have a week fewer of classes. They will have 28 weeks out of the year, excluding the summer, in which instruction will be carried on.

PROF. KOLESKI: Do they do this by adjusting a clock?

DEAN SCHALLER: Forty-five minutes to fifty minutes. Of course, that doesn't deal with the problem of frequency of contact or anything else. They didn't adjust the clock because they felt 50 minutes were better than 45 minutes. They adjusted the clock so they could knock a week off classes each semester.

PROF. KOLESKI: Did this campus consider that idea?

DEAN SCHALLER: I don't think so, and I hope we don't. But, that is just one opinion. It is a rather frivolous approach to classroom responsibility.

PROF. RESCH: Basically, we have 15 weeks to teach what is done in Bloomington in 14 weeks. Either we teach more in greater depth or they are more efficient or both.

PROF. KARLSON: Obviously, when this is presented to us at this late time of the year, it is difficult to make a lot of the changes. However, I do feel that given the principle that Bloomington and Indianapolis are both parts of the same core campus, we should not be teaching significantly longer during the year

than they do. It is more than a week, quite a bit more. It is almost a month when you start adding all of the academic days together. One of us should change and, if this doesn't transpire, to say that we are both part of the same core campus is ridiculous. I do feel that our Calendar Committee should be instructed that, the next time they come to us, that we have the same calendar, whatever that calendar is. I should say that Bloomington should have the same calendar that we have.

DEAN SCHALLER: If you adopt their calendar, our calendar will be dictated by local Bloomington concerns, including the Little 500 weekend, the vacation periods of the Monroe County school corporation, and the fact that their students simply will not go to class on Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week. Those three things then will dictate our calendar in Indianapolis.

PROF. KARLSON: Again, I think for an academic calendar to be dictated by a Little 500 athletic event is somewhat ridiculous.

DEAN SCHALLER: Then you don't want the Bloomington calendar.

PROF. KARLSON: Then perhaps they should adopt ours. One or the other. For a core campus, we should have the same calendar.

PROF. BESCH: I think Chris did start out by indicating that members of the joint Calendar Committee have reaffirmed in their operating rules that they intend to work toward similar calendars.

PROF. WILSON: My objection is not with the number of weeks that we teach. I don't mind teaching 15 weeks. I just don't like the arrangement of the way we do it. It just doesn't work out very well for the faculty, and if faculty aren't happy, the students aren't happy.

DEAN SCHALLER: And vice versa. That is a good point.

PROF. BOTHMAN: Does graduation actually have to come after the final exam period is over?

DEAN SCHALLER: You have to be able to determine final grades. At IUPUI we give them their real degree at commencement.

PROF. QUATE: I would vote that we should not move the beginning of the fall semester up because we have many students who are married and have children. Their children are still out of school for another two weeks.

PROF. KEHREIN: Concerning the instructors who teach on both campuses, which calendar do they follow?

PROF. VESSELY: They don't follow either. Some chose to only have a 13-week semester. Some of them don't come to class until the 13th of January.

PROF. BESCH: There is one suggestion which I expected to hear made explicitly but haven't heard yet, and that is that the Commencement be moved further into the year by one week so that the additional week would not "be lost in the summer." Moving commencement day is an especially cumbersome matter. There are eight or ten commencements in the IU system and the administration must of course be present at them to confer the degrees. For IUPUI, there is the additional requirement for Purdue administrators to be scheduled. Although I think these points raising objections to the proposed calendar are very important, for this particular calendar, at least the 1986-87 year, it simply isn't possible to take them all into account at this time. The point I am trying to make is that we are hearing a variety of objections to the proposed calendar, and few specific suggestions for improvements. It is easy to disagree; it is much more difficult to find solutions than it is to find problems.

PROF. CUTSHALL: I just have one question for clarification. I don't quite understand the significance

of the two summer sessions.

PROF. KLOESSEL: They are the same length. They are both exactly six weeks long. The problem is that recess days would cancel the first classes of each session. Those two classes are made up at the ends of each session.

PROF. CUTSHALL: That is still the same total number of classes?

PROF. KLOESSEL: Yes. It is just so that one day can be made up later on a different day of the week. This may, initially, seem confusing but I think it is a wonderful solution.

PROF. WILSON: I move that the Calendar Committee be instructed to reconsider....

DEAN SCHALLER: Wait a minute. There is a motion on the floor. This is a committee report, therefore, it has been moved and seconded.

PROF. WILSON: I want to make a motion that we table it.

PROF. KARLSON: The motion is seconded. A motion to table it would not have the effect you are seeking. What you want is a motion to resubmit to the committee for direction, which is not a motion to table it.

PROF. BLAKE: Is that appropriate?

PROF. KARLSON: Yes it is. You can make such a motion.

PROF. BESCH: I don't know if it is appropriate, but it is in order.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I haven't heard a second to that motion. [There was a second to the motion.] We will vote on the motion to send this back to the committee. All in favor of that, say "Aye." Opposed, same sign. We had better have a show of hands. All in favor of sending this back to the committee, raise your hand. All opposed to the motion, raise your hand. That motion dies. The count was 22-15. Now we will take up the original motion of the Calendar Committee. All in favor of that motion, say "Aye". Opposed? The ayes have it.

PROF. ROTHMAN: Could someone make a motion that the concerns brought up in this meeting be forwarded to the Calendar Committee for consideration?

DEAN SCHALLER: They will be in the minutes.

PROF. ROTHMAN: That doesn't mean that the committee is going to consider it.

DEAN SCHALLER: There will be another new Calendar Committee next year. There will be some carryover and some new members.

PROF. BESCH: We will take note of this and do it. I wanted to mention a couple of other points before I relinquish here. I would like to remind you of some dates. Tomorrow, March 8, is the last date for the unit representatives to the IUPUI Faculty Council to be identified by the Deans. We had previously announced that March 8 — not March 15 — this year is the last day for that because the committee structuring will be beginning.

I also want to remind you that the standing committee reports, are due in to the Faculty Council Office by March 29. This has been announced and reconfirmed a couple of times. We have set this date so that we can get them into the minutes, and give the Executive Committee time to arrange meetings of the outgoing with the incoming members. At least one committee chairman has called to suggest that committee

would be unable to submit a report by the 29th because they have a committee meeting after that date. The Executive Committee's would like to have your report on time anyway. Additions, corrections, or changes can be made later for inclusion with the minutes of our last Faculty Council meeting this year. We would like to have them all in so that the Executive Committee's work can be taken care of. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Standing Committee Reports

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item regards some standing committee reports.

PROF. RESCH: I don't see Steve Mannheimer, who was to give a report on the Metropolitan Affairs Committee.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Henry, would you then give us the Constitution and Bylaws Committee report.

PROF. KARLSON: As stated in the minutes which were previously distributed, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee has two amendments to propose; one to the Constitution and one to the Bylaws. They are contained in this document [IUPUI Circular 84/85-013]. As stated, the first is an amendment to the Constitution which we are asking the Faculty Council to merely approve for circulation to the entire faculty. Because it amends the Constitution, it would have to be submitted to the faculty for final determination as to whether or not it would be added to the Constitution. This was brought to us from the Acting Dean of Student Affairs. The recommendation is to permit the President, or in his or her absence, the Vice President of the IUPUI Student Assembly to become a non-voting ex-officio member of the Council. The purpose is to allow greater communication between faculty and students and to allow the students to have some awareness of what is going on in this Council. An example would be discussion on the academic calendar. I think the Council would have been served well to have had a student present.

The second proposal is to amend the Bylaws. An amendment to the Bylaws takes effect immediately upon passage. In each case, to have approval of the Constitutional amendment or the Bylaws, it will take a two-thirds vote from those present because there was prior notice. This amendment is something more controversial. This is something that took the Constitution and Bylaws Committee three separate meetings trying to determine what date we wanted to use. Basically, what it will do is set the terms of members of Boards of Review at one year. Presently, we state one academic year. Also, it will say the term will start on April 1. There is no dispute about the change of the provision one academic year to one year. The provision, however, starting on April 1, causes some controversy. Other dates considered by the committee included February 1, August 1, and March 1. We finally decided April 1 would be the appropriate time. As these proposals come from a standing committee, no second is necessary.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there discussion of that Bylaw change?

PROF. DIMICCO: My understanding is that the elections of the Faculty Boards of Review presently take place in January. Why do you propose a long lag between the time that the elections are held and the time that the new Boards of Review take office?

PROF. KARLSON: Actually, there has been a lag in every case. For example, the new members of the Tenure Committee take office July 1 as do the new members of the Nominating Committee. Both were elected in May. So, there is usually a lag. The thing that we tried to determine was at what point was the best season? We wanted a time when new people would come on board when the old complaints would have been dealt with and the new ones would not yet have gotten there. It is very difficult to find any period that is perfect. Many people are on the committees and have either served previously or are presently serving on Boards of Review. We, of course, took into account the experience which they had gained in the nature of the cases, the type of cases, and when these cases were most likely to arise. As I have

said, we met three times on this issue. After much discussion and several competing proposals, it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that April 1 be the appropriate date. That is why it is being brought to you. These are two separate motions. I feel that we should deal with the amendment to the Constitution first. I think that is less controversial and then the amendment to the Bylaws next, because that will take effect immediately upon passage.

Let's deal with the issue of the student member first. These are two separate proposals and there cannot be two motions on the floor at one time. The first motion from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee is to amend the Constitution to provide for a non-voting student member, that person to be the President of the IUPUI Student Assembly.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any further discussion of that? All in favor of the amendment of the Constitution as stated, say "Aye". Opposed, say "Nay". Motion carries. Is there any further discussion on the Bylaws amendment?

PROF. KARLSON: The motion on the Bylaws is stated in your minutes of today's meeting. I will remind you again, this motion comes from a standing committee and therefore needs no second. It is now on the floor for discussion.

PROF. DIMICCO: The implications from your comments about lag times are, I believe, incorrect. The examples you cited actually have no lag period if you consider normal class days. School is out in June. They therefore take office the beginning of the "next" month after their election. Also, there was essentially no lag for the Secretary, until the election month was moved for the convenience of the UFC. I question the wisdom of your renewed seeking, as you described, the "best time" for having a committee begin its work, particularly since, it's my understanding that cases do come before the Board prior to April 1 of the year. The Board that is sitting at the time that those cases are brought forth, is required to hear those cases through to completion, which would take them past April 1. As stated here, April 1 is the time when their term would end. It seems to me that we would have last year's Board looking at this year's cases, and, in addition, the Boards' members are going to be carried over past the normal termination of their time served.

PROF. NESCH: I must agree with Professor DiMicco. Henry gave you a history of the three meetings of this year's Constitution and Bylaws committee. I can recall for you a little longer history than that. In the first IUPUI Constitution which was adopted in June, 1969, a February 1 date was specified. I have copies of the relevant section here. Our present Constitution and Bylaws, adopted in June, 1969 supercedes that one, but it too contained the February 1 date. The then current Constitution and Bylaws committee chaired by Carl Fuller proposed major revisions of the section on Faculty Boards of Review in May, 1979. These revisions did not alter the February 1 date. Additional revisions occurred in 1980, when the section was moved from the Constitution and placed in the Bylaws. Miriam Langsam called to say that she was involved in the updating of that section, which occurred then and involved university counsel to assure compliance with prior Board of Trustees actions, state laws, etc. I see she has had to leave this meeting but I can relate to you that she intended to speak against April 1, and to speak in favor of a February 1 starting date. She believes the omission to the February 1 starting date may have been inadvertent. Going back some years to my own service on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee which began in 1979, I recall that we first took up this issue in 1982 but thought it was so trivial that we delayed its introduction to the Council. I have here copies of a resurrection memo dated March 7, 1983, which I circulated to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee at that time. All of the members, including Professor Karlson who was serving at that time voted in favor of the February 1 date, but since that was later than this meeting, we decided again to postpone it until the next year. That brings us to the current year, when for the first time in a history of 16 years, a date other than February 1 has emerged.

I guess the reason I feel it should be February 1 is that I see it from the Secretary's point of view. I am the one to whom people who have grievances first speak. Today is March 7 and we have two faculty members who have recently called and asked about initiating proceedings for Boards of Review. If we were

to have adopted a starting date of April 1, that would mean that we would now be in a position where these faculty would necessarily face an additional potential problem. Should they press to get on the agenda of a current Board that they would consider more favorable? Now they potentially have four to choose from since we are in a lame duck period. Should they wait and delay their request in order to get on the agenda of what they might consider a more favorable new Board? Their administrators could say that they must act expeditiously and if they don't they might be in jeopardy of review denial for not having acted quickly enough. I think it is bad for the faculty member to be subjected to a situation where the Review Boards have been very active and are now given a case at the end of their term. This year's Boards are tired. They have had a substantial load already this year. You will hear about it in their year-end report. I know the Boards that are seated now don't want any new cases. They have put in a lot of hours, a lot of time. An April 1 date also means that the Secretary's actions would have to be delayed. The Secretary really can't do anything until the Board takes office. That diminishes the time for potential administrative actions before a Board hearing is mandated. Practically speaking, I can see no reason to delay. In fact, it would seem reasonable to me that the Boards of Review take office the day they are elected.

PROF. VESSELY: Henry, those cases which you spoke of, when did they come in?

PROF. KARLSON: I first heard of them a little over two weeks ago. Direct contact about the second one came to me today.

PROF. VESSELY: But they have not been assigned.

PROF. BESCH: They have not been assigned.

PROF. VESSELY: For what reason?

PROF. BESCH: I explained to them that this amendment was coming up.

PROF. VESSELY: The Boards that are on now technically don't leave office until when?

PROF. BESCH: I think Jeff's questions get at the point that I'm trying to make. I guess, by the most strict construction, they should have been assigned by now. More than 10 days have elapsed. They agreed to wait until we decided here what would happen.

PROF. VESSELY: I guess what I am thinking involves the people that were on the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, myself included, who were serving on a Board this year, or had served last year, or the year before. Regarding the eight cases that were represented in that group, we went back through the minutes and took the dates and assignments, none of which fell in this period that we are calling the "dead period" or the "interim period." The assignments were all made on May 1 or in the summer or around the first of August. That was what we based the decision on. Of the most recent cases, all of them fell somewhere after April 1 and not between February 1 and April 1. That was the only wisdom that that committee could use. As to what the 1982 group thought was appropriate, maybe the trend was different.

PROF. BESCH: So, to summarize for you, the most recent data you had at the time you drafted the amendment suggested April 1. The most recent data you have at this time, suggests February 1. I think I can second your motion to move the date to February 1.

PROF. VESSELY: But, they are not assigned yet.

PROF. BESCH: They could have been if we had a February 1 date.

PROF. KARLSON: There are two points to keep in mind. First, as Professor Vessely pointed out, the committee considered this carefully. I have served on the Boards of Review, twice as legal advisor and

once as a member. Anytime that you have where something is going to change, your Board is going to change and a new Board is going to take over. Some of them wait and select their board. That problem is not going to April 1, and it is not going to February 1. Secondly, since February 1 has passed, we cannot become retroactive. We can only go forward. Therefore, it will not take effect for that purpose until next February 1, which obviously is not what we want. I would have to say that what we have here is, if you select February 1 as the date, it is not going to solve any problem this year; whereas, April 1, as it is a prospective change, can take effect immediately.

PROF. BESCH: Henry, your reasoning brings to mind a party invitation I received from a Chinese couple who were getting an amicable divorce. They had simply decided to celebrate the well-known fact that two Wongs do not necessarily make a right.

PROF. DIMICCO: Are you [Karlson] really saying that if we can't correct it this year, let's not correct it for next year?

PROF. KARLSON: Then it is a question as to whether or not it is correct.

PROF. DIMICCO: That is so, but you can't reasonably argue against the correctness of the issue on the basis of whether it is timely this year.

PROF. KARLSON: I am merely stating that the committee did consider this for a long time and that February 1 was discussed. As a matter of fact, when I sat on a Board, it started on February 1, and it was well into the beginning of the summer before we had a case assigned to us. This is not uncommon. It was the opinion of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and of those present who had sat on Boards for quite a number of years that April 1 would be the best date.

PROF. BLAKE: I think there is a difference in what our Boards of Review are seeing these days. We used to have Boards of Review that dealt rather narrowly with tenure. The last couple of years we have dealt with other grievances as well as tenure. That makes a different picture in my estimation and I am on a Board of Review presently. I am the lame duck. That makes them fall anytime within an academic year. There is no limit as to when faculty can appeal now. It seems to me members should take office the minute the election is over.

DEAN SCHALLER: Pat, it does say in the Constitution that appeals should be made within a reasonable time. Of course then the Faculty Boards of Review have to decide in each case what is a reasonable time.

PROF. BLAKE: I want to speak in favor of February 1.

PROF. KOLESKI: We have heard from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee as to what they considered, but we would like to hear from those who have served on Boards of Review as to what they might consider.

PROF. BESCH: I did not want to speak for Miriam since she was here to speak for herself and had to leave, but I can convey to you that she chaired one of the Boards of Review this year. She was previously Secretary of this Council and a main author of the current statutes describing the Boards of Review procedures. She indicated to me that the committee may have dropped February 1 out of a feeling that it was obvious. They felt that after election in January, the Boards ~~soon~~ would automatically take office the next month. We have always operated on that assumption in this Council.

PROF. DIMICCO: Can I move that we amend the amendment? Can amendments be amended? To change the date from April 1 to February 1?

PROF. BESCH: It's in order if you have a second.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there discussion of the amendment to change the basic amendment to February 1?

All in favor of the amendment to change April 1 to February 1, say "Aye". Opposed, "Nay". The Ayes have it.

PROF. KARLSON: Now the amended portion.

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: All in favor of the amendment as amended, say "Aye". Opposed? "Nay". The Ayes have it.

PROF. BESCH: I am sure that it is agreed that the Boards of Review that have been elected to hear cases this year will be the ones to consider cases that are now coming up.

PROF. KARLSON: In accordance with the Constitution, we will submit this to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for an interpretation, along with the aid of the Parliamentarian.

AGENDA ITEM VII
Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Does anyone have any other business? Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned.

[3/7/1985]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

THURSDAY, April 4, 1985, LS 116, 3:30 p.m.

*Recd
3/27/85
12 file
pls refer 3/5/85*

A G E N D A

- I. Call to Order - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of March 7, 1985 meeting
- III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.
- IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary
- V. Nominating Committee Report: Slates for Tenure Committee,
Nominating Committee and Executive Committee - Professor Pat Blake
- VI. Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations
- VII. Adjournment

*Enc. Cite OIR - 1985-86 Acad Calendar +
OIR - 1986-87 Acad Calendar + discussion
OIR - Const Amend - re student members on FC.*

[417]1 *
HENRY BESCH, JR.
PHARM & TOXICOL
MS A 405
IUPUI

FA-CO

Minutes

IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

April 4, 1985

3:30 P.M., Law School, Room 116

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D., Executive Dean Howard G. Schaller. Deans: Patricia A. Boaz, Walter J. Daly, Barbara Fischler, Nicholas Kellum, Ralph E. McDonald, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Henry R. Besch, Jr., David Bixler, Patricia Blake, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Ira Brandt, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Cariley, Theodore Outshall, Ian Dowdeswell, James Edmondson, Naomi Fineberg, Paul Galanti, LaForrest Garner, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Ray Koleski, William Kulrud, Juanita Laidig, Jeanne Mueller, Rebecca Porter, Shirley Quate, Anoop Sondhi, Marie Sparks, Jeffery Vessely, Harriett Wilkins, George Willis, Kathryn Wilson, Ruth Woodham. Student Representative: Steven Akard [Student Body President].

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Deans: James F. Bindley for Gerald L. Bepko; Merle R. Draper for Howard Mehlinger; Raymond A. Kane for Sheldon Siegel, Georgia B. Miller for Jack Wentworth. Faculty: Maudine Williams for Jean Gnat; Jennifer Hehman for Vania Goodwin; Jacqueline Blackwell for Ruth Holland; Joyce Martin for Jean Hutten; Elton Ridley for Erna Simek.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Deans: Charles F. Bonser, Elizabeth Grossman, Arthur Weber, Arthur Weigand. Faculty: C. Aliprantis, Stephen Allen, Robert Appledorn, Philip Bendick, Angenieta Biegel, Charles Blevins, Varoujan Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Michael Cohen, David Crabb, Donna Dial, Russell Dilley, Kenneth Dunipace, John Eble, Charles Ellinger, Donald Gartner, Michael Glant, Gary Gruver, Ain Haas, Charles Hutton, Lucreda Hutton, Thomas Jones, Joseph Kuczowski, Brenda Lyon, Steven Mannheim, Onkar Markand, Leo McCarthy, Gerald McHugh, Forrest Meiere, Lillie-Mae Padilla, Catherine Palmer, Murray Passo, Richard Pflanzner, Mitchell Rhodes, Frances Rhone, Neal Rothman, Ramsis Salama, James Shanks, Philip Shea, Jan Shipps, Jay Simon, Ernest Smith, Elizabeth Solow, Richard Turner, Roger Wall, Victor Wallis, Lawrence Wheeler, Charles Yokomoto.

AGENDA ITEM I

Call to Order

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of Minutes - March 7, 1985

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The first item of business is the approval of the minutes of our March 7 meeting. Is there a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any discussion of the motion? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion, say "Aye." Opposed, "Nay." Motion carries.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: I have a brief report which concerns the session of the General Assembly. Since our last meeting, one month ago, the Senate has passed a budget bill which is basically the same as the House bill which I reported on. There were a few exceptions, particularly on the Capital side. They made some additions believe it or not. They made an addition of \$6 million for the Conference Center for this campus. They also made a \$3 million budget item for the National Fitness Center also to be on this campus. Lastly, they approved the equipment for the Columbus Center which had not been funded for that new addition.

As we have analyzed the budget since the last meeting, there were buried certain items under "Quality Improvement" that I was unaware of at the time of our last Council meeting. For example, several of the statewide Nursing New Degree Programs have been approved and have been funded rather substantially. They include additional support for the A.S. in Nursing at IU East, the establishment of a B.S. program on that campus in Nursing, a B.S. degree in Nursing at Kokomo, and a Master's degree in Nursing which is a statewide system degree offered by Nursing here. They did not, however, approve funding for the Baccalaureate in Nursing at South Bend or at IU Northwest. There is effort being made to restore, in the Quality Improvement arena, the other degrees besides the Nursing degrees that were funded, especially those other degrees that exist for this campus. How successful that effort will be is hard to determine. The Conference Committee on the budget will meet formally on Monday. I suspect that we will have some news sometime next week as to what the final budget bill for 1985-87 will look like. Hopefully, we can then put together the budget for the campus.

That is all I have to report. Does anyone have any questions?

AGENDA ITEM ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report

PROF. NESCH: I would like to begin the Executive Committee Report by turning the floor over to Dean Patricia Boez for an introduction that relates to the change in the Constitution and Bylaws that we made last time.

DEAN BOEZ: It is a real pleasure to introduce to you the outstanding young man who is our Student Body President who joins us for the first time today as a non-voting member by action of this Council. He was a member of the IUPUI Student Assembly in 1983-84, and has been on the Sagamore advertising staff. He has been the IUPUI Student Body President this year and, as such, holds ex-officio memberships on the Student Affairs Advisory Council and on the University Faculty Council. He also has membership on the Minority Affairs Advisory Council and the Parking Appeals Committee. As Student Body President he is charged with a great many duties. He is the official student body spokesman and representative, and manages the Student Government Office which includes its budget, employment, honors banquet, trips, festivals, elections, and standing student services. He is also charged with legislative activity with the Student Assembly and, in cooperation with the Office for Student Affairs organizes a monthly meeting of students with the Vice President. He is a member of the Circle K Club and also the French Club on which he will serve as treasurer next year. I am sure you will be pleased to know that he is also a Distinguished Scholar, participating in the IUPUI Honors Program. He holds an IUPUI Merit Scholarship, a Hoosier Scholarship, and the United States Senate Youth Program Scholarship. He is a double major in Economics and French. He joined the Indiana University Overseas Study Program in Dijon, France during the past summer and he maintains a 3.75 grade point average. Please join me in welcoming Steven Akard, Student Body President.
[Applause]

MR. AKARD: Thank you. I will keep my comments very brief. My term on this body will be very short this year as I am about to leave office. However, it is my hope and belief that this position will be very beneficial from your standpoint and from the students' standpoint. This will serve as a complement to my position on the University Faculty Council, and it will equal my Bloomington counterpart who sits on the Bloomington Faculty Council. I believe that the position will be a constant reference for you on student positions in the future. Thank you!

PROF. NESCH: Thank you, Steve. I would add that in working with the University Faculty Council, I have come to know Steve Akard over the course of this year. I can assure you that dry statistics don't begin to half describe the value of the input that he makes to the UFC. We welcome you, Steve.

My next item concerns the Faculty Relations Committee meeting that occurred in conjunction with the last Board of Trustees meeting. We have done this whenever they meet on this campus. At the last meeting we had a very successful interaction with the Faculty Relations Committee. We presented a program on your behalf called "Faculty Spheres of Influence" with spheres being urban, inter-urban, and, for a lack of a better word, super-urban. Jan Shipps, director of the Center for American Studies, was at the time running

a meeting that was called "Re-Visioning America." It drew from all over America and was a pronounced success. She described this program as well as the development of the Center for American Studies. Her comments were very well received, and reflected well on the humanities as a whole at IUPUI.

We next had a presentation by Bill Duckworth who described collaborative medical research in diabetes between members of the Diabetes Research and Training Center here and a satellite operation on the Purdue campus at West Lafayette. Bill serves as a Co-Director of the DRTC based in the School of Medicine. He emphasized that the research ties and interactions involving collaborative diabetes research continue to grow with our West Lafayette colleagues.

The third component was the Urban Symposium, which was put together by the Metropolitan Affairs Committee, chaired by Steve Mannheim. He described not only the interesting program of the Symposium but also some enlightening interactions between city and university leadership, interactions to the benefit, we think, of the city leaders. Participating in that symposium was Dean Schaller.

In summary, we emphasized two points to the Board members: first, that these activities are ones which, like the meeting of the Faculty Relations Committee itself, take place in the spare time, as it were, of the faculty member when he or she is not teaching, researching, or serving in the classroom; and, secondly, these three examples of faculty service are underwritten by grants from outside the University. Trustee Carolyn Gutman, who chairs the Faculty Relations Committee was laudatory in her report on the meeting to the Board as a whole. Are there any questions about those meetings in general?

Now that you have turned in your committee preference sheets, the Executive Committee is working on committee structures, including memberships, chairs and secretaries of the committees. I wanted to bring you a few statistics about your volunteer responses as a group. First, as you would imagine, not every committee fares equally well in the population contest. There were 120 people who volunteered or who expressed an interest in serving on the Academic Affairs Committee and 106 for the Faculty Affairs Committee. Since committees are going to be limited to about 10 percent of those numbers, not everyone who volunteered will be on the committee of their first choice. We do, however, have the preference list computerized now and your preferences will be retained for next year. We hope that by having your records on hand we will be able to better identify the right persons to replace people who leave committees, etc. Also, we hope to better spread the committee burden among the faculty. In fact, with Dean Schaller's concurrence, we are now attempting to look at the administrative committees and their membership. We would like to make sure that we have good interaction between those committees and committees of this body.

We also had a box on the committee preference form for "dis-volunteering" and a number of you took advantage of this option to express your lack of enthusiasm for service on certain of the committees. I won't identify the individual committees publicly but 25 faculty said they would not serve on one committee, and another 28 said they would not serve on another committee. This information is also useful. Most of the people who said they would not serve on a particular committee identified some other committees which they would like to serve on. Knowing both your likes and dislikes is very useful as we try to put together the committee structures. Overall, I think there were 184 people who volunteered to serve on committees and gave their committee preferences.

We have also looked at attendance, both at committee meetings and in this Faculty Council. To this point, attendance at the Faculty Council is about 60%, which compares favorably with most elected bodies. The overall winners in the high attendance category are the deans. I think that deserves mention. Of the faculty, there are 11 people who have been here in person every time. The numbers show that the School of Nursing faculty has the closest-to-perfect attendance, with an average attendance of 86 percent. I think that is a compliment to them and deserves to be made public. There are four people who have been elected to this body who, for reasons known best to them, have not seen the interior of this chamber this year and have never even sent an alternate. We might be better off if they don't see it next year either. If they do come, at least they won't be prejudiced by a knowledge of what is going on.

I think you know that the President has appointed a Task Force on University Organization as we have mentioned here before. The chairman of this committee is Robert Bareikis who is Associate Professor of Germanic Studies and co-chair of the University Faculty Council this year. Serving on the Task Force from

this campus are Miriam Langsam, Jim Faris and me. Bob has asked to speak to our Faculty Council (and the others around the system) before the Task Force formally begins its work, which will largely be taken up during the summer months. We have scheduled him to speak at our last meeting of the year which will be held on May 2. A portion of that meeting will be devoted to the Task Force on University Reorganization. Although it has not been widely announced in the media, a resource group for the Task Force was also appointed by President Ryan. These are persons who are knowledgeable about the current organizational structure of the University. These are: Executive Vice President George Pinnell, Executive Dean Howard Schaller, Professor Emeritus York Willbern, the Chair of the 1974 Reorganization Task Force, and Vice President for Administration, Edgar Williams.

Finally, the last item I have regards the standing committee reports that were due March 29. We have received a number of them but not all of them. The reports will appear with the minutes of the last meeting of the Faculty Council, probably dated in order of their receipt.

That is all I have. Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM V

Nominating Committee Report

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is the Nominating Committee Report from Pat Blake.

PROF. BLAKE: Thank you. It is time to present the last slate of the year to you. You will be electing in May the following committees: Executive, Nominating, and Tenure Committee. The ballot for these committees was read and appears below.

NOMINEES FOR MEMBERS TO BE ELECTED AT MAY IUPUI FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING

Executive Committee

Vote for four (4) only

Jean Gnat, Libraries
Eugene Helveston, Medicine
Monroe Little, Jr., Liberal Arts
Gerald Powers, Social Work
Shirley Quate, Journalism

Nominating Committee

Vote for three (3) only

Jacqueline Blackwell, Education
Robert Harris, Medicine
Rebecca Markel, Nursing
Kathryn Wilson, Science

Tenure Committee

Vote for three (3) only

Patricia Blake, Nursing
James Edmondson, Medicine
LaForrest Garner, Dentistry
Christian Kloesel, Liberal Arts
Elizabeth Navarre, Social Work
Edward Robbins, Education

The Executive Committee and Nominating Committee must come from the Faculty Council membership. The Tenure Committee is chosen campus wide from all tenured faculty.

AGENDA ITEM VI

Standing Committee Reports and Recommendations

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: The next item is standing committee reports and recommendations. Since there are none to bring forward now, I will entertain any other business we should consider.

PROF. CUTSHALL: Are there any reports back yet from the Fringe Benefits Committee?

PROF. BESCH: Yes. We have talked with Miriam Langsam about making a report here. She is reporting on April 23 at the University Faculty Council meeting. The University has just received a study on projected costs to implement the proposed changes in the 18/20 rule, and in the long term disability funding. We could ask Miriam to come to the May meeting. We had thought about doing that anyway, but since you've asked, we'll try extra hard to get it on the agenda.

PROF. KOLESKI: What is the purpose of the University Task Force?

PROF. BESCH: Rather than paraphrase that, I brought a copy of the letter from President John Ryan. It states: "The purpose of the Task Force is: (1) to review the fundamental objectives and policies which undergird our present University organization; (2) to consider the essential functions which must be performed in carrying out those policies and objectives, and, (3) study and evaluate our present organization having regard to circumstances and functions which may have arisen or changed since 1974, or which may be anticipated in the next decade or so."

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: Is there any other business?

AGENDA ITEM VII

Adjournment

VICE PRESIDENT IRWIN: We are adjourned.

[4/4/1985]

** PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF VENUE AND TIME **

ANNOUNCEMENT OF
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Faculty Council Meeting

THURSDAY, May 2, 1985

Union Building Cafeteria 3:00 P.M. - 4:10 P.M.

I. Memorial Resolutions

Frederick O. Martin, Associate Professor Emeritus of Physical
Education - read by Jeffery Vessely [IUPUI Circular 84/85-017]

David K. Rubins, Professor Emeritus, Herron School of Art
- read by Dean Arthur Weber [IUPUI Circular 84/85-018]

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 4, 1985 meeting.

III. Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

IV. Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

Elections of Executive, Nominating, and Tenure Committee members
Elections Committee: John Chalian, Jeff Vessely, Pat Blake, Joe DiMicco

V. Discussion on Task Force on University Organization - Robert P.
Bareikis, Chair

VI. Report of Fringe Benefits Committee - Miriam Langsam
Revisions of 18/20 Rule; Long-term Disability Policy

VII. Athletic Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh Wolf

VIII. Election results (HRB) *2 Sec

IX. Adjournment

Jeff Vessely

discard
destroy ballots

ANNUAL JOINT SPRING FACULTY / STAFF MEETING

Union Building Cafeteria/4:15 P.M.

VICE PRESIDENT'S RECOGNITION AWARDS CEREMONY

Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

VIII. NEW BASS:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS

Minutes of the Faculty Council Meeting

May 2, 1985

3:00 P.M. Union Building Cafeteria

MEMBERS PRESENT: Administration: Executive Dean Howard Schaller. Deans: Patricia Boaz, Gerald L. Bepko, Charles F. Bonser, Walter J. Daly, Barbara Fischler, Elizabeth Grossman, Ralph E. McDonald, William M. Plater, R. Bruce Renda, Sheldon Siegel, Arthur Weber, Marshall Yovits. Faculty: Henry Besch, Jr., Angenieta Biegel, Patricia Blake, Charles Blevins, Frances Brahmi, Zacharie Brahmi, Edwin Brown, Charlotte Carley, David Crabb, Theodore Cutshall, Donna Dial, Ian Dowdeswell, Paul Galanti, Donald Gartner, Jean Gnat, Vania Goodwin, Jean Hutten, Thomas Jones, Betsy Joyce, Henry Karlson, Linda Kasper, Suetta Kehrein, Ray Koleski, Joseph Kuczowski, Juanita Laidig, Gerald McHugh, Richard Pflanzner, Rebecca Porter, Shirley Quate, Mitchell Rhodes, Neal Rothman, Ramsis Salama, James Shanks, Jay Simon, Ernest Smith, Elizabeth Solow, Marie Sparks, Jeffery Vessely, Lawrence Wheeler, Harriett Wilkins, George Willis, Charles Yokomoto.

Student Representative Present: Stephen Akard, Student Body President.

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Hugh Wolf for Howard Mehlinger; Georgia B. Miller for Jack Wentworth; Myra Mason for LaForrest Garner; Ed Robbins for Ruth Holland; Joe DiMicco for Donald Kettelkamp; Mary A. Feeley for Jeanne Mueller; Elton Ridley for Erna Simek.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Administration: Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr. Deans: Nicholas Kellum, James Weigand. Faculty: C. Aliprantis, S. Allen, R. Appledorn, P. Bendick, D. Bixler, I. Brandt, V. Chalian, Mervyn Cohen, Michael Cohen, R. Dilley, K. Dunipace, J. Eble, J. Edmondson, C. Ellinger, N. Fineberg, M. Glant, G. Gruver, A. Haas, C. Hutton, L. Hutton, W. Kulsrud, B. Lyon, S. Mannheimer, O. Markand, L. McCarthy, F. Meiere, L. Padilla, C. Palmer, M. Passo, F. Rhone, P. Shea, J. Shipps, A. Sondhi, R. Turner, R. Wall, V. Wallis, K. Wilson, R. Woodham.

AGENDA ITEM I

Memorial Resolutions

DEAN SCHALLER: Good afternoon. Dr. Irwin has been called to a Trustees' committee meeting this afternoon and he has asked me to preside. There are two memorial resolutions this afternoon. The first one is for Frederick O. Martin, Associate Professor of Emeritus of Physical Education. This will be read by Jeffery Vessely. [IUPUI Circular 84/85-017]

PROF. VESSELY: With your permission, rather than reading this resolution in its entirety, I will highlight it. The complete version will be printed in the minutes. [Professor Vessely read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed].

DEAN SCHALLER: The next memorial resolution is for David K. Rubins, Professor Emeritus, Herron School of Art. This will be read by Dean Arthur Weber. [IUPUI Circular 84/85-108] [Dean Weber read the memorial resolution and a moment of silence was observed].

AGENDA ITEM II

Approval of the Minutes of April 4, 1985

DEAN SCHALLER: The next item is the approval of the minutes of the April 4, 1985 minutes. Do I

hear a motion to approve? [So moved] Is there a second? [Seconded] Is there any discussion? Hearing none, I'll call for the vote. All of those in favor of approving the minutes, please signify so by saying "Aye". Opposed, by saying "Nay". The minutes are approved.

AGENDA ITEM III

Presiding Officer's Business - Vice President Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D.

DEAN SCHALLER: We won't have any Presiding Officer's Business today, obviously, since Vice President Irwin is not here. The main thing that he was to have done this afternoon which he will very much miss doing would be to present the awards immediately following this meeting. I will be doing this on his behalf.

AGENDA ITEM IV

Executive Committee Report - H. R. Besch, Jr., Secretary

DEAN SCHALLER: I will now turn the meeting over to Henry Besch for the Executive Committee report.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. The main item to be brought to you from the Executive Committee is the election of the Executive, Nominating, and Tenure Committees' new members. The Election Committee consisting of John Chalian, Jeff Vessely, Pat Blake, and Joe DiMicco had been scheduled to carry out the balloting. Substituting for John Chalian, who is unable to be here because he is at a meeting of the American Dental Association downtown, is a familiar face and friend of the Council, Glen Sagraves. We can proceed with the elections while we carry out the other business of the Executive Committee.

As a follow up to some comments we have made at an earlier meeting of the Council, I wanted to report to you that at the University Faculty Council meeting held earlier this month there was to have been a vote on several resolutions to amend the statements on interpersonal relations in the Academic Code of Ethics that appear in the Faculty Handbook. A number of people called the Faculty Council Office and commented on these resolutions. In general, I think the comments about the resolutions could be considered unfavorable -- not to the idea of specifying that certain behaviors are contrary to good sense but to the specific wording of the resolutions. Someone said that they applauded the spirit of the resolutions but the flesh was weak. I feel that it is important to report to you that the resolutions were considered at the UFC meeting, and after some debate, were committed to the Agenda Committee for consideration by the individual campus Faculty Councils. Among the principle reasons for recommitting these resolutions to the Agenda Committee was that they had previously been considered only by the Bloomington Faculty Council and not other councils and senates of the IU system. The resolutions will be coming to this Council in the fall for comments. Since they involve intimate personal relationships between people, they are serious indeed, but nevertheless, lend themselves to a great deal of humorous comments. We should not pass the opportunity of allowing our faculty to show their erudition and have this appear in the records of this body. After we have considered and commented on the resolutions this fall, the University Faculty Council is to consider them at its first spring meeting next year.

I need not tell you that this is the last meeting of the Faculty Council this year. I would like to take a moment to offer you my appreciation for having been allowed to serve as your Secretary this year. The task has been lighter than it might have been due to the excellent assistance I have gotten this year. I especially want to thank the other members of the Executive Committee including John Chalian, Jean Gnat, Lucreda Hutton, Brenda Lyon, Steve Mannheimer, Richard Turner, Jeff Vessely and Charles Yokomoto. Of those, I think you know that Steve Mannheimer, Richard Turner, and Charles Yokomoto will not be serving on the Executive Committee next year; their terms have ended. We will miss their help. I wish to thank Executive Dean Howard Schaller and Vice President Glenn Irwin, who

also serve on the Executive Committee. We all owe them a great deal of thanks for their support of Faculty Council activities, and for their many good ideas. I would be remiss if I did not formally thank Bernice Chunley. A special note of thanks is also due to the secretaries at my own office, Betty Rode and Kathy Johnson, who have helped in many, many ways with the IUPUI Faculty Council business. Henry Karlson deserves special thanks for needleing me, and keeping me on my toes. I would also thank Bob Bareikis, the co-chair of the University Faculty Council, and also the UFC's Ellen Pettay. Bob has been very helpful in increasing my awareness of how the UFC operates. That is a body which functions quite differently from our Council, and I needed some enlightenment from time to time.

I am sure I have missed thanking some very important hard working people, but, if I listed everyone, we would never get home tonight. So, thanks collectively to all of these other folks as well.

I have a few other items of Faculty Council Executive Committee business to bring to you. With the variety of building activities that are going on around campus, the Faculty Affairs Committee has organized an effort to assess our interest in a Faculty Club. We have talked about such a club in the past in this Faculty Council, but in less constructive times, the costs for building a special Faculty Club have simply been prohibitive. In the current construction boom around the campus, there now seems to be a possibility, at least, that the faculty and librarians at IUPUI might be able to have a specific room in one of the new buildings that would be designated for their use. The Faculty Affairs Committee's proposal is that such a room would be perhaps in the new hotel complex that will be located east of the University Hospital and north of Cavanaugh Hall. Obtaining space for this designation is dependent upon amount of interest shown by the faculty and librarians supporting use of this room. For this then, the Faculty Affairs Committee, chaired by Byron Olson, Secretary Susan Zunt, and also with considerable input from Henry Wellman, have devised a short survey instrument which they will be circulating to you soon. I did want, at this time, to take a straw vote here, to see if there would be any interest in such a thing. I would like to have a straw vote to the question, "Would you be in favor of forming a faculty/librarian organization or club?" Please hold up your hand if you would. It looks like most of you would be.

DEAN YOVITS: Do you plan to have a branch on 38th Street?

PROF. BESCH: No, we plan to move 38th Street campus down here. Vice President Irwin is working on it. The second question: What maximum amount of annual dues would you be willing to pay? There are several slots to check off an amount on the form that will be circulated. I wondered if we might have a straw vote about a single number. Would you be willing to pay \$50 on an annual basis for such a club or facility? You are not committed since we are not taking names. (After a show of hands, it appeared to be about the same number of people as before.) Thank you.

There are two matters regarding student activities that I would like to bring to your attention. The first concerns the results of the recent student election. Steve Akard, whom we met last time, will tell us about those results.

STEVE AKARD: My stay with the Faculty Council has been relatively short but I want you to know how much I have enjoyed it. Your student body representative for next year will be Martin Dragonette, Student Assembly President, a junior majoring in Psychology. The Student Assembly Vice President will be Armita Anoushiravani, a sophomore from the medical school. Thanks again for the last two months of my membership with this Council.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Steve, for the report and for your outstanding service as President. For the next item, although I haven't forwarned Dean Boaz, I would now ask her to comment briefly on a major distinction one of our students has just received — the Harry Truman Award.

DEAN BOAZ: I mentioned to Henry earlier that one of our students has received this highly competitive award. The student's name will be made public in an appropriate ceremony. At this point, I will simply report that the selection of one of IUPUI's students for this honor should be a source of pride for the faculty.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you Pat, very much. That ends the Executive Committee Report.

AGENDA ITEM V

Discussion on Task Force on University Organization - Robert P. Bareikis, Chair

DEAN SCHALLER: The next item on the agenda concerns the Task Force on University Organization, which President Ryan appointed recently. Bob Bareikis, the Secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council and co-secretary, along with Henry Besch, of the University Faculty Council, was appointed chairman of that Task Force. He was to have been here today to give you a report on that, but is unable to do so. Henry Besch will give the report for Bob. Henry has been working with the President and with Bob in establishing this committee, so I think Henry is as much up to date on it as Bob. At this point, I will ask Henry to give you a report.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you. Bob Bareikis did very much want to be here today. As you will see in the remarks that I will read from him, he was called by the President to another meeting and could not come here today. I will read to you a statement from Bob and then, if there are any questions or comments, I will be happy to have them. I hope that I will be able to capture the flavor of what Bob wanted to convey to you but I don't have his Bostonian accent. I hope you will forgive the loss of flavor that will inevitably occur as I just read Bob's statement. The text will appear as IUPUI Circular 84/85-109 attached to the minutes of this meeting. [The statement was read].

There are other pressing matters on today's agenda, but if you have comments or questions that you feel need to be made now, they could be taken. If not, thank you very much. I will include the complete committee membership list in the minutes of this meeting.

[Secretary's note: The other members of the Task Force on University Organization are: Mr. Robert L. Cochran, Director of Administration and Assistant to the Vice President, IUB; Professor Michael C. Downs, Associate Professor of Political Science, IPFW; Professor James V. Faris, Associate Professor of Radiology, IUPUI; Professor Donald J. Gray, Professor of English; Professor Miriam Z. Langsam, Professor of History, IUPUI; Mr. Michael A. Kristoff, Student Government President, IUNW; Professor John D. Long, Chairperson of Insurance and Real Estate, IUB; Professor Karl O'Lessker, Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs, IUB; Mr. Ron Rawald, President of the Student Body, IUB; Professor Mary L. Remley, Associate Professor of Physical Education, IUB; and, Professor Philip Rutledge, Director of the Division of Public and Environmental Affairs, IUNW.]

DEAN SCHALLER: We are due to adjourn at 4:10. As a matter of courtesy to the staff who will be joining us at 4:15 for the annual faculty/staff meeting, we must adjourn at 4:10 to allow time to prepare the room and be ready to start at 4:15. I ask the next two people on the agenda to telescope their remarks a bit and keep them brief. I can assure both of them that, if there is a need for more attention to these items, the Executive Committee would consider putting them on the agenda at the first meeting in the fall. With that, I will ask Miriam Langsam to give us her report on the Fringe Benefits Committee.

AGENDA ITEM VI**Report of Fringe Benefits Committee - Miriam Langsam**

PROF. LANGSAM: The Fringe Benefits Committee made recommendations for a change in the 18/20 rule, as well as some recommendations for changes in disability benefits. Before forwarding these recommended changes to the administration, the University was required to go to an outside consultant to get some projections on costs. The report is now back. It arrived just about one week into the hectic budgetary period. The President has looked at it but has not come to any decision. The change that would permit invoking the 18/20 rule at age 64 instead of 65 looks good on initial examination (but we are already doing that basically through the Exceptions Committee). The disability proposal doesn't look quite so good financially. We put in a proviso that, if at any point, that change would cost more than 0.6 percent of the Personnel budget for fringe benefits, it should go back to the UFC for further consideration. We are still looking at the figures. No further action has taken place. It might take effect in the fall, but not until the President looks at it and the Trustees make a decision after his recommendation. Thank you.

DEAN SCHALLER: Very good, Miriam. Thank you. The next report is from the Athletic Advisory Committee, and will be presented by Dean Hugh Wolf.

AGENDA ITEM VII**Athletics Advisory Committee Report - Dean Hugh Wolf**

DEAN WOLF: I am on your agenda today to comply with a document that was approved three or four years ago by the University Faculty Council which requires that each campus Athletics Advisory Committee report annually to the Faculty Council. I am going to do that by handing this report to your Secretary and asking that it be recorded in the minutes. Thank you. (The report appears as IUPUI Circular 84/85-020, attached).

DEAN SCHALLER: We might run out of material before 4:10. Let me say that we had an excellent year in intercollegiate athletics. I think that the coaches and staff are very much to be congratulated. We have had a number of successes on the playing fields, and a large number of young people have had the opportunity to compete and develop their skills. At the same time, I might say, they maintained grade point averages at the general student body level. Hugh, I hope you will convey the faculty's appreciation to Dean Kellum and Coach Lovell and the other coaches.

AGENDA ITEM VIII**New Business**

DEAN SCHALLER: We come now to New Business. The new business that we have to transact at this point is to announce the results of the elections. I will let Henry do that.

PROF. BESCH: Thank you, Howard. The winners are:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Jean Gnat, Monroe Little, Gerald Powers, Shirley Quate.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Jacqueline Blackwell, Rebecca Markel, Kathryn Wilson.

TENURE COMMITTEE: Patricia Blake, LaForrest Garner, Edward Robbins.

Since we do have a moment, may I close by extending my thanks to the chairs and secretaries of the standing committees that really do the work of the Faculty Council. Finally, I would like to congratulate IUPUI on a very successful year. It has certainly been a busy one. We have welcomed Dean Sheldon Siegel; we have said "so long" to Dean Ralph McDonald. We have allowed Art Weber to return to the classroom and to the studio. I have probably forgotten some people but those are some highlights that come to mind.

MARIE SPARKS: Having been on the Nominating Committee, it is appropriate to ask who received the highest number of votes and will therefore be the chair in the second year?

PROF. BESCH: That will be Rebecca Markel.

DEAN SCHALLER: At this time, with the election completed, we need a motion to destroy the ballots. [Dean Grossman made the motion] Is there a second? [Seconded by Marie Sparks]. Is there any discussion regarding destroying the ballots? Hearing none, I will call for your vote. All of those in favor of destroying the ballots, please say "Aye". Is anybody opposed to destroying the ballots? There is no opposition to destroying the ballots. The ballots will be destroyed.

We do have a minute or two if there are any new business items you would like to bring before the Faculty Council.

PROF. BESCH: The next Faculty Council meeting will be September 5, 1985.

DEAN SCHALLER: This is the last Faculty Council meeting which Arthur Weber will be attending as Dean. Ralph McDonald was not able to be here today. I would like to say to them on behalf of the Faculty Council, that their service as deans and as members of this body has been greatly appreciated. I will ask the Secretary to make sure that the minutes reflect our very best wishes to them.

AGENDA ITEM IX

Adjournment

DEAN SCHALLER: This meeting is adjourned. We will reassemble in five minutes for the annual Faculty/Staff meeting.